



Terms of Reference

Joint Evaluation of Joint Programmes on Gender Equality

1. Background

In July 1997, the Secretary-General of the United Nations launched a reform agenda to create a more effective and efficient UN.¹ This led to the creation of the UN Development Group (UNDG), whose aim is to coordinate, harmonize and align UN development activities, particularly at the country level in order to deliver more coherent, effective and efficient support to governments.² Common Country Assessments (CCA) and UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAF) were developed to support this effort and were intended to promote joint programming among UN agencies. Joint programmes were seen as a relevant means to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the UN system by harnessing the comparative advantages of agencies in a coordinated manner.

The importance of joint programming for UN reform efforts was reiterated by the Secretary-General in 2002 and again in November 2006 when the Secretary General's High Level Panel on System-Wide Coherence in the Areas of Development, Humanitarian Assistance and the Environment (HLP)³ released its report, which launched the Delivering as One (DaO) initiative to further UN reform at the country level.⁴ That same year, the Government of Spain established the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) that provided US\$ 705 million to improve UN effectiveness mainly by providing additional resources for joint programming to promote more coherent UN support for MDGs at the country level, including a specific programmatic window on gender equality and women's empowerment. In 2008, UN General Assembly T CPR Resolution emphasized the importance of joint programming urging the United Nations development system "to fully utilize such opportunities in the interest of enhancing aid

¹ Secretary General Report *Renewing the United Nations: A Program for Reform: Measures and Proposals* 1997.

² UNDG website

³ Delivering as One, Report of the Secretary-General's High Level Panel on System-wide Coherence in the Areas of Development, Humanitarian Assistance and the Environment (A/61/583)

⁴ Delivering as One, Report of the Secretary-General's High Level Panel on System-wide Coherence in the Areas of Development, Humanitarian Assistance and the Environment (A/61/583)

efficiency and aid effectiveness”⁵. These developments led to an increase in the overall number of joint programmes initiated, including those with specific objectives on gender equality and women’s empowerment. At the same time, the HLP’s Delivering as One report⁶ also found that despite the UN system’s key role in supporting governments to achieve gender equality and women’s empowerment, its contributions in this area had been incoherent, under-resourced and fragmented. It concluded that a gender entity within the UN system needed to be created to give a stronger voice to women’s issues and to more vigorously pursue gender equality and women’s empowerment. General Assembly resolutions in 2009⁷ and 2011⁸ also emphasized the need to enhance accountability of the UN system on gender equality and women’s empowerment. This led to the creation of UN Women in 2011, with a mandate to lead and promote coherence in the UN system on gender equality and coordinate the overall efforts of the UN system to support the full realization of women’s rights and opportunities.⁹ The Government of Spain and Government of Norway, which are participating in this evaluation, took a very active role in supporting the work on gender equality and women’s empowerment and the establishment of UN Women within the process on United Nations reform.

Joint programmes on gender equality and women’s empowerment (JGPs)¹⁰ is a key means to this end. Yet, to date, there have been limited assessments of joint programmes in general and on JGPs specifically, despite the need to better understand the value of joint programming for achieving results on gender equality and women’s empowerment and how to improve upon current joint programmes modalities and processes to improve performance. A Joint Nordic Independent Assessment of CCA/UNDAF in 2001 highlighted several barriers to joint programming including lack of clarity, guidance and the administrative systems of individual agencies.¹¹ In 2006 UNDG assessment of 160 joint programmes found that “they did not exploit their potential to mainstream gender equality and that gender was an area that could be more deeply integrated into implementation when UN agencies work together”. Furthermore, a joint evaluation of the UNDG contribution to the implementation of the Paris Declaration Principles on Aid Effectiveness concluded in 2007, *inter alia*, that the mainstreaming of gender equality had been limited in the face of general reform and programming requirements to comply with UN coherence/aid effectiveness.

⁵ UN A /Res/62/208 Triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations

⁶ Delivering as One, Report of the Secretary-General’s High Level Panel on System-wide Coherence in the Areas of Development, Humanitarian Assistance and the Environment (A/61/583)

⁷ United Nations General Assembly Resolution United Nations 63/31163/311, “System-wide coherence”, 2009

⁸ United Nations General Assembly Resolution 65/191, “Follow-up to the Fourth World Conference on Women and full implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the outcome of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly”, 2011

⁹ Please see General Assembly Resolution 64/289

¹⁰ The acronym JGP (joint gender programme) is used throughout the TOR as a simplification for “joint programmes on gender equality and women’s empowerment”.

¹¹ Ljungman, C et al. *Laying the Keystone of UN Development Reform: the Joint Nordic Assessment of the CCA/UNDAF Process*. COWI A/S 2001.

In addition, while a number of corporate level gender evaluations have been undertaken by individual UN agencies in the last decade, they have focused on gender mainstreaming *within* UN agencies, and less on the achievement (or lack of) results on gender equality and women's empowerment at the country level.

In recognition of this gap in evaluative information on JGPs and its specific mandate to evaluate JGPs, in 2010 the Evaluation Unit of the former United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) conducted a scan and developed a database of JGPs in which UNIFEM partnered. The transition to UN Women the following year provided further impetus and opportunity for commissioning a joint evaluation of JGPs given its strengthened mandate on this issue.

In 2011, the UN Women Evaluation Office undertook a more comprehensive portfolio analysis of JGPs based on the initial UNIFEM scan as a pre-scoping exercise for the initiation of a joint evaluation on JGPs. It also reached out to UN agencies and donor countries to partner in the

Evaluation in light of the 2002 SG report and GA resolution 62/208 encouraging UN agencies to conduct joint evaluations and given the collaborative nature of JGPs.¹²

Given the above mandates and information gaps on joint programmes and gender equality and women's empowerment in the UN system, a joint evaluation on JGPs is now being commissioned. The eight partners to the joint evaluation include: the United Nations Development Fund for Children (UNICEF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (UN Women), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the Millennium Development Achievement Fund (MDG-F), the United Nations Development Coordination Operations Office (UNDOCO); and the Government of Norway and the Government of Spain.

2. Evaluation Purpose and Use

This evaluation is being undertaken to provide credible and useful evaluative information on the added value of JGPs in enhancing achievement of results on gender equality and women's empowerment through improved UN system coherence and efficiency by using joint design and implementation process.

More specifically, it aims to provide evaluative information for the strategic direction and use of JGPs within the UN system reform process and support future policy and guidance on their design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for a more coordinated and effective UN system contribution to advance gender equality at the country level. It will also be a key input to knowledge management on joint programmes and programmes for gender equality and women's empowerment. Furthermore, the evaluation is expected to provide UN Women with relevant information for an enhanced coordination role on gender equality in the UN system, and to inform a system-wide coordination strategy on gender equality being developed by UN Women and UNDG.

¹² Secretary General's report "Strengthening the United Nations: an Agenda for Further Change" (A/57/387)

The main objectives of the evaluation are to assess, taking into account of local and national circumstances:

- the overall contribution of JPGs to national development results on GE/WE, including intended and unintended results and the efficiency of JPGs in achieving their objectives
- the extent to which JGP objectives and results are relevant to UN and national development goals and policies
- the overall sustainability of JGP results, including the level of national ownership, national capacity development, partnerships between the UN system and national partners, as well as sustainability aspects in programme design and programme exit strategies

- the extent to which JGPs have created synergies that contribute to gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment in UN efforts at the national level
- the overall level of integration of human rights based approaches in JGPs

The main users of the evaluation include UN agencies involved in JGPs - , including their governing bodies, senior management, joint programme managers/focal points and gender advisers – governments of the programme countries and donor countries supporting joint programmes. Senior management partners of the joint evaluation will be specifically responsible for developing management responses and action plans to the evaluation findings and recommendations.

It is expected that the evaluation results will also be of use to the UN High Level Panel for System-Wide Coherence; the preparation of 2012 Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) of UN system operational activities by the General Assembly; the UNDG; the wider community of UN agencies engaging in joint programmes in general; donor and partner countries; and civil society, particularly women's groups and networks; and evaluation networks.

3. Joint Gender Programmes Portfolio

The UNDG defines joint programmes as those that involve two or more UN agencies and/or (sub) national partners. A joint programme is one that is undertaken within the framework of a joint programme document signed by all partners, governed by a joint committee and that adopts an agreed fund management modality. Excluded from this definition are joint events and activities such as conferences and campaigns. In 2003, UNDG developed a Guidance Note on Joint Programmes¹³; this remains the key guidance on joint programmes to date.

¹³UNDG. Finalized Guidance Note on Joint Programming. Retrieved 14 September 2011 from UNDG website/Policy and Guidances: <http://www.undg.org/index.cfm?P=240>

Joint programming in the UN system covers a wide range of areas and sectors of work, including on gender equality and women's empowerment. The *Analytical Overview of the Joint UN Gender Programme Portfolio* (referred to hereafter as the Portfolio Analysis) commissioned by UN Women Evaluation Office in 2011 defined JGPs as those with an explicit objective of empowering women and/or promoting gender equality. This definition excluded joint programmes that mainstream gender equality, but do not have it as a main programmatic goal.

The Portfolio Analysis identified a total of 113 JGPs initiated during the period 2001 – 2010, with a marked increase in the number and size of JGPs from 2006 onwards.¹⁴ From 2001 – 2005, JGPs were relatively modest in terms of number and budget with only 19 JGPs existing during this period with a median planned¹⁵ budget size of US\$320,000. Unfortunately, the reliability of data related to JGPs in the period 2001 – 2005 is low due to the fact that it was not possible to find signed programme document and verify their initiation. Therefore, the Portfolio Analysis focused its analysis mainly on 94 JGPs initiated from 2006 – 2010, for which there is reliability based on signed programme documents.¹⁶

The period 2006 – 2010 saw an increase in JGPs with a total of 94 JGPs identified with a median planned budget of US\$2.1 million. The increase in JGPs after 2006 may be attributed to key developments in UN reform including:

- Harmonisation of accounting standards, business practices and human resources management
- Further alignment of the UNDAFs both with national processes and among UN agencies
- Initiation of the MDG-Fund, which specifically provided funding for joint programmes¹⁷
- Delivering as One (DaO) piloted in eight countries (Albania, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Pakistan, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uruguay and Vietnam)
- Paris Declaration which spurred interest in and commitment to “jointness” among some countries and UN agencies.

Overall, during the period 2006 – 2010, JGPs were initiated in 61 countries, with 17 countries having two or more JGPs. The largest number of JGPs is found in Africa (29), followed by Latin America and Caribbean (26) region, Asia Pacific (17), Arab States (13) and Europe and Central Asia (8). Of these, six were regional programmes and only 1 global JGP was identified. Likewise, planned budget size followed a similar pattern with the largest allocations to JGPs in Africa (US\$

¹⁴ UN Women was able to identify only 113 JGPs during this period; however, this does not exclude the possibility that additional JGPs may exist that were not reported: a comprehensive database on UN joint programmes or JGPs does not currently exist.

¹⁵ The database developed in the framework of the development of the Portfolio Analysis contains information on both the planned budget of each JGP and the funded budget at the time the programme document was signed. Since just over 50 percent of the JGPs were fully funded from the start, these figures are the same for many JGPs. The difference between these two figures (the funding gap) differs from JGP to JGP but is on average 28 percent. It is important to note that unless the programme is fully funded, both figures are indicative. The team did not collect data on the current funding situation of the JGPs.

¹⁶ While there is reliability related to information in signed programme documents, it is important to note that this information may not be accurate or updated in terms of resources, fund management, duration, etc., which may have changed since programme initiation.

¹⁷ The MDG-Fund has provided funding to 128 joint programmes in 49 countries; 14 of these are considered JGPs.

254M), followed by LAC (US\$ 66M), Asia & Pacific (US\$ 66M), Arab States (US\$ 54M) and Europe and Central Asia (US\$ 8M).

JGPs focusing on ending violence against women and girls (EVAW) and Governance make up the largest segment of the portfolio; however, EVAW JGPs make up almost one-third (27%) of the aggregated planned financial value of the JGP portfolio, while governance JGPs only account for 13% of the total. Other themes identified among JGPs include economic empowerment, health, education, trafficking, and HIV/AIDS, which combined make up 30% of the portfolio and only 27% of the aggregate planned financial value of the portfolio. Multi-sectoral JGPs are only 11% of the portfolio, but they have large budgets that account for 33% of the aggregated planned financial value of the JGP portfolio. Only 5 JGPs representing 4 thematic areas have objectives with a conflict-related angle, but another 8 JGPs are located in conflict countries.

Twenty-four different UN entities have participated in JGPs, with UNFPA, UNDP, UN Women (formerly UNIFEM) and UNICEF participating in over 60 JGPs each and UNDP, UNFPA and UN Women most often acting as lead agency. The majority of JGPs are made up of 3 to 4 participating UN agencies with one-third having more than 5 and some involving over 11 agencies.

JGPs are mainly financed by core funds from the participating UN agencies, 62% to 72% of the JGPs from 2006 to 2010, and amounts to over US\$ 98 million. The MDG Fund is the largest non-core source of funding contributing approximately US\$ 90 million for 14 JGPs. Other trust funds, bilateral contributions and financial and in-kind contributions by national governments account for the remaining resources available for JGPs.

The Portfolio Analysis provides more in-depth quantitative and qualitative information on the JGPs, including information related to funding modalities, planned programme timeframes, findings from evaluations of JGPs and potential areas of inquiry for scoping of any future evaluation.

4. Evaluation Scope

This evaluation will provide an assessment of JGPs within the UN system, defined as those joint programmes with a specific and explicit objective related to gender equality and/or women's empowerment.

Taking into account the information collected in the Portfolio Analysis and the timeframe and resources available, the study will be carefully designed to ensure assessment of a sample of the 94 JGPs identified during the period 2006 – 2010 on which to base its findings, conclusions

and recommendations. This selection of timeframe is based on the high reliability and completeness of data on JGPs during this period and the need to reflect a number of contextual changes for joint programming that began in 2007 (e.g. initiation of DAO pilots, MDG-Fund, Paris Declaration, etc.).

Given the relatively small size of the portfolio of JGPs and the resources available for the study, the sample selection will not follow a randomized approach, but will be purposeful and allow for a level of comparison and lessons learned based on specific characteristics. Sampling will be based on specific criteria agreed by key stakeholders in order to ensure an adequate basis to emit evaluative judgments and conclusions. The initial criteria to select the sample for scoping the study are listed below and will be reviewed and further refined by the evaluation team to ensure a robust evaluation design.

- ***Geographic level of intervention.*** JGPs implemented at the country level, given the high number and inherent emphasis of joint programming at the country level; regional and global programmes (6% of JGPs identified in the portfolio analysis) will not be included in the assessment
- ***Country Context.*** JGPs undertaken in a range of development, conflict/post-conflict, fragile states, and middle-income countries to capture the existing diversity of country contexts. It could be of special interest of this evaluation to include at least one Arab country due to the specific context of the Arab Spring and current political developments.
- ***DAO country.*** The purposeful sampling will include at least one DAO country to explore how the context of DAO affects the results and implementation of JGPs.
- ***Duration.*** JGPs that will have at least 2 – 3 years of implementation at the time of the evaluation and were initiated no later than 2008 and priority will be given to the initiatives with at least 3 years of implementation.
- ***Regional characteristics.*** JGPs spanning the five geographic areas (Africa, Asia & Pacific, Arab States, Europe and Central Asia, and Latin America and Caribbean) to capture regional specificities related to gender issues, programmes on gender equality and joint programmes. The EMG may also consider to include a regional representation or prioritize the most prominent regions for JGPs (Africa, LAC, Asia Pacific).
- ***Thematic coverage.*** JGPs with a thematic focus related to EVAW, governance, economic empowerment, health and multi-sectoral, given the number and size of investment in these areas; JGPs dealing with Human Trafficking and HIV/AIDs will not be assessed. The EMG may also determine the need to focus only on those

sectoral areas representing those of greatest investment (EVAW, Governance and multi-sectoral).

- ***Governance and funding modalities.*** The selection of sample will take into account the diversity related to programme governance, management and funding modalities and the overall number of partners in any given JGP including national stakeholder participation and leadership.
- ***Financial value.*** JGPs that have a planned budget of US\$1M or above, given the greater expected return on results

5. **Key evaluation issues, questions and criteria**

The selected evaluation criteria and questions are closely informed by the information needs outlined in the Portfolio Analysis based on consultations with a range of stakeholders, past evaluations/reviews and other related documentation.

Overall, of key importance throughout the evaluation is the assessment of the design and quality of JGP “jointness”, particularly within the following strategic priorities and **emerging key issues** identified:

- **Design of JGPs assessing** to what extent have JGPs been conceptualized, planned and designed to respond to international, regional and national commitments on GE/WE and country context factors.
- **Results and added value of JGPs** assessing to what extent and in what ways collaborating in a JGP has enhanced the GE/WE effects achieved by the participating UN agencies and their partners. This includes assessing the contribution to results and operational effectiveness.
- **Sustainability, national level partnerships, ownership and people-centered approaches** and assessing to what extent and in what ways JGPs have contributed to governments meeting their commitments to the Beijing Platform for Action and fulfilled their obligations towards women’s and girl’s human rights; while also supporting rights-holders to demand their rights
- **Synergies between JGPs and other UN efforts** and assessing to what extent and in what ways JGPs have contributed to improved gender equality mainstreaming and women’s empowerment in other UN programmes and efforts at country level

More detailed corresponding questions are included in the **Matrix of Evaluation Questions** included in Annex 2. The study will answer the following **key overarching questions** responding to the strategic priorities and emerging issues identified in the portfolio analysis.

- i. To what extent have JGPs been conceptualized, planned and designed jointly to respond to international, regional and national commitments on GE/WE; to establish coherence and capitalize on the comparative advantages of participating UN agencies; and to integrate a HRBA to programming?
- ii. What are the key contributions and added value in terms of short and long term, intended and unintended, positive and negative GE/WE results achieved by JGPs to date at the national level?
- iii. What is the influence of the specific country context and circumstances (conflict/ post conflict, fragile state, DAO country) on the achievement of JGPs results and operational effectiveness?
- iv. Have JGPs led to improved efficiency in the management of resources and what has been the relationship between increased/decreased efficiency and (potential) results on GE/WE? Do certain levels or models of “jointness” lead to better GE/WE results?
- v. Have JGPs strengthened national ownership through the participation and inclusion of national governments and civil society groups in their programming process and what were the related challenges and opportunities specific to JGPs?
- vi. Is there any measurable impact of JGPs both at the national level and in terms of UN system processes?
- vii. To what extent and how have JGPs led to complementary and synergistic effects on broader UN efforts to achieve GE/WE (e.g. enhanced collaboration and coordination among UNCTs, improved UN programming on GE/WE, enhanced gender mainstreaming etc.)?

The evaluation criteria that will frame the assessment of JGPs are outlined below:

- **Relevance/coherence** of the planning, design and implementation processes of JGPs to international, regional and national commitments, policies and priorities; aid effectiveness principles; UN mandates and UNDAFs, and individual agency policies, mandates and comparative advantages in terms of their responsiveness and alignment with country needs on GE/WE.
- **Effectiveness and impact** of JGPs in achieving their stated objectives on GE/WE and any intended or unintended long-term effects at the national level and for gender mainstreaming within the UN system, including the use of innovative approaches

- **Participation and inclusion** of national duty-bearers and rights-holders – specifically those most marginalized – in JGPs processes
- **Sustainability** of the results of JGPs given the level of national ownership generated, effective partnerships established and national capacity strengthened through JGP processes
- **Efficiency** increases and/or decreases specific to JGPs and their relationship to the (expected) achievement of both short and long term results on gender equality and women’s empowerment

Additional evaluation criteria may be introduced following the final scope of JGPs for review.

6. Information sources

The Evaluation Team will have access to a number of information sources compiled in preparation for the evaluation study, including a document repository of the 113 JGPs identified through the Portfolio Analysis (currently the most complete database of its kind for JGPs); 4 final evaluations, 12 mid-term evaluations and 4 reviews of JGPs undertaken from 2006 – 2011; 31 interviews with gender experts, evaluation specialists and others engaged in joint programming in both headquarters and field offices; and a number of relevant UN General Assembly and ECOSOC resolutions and reports to the Secretary-General and governing bodies of UN agencies.

The full report “Analytical Overview of Joint UN Gender Programme Portfolio” (UN Women, 2011) will be made available to the evaluation team and will act as a key source of information for determining the characteristics of the universe of JGPs identified provide a better understanding of the subject of analysis and ensure adequate focus on the information needs of stakeholders. Additional information will be gathered by partner agencies to fill existing information gaps prior to the start of the evaluation. For instance, the MDG fund will be undertaking a number of evaluations of JGPs in 2011 and will contribute to this evaluation with data sources. Furthermore, this evaluation will identify any evaluation efforts undertaken by partner agencies to avoid the duplication and ensure synergies in data collection.

In summary, the sources of information available include, but are not limited to: the UN Women Analytical Overview of Joint UN Gender Programme Portfolio; signed programme documents of identified JGPs; reports of identified JGPs; 20 reviews, mid-term and final evaluations of JGPs; DAO evaluations undertaken in 2010; 2006 UNDG review of joint programmes; evaluations of gender equality policies/mainstreaming in the UN system; UNDAFs and CCAs; and UNDG and agency guidance and reports on joint programming and/or gender equality and documents related to UN reform processes.¹⁸

¹⁸ A meta-evaluation of 11 JGPs funded by the MDG-F will also be available in 2011.

It should be noted that information on JGPs is not consolidated and scattered among different sources; therefore, proposals should consider that additional time and effort may be required for data gathering.

7. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The evaluation will be utilization-focused, gender and human rights responsive and follow a mixed methods approach. These complementary approaches will be deployed to ensure that the study:

- responds to the needs of users and their intended use of the evaluation results
- provides both a substantive assessment of GE/WE results of JGPs, while also respecting gender and human rights principles throughout the evaluation process, allowing for the participation and consultation of key stakeholders (rights holders and duty-bearers) to the extent possible
- utilizes both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis methods to enhance triangulation of data and increase overall data quality, validity, credibility and robustness and reduce bias

The evaluation will follow UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN system and abide by UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct and any other relevant ethical codes.

Given the characteristics of the portfolio of JGPs, the methodological design of the study will involve the use of collective case studies. It will have a robust approach to the sampling of programmes and selection of case studies in order to enable an adequate level of comparison and generalization regarding the evaluation criteria. The creative use of a counterfactual to assess the difference between “joint” programme modality versus “single agency” intervention, the “JGPs” versus “regular” joint programmes could also be considered in the methodological design.

The Evaluation Team is expected to outline a detailed and comprehensive evaluation methodology in its Inception Report, including the selected sample of joint programmes to be evaluated. It should allow for the assessment of the range of potential effects of JGPs, including those related to capacity development, empowerment of national stakeholders, potential intangible effects and the added value of working “jointly”. The methodology should explicitly outline how it will integrate a human rights based approach and explore the possibility of utilizing participatory methods for developing case studies. Data should be disaggregated by sex and according to other relevant parameters.

The evaluation process will involve the following steps:

Inception Phase

- The inception phase will involve the development of a work plan and a comprehensive review of key documents including a number (to be determined) of the JGPs programme documents. Individual and focus group discussions will be undertaken by phone or through an inception mission to New York.
- The team will present an analytical framework and develop an Inception Report that may refine the criteria for scoping the evaluation as outlined in Section 4 and will further refine the evaluation criteria, questions and methodology, and determine the sample of JGPs for further in-depth desk review.

Data Collection, Analysis and Report Writing Phase

- The team will conduct a more in-depth desk review of the selected JGPs identified from the inception phase, reviewing relevant programme documentation and conducting phone interviews with key stakeholders. The in-depth desk review will allow for the refinement of selection criteria for 4-6 JGP case studies.
- The team will undertake site visits to develop JGP case studies, which may involve further desk review, interviews, focus group discussions, and the use of surveys.
- Surveys will be administered strategically to collect additional information.
- Preliminary findings PPT/paper will be developed by the team to be shared with key stakeholders and to receive feedback for elaborating the draft and final reports. The team will be present the findings to stakeholders for their validation.

Key elements of the methodology should include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Desk Review

A comprehensive desk review of the key information sources available and cited above will be conducted initially. This will include the JGP documents of the total pool of JGPs identified for inclusion in the study based on the scoping criteria outlined in Section 4.

This will provide the basis for identifying data gaps that need to be remedied and will also inform the further selection of a sample of JGPs for more in-depth study from the overall pool that should strive to include JGPs that:

- are perceived to be innovative
- are considered successful and will likely provide a number of good practices

- are known to have faced challenges
- located in both conflict/post-conflict, developing and middle-income countries
- In DAO countries and those with more than/less than 4 participating agencies
- utilize both national and direct execution
- include a mix of human development and gender equality index levels
- located in countries with gender mainstreaming strategies or have MDG 3 component in their UNDAF
- those that have or will be undergoing evaluation
- are supported by the MDG-Fund

The above parameters shall be further refined by the evaluation team once the initial desk review is conducted.

- In-Depth Interviews

In depth phone and in-person interviews will be conducted with key stakeholders selected during the inception and conduct phases of the evaluation. Attention will be paid to ensuring inclusion of both headquarter and field perspectives.

- Case Studies

A collective case study involving multiple cases will be a key aspect of the methodology. The inception phase and desk review should inform the selection of approximately 4 – 6 JGP case studies for the evaluation. Case study selection will be guided by agreed criteria that should prioritize inclusion of:

- at least 1 JGP each in a developing, DAO and conflict/post-conflict country
- at least 1 JGPs in an African country, due to the large concentration and investment of JGPs in the region

Selection of case studies will also take into account countries with more than one JGP in order to maximize the potential number of case studies and explore if synergies exist between JGPs

- Focus Group Discussion

Focus group discussions will be conducted with key stakeholders during the inception meeting and site visits. The selection and use of FGDs will be decided based on initial and in-depth desk reviews and the selection of case studies.

- Surveys
Surveys should be utilized to capture both qualitative and quantitative information from a wide range of stakeholders and should be administered using appropriate channels. For example, electronic surveys could be administered to UN staff, while national researchers may be needed to administer surveys to national partners.

The Evaluation Team should also clearly outline the data analysis methods to be used and should incorporate gender and human rights analysis when relevant.

8. Evaluation Management

The global management structure for this evaluation will engage key stakeholders from Senior Management at the highest levels, central Evaluation Offices, and gender and joint programme focal points and independent experts. Their participation in the evaluation will enhance the quality and credibility of the evaluation, act to validate the findings of the evaluation and strengthen the use of the evaluation findings and recommendations. Key bodies within the global structure will include:

An **Evaluation Management Group (EMG)** will be the main decision-making body for the evaluation and is composed of designated representatives from the evaluation offices of the key joint evaluation partners. The EMG will be responsible for the overall management of the evaluation and will constitute a *Secretariat*, managed by UN Women Evaluation Office, a core group within the EMG that will oversee the day to day business of the evaluation and communication with the *Evaluation Team*. Members of the EMG may accompany the team during site visits.

A **Reference Group (RG)** composed of Gender Focal Points, Joint Programme Focal Points, UNDG Gender Team members, representatives from donor countries, UN Resident Coordinators, UNCT members, UN Gender Theme Group members, and CSOs and national counterparts will be consulted on key aspects of the evaluation process. The group will be composed to ensure that both HQ and field perspectives are represented.

A **Steering Committee (SC)** that is composed of the Executive Directors/Directors of the joint evaluation partners and donor countries will provide political and institutional support for the evaluation at the highest level, endorsing a robust and credible evaluation and ensuring the use of the findings and recommendations elaborated through formalized management responses and associated action plans.

Separate TORs have been developed for each of the above groups.

9. Timeframe and Products

The evaluation process will run from September 2011 to September 2012. The Evaluation Team will undertake the study from December 2011 to July 2012.

1. *Development and approval of F-TOR. EMG; RG (November 2011)*
2. *Engagement of external evaluation team. EMG (January 2011)*
3. *Work plan. ET. A detailed work plan, including a dissemination strategy, will be developed by the team and agreed upon with the EMG outlining specific dates for key deliverables (January 2011)*
4. *Inception Phase. ET. (January-March 2012). The Evaluation Team will undertake a preliminary desk review and an inception mission to New York to meet with the Evaluation Management Group and interview key stakeholders. An inception report will be developed that further refines the overall scope, approach and questions, provides a detailed outline of the evaluation methodology and criteria for selection of in-depth desk review and case studies. The report will include an evaluation matrix and revised work plan, if needed.*
5. *Data Collection (including field visits) and Analysis (March –May 2012). The Evaluation Team will implement the methodology agreed upon in the inception report and will conduct at least 4 country site visits to collect data. The site visits will be supported by partner agencies offices in the selected locations. Preliminary findings PPT/paper will be shared to gather feedback for the elaboration of the draft report.*
6. *Reports from Country case studies (approximately 6 cases). Interpretation of data, synthesis and report writing and Validation Process (May-July 2012)*
7. *A draft and final evaluation report, including a concise Executive Summary, will be produced that incorporates the comments and feedback received from the EMG and Reference Group. The draft report will be presented at a validation meeting of key stakeholders to discuss the findings and receive feedback before finalization. (July-October 2012)*
8. *An evaluation brief for use in stakeholder presentations, and a methodology brief to faceplate the learning of lessons from evaluation process. (October 2012)*
9. *PowerPoint presentation for senior management, the executive Board and other stakeholder to be used during stakeholders' feedback sessions. (October 2012)*
10. *Management Response and Dissemination of Findings (October-December 2012)*

The commissioners of the evaluation are responsible for issuing management responses and disseminating the evaluation findings, including informing their respective governing bodies. The Evaluation Team will be responsible for developing a dissemination product/pamphlet extracting the key information from the evaluation report.

10. Evaluation Team

A highly qualified and committed evaluation team is required to undertake this complex joint evaluation in order to develop a high quality and useful report that will provide actionable recommendations on how to strengthen joint programmes for achieving gender equality and women's empowerment. The evaluation team should ideally be composed of 5 – 8 members that include an experienced Team Leader; a senior gender and evaluation expert; a senior evaluator and 2 evaluation specialists and research assistants.

The team members will have evaluation experience in gender and development and humanitarian/emergency fields and prior experience in working with multilateral agencies. Team composition will reflect a very clear understanding of the United Nations system and human development principles in general and, in particular, of gender equality and women's empowerment.

The evaluation core team will be responsible for document review, design of case studies, coordinating case studies and contributing to the preparation of the synthesis report.

Detailed profiles of individual team members are provided in Annex 3. The combined expertise of the team should include:

- Advanced evaluation expertise and experience in a wide range of evaluation approaches including utilization-focused, gender and human rights responsive and mixed methods
- Previous experience in conducting joint evaluations/complex multi-stakeholder evaluations, evaluation of capacity development initiatives; experience in evaluating UNDAF an asset
- Knowledge of the UN system, UN reform processes and UN programming at the country level, particularly of joint programming policies and processes
- Expertise in gender equality and women's empowerment, gender mainstreaming, gender analysis and the related mandates within the UN system; experience/knowledge of women's movements is an asset
- Strong experience and knowledge in human rights issues, the human rights based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system
- Excellent analytical, facilitation and communications skills; ability to negotiate with a wide range of stakeholders
- Proficiency in English and other official UN languages, particularly Spanish and French
- Balanced in terms of gender and regional representation, with the inclusion of regional/national evaluators

The **team leader** will be responsible for delivering the key outputs outlined in section 9. She/he will prepare the final report and the dissemination strategy and ensuring quality and efficient conduct of

work by the members of evaluation team. The team leader will coordinate the work of all other team members during all the phases of the evaluation process, ensuring the quality of outputs and methodology as well as timely delivery of all products. In close collaboration with the EMG she/he will lead the conceptualization and design of the evaluation, the coordination and conduct of the country visits and the shaping of the findings conclusions and recommendations of the final report. More specifically the tasks of the team leader include:

- Conducting an inception mission and developing an inception report outlining the design, methodology and the criteria for the selection of the case studies, required resources and indicative work plan of the evaluation team. Assigning and coordinating team tasks within the framework of the TOR.
- Directing and supervising the research associate/s in carrying out research and analysis of secondary evidence, project documents, databases and all relevant documentation.
- Coordinating the conduct of country case studies and preparation of the case studies report.
- Overseeing and assuring quality in the preparation of the case studies and taking a lead in the analysis of evaluation evidence
- Drafting the evaluation report and leading the preparation of specific inputs from designated team members, based on country reports prepared by the team members, desk research, focus groups, surveys, etc.
- Preparing for meetings with the EMG and other stakeholders to review findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- Leading the stakeholder feedback sessions, briefing the EMG on the evaluation through informal sessions and finalizing the report based on feedback from the EMG.
- Preparing evaluation briefs, PPT presentation and working with the report editor, responding to final edits on the evaluation report.

The senior gender and evaluation expert will provide substantive advice on gender equality programming and the integration of gender equality and women's rights approaches in evaluation. Under the overall supervision of the evaluation team leader, the different evaluation specialists, including the senior gender and evaluation expert, will participate in the inception and the conduct phase of the evaluation. Each specialist will provide inputs for the inception report, will carry out one or two country case studies and will draft the country case studies reports, based on a standardized approach and format. In addition, all the evaluation specialist will contribute to the preparation of the final report and evaluation briefs, as necessary and will support the team leader in the supervision of the research associate/s work.

11. [UNEG Ethical Code of Conduct](#) (please see hyperlink)

List of annexes

[Annex 1: Portfolio Analysis of Joint Gender Programmes](#) (please see hyperlink)

Annex 2: Matrix of Evaluation Questions

Annex 3: Team Member Profiles

[Annex 4: UNEG Norms and Standards](#) (please see hyperlink)

[Annex 5: UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports](#) (please see hyperlink)

Annex 6: Description of Evaluation Partners/Commissioners

Annex 7: Selection of Evaluators/Evaluation Team

[Annex 8: UNEG Handbook on Integrating Gender Equality and Human Rights in Evaluation](#)
(please see hyperlink)

Annex 2: Matrix of Evaluation Questions

As noted in the Portfolio Analysis, the definition of a joint programme provides a basic set of criteria that need to be met for the programme to be recognized as a joint programme. As pointed out by a couple of previous evaluations, it is fairly easy for a programme to pass as joint. However, stakeholders and evaluations hold that joint programmes vary considerably in terms of their “*jointness*” and therefore determining the degree and quality of “*jointness*” is also an objective of this evaluation. Since “*jointness*” is a key element, in this revised Matrix “*jointness*” has been mainstreamed in the different questions related to the strategic priorities proposed. These are: **1) Design of JGPs; 2) Results and Added Value; 3) Sustainability, National Level Partnerships, National Ownership, & People Centred; 4) Synergies**

Strategic Priority 1: Design of JGPs		
To what extent have JGPs been conceptualized, planned and designed jointly to respond to international, regional and national commitments on GE/WE?		
	Questions	Criteria
1	When and why is a joint programme design approach considered a viable and relevant execution instrument to attain development results on GE/WE? To what extent did the level of complexity, the funding, and the expected results factor into the decision-making process?	Relevance Efficiency
2	To what extent were JGPs conceptualised and designed collaboratively, with a shared vision among UN partner agencies, and in response to CRC & CEDAW concluding observations/comments, national priorities and commitments on GE/WE, new aid modalities and the UNDAF? And to what extent national partners were involved in conceptualization and design process?	Relevance
3	Are JGP designs based on quality analysis, including gender and human rights based analysis, risk assessments, socio-cultural and political analysis and conflict assessments (if applicable)?	Relevance
4	How the designs of the programmes match the complexity of national structures, systems and decision-making processes?	Relevance
5	To what extent are JGPs’ goals realistic – i.e.in step with the resources, capacities and situation at hand as opposed to needs? Were mitigation strategies incorporated in the design?	Relevance Efficiency

6	To what extent do JGP designs capitalise on the added value (e.g. strengths and expertise) of each participating agency and establish coherence in regards to their roles? Were there trade-offs between coherence and inclusion?	Relevance
7	To what extent were differences among participating agencies in methodology and approach (prioritization of areas and populations, methodology for community mobilization, modality of delivery of technical assistance) identified and resolved?	Effectiveness
8	How was the participation level of each JGP partner agency determined and is exposure to potential risks shared?	Relevance Sustainability
9	To what extent did JGP design processes integrate human rights principles and strategies of the HRBAP? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the level of decision-making/participation of duty-bearers and rights holders in the design process? • Was capacity development of rights-holders and duty-bearers a central tenet of JGP design and were specific capacity development plans developed? 	Relevance Participation and Inclusion Sustainability

Strategic Priority 2: Results and Added Value

To what extent have JGPs achieved results on GE/WE at the national level and has collaborating through a JGP facilitated UN agencies and their partners to enhance the level of results achieved?

Questions		Criteria
1	To what extent and in what ways are JGPs contributing to intended/unintended, positive and negative, short, medium and long term results on GE/WE at the national level, particularly the objectives set by the Beijing Platform for Action (BPA)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have JGPs led to joint and intensified policy advisory services, advocacy efforts, training, legislative and statistical work to promote the national application of international norms, standards and actions on human rights and global GE/WE issues? • What types of intangible results have JGPs been able to achieve in terms of target populations, partners and processes? • Has the application of human rights principles in JGPs' design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation processes led to contributions to women's human rights? • To what extent have JGPs contributed to capacity development results in relation to both rights-holders and duty-bearers? <i>(For example, have the JGPs been able to offer contextually relevant and high quality gender equality mainstreaming training to senior policy makers, focal persons and NGO executive staff?)</i> • Is there evidence that JGPs enabled rights-holders to claim their rights more successfully and duty-holders to perform their duties more efficiently? • To what extent have JGPs been successful in ending harmful and discriminatory practices against women? • What is the influence of the country context on the achievement of JGPs results? What are enabling factors and constraints? 	Effectiveness Impact Participation and Inclusion

2	<p>In comparison to single agency programmes, is there evidence that JGPs add value in contributing to the achievement of GE/WE results at the national level? How has “jointness” contributed to any results?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do JGPs deliver coherent and joint outputs and outcomes that add up to something greater than a series of activities? • Are there any specific JGP design characteristics that can be linked to the successful achievement of results? • What types of joint arrangements work best and in which contexts (e.g. DaO)? • To what extent do partners, including civil society and national women’s movement, perceive the UN as operating differently under the JGPs? What do partners consider to be the main advantages/disadvantages? 	Effectiveness
3	<p>To what extent and how do UN agencies participate as equal partners in the implementation processes of JGPs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have JGPs benefitted from effective leadership and a shared vision for delivering results? • Do participating agencies implement activities jointly? • Were implementation plans shared and synchronized among the participating agencies? • Has resource mobilisation been jointly undertaken, capitalising on each agency’s comparative advantages in this area? • Is there joint accountability among agencies participating in JGPs in terms of having joint reporting, monitoring and evaluation and knowledge management systems in place to address needs at national, regional and HQ levels? 	Effectiveness
4	<p>What, if any, types of innovative practices have been introduced in joint gender programmes for the achievement of results in GE and WE? In what contexts have these innovative practices worked better?</p>	Effectiveness
5	<p>Have good practices from JGPs been identified and do they have the potential for replication and upscaling? If so, to what extent have there been efforts to promote future upscaling?</p>	Effectiveness
6	<p>Taking into account potential medium and long-term results, have specific characteristics of JGPs led to increases/decreases in operational effectiveness? What factors, if any, contributed to these increases and decreases?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the different fund management options or number of partners involved affect the efficiency of JGPs? • What, if any, is the relationship between programme duration and efficiency? • Do JGPs seek to limit transaction costs, especially for partner governments and other national partners? • To what extent have the release of funds and the work plan been synchronized by the different agencies involved in the implementation of JGPs? 	Efficiency
7	<p>What role(s) have been played by agency HQs, regional offices and UNDOCO in supporting efficient implementation processes?</p>	Efficiency

Strategic Priority 3: Sustainability, National Level Partnerships, National Ownership, & People Centred Approaches		
To what extent and in what ways JGPs have contributed to governments meeting their commitments to the BPA and fulfilling their obligations towards women's and girls' human rights; while also supporting rights-holders to demand their right?		
Questions		Criteria
1	To what extent are JGPs aligned with government priorities and integrated into national plans and budgets? Are they compatible with new aid instruments?	Sustainability
2	To what extent were the capacities of government and participating national agencies considered in the design of the JGP and what steps were taken to develop and/or reinforce the operating capacities of national partners during implementation? How was any resistance addressed?	Sustainability
3	To what extent have governments shown proactive leadership and commitment to JGPs by exercising joint decision-making with UN participating agencies and engaging in conceptualisation processes and providing resources (financial and/or in-kind) to JGPs?	Sustainability
4	What role has civil society – in particular women's movements – played in the planning, design, implementation and monitoring of JGPs and is their involvement enhanced or decreased in comparison to single agency programmes?	Sustainability
5	To what extent do JGPs have exit strategies that are geared toward sustainable phase-out of activities?	Sustainability
6	To what extent have public/private national resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to JGPs' objective and produce results and impacts?	Sustainability
Strategic Priority 4: Synergies		
To what extent and in what ways have JGPs contributed to improved gender equality mainstreaming and women's empowerment in other UN programmes and efforts at country level?		
Questions		Criteria
1	To what extent have JGPs enhanced communication between the UN and governments?	Effectiveness Sustainability
2	To what extent have JGPs promoted or led to improved communication, synergies, coordination and collaboration among national stakeholders, e.g. between different line ministries and among government and civil society?	Sustainability Effectiveness
3	To what extent JGPs affected increased collaboration, coordination, and information exchange within UNCTs in relation to GE/WE?	Effectiveness Impact
4	To what extent have JGPs contributed to inter-agency networking, informal information	Effectiveness

	exchange, a constructive team spirit, a conscious feeling of being a member of one UN family, etc. among the UN agencies?	Sustainability
5	What effect do JGPs have on the allocation of funds within the agencies for GE/WE, including gender mainstreaming?	Effectiveness Sustainability Impact

Annex 3: Team Members profiles

As indicated in Section 10 of the TOR, the evaluation team should be composed of 5 – 8 members that include an experienced Team Leader, a senior gender and evaluation expert, a senior evaluator, 2 evaluation specialists and research assistants. Ideally, the team leader should have expertise in UN programming processes, while the senior evaluator has strong knowledge of human rights issues. The team should be gender balanced and include the at least 2 regional evaluators; the use of national researchers is also encouraged. Below is a more detailed description of the qualification requirements expected for each team member:

Team Leader

- At least 10 -15 years practical experience in conducting evaluation of international policies and programmes utilizing a wide range of approaches and methods including utilization focused, gender and human rights responsive, and mixed methods and background in social research
- Extensive experience acting as team leader for complex evaluations and proven ability to manage a diverse evaluation team
- Previous experience in conducting joint evaluations/complex multi-stakeholder evaluations, and/or evaluation of capacity development; experience in UNDAF evaluation an asset
- Excellent knowledge of the UN system, UN reform processes and UN programming at the country level, particularly of joint programming policies and processes, in development, conflict/post-conflict and Delivering as One country contexts.
- Experience and knowledge on gender equality and women’s empowerment, gender mainstreaming, gender analysis and the related mandates within the UN system; experience/knowledge of women’s movements is an asset
- Experience and knowledge on human rights issues, the human rights based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system
- Excellent analytical, facilitation and communications skills and ability to negotiate amongst a wide range of stakeholders
- Fluent in English and knowledge of other official UN languages.

Senior Gender and Evaluation Expert

- At least 5 – 7 years of experience in conducting evaluation of international policies and programmes and knowledge of a wide range of approaches including gender and human rights responsive, utilization focused and mixed methods; previous experience in conducting joint evaluations/complex multi-stakeholder evaluations, UNDAF evaluation and/or evaluation of capacity development an asset
- At least 10 years professional experience in gender equality and women’s empowerment issues, gender mainstreaming, gender analysis and thorough knowledge of the related mandates within the UN system; experience/knowledge of women’s movements is an asset
- Knowledge of the UN system, UN reform processes and UN programming at the country level, particularly of joint programming policies and processes, in development, conflict/post-conflict and Delivering as One country contexts.
- Knowledge of human rights issues, the human rights based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system
- Strong analytical, facilitation and communications skills and ability to negotiate amongst a wide range of stakeholders
- Fluent in English and knowledge of other official UN languages.

Senior Evaluator

- At least 7 – 10 years of experience in conducting evaluation of international policies and programmes and knowledge of a wide range of approaches including gender and human rights responsive, utilization focused and mixed methods; previous experience in conducting joint evaluations/complex multi-stakeholder evaluations, UNDAF evaluation and/or evaluation of capacity development an asset
- Strong knowledge of human rights issues, the human rights based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system
- Knowledge of the UN system, UN reform processes and UN programming at the country level, particularly of joint programming policies and processes, in development, conflict/post-conflict and Delivering as One contexts.
- Experience and knowledge in gender equality and women’s empowerment, gender mainstreaming, gender analysis and the related mandates within the UN system; experience/knowledge of women’s movements is an asset
- Excellent analytical, facilitation and communications skills and ability to negotiate amongst a wide range of stakeholders
- Fluent in English and knowledge of other official UN languages.

Evaluation Specialists (2)

- At least 5 -7 years of experience in conducting evaluation of international policies and programmes and experience with a range of approaches; knowledge of gender and human rights responsive, utilization focused and mixed methods or previous experience in conducting joint evaluations/complex multi-stakeholder UNDAF evaluation and/or evaluation of capacity development or highly desirable
- Knowledge of the UN system, UN reform processes and UN programming at the country level, particularly of joint programming policies and processes, in development, conflict/post-conflict and Delivering as One contexts.
- Understanding of human rights issues, the human rights based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system
- Understanding of gender equality and women's empowerment, gender mainstreaming, gender analysis and the related mandates within the UN system; experience/knowledge of women's movements is an asset
- Strong analytical and communications skills
- Fluent in English and knowledge of other official UN languages.

The team composition should be completed with the inclusion of **Research Assistants** with the requisite skills and experience needed to support the evaluation team in conducting the study.

Annex 6: Description of Evaluation Partners/Commissioners

UN Women

In July 2010, the United Nations General Assembly created UN Women, the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.

In doing so, UN Member States took an historic step in accelerating the Organization's goals on gender equality and the empowerment of women.

The creation of UN Women came about as part of the UN reform agenda, bringing together resources and mandates for greater impact. It merges and builds on the important work of four previously distinct parts of the UN system, which focused exclusively on gender equality and women's empowerment

For many years, the UN has faced serious challenges in its efforts to promote gender equality globally, including inadequate funding and no single recognized driver to direct UN activities on gender equality issues.

UN Women was created to address such challenges. It will be a dynamic and strong champion for women and girls, providing them with a powerful voice at the global, regional and local levels.

Grounded in the vision of equality enshrined in the UN Charter, UN Women, among other issues, works for the:

- elimination of discrimination against women and girls;
- empowerment of women; and
- achievement of equality between women and men as partners and beneficiaries of development, human rights, humanitarian action and peace and security.

UNICEF

UNICEF is mandated by the United Nations General Assembly to advocate for the protection of children's rights, to help meet their basic needs and to expand their opportunities to reach their full potential.

UNICEF is guided by the Convention on the Rights of the Child and strives to establish children's rights as enduring ethical principles and international standards of behaviour towards children.

UNICEF insists that the survival, protection and development of children are universal development imperatives that are integral to human progress.

UNICEF mobilizes political will and material resources to help countries, particularly developing countries, ensure a "first call for children" and to build their capacity to form appropriate policies and deliver services for children and their families.

UNICEF is committed to ensuring special protection for the most disadvantaged children - victims of war, disasters, extreme poverty, all forms of violence and exploitation and those with disabilities.

UNICEF responds in emergencies to protect the rights of children. In coordination with United Nations partners and humanitarian agencies, UNICEF makes its unique facilities for rapid response available to its partners to relieve the suffering of children and those who provide their care.

UNICEF is non-partisan and its cooperation is free of discrimination. In everything it does, the most disadvantaged children and the countries in greatest need have priority.

UNICEF aims, through its country programmes, to promote the equal rights of women and girls and to support their full participation in the political, social, and economic development of their communities.

UNICEF works with all its partners towards the attainment of the sustainable human development goals adopted by the world community and the realization of the vision of peace and social progress enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

UNDP

UNDP is the United Nations' global development network, an organization advocating for change and connecting countries to knowledge, experience and resources to help people build a better life. We are on the ground in 177 countries, working with them on their own solutions to global and national development challenges. As they develop local capacity, they draw on the people of UNDP and our wide range of partners.

World leaders have pledged to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, including the overarching goal of cutting poverty in half by 2015. UNDP's network links and coordinates global and national efforts to reach these Goals. Our focus is helping countries build and share solutions to the challenges of: democratic governance, poverty reduction, crisis prevention & recovery, environment & energy and HIV/AIDS.

UNDP helps developing countries attract and use aid effectively. In all our activities, we encourage the protection of human rights, capacity development and the empowerment of women.

The annual Human Development Report, commissioned by UNDP, focuses the global debate on key development issues, providing new measurement tools, innovative analysis and often controversial policy proposals. The global Report's analytical framework and inclusive approach carry over into regional, national and local Human Development Reports, also supported by UNDP.

In each country office, the UNDP Resident Representative normally also serves as the Resident Coordinator of development activities for the United Nations system as a whole. Through such coordination, UNDP seeks to ensure the most effective use of UN and international aid resources.

UNFPA

UNFPA, the United Nations Population Fund, is an international development agency that promotes the right of every woman, man and child to enjoy a life of health and equal opportunity. UNFPA supports countries in using population data for policies and programmes to reduce poverty and to ensure that every pregnancy is wanted, every birth is safe, every young person is free of HIV, and every girl and woman is treated with dignity and respect.

UNFPA works in partnership with governments, other agencies and civil society to advance its mission. Two frameworks guide its efforts: The Programme of Action adopted at the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development and the Millennium Development Goals, a set of eight time-bound targets to reduce extreme poverty by 2015. Because the dates for achieving these interconnected sets of goals and related targets are fast approaching, considerable work has been done to analyze what has worked, galvanize support and redouble efforts.

UNFPA three core areas of work - reproductive health, gender equality and population and development strategies - are inextricably related. Population dynamics, including growth rates, age structure, fertility and mortality, migration and more, influence every aspect of human, social and economic development. Reproductive health and women's empowerment powerfully affect, and are affected by, population trends.

MDG Achievement Fund

The MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F) is an international cooperation mechanism whose aim is to accelerate progress on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) worldwide. Established in December 2006 with a generous contribution of € 528 million Euros (\$US710M) from the

Spanish Government to the United Nations system, the MDG-F supports national governments, local authorities and citizen organizations in their efforts to tackle poverty and inequality.

With 128 active programmes in 49 countries spread across 5 regions of the world, we are helping more than 3.5 million people, with another 20 million people impacted indirectly. In September 2008 at the UN High Level Event on MDGs, Spain committed an additional €90M to the MDG-F.

In all the funded country programmes, MDG-F works through the UN and with dozens of governmental and nongovernmental organizations ranging from farmer associations to national alliances and ministries; this ensures that development processes are owned and driven locally. With the aim of improving aid effectiveness, all MDG-F-financed programmes build on the collective strength of the UN, bringing several Agencies together to address issues that cut across the mandate of individual organizations. The MDG-F is thus at the forefront of the UN Reform process, making a significant contribution to the UN's efforts to deliver as one.

Government of Spain

Gender equality has been both a priority sector and a cross-cutting issue in Spanish development policy and assistance since 2005. Thenceforth Spain has set gender equality high on its political agenda, building up a reputation as a champion of gender equality and support to women's organisations, and put in place multiple instruments and mechanisms to achieve this commitment

Spain has backed this political commitment with significant financial and strategic content contributions to support gender equality. In the last five years, Spain has substantially increased the budget devoted to gender issues and sexual and reproductive health, and it has become a leading donor in this support of gender equality and women's empowerment within the United Nations System. Its financial contributions and proposed new cooperation instruments¹⁹ have been especially strategic to cover important thematic gaps where other donors have retired despite severe and persisting gender inequalities. This has been the case in many programs in Latin American middle-income countries, or focussed on indigenous women, rural women or women with disabilities and lesbians.

¹⁹ In particular, Spain has opted for the budgetary predictability with its UN strategic partners to advance the gender equality agenda through the Strategic Partnership Framework with UNIFEM (now UN Women) and UNFPA. Furthermore, the Government of Spain has committed itself to support new multilateral initiatives and instruments such as the Multi-Donor Fund for Gender Equality, the Global Fund on Violence and the Programmatic Window on Gender Equality through the MDG-F. Moreover, Spain has supported the strengthening of UNIFEM (UN Women) evaluation function since the establishment of its Evaluation Office

Spain has given itself a concrete gender-related mandate in bilateral and multilateral co-operation through the approval of a strategic framework of reference²⁰ and the development of tools to mainstream this priority through its policy and work.

Spain has actively supported the new gender architecture as a key element in the reform of UN system (System- Wide Coherence). The Spanish government has fought for the final constitution of UN Women and is an active member of its executive board. At the same time it has provided continuous support to the Delivering as One Initiative, and the coherence of UN's work as a whole, in many ways: Through its active sponsoring in key fora, such as specialized Agencies, Programmes and Funds' Executive Boards or key International Meetings; the development and financing of joint programmes on the ground through the MDG Fund or the creation of the DAO-EFW with other donors.

At the same time Spain has been very active in the establishment and implementation of the aid effectiveness agenda honouring its commitments on gender equality. At a European level, it is worth mentioning the approval of the EU Gender Action Plan for the Development during the Spanish Presidency of the EU.

Government of Norway

Norway is a strong supporter of the United Nations and has made the Millennium Development Goals a major priority, specifically on MDGs 4 and 5, reducing child mortality and improving maternal health by 2015, respectively. The Government of Norway intends to be a leading nation in environmental policy and has made climate change another priority area of focus in development.²¹

Norway, a strong supporter of multilateral development agencies, has an estimated 30% of its country's ODA going to multilateral agencies. It has also increased its support to multilateral organizations, particularly to global funds with focus on health.²² For development and humanitarian assistance, Norway views children, women minorities and indigenous peoples as priority groups.

In March of 2010, Norway extended its Action Plan for Women's Rights and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation to 2013.²³ Norway is on the forefront of advocating gender equality in the international community. The four thematic areas in which the Action Plan for Women's Rights and Gender Equality focus on: women's political empowerment, women's economic

²⁰ Revised Gender Strategy (2008), a Strategy on Women in Peacebuilding (2009), and an inter-ministerial National Action Plan on Security Council Resolution 1325 .

²¹ http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/smk/aktuelt/taler_og_artikler/politisk_ledelse/taler-og-artikler-av-statssekretar-mina-/2009/operationalizing-deliveries-of-intervent.html?id=587042

²² http://www.euroresources.org/guide/donor_profiles/no_norway.html

²³ http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud/Documents/Reports-programmes-of-action-and-plans/Action-plans-and-programmes/2010/ActionPlan_Women.html?id=458393 Action Plan for Women's Rights and Gender Equality in Cooperation (2007-2009) Extended for the period of 2010-2013. PDF document.

empowerment, sexual and reproductive health and rights, and violence against women.²⁴ Along with the moral goal of equal rights for women, Norway's ultimate goal is to improve the status and lives of women throughout the developing world, which they believe will in turn foster economic growth and the alleviation of poverty.

In 2011, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Justice and the Police and the Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion, launched the new strategic plan 2011-2013 on women, peace and security, which provides a framework to integrate Security Council Resolution 1325 into its peace and security efforts.²⁵

At the 55th Session of the Commission on the Status of Women February 2011, the State Secretary of International Development, Ms. Ingrid Fiskaa, in absence of Mr. Audun Lysbakken, the Ministry of Children, Equality & Social Inclusion, stated: "Many seem to believe that a country must develop and become rich before it can afford to promote gender equality and empowerment of women. That is wrong! [...] When reconciling differences and rebuilding peace, we call on member states and the United Nations system to fully implement the Security Council Resolutions on Women, Peace and Security. Only by protecting all women's human rights and ensuring women's full and equal participation in economic, social and political life – can sustainable peace and development be achieved."²⁶

²⁴ In the PDF document on the Action Plan for Women's Rights and Gender Equality in Cooperation pp.16-23

²⁵ http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/UD/Vedlegg/FN/Kvinner_likestilling/sr1325_strategic_planE880E_web.pdf

²⁶ <http://www.norway-un.org/Statements/Other-Statements/Norways-statement-at-Commission-on-the-Status-of-Women/>

Annex 7: Selection of Evaluators/Evaluation Team

The selection of the evaluation team will be based on the fulfillment of the specifications established in the TOR. The submitted proposals will be assessed on three main categories: the expertise and competencies of the evaluators, as reflected in their CVs, gender balance and diversity of team; the technical proposal for the specific evaluation; and financial proposal. The categories will be assigned different weighting, which will total to 100 %.

I. Team Composition (35%)

The team leader's and all team's experience and qualifications meet the criteria indicated in the TOR. The team is gender balanced and cross-culturally diverse.

II. Technical proposal (35%):

1. **Evaluation matrix.** The matrix clearly addresses the TOR, relating evaluation *Questions* with evaluation *Criteria*, with *Indicators* and with *Means of verification*.
2. **Evaluation approach and methodology.** The proposal presents a specific approach and a variety of techniques for gathering and analyzing qualitative and quantitative data that are feasible and applicable in the timeframe and context of the evaluation, and incorporates human rights and gender equality perspectives.
3. **Work plan.** The timeframe and resources indicated in the work plan are realistic and useful for the needs of the evaluation.
4. **Motivation and ethics.** The evaluators reflect clear professional commitment with the subject of the assignment and follow UNEG ethical code of conduct.

III. Budget (30 %)

The budget proposed is sufficient for applying the data gathering techniques and for obtaining reliable data for the evaluation in the timeframe indicated.

Please indicate whether you are planning to submit a proposal that we could update you about information regarding the evaluation. Proposals and any questions should be submitted electronically to belen.sanz@unwomen.org copy to isabel.suarez@unwomen.org, jeriksen@unicef.org and antana.locs@unwomen.org.