



TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR END-EVALUATION OF PHASE II

Programme Title: Ethiopia Joint Programme on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE JP)

Duration: July 2013-December 2015 (extended up to 31 June 2016)

- Total estimated budget: USD 41,502,304 (before merger with the Joint Program on Rural Women Economic Empowerment the total budget of the JP was - 35,502,304)

Coordinating Agencies: UN Women, UNFPA

Administrative Agent (One UN Fund): Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF)

I. Description of the Programme

The GoE - UN Joint Flagship Programme on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE JP) brings together six participating UN agencies¹ and multiple Government of Ethiopia line ministries and entities coordinated by Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation (MoFEC formerly known as Ministry of Finance and Economic Development) and Ministry of Women and Children Affairs (MoWCA formerly known as Ministry of Women, Children and Youth Affairs). The GEWE JP was launched in 2011 for an initial pilot phase planned to last 18 months from January 2011 until June 2012. The first phase was extended twice, first to December 2012 and then to June 30 2013 to allow for the completion of planned activities. The first phase was initiated as a result of UNDAF 2007-2011 mid-term review, which identified result areas for which the UN system would benefit from an increasingly harmonized and scaled up programmatic approach. Additionally, Ethiopia had a status of Delivering as One self-starter and the 'flagship' programmes were meant to drive forward innovation in operational modalities towards increased alignment and effectiveness of delivery. The first phase was evaluated in 2013. The second phase of JP GEWE was further extended to last until June 30 2016 to align it with the start of the new UNDAF 2016-2020 and to align it with GoEs Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP) second cycle (2015/2016-2019/2020).

The second phase of JP GEWE was built on the 'lessons learned' and progress in operational effectiveness from JP GEWE Phase one, to provide a multi-year programming framework with mechanisms in place for medium-term monitoring aligned to the UNDAF 2012-2015 and the Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP) 2010/11-2014/15 results framework. This phase also brought on board the efforts of three more UN Agencies, namely FAO, IFAD and WFP, that are endeavouring to accelerate the economic empowerment of poor rural women. As per the agreement reached between MoFED and UNCT, the Rural Women Economic Empowerment Programme (RWEE) has been integrated into the JP GEWE, specifically in to Outcome One and Two, for improved linkages and synergies which will ensure complimentary activities, results and impact with the GEWE JP. This evaluation will not be looking at the implementation of the RWEE component of the JP GEWE.

The GEWE JP (both phase I and phase II) was the first UN programme to receive financial support through the Ethiopia One UN Fund, established in January 2011. The One Fund is intended to facilitate the realization of One UN Programme outcomes by strengthening the planning and coordination process, aligning the funding allocation to the needs of the One UN Programme and channeling funds towards the highest priority needs of the country.

The GoE- UNDP High-Level Steering Committee exercises overall oversight of the programmatic response and modalities in place to operationalize 'Delivering as One' in Ethiopia. The GEWE JP also has a Steering Committee, which is responsible for prioritization, resource allocation decisions and progress review specific to the GEWE JP. In terms of communication, joint resource mobilization, progress review and consolidated reporting, UN Women, jointly with

¹ ILO, UN Women, UNICEF, UNESCO, UNDP and UNFPA



MoWCA, is the responsible co-lead, while UNFPA is the co-lead responsible for operational and financial management and monitoring, jointly with MoFED. Thematically each of the four focus areas is coordinated by an assigned agency, which is responsible for strategic guidance, resource mobilization and progress monitoring within the result area. They are:

1. **Rural and Urban Women have increased income for improved livelihoods (ILO):** This outcome of the JP seeks to increase access to financial and business development services by Vulnerable Women. This will be achieved by strengthening the capacities of financial institutions, BDS providers, associations and cooperatives to provide diversified financial products and Business Development Services to urban and rural Women; by increasing access to training and information on financial and business development services for Women (in formal and informal businesses), by increasing access to credit for Women (in formal and informal businesses), and developing a national strategy and implementation framework for micro finance services targeted to vulnerable groups. The program also seeks to improve food security and nutrition in rural target households.
2. **Rural and Urban Women and girls have increased opportunities for education, leadership and decision making (UNICEF):** Under this outcome the JP seeks to increase opportunities for education, leadership and decision making for women and girls in rural and urban localities. This will be achieved by increasing numbers of girls and women who receive support for secondary and tertiary education; increasing numbers of teachers who have knowledge and skills to provide a gender responsive pedagogy; increasing numbers of women and girls who obtain basic functional literacy skills; increasing women's access to professional and leadership development opportunities and increasing the general public awareness on women's participation in leadership.
3. **Federal and Local level government institutions have strengthened their capacity to implement national and international commitments on gender equality (UN Women):** under this component, the JP seeks to strengthen the capacity of Federal and local government institutions to implement national and international commitments on gender equality. This will be achieved by putting in place systems at federal and local levels to monitor performance on gender related commitments and increasing the existing capacities of federal and local government institutions for gender responsive planning and budgeting
4. **Federal and local level institutions and communities have enhanced their capacity to promote and protect the rights of women and girls (UNFPA):** Under this outcome, the JP seeks to enhance the capacity of Formal and informal institutions at national and local levels to promote and protect the rights of girls and women. This will be achieved by establishing knowledge networks on gender equality and women's empowerment at federal and regional levels, establishing/strengthening coordination mechanisms for prevention and response to VAWG at federal and local levels, increasing capacity of service providers to deliver gender responsive support (health, psycho-social support, social and economic reintegration) to survivors of violence, enhancing the capabilities(knowledge, skills and systems) of Law enforcement agencies to promote and protect the rights of women and increasing community interventions/actions that promote and protect the rights of women and girls

II. Purpose and Scope of the evaluation

Purpose:

The evaluation at the end of Phase II of the JP GEWE is scheduled in line with the programme's M&E plan. The purpose of the evaluation is to provide an in-depth assessment of the results against the four outcomes of the program and performance in terms of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, appropriateness of design and coherence. It also aims to identify lessons learned, good practices, and the factors that facilitated/hindered achievement and provide practical recommendations so as to inform the design, implementation, management and coordination of future joint programs.



The specific objectives of the Phase II End evaluation are to:

- Assess the extent to which the results of the joint programme are achieved keeping into account that the program suffered from a huge funding gap and examine the extent to which the programme is consistent with national needs (in particular vulnerable group needs) and aligned with Ethiopia government priorities as well as with the UNDAF;
- Determine the extent to which planned programme activities were completed and review the programme design, implementation strategy, institutional arrangements as well as management and operational systems.
- Examine the programme management effectiveness and efficiency in achieving expected results.
- Assess the inter-agency coordination, the leadership and management of the JP, including the management, operational and financial systems laid down by the programme
- Highlight good practices and lessons learnt and make concrete recommendations on how to improve future joint programming;

This evaluation is an important endeavor to building knowledge and to contribute to organizational learning among UN agencies and implementing partners.

Scope:

The end of the II Phase program evaluation will cover the period July 2013-December 2015 (extended up to 31 June 2016) and the four Outcomes. All UN participating organizations and main implementing partners of the joint programme will be at the center of the evaluation. The evaluation will cover all regions in the country including the two city administrations and selected districts. Specific sites for the evaluation will be further worked out by the respective UN agencies during the actual planning of the evaluation process.

Clients:

The clients of the evaluation and main audience of the report are:

- Relevant staff in Implementing partners including federal and local governmental institutions, technical committees and participating CSOs;
- UN Women - UN System Coordination Division;
- Relevant staff, Technical Units and head of Units in the participating UN-agencies;
- Participating UN Agencies Headquarters;
- Development partners;

III. Key Evaluation Questions

The final evaluation questions and relevant evaluation instruments will be determined during the inception stage.

Relevance and strategic fit:

- Are the planned programme outputs and results relevant and realistic for the situation on the ground?
- Do they need to be adapted to specific (local, sectoral etc.) needs or conditions?
- Have the stakeholders taken ownership of the programme concept?

Validity of design:

- How the programme is aligned to the UNDAF and was a gender analysis conducted during the UNDAF or the development of the JP GEWE. If undertaken, did the gender analysis offer good quality information on underlying causes of inequality to inform the JP?
- Is the intervention logic coherent and realistic, taking into account the phases of the programme from joint programming towards a joint programme? What needs to be adjusted? (refer to the programme Results Matrix)
- Do results causally link to the intended outputs (immediate outcomes) that link to the outcomes and broader impact (development goal)?
- What are the main strategic components of the programme? How do they contribute and logically link to



the planned outcomes? How well do they link to each other?

- How strategic are partners in terms of mandate, influence, capacities and commitment?
- How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the programme document in assessing the programme's progress? Are the targeted indicator values realistic and can they be tracked? If necessary, how should they be modified to be more useful? Are the means of verification for the indicators appropriate?

Effectiveness:

- Is the programme making sufficient progress towards its planned outputs? Will the programme be likely to achieve its planned outputs upon completion?
- How have stakeholders been involved in programme implementation?
- Have the quantity and quality of the outputs produced so far been satisfactory? Do the benefits accrue equally to men and women?
- How has the JP enhanced ownership and contributed to the development of national capacity?
- Are UN agencies working together more effectively?
- How was the programme monitored and reviewed? To what extent was this exercise useful and used?

Efficiency:

- Have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- Have programme funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the bottlenecks encountered?
- Are there sufficient resources (financial, time, people) allocated to integrate human rights and gender equality in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the JP?
- Were there any constraints (e.g. political, practical, and bureaucratic) to addressing human rights and gender equality efficiently during implementation? What level of effort was made to overcome these challenges?

Sustainability:

- Did the intervention design include an appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting national/local ownership, use of national capacity, etc.) to support positive changes in human rights and gender equality after the end of the intervention?
- To what degree did partners change their policies or practices to improve human rights and gender equality fulfillment (e.g. new services, greater responsiveness, resource re-allocation, improved quality etc.)?

Coherence:

- To what degree are partners working towards the same results with a common understanding of the inter-relationship between interventions?
- To what extent are approaches such as attention to gender, human rights based approach to programming and results based management understood and pursued in a coherent fashion?

Management and Coordination:

- How well are responsibilities delineated and implemented in a complementary fashion?
- How well have the coordination functions been fulfilled?
- Were management and implementation capacities adequate?
- How effectively does the programme management monitor programme performance and results?
 - o Have appropriate means of verification for tracking progress, performance and achievement of indicator values been defined?
 - o Is relevant information and data systematically being collected and collated?
 - o Is information being regularly analyzed to feed into management decisions?



- Has the programme made strategic use of coordination and collaboration with other Joint Programmes to increase its effectiveness and impact?

IV. Methodological Approach

The evaluation methodology will be developed by the Evaluation Team and presented for approval to the Evaluation Steering Committee. The methodology should use a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods that are appropriate to address the main evaluation questions. These methods should be applied with respect of human rights and gender equality principles and facilitate the engagement of key stakeholders. Measures will be taken to ensure data quality, validity and credibility of both primary and secondary data gathered and used in the evaluation.

The evaluation will be carried following UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards (see <http://www.uneval.org/>), UN Women Evaluation Policy as well as the Ethical Guidelines for evaluations in the UN system.² In line with Norms and Standards a management response will be prepared for this evaluation as practical means to enhance the use of evaluation findings and follow-up to the evaluation recommendations. The management response will identify who is responsible, what are the action points and the deadlines.

V. Evaluation process

Evaluation Phases	Deliverables	Dates/working days	Responsible
Phase 1 Preparations	Draft TOR	15 days	UN Women
	Establishment of Evaluation Reference Group		
	Discussion and endorsement of final evaluation TOR		
	Post RFQ, assess bids and contract evaluators		
Phase 2 Evaluation design & desk review	Conduct desk review	5 days	Consultants
	Drafting and presentation of evaluation inception report, data collection tools and instruments		
	Submission of final inception report		
Phase 3 Data collection & field visits to regions	Field missions to selected Federal ministries and Regional bureaus	30 days	UN Women in collaboration with UN participating agencies, government, DGGE, partners, beneficiaries etc.) under the leadership of UN Women
	Preparation of draft evaluation report		
	Presentation and validation of evaluation findings to stakeholders and collect feed back		
Phase 4 Finalization	Preparation of final evaluation report	10 days	Consultants
	Preparation of management response and input into JP II		

² Annex I of this TOR.



Documents that will be shared with evaluators

- GTP and Policy Index
- UNDAF 2012-2015
- JP GEWE II Prodoc
- Programme work plans
- Progress reports (and presentations on progress and achievements)
- Interim reports
- Midterm evaluation report
- Publications and promotional materials
- Reports on specific activities
- Documents related to programme achievements
- Reports of JP GEWE Review meeting workshops

VI. Main Outputs of the Evaluation and Reporting Structure

The evaluators will be expected to deliver:

- Inception report that includes a detailed evaluation design including evaluation work plan, key questions, data collection and analysis methods. This framework should be developed in participatory manner by the evaluation team and the Evaluation Reference Group before commencement of the Evaluation;
- A draft evaluation report for review by Evaluation Reference Group;
- Presentation of draft findings at validation meeting;
- A final evaluation report incorporating comments made on the draft report in addition to having annexes of specific findings from the evaluation and recommendations;

Accordingly, the following reporting structure is suggested for the final report:

1. Title page (1 page)
2. Table of Contents (1 page)
3. Executive Summary (2 pages)
4. Acronyms (1 page)
5. Background and Programme Description (1-2 pages)
6. Purpose of Evaluation (1 page)
7. Evaluation Methodology (1 page)
8. Findings, Analysis, Conclusions, and Recommendations (no more than 15 pages) this section's content should be organized around the TOR questions, and include the findings, conclusions and recommendations for each of the subject areas to be evaluated
9. Lessons learned and challenges (1-2 pages)
10. Annexes: including the terms of reference, evaluation work plan and any other relevant documents.

VII. Management Arrangements and Time Frame

In line with UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards, an Evaluation Reference Group will be constituted to serve as sounding board and consultative body to ensure the active involvement of stakeholders. The evaluator/s will report directly to the evaluation reference group which will serve as the primary contact point for the evaluation team. The Evaluation Reference Group will help to provide a balanced picture of views and perceptions regarding achievements and limitations of the JP. It will make the evaluation more relevant through providing inputs and feedback throughout the evaluation process. The Group will also help to ensure ownership of evaluation findings and recommendations through prompting users of the evaluation and other stakeholders into action during and after the evaluation.



Specifically the Evaluation Reference Group will:

- review ToR, inception report, methodology and data gathering tools;
- take part in the evaluation inception and debriefing session and provide feedback on the different evaluation products (evaluation inception and draft report);
- provide relevant background information to the evaluation team as relevant
- review the draft and final evaluation report;
- participate in stakeholder meetings and feedback sessions where deemed necessary;
- participate in the validation meeting of the final evaluation report and support dissemination of evaluation results

The Evaluation Reference Group will consist of the following representatives:

- MoWCA & MoFEC
- UN agencies participating in the JP

The evaluation will be done in 60 working days starting from August 15 – October 30, 2016. A detailed work plan will be elaborated by the evaluation team during the inception phase based on inputs from the Evaluation Reference Group.

VIII. Accountabilities

UN Women, UNFPA and MOWCA will be accountable for coordination of stakeholders' involved, organizing field-visits, focus groups, providing translator/interpreter and other logistical issues. They will give approval for the final evaluation report.

IX. Evaluation Team

An international evaluation consultant supported by a national evaluation expert will undertake the evaluation. The evaluation team will be assembled to ensure the right mix of evaluation expertise, knowledge of the national context and expert knowledge of gender issues.

Required Background and Experience

International consultant

- Advanced Degree in Social Sciences, Development Studies or other relevant field and with formal research skills. A special training in Monitoring and Results Based Management is considered an asset.
- At least 7 years' experience in conducting evaluations as team leader
- High proficiency in English
- Ability to manage and supervise evaluation teams and ensure timely submission of quality evaluation reports
- Experience in leading complex evaluations e.g. of UN Joint Programs, Delivering as One etc.

National consultant

- Advanced Degree in Social Sciences, Development Studies or other relevant field and with formal research skills.
- At least 5 years' experience in conducting evaluations
- High proficiency in English
- Fluent in English and Amharic / local language

Required competencies for both International / National consultant

- Knowledge of issues concerning governance, women's rights and gender equality
- Specific knowledge in the area of democratic governance, economic empowerment, GBV and/or gender mainstreaming
- Excellent facilitation and communication skills
- Experience with focus group discussions and key informant interviews
- Ability to deal with multi-stakeholder groups



- Ability to write focused evaluation reports.
- Wide experience in quantitative and qualitative data collection methods.
- Willingness and ability to travel to the different project's sites in the country.
- Ability to work in a team.

Core values / guiding principles:

The evaluators will adhere to the following core values and guiding principles:

- Integrity: Demonstrating consistency in upholding and promoting the values of UN Women in actions and decisions, in line with the UN Code of Conduct.
- Cultural Sensitivity/Valuing diversity: Demonstrating an appreciation of the multicultural nature of the organization and the diversity of its staff. Demonstrating an international outlook, appreciating differences in values and learning from cultural diversity.

X. Applying for the consultancy

Applications should include:

- Cover letter stating why you want to do this work, your capacity and experience and available start date.
- It should also indicate whether you apply for the International or National consultancy
- Detailed CV (UN Women P11)- this can be down loaded from the UN Women website
- **Applications with the above details should be sending to UN Women Ethiopia country office until latest August 15, 2016.**

ANNEX I: ETHICAL CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE EVALUATION

It is expected that the evaluators will respect the Ethical Code of Conduct of the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG). These are:

- **Independence:** Evaluators shall ensure that independence of judgment is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
- **Impartiality:** Evaluators shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project or organizational unit being evaluated.
- **Conflict of Interest:** Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any past experience, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise.
- **Honesty and Integrity:** Evaluators shall show honesty and integrity in their own behavior, negotiating honestly the evaluation costs, tasks, limitations, scope of results likely to be obtained, while accurately presenting their procedures, data and findings and highlighting any limitations or uncertainties of interpretation within the evaluation.
- **Competence:** Evaluators shall accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to complete successfully.
- **Accountability:** Evaluators are accountable for the completion of the agreed evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed, while operating in a cost effective manner.
- **Obligations to Participants:** Evaluators shall respect and protect the rights and welfare of human subjects and communities, in accordance with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights conventions. Evaluators shall respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting. Evaluators shall ensure prospective participants are treated as autonomous agents, free to



choose whether to participate in the evaluation, while ensuring that the relatively powerless are represented.

- **Confidentiality:** Evaluators shall respect people’s right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality, while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.
- **Avoidance of Harm:** Evaluators shall act to minimize risks and harms to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation findings.
- **Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability:** Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete and reliable. Evaluators shall explicitly justify judgments, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale, so that stakeholders are in a position to assess them.
- **Transparency:** Evaluators shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings. Evaluators shall ensure that stakeholders have a say in shaping the evaluation and shall ensure that all documentation is readily available to and understood by stakeholders.
- **Omissions and wrongdoing:** Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it to the proper oversight authority.