UN WOMEN

United Nations Entity for Gender Equality
and the Empowerment of Women

TERMS OF REFERENCE
FINAL EVALUATION OF UN WOMEN SUPPORT TO THE POSITIVE WOMEN'S NETWORK
ON HIV/AIDS PROJECTS IN INDIA

1. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

i. Background

The National AIDS Control Programme–Phase II (NACP-II) recognizes that involving people living with HIV/AIDS and affected communities in the HIV/AIDS response enables individuals and communities to draw on their life experiences and thus contributes to increasing the effectiveness and appropriateness of the HIV/AIDS response. The movement for people living with HIV in India made its presence felt in the mid 90's through the effort of a handful of affected people and has steadily grown in size, visibility and capacity. In the late 90's the first national network of people living with HIV, Indian Network for people living with HIV/AIDS (INP+), was formed which has since grown to have many state level networks and district level networks (DLNs). Soon women living with HIV/AIDS became part of the growing group of articulate and informed advocates, and felt the need of establishing a network for them. In October 1998 a small group of women living with HIV/AIDS formed the *Positive Women Network (PWN+)* to address the need for a support system and to improve the quality of life of women living with HIV and their children in India.

At present, PWN+ has over 5000 members across 16 states in India. Moving from a largely South-based network, it has now come to represent the face of WLHA (Women Living with HIV/AIDS) across the country. Through this journey the network has forged collaborations and partnerships with diverse stakeholders including UN agencies, NACO, government departments, SHG, CSOs and corporate institutions. PWN+ implements its programs through organizing and mobilizing women living with HIV toward self-reliance and sustainability implemented by them and through them.

UN Women has provided support to PWN+ programmes and projects on HIV/AIDS since early 2000s. Women constitute a part percentage of the total people living with HIV/AIDS in India. By 2004, there were more than two million women living with HIV/AIDS, which is approximately 39 percent of the estimated 5.1 million living with HIV/AIDS in the country. Nationally, the prevalence rate for adult females is 0.29 percent.[1] In the country there is a growing recognition of the feminisation of the epidemic. Existing studies on Gender and HIV/AIDS, have extensively documented such factors as low levels of awareness and limited access to healthcare, as being responsible for the growing incidence of HIV/AIDS among women. Women's vulnerability to HIV/AIDS stems from a host of circumstances. They include social norms that deny women sexual health knowledge and practices that prevent them from controlling their bodies. The economic, social and psychological burden on women, especially widows, of HIV/AIDS is immense and is compounded by poverty, physical ill health, social exclusion and responsibility of caring for dependents.

This gendered dimension of the HIV/AIDS epidemic provides the backdrop for UN Women's support to PWN+ programmes. In India, through its partnership with PWN+, UN Women advocates a gender-sensitive approach to combating HIV/AIDS and support women's participation in policy-making on HIV/AIDS.

ii. Rationale

UN Women has supported project initiatives of PWN+ since 2002 towards scaling-up advocacy on gender and HIV/AIDS and for increasing its outreach with groups of positive women. UN Women has supported various PWN+ activities on HIV/AIDs, including the following:

1. Empowering women living with HIV through advocacy, July 2004-Dec 2004.
2. Charca - creating a sustainable model in strengthening groups of young WLHA who are better able to advocate for their issues, 2005-06
3. Reviewing and taking stock of UN Women supported PWN+ activities, Sept-Dec 2005.

---

[1] Technical report, India HIV estimates 2006, NACO & ICMR

4. Increasing awareness amongst women living with HIV and others vulnerable, 2005-06
5. Empowering women living with HIV to lead a violence free life, Mar-Apr 2007.
6. National consultation and workshop for improving the participation, representation and involvement of Women Living with HIV, Aug 2008-Mar 2009
7. Strengthening and bringing new perspective to women Drop In Centres (DICs) with PWN+ of India, 2009-10.

Further details regarding these programmes can be found in Annex 1.

A UNIFEM sponsored report that examined PWN+ activities was published in September 2005[2]. This report conducted a detailed case study of various PWN+ activities and its partnership with UNIFEM since 2002. Two further UN Women monitoring reports were conducted in 2010 by Meera Mishra and Anindit Roy Chowdhary. However, there has been no evaluation of the overall programme and of UN Women supported PWN+ activities and initiatives since its inception. As a result, the PWN+ programme was selected for a corporate evaluation in the year 2010-2011 as per the UN Women's Evaluation Policy and Management Results Framework. This evaluation will examine UN Women's support to PWN+ programmes on HIV/AIDS since 2006.

2. OBJECTIVES

The principal objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Ascertain the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of UN Women's support to PWN+;
- Clarify the strategic role of UN Women vis-a-vis other development partners in providing support to PWN+ activities; and
- Identify gaps and form recommendations for improvement of UN Women's support for HIV/AIDS programmes and its partnership with PWN+.

The lessons from this evaluation are expected to strengthen and contribute to the improvement of the UN Women's support for HIV/AIDS programmes and projects in India.

3. SCOPE AND PRELIMINARY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

i. Scope

While UN Women has partnered with PWN+ since 2002, this evaluation only focuses on its activities since 2006 onward until 2010. The rationale for selecting this time period is that a case study report has already examined UN Women's support to PWN+ prior to 2005. UN Women supported several programme components in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Kerala, Delhi and few Northeastern states. A sub-sample of the UN Women supported will be selected for a detailed data collection and analysis.

ii. Evaluation questions

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess UN WOMEN's support to PWN+, between 2006 and 2010. It will provide findings and recommendations that are expected to assist in identifying strategies and operational approaches to strengthen UN WOMEN's mandate in the area of gender and HIV/AIDS as well as provide recommendations for its continued support to PWN+.

In addition to addressing the standard evaluation criteria – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact – this evaluation will be organized around a set of specific questions, each of which may address more than one of the criteria.

These questions are intended to make the criteria more precise and accessible, thus optimizing the focus and usefulness of the evaluation. The choice of evaluation questions determines the subsequent phases of information and data collection, methods of analysis, and derivation of final judgements discussed in the following sections.

The evaluation questions and their rationale will be revisited and modified by the evaluation team in the final inception report and then validated by the UN Women M&E Unit. The current questions and sub-questions are:

---

[2] Kousalya P., Shyamala Shiveshwarkar, Akhila Sivadas and Suneeta Dhar. 2005. "Using Rights-Based Processes Towards Building Gender-Sensitive Responses for Women Living with HIV/AIDS: The UNIFEM South Asia Partnership with the Positive Women Network, India and Centre for Advocacy and Research in India"

> **Q 1.   What is the relevance of UN Women's support to PWN+ programmes in context of its goals on gender and HIV/AIDS**
>
> 1.1 Is UN Women's support to PWN+ considered an important part of its overall strategy on gender and HIV/AIDS?
>
> 1.2 Do the activities supported by UN Women adequately address the issues of WLNA and other objectives on HIV/AIDS and gender?
>
> **Q 2.   How effective is UN Women's support to PWN+ in terms of the contents and delivery in improving the lives of WLHA and developing their network?**
>
> 2.1 Has UN Women support to PWN+ resulted in better delivery and content in its various activities?
>
> 2.2 To what extent has the capacity of the PWN+ members and stakeholders to create networks and improve WLHA's lives been enhanced by the PWN+ support?
>
> 2.3 To what extent has UN Women support to PWN+ resulted in improvements in the lives of WLHA women, removed social stigma and sensitized other stakeholders?
>
> 2.4 What factors (either facilitators or barriers) influenced the effectiveness of UN Women's support to PWN+ projects on HIV/AIDS?
>
> **Q 3.   What has been the impact of UN Women's support to PWN+ in improving the lives of WLHA and creating awareness about HIV/AIDS and gender?**
>
> 3.1 What evidence exists that the UN Women supported PWN+ activities, advocacy and training improved the lives of WLHA?
>
> 3.2 As a result of PWN+ intervention, what are the positive and negative changes produced directly or indirectly by the programme on the WLHA and other vulnerable groups, and on their societal conditions?
>
> **Q4. How efficient is the UN Women support to PWN+ programmes on HIV/AIDS?**
>
> 4.1 What steps were taken by UN Women at the planning and implementation stage to ensure that the partnership with PWN+ was efficient in its programme delivery?
>
> 4.2 What are the strengths and weaknesses of UN Women's support to PWN+ programmes?
>
> 4.3 How effective has UN Women been in ensuring adequate human, financial and technical resources towards the programme?
>
> **Q5. Has UN Women's support to PWN+ resulted in sustained institutional capacity and results?**
>
> 5.1 What is the likelihood that PWN+ can maintain similar level of programme delivery in the absence of UN Women support?
>
> 5.2 How has UN Women supported sustainability capacity in PWN+?

4. PRELIMINARY APPROACH

i.   Sampling Strategy

The reference period for this evaluation includes all UN Women supported activities and initiatives supported since 2006 since there already exists a case study of UN Women's partnership with PWN+ prior to 2006.

The geographical scope of this evaluation includes work done by UN Women to support PWN+ programmes across all states in India. Annex 1 shows that UN Women's support to PWN+ activities has been concentrated in the southern states, Delhi and a few northeastern states. Given the time and budget constraints, this evaluation will need to select a small sample of activities for data collection and analysis. There can be several criteria to guide the sample selection, including, the amount of UN Women's financial support, the number of beneficiaries and so on.

Within the sampled activities, various data collection activities will be undertaken, including interviews and surveys. Since the time elapsed since these activities were undertaken is relatively long, it will be difficult to trace all beneficiaries. Therefore, it will be difficult to get a representative sample for conducting interviews and surveys. The sampling strategy for selection of candidates for interviews and survey should be purposive, based on recommendations from PWN+ staff and identification by the evaluation team.

ii.   Data Collection

In view of the nature of UN Women's support to PWN+, the evaluation will seek to obtain data from a range of sources, including thorough desk reviews and document analyses, surveys and questionnaires, as well as stakeholder consultations, interviews and focus groups of UN Women programme staff, PWN+ members and staff, and beneficiaries. The rationale for using a range of data sources (data, perceptions, evidence) is to triangulate findings in a situation where much of the data, due to the very nature of UN Women's work in

HIV/AIDS, is qualitative, and its interpretation thus critically dependent on the evaluators' judgment. Triangulation provides an important tool in shoring up evidence by using different data sources to inform the analysis of specific issues.

Where possible and appropriate, the evaluation should seek to obtain evidence as to what may or may not have occurred in the absence of UN Women's support to PWN+. This is especially important given PWN+ received support from other UN agencies as well (such as UNICEF and UNAIDS) and it will difficult to distinguish the effectiveness of UN Women's work from the other agencies'.

The evaluation will be based on the following sources of data: (i) documents; and (ii) interviews with key personnel in UN Women and other partner agencies; PWN+ members and staff; and beneficiaries.

Document reviews should include all relevant documents pertaining to the project such as:

- UN Women ToR for PWN+ activities
- Periodic Reports submitted by PWN+.
- Workshop / training reports prepared by PWN+
- Project Completion reports submitted by PWN+
- Monitoring visit reports prepared by internal and external monitors of UN Women.

Supplementary interviews may include:

(i)   Semi-structured 'outsider' individual interviews with beneficiaries of PWN+ projects;
(ii)   Semi-structured 'insider' individual interviews with UN Women programme personnel, United Nations personnel in agencies directly collaborating with PWN+ on HIV/AIDS, and PWN+ members and staff involved with UN Women HIV/AIDS programmes.
(iii)   Other interviews to validate findings and to gather insights into the operational and other dimensions of UN Women's support of PWN+ activities.

Depending on the data source, the evaluation team will need to develop data collection instruments (such as semi-structured questionnaires, focus group checklists, and so on). Following an initial desk review, the evaluation team is expected to revisit this evaluation framework and propose the final areas of enquiry, evaluation questions and sub-questions, and the methodologies to be used for data collection and analysis in the Inception Report. The evaluation framework will be finalized in consultation with the UN Women SASRO.

5. EVALUATION MANAGEMENT

i.   Management arrangement

The UN Women SASRO M&E unit will provide the substantive technical support to the Evaluation Team and will work particularly closely with the Evaluation Team Leader throughout the evaluation.

Further, a stakeholder group will be constituted that will be consulted during different phases of the evaluation in order to (i) ensure an adequate understanding of the nature of UN Women's partnership with PWN+ and work in HIV/AIDS, (ii) validate the overall evaluation approach, (iii) ensure that the evaluation report is factually correct and contains no errors of interpretation, and (iv) facilitate the formulation of conclusions and recommendations that are relevant and utilization-focused. The stakeholder group will include a mix of UN Women programme staff and PWN+ staff members.

ii.   Evaluation team

This evaluation is to be carried out by a team comprising 3-4 individuals with advanced knowledge and experience in evaluation, especially related to HIV/AIDS. The core evaluation team will consist of one team leader and up to three junior experts or research assistants. The senior expert will act as the team leader and will be a HIV/AIDS expert with experience in conducting evaluations. The team leader will provide intellectual leadership and direction and will lead the dissemination of the findings and recommendations. *Given the budget constraint, the total number of team members should not exceed four.* Further details regarding team responsibilities and expected experience level are provided in Annex III.

iii. Evaluation schedule

Table 2: Timeline and Products

Activities	Weeks

#	Activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

1.	**Evaluation Planning**
	Initial document review
	Consultations with Programme Unit and M & E Unit on following:
	  o Evaluation approach
	  o Powerpoint presentation on the evaluation approach that will be shared with key stakeholders
		■								

2.	**Composition of evaluation team**	■								

3.	**Inception report** (not more than 10 pages) containing:
	  o Overview of the evaluation purpose and objectives
	  o Team - Roles and Responsibilities
	  o Evaluation Framework
	     ✓ Evaluation questions and sources of data
	     ✓ Sampling and data collection tools
	  o Work plan – including reporting timelines, data collection and analysis
	On submission of the inception report the second instalment will be released
			■							

4.	**Planning for data collection and field visits**
	  o Desk review of all the resource materials developed by PWN
	  o Drafting the questionnaire for the data collection (In consultation with the programme and M & E Unit)
	  o Pilot test the questionnaire
	  o Orientation of the evaluation team members for conducting the survey and interviews
				■						

5.	**Data collection and field visit** Field visits for data collection through individual interviews & FGDs with project functionaries/intermediaries, UNWOMEN programme unit and interviews with project beneficiaries				■	■				
6.	**Data compilation and analysis**						■			
7.	Draft Evaluation report and organization assessment report and reports submitted to UN Women SASRO (by the end of the week)							■		
8.	**Finalize Evaluation Report** incorporating comments from UN Women and other key stakeholders								■	
9.	**Workshop** to disseminate the findings of the evaluation with key stakeholders and UN Women Programme and Evaluation staff									■

iv. Deliverables

Deliverable 1 – Inception Report
Deliverable 2 – Final Evaluation Report
Deliverable 3 – Organizational Assessment Report
Deliverable 4 – Dissemination workshop

Inception Report

The inception report will include evaluation methodology, detailed workplan, data collection instruments (including questionnaire for the interviews)roles and responsibilities of the team members and plans for field visits.

Final Evaluation Report

A final evaluation report will be submitted by the organization and that should not exceed 75 pages, excluding Annexes. The Report should contain at least the following sections:

- Executive Summary
- Background and context of the evaluation
- Programme description – its logic theory, results framework and exogenous factors likely to affect success
- Evaluation purpose
- Evaluation approach and methodology
- Findings – from various data sources including desk reviews, case studies, interviews, surveys etc. Provide explanation of findings and interpretations
- Conclusions and lessons learnt
- Recommendations

- Annexes:
  - Terms of Reference for the evaluation
  - Itinerary (actual)
  - Data collection instruments: interview/survey questionnaire, focus group discussions questionnaire
  - List of documents reviewed
  - List of beneficiaries, PWN+ staff and (current and former) programme staff interviewed (without identifying names to maintain confidentiality).

Dissemination workshop

A dissemination workshop will be organized by the evaluation agency in consultation with and funded by UN Women SASRO, wherein PWN+ office bearers, various stakeholders involved in the HIV/AIDS programme and government departments will be invited. The dissemination workshop will present the key findings and recommendation of the evaluation. In addition the recommendations and experiences of the participants will also be documented in a separate module of the main report.

v. Evaluation audience

The evaluation users are UN Women headquarters, regional office and country programme office in S. Asia; Government of India and relevant ministries and departments; bilateral and multilateral agencies and donors; PWN+ staff and members and CSOs working on HIV/AIDS.

vi. Mode of payment

The payment for the consultants selected through the competitive process will be as per approved budget. 20% of the payment will be made on signing of the contract agreement, 30% on submission of the inception report, 30% on the submission of the draft evaluation report and the final 20% on the submission and acceptance of the final evaluation report and other agreed products.

ANNEX I: LIST OF PWN PROGRAMME ACTIVITIES/INITIATIVES, 2004-2010

Project Title and description	Project Period	Geographical spread	Major highlights	Total Project Cost
Charca Creating a sustainable model in strengthening groups of young WLHA who are better able to advocate for their issues	Aug 2005 – Feb, 2006 (7 mo)	Two districts in India – Either Guntur (Andhra Pradesh), and Kanpur (Uttar Pradesh)	Facilitated capacity building programme for 25 WLHA in 2 districts - Kanpur and Guntur / Bellary districts. Facilitated a multisectoral policy roundtable in each of the two districts. Developed a resource directory for WLHA in India. Training follow up, monitoring and refresher at district level	346,500
A Review of PWN+ activities in the past three years in partnership with UNIFEM	Sept – Dec 2005 (4 mo)	Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat	Conducted a participatory review of the impact of the work done by PWN+ in partnership with UNIFEM over the past 3 years. Identified and reviewed the existing situation regarding the integration of WLHA concerns into the schemes of the key Government Departments in 3 states. Developed strategies for operationalizing these schemes on the ground for WLHA. Reviewed activities in Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat. Organised a high level stakeholder's workshop in Andhra Pradesh with representatives from various ministries and departments of the Govt of India.	607,100
UN Trust Fund in Support of Actions to Eliminate Violence Against Women support for PWN+	30 Nov 2005 – 29 Nov 2006	**Madurai, TN**	Conducted a base line survey for 40 positive women from Madurai district to assess their knowledge on issues of reproductive health/ VAW/property and legal rights and livelihood options Organized 3 two-day training and capacity development workshops for these 40 positive women on reproductive health/VAW/property and legal rights and livelihood options in collaboration with women's groups working on these issues. Comprehensive documentation of each case profile of the 40 women and referrals made Developed some campaign material (posters/leaflets) to raise awareness of other vulnerable women in Madurai district on the linkages between reproductive health/ VAW & HIV/AIDS and other critical issues such as property rights and livelihood issues Organized one state level sensitization workshop bringing in representatives from panchayat raj institutions (PRIs), judiciary, health officials and police to share concerns of positive women Conducted an end line survey with the 40 positive women	**11,25,500**

Project Title and description	Project Period	Geographical spread	Major highlights	Total Project Cost
			Facilitated project evaluation and assessment	
National consultation and workshop for improving the participation, representation and involvement of Women Living with HIV	Aug 08 - Mar'09	National and state level representation from 8 - 10 states	PWN+ provided the advocacy materials such as brochures and media copies. UNIFEM partnership was acknowledged in all materials.	**11,99,200**
Empowering Women living with HIV/AIDS to protect their legal rights and lead a violence free life.	Mar-Apr2007	Kerala and Tamil Nadu	Activities included street plays, the 'Walk' and sensitization programme with college students, positive people, people in the government and the general public. Copies of the brochures and posters were developed for the project. Training programme was conducted End of Project Report was delivered that captured the work of PWN+ with regard to violence on HIV+ women. Submission of an audited statement certified by an external auditor. Also submit financial statement.	**2,71,200**
Strengthening & Bringing New Perspective To Women Drop In Centres (DICs) with PWN+ of India	November 2009 – October 2010	Tamil Nadu and Delhi	Revised operational guidelines and related tools developed for the women focused DICs DIC staff trained for effective implementation of the revised operational guidelines and related tools for scaling up Innovative partnership model set up in one DIC each in two states with women welfare organizations for leveraging support in the areas, viz., programmatic, technical, financial, etc. Formation of a partnership forum SACS and NGOs use the PWN+ developed training tools for operationalisation of the DIC guidelines in two states	**15,68,475**
Empowering women living with HIV through visioning, capacity building and advocacy.		Northern region (Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Gujarat, Delhi, and Orissa); Northeastern region (West Bengal, Manipur, Nagaland, Meghalaya and Assam). Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat	Conducted regional workshops for developing a national perspective of PWN's vision and activities to help PWN in strategic planning. Legal literacy workshops conducted. Mainstreaming gender issues of equity and empowerment in the Positive People Networks. Developing Advocacy materials on rights of positive women.	10,57,250/-

ANNEX II: EVALUATION TEAM

Team Responsibilities

The Evaluation Team will be responsible for:

  i.   Refining the evaluation approach and methodology;
 ii.   Implementing the evaluation with adequate attention to building ownership of common analysis and recommendations;
iii.   Developing and testing data collection instruments, including questionnaires, interview questions and focus group protocols;
 iv.   Developing any databases needed for processing quantitative and qualitative data;
  v.   Systematic evaluation data collection and data processing;
 vi.   Design and facilitation of required meetings;
vii.   Preparation and delivery of draft and final reports and presentations; and
viii. Completing the evaluation on time and within budget.

Expected Experience of Team

The evaluation team should consist of not more than four members with one senior expert and two junior experts or research assistants. As a unit, the Evaluation team must offer the following demonstrated experience and knowledge:

- Significant knowledge and experience of evaluation concepts and approaches;
- Experience of conducting studies and evaluation
- Experience of conducting financial analysis
- Knowledge of HIV/AIDS.
- Should also have experience of working with UN agencies.
- Good knowledge of the UN system, national programmes, information/ data/ statistical systems, etc.
- Updated experience with gender equality issues and knowledge of mainstreaming gender into policies/programming/development; knowledge of gender related strategies of government and non-government agencies;
- Sound understanding of human rights based approaches;
- Facilitation skills, particularly design of stakeholder consultations exercises;
- Strong quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis skills; and
- Excellent analytical skills and documentation skills.

The senior expert must have extensive experience in the field of evaluation, especially related to gender and HIV/AIDS. Ideally, the senior expert will be a known leader in the field and will serve the role of the team leader. The team leader should have:

- Minimum fifteen years working experience in international development and good understanding and experience of the UN system;
- Experience in conducting and leading corporate/organizational evaluation;
- Excellent analytical skills and communication skills.
- Demonstrated excellent report writing skills in English;
- Experience of facilitating workshops for initiating evaluation and for sharing evaluation findings.

The two junior team members should have at least five years experience in development, with specialization in gender, HIV/AIDS, social development, women's rights and international human rights instruments, and gender information, data and statistical systems. Evidence of the above experience of the team in conducting similar evaluations will need to be submitted by the team, in addition to their latest CVs.

ANNEX III: ETHICAL PRINCIPLES IN EVALUATION

INTENTIONALITY OF EVALUATION

Utility

Evaluations should be designed to help organisations address and effectively serve the needs of the full range of participants (see also 3.3 Participants). Evaluations are valuable to the extent to which they serve the information and decision-making needs of intended users, including answering the questions posed of the evaluation by its commissioners.

Necessity

Evaluation involves the expenditure of time and financial resources and, even where mitigated, can lead to disruption, invasion of privacy and exposure to risks. Therefore evaluations shall only be commissioned where they are necessary and the effort justified in terms of the benefits likely to accrue from the evaluation exercise.

OBLIGATIONS OF EVALUATORS

Independence

Evaluation in the United Nations systems should be demonstrably free of bias. To this end, evaluators are recruited for their ability to exercise independent judgement. Evaluators shall ensure that they are not unduly influenced by the views or statements of any party. Where the evaluator or the evaluation manager comes under pressure to adopt a particular position or to introduce bias into the evaluation findings, it is the responsibility of the evaluator to ensure that independence of judgement is maintained. Where such pressures may endanger the completion or integrity of the evaluation, the issue will be referred to the evaluation manager and, where necessary, the director of evaluation, who will discuss the concerns of the relevant parties and decide on an approach which will ensure that evaluation findings and recommendations are consistent, verified and independently presented. (See also 3.2.4 Conflict of Interest)

Impartiality

Evaluations must give a comprehensive and balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project or organizational unit being evaluated, taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders. Evaluators shall:

   i. Operate in an impartial and unbiased manner at all stages of the evaluation.
   ii. Collect diverse perspectives on the subject under evaluation
   iii. Guard against distortion in their reporting caused by their personal views and feelings.

Credibility

Evaluation shall be credible and based on reliable data and observations. Evaluation reports shall show evidence of consistency and dependability in data, findings, judgements and lessons learned; appropriately reflecting the quality of the methodology, procedures and analysis used to collect and interpret data. Evaluation managers and evaluators shall endeavour to ensure that each evaluation is accurate, relevant, and timely and provides a clear, concise and balanced presentation of the evidence, findings, issues, conclusions and recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest

Conflicts of interest shall be avoided as far as possible so that the credibility of the evaluation process and product shall not be undermined. Conflicts of interest may arise at the level of the Evaluation Office, or at that of individual staff members or consultants. Conflicts of interest should be disclosed and dealt with openly and honestly.

Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any past experience, of themselves, their immediate family, close friends or associates, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest.

Evaluators engaged by a UN agency shall not have had any responsibility for the design, implementation or supervision of any of the projects, programs or policies that they are evaluating.

Under exceptional circumstances, it may be necessary to engage an evaluator who has a past connection with the object of the evaluation, for example where there is very small pool of competent experts. In such a case,

measures to safeguard the integrity of the evaluation shall be adopted and such measures shall be disclosed in the evaluation report. The director of evaluation shall ensure that the evaluator in question is not appointed as evaluation manager or evaluation team leader.

The Evaluation Office shall avoid any conflict of interest, which might arise, or appear to arise, as a result of the acceptance of any form of external support or assistance. For example, the acceptance of supplementary funding for any of its activities, from bilateral or multilateral agencies or other parties shall be carefully considered and managed. Such funding must not lead to any bias in the evaluation approach, opinion, or findings. The director of evaluation shall carefully assess any offer of assistance to ensure the necessary independence of judgement from any contributing parties and to prevent any undue influence over the work of the Office.

Honesty and Integrity

Successful evaluation depends on the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process. Evaluators shall:

i. 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 successfully complete
ii. Negotiate honestly the costs, tasks to be undertaken, limitations of methodology, scope of results likely to be obtained, and uses of data resulting from the evaluation
iii. Accurately present their procedures, data and findings, including ensuring that the evaluation findings are not biased to make it more likely that the evaluator receives further commissions from the Client
iv. As far as possible, prevent or correct misuse of their work by others.
v. Decline evaluation assignments where the client is unresponsive to their expressed concerns that the evaluation methodology or procedures are likely to produce a misleading result. (If declining the assignment is not feasible, the evaluator shall record his/her dissent either in the evaluation report or otherwise).

Accountability

Evaluators are accountable for the completion of the evaluation as agreed with the Client. Specifically, evaluators shall:

i. Complete the evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed
ii. Exercise prudence and probity in fiscal decision–making so that evaluation expenditures are properly accounted for and the client receives value for money
iii. Give the evaluation manager early notice of any change to the evaluation plan or any risks to the successful completion of the evaluation and record the reasons for any changes made to the evaluation plan

OBLIGATIONS TO PARTICIPANTS

Evaluations shall be designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of human subjects and the communities of which they are members, in accordance with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights conventions.

Respect for Dignity and Diversity

Evaluators shall:

i. Respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, and be mindful of the potential implications of these differences when planning, carrying out and reporting on evaluations, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting
ii. Keep disruption to a minimum while needed information is obtained, providing the maximum notice to individuals or institutions they wish to engage in the evaluation, optimizing demands on their time, and respecting people's right to privacy.

Rights

In including individuals or groups in the evaluation, evaluators shall ensure:

i.   *Right to Self-Determination*. Prospective participants should be treated as autonomous agents and must be given the time and information to decide whether or not they wish to participate and be able to make an independent decision without any pressure or fear of penalty for not participating.

ii.   *Fair Representation*. Evaluators shall select participants fairly in relation to the aims of the evaluation, not simply because of their availability, or because it is relatively easy to secure their participation. Care shall be taken to ensure that relatively powerless, 'hidden', or otherwise excluded groups are represented.

iii.   *Compliance with codes for vulnerable groups*. Where the evaluation involves the participation of members of vulnerable groups, evaluators must be aware of and comply with legal codes (whether international or national) governing, for example, interviewing children and young people.

iv.   *Redress.* Stakeholders receive sufficient information to know a) how to seek redress for any perceived disadvantage suffered from the evaluation or any projects it covers, and b) how to register a complaint concerning the conduct of an Implementing or Executing Agency.

Confidentiality

Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality. Evaluators must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source so that the relevant individuals are protected from reprisals.

Avoidance of Harm

Evaluations can have a negative affect on their objects or those who participate in them. Therefore evaluators shall seek to: minimise risks to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation; and seek to maximize the benefits and reduce any unnecessary harms that might occur from negative or critical evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation.

EVALUATION PROCESS AND PRODUCT

Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability

Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete and reliable. In the evaluation process and in the production of evaluation products, evaluators shall:

i.   Carry out thorough inquiries, systematically employing appropriate methods and techniques to the highest technical standards, validating information using multiple measures and sources to guard against bias, and ensuring errors are corrected

ii.   Describe the purposes and content of object of the evaluation (programme, activity, strategy) clearly and accurately.

iii.   Present openly the values, assumptions, theories, methods, results, and analyses that significantly affect the evaluation, from its initial conceptualization to the eventual use of findings.

iv.   Examine the context in enough detail so its likely influences can be identified (for example geographic location, timing, political and social climate, economic conditions)

v.   Describe the methodology, procedures and information sources of the evaluation in enough detail so they can be identified and assessed.

vi.   Make a complete and fair assessment of the object of the evaluation, recording of strengths and weaknesses so that strengths can be built upon and problem areas addressed.

vii.   Provide an estimate of the reliability of information gathered and the replicability of results (ie how likely is it that the evaluation repeated in the same way would yield the same result?)

viii.   Explicitly justify judgements, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale so that stakeholders can assess them

ix.   Ensure all recommendations are based on the evaluation findings only, not on their or other parties' biases

Transparency

Transparency and consultation with the stakeholders are essential features of evaluation. The Evaluation Office and the evaluation team leader shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings.

Stakeholders shall be consulted on the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation and their views taken into account in the final TOR. The Evaluation Manager shall carefully balance the views and requirements of

stakeholders, ensuring that the evaluation retains a clear focus and that sound evaluation principles are not compromised by the wishes of stakeholders.

Evaluation methodology shall be disclosed in advance of the evaluation and clearly described in the evaluation report, including the assumptions and values underlying the evaluator's judgements. Evaluation documents shall be easily readable and specify their information sources and approaches.

Evaluation reports shall make the link between evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations transparent, persuasive and proportionate to the body of evidence collected.

Reporting

The formal parties to an evaluation should ensure that the full set of evaluation findings along with pertinent limitations are made accessible to the persons affected by the evaluation, and to any others with legitimate claims or rights to receive the results, in relevant language(s).

As a norm, all evaluation reports shall be made public. Evaluation reports will only be withheld from publication for compelling reasons and in accordance with relevant rules within each agency. The director of evaluation shall ensure high standards in accessibility and presentation of published reports and use a range of channels to reach audiences through, for example, electronic and interactive channels, knowledge networks, communities of practice, presentations at relevant conferences, as well as appropriate publications.

At country level, evaluation findings shall be presented and discussed at the appropriate national or local level, to enable stakeholders to respond to them, and ideally before the evaluation report is complete.

All materials generated in the conduct of the evaluation are the property of the agency and can only be used by permission. Responsibility for distribution and publication of evaluation results rests with the Evaluation Office. With the permission of the agency, evaluation consultants may make briefings or unofficial summaries of the results of the evaluation outside the agency.

Original data, including interview records and meeting notes will be retained in confidential files until completion of the evaluation. The director of evaluation shall determine an appropriate time for further retention, after which such data shall be securely disposed of in accordance with any Agency policy on the disposal of records. Databases of unpublished information on individual project activities shall be securely stored in the Evaluation Office and available for use only by the Office's staff and consultants, and only released to consultants in a manner which will maintain confidentiality and evaluation integrity.

Omissions and wrongdoing

Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it, whether or not such conduct relates directly to the evaluation Terms of Reference. Evaluators shall inform the Evaluation Manager who will in turn agree with the Evaluation Director on the most appropriate channel for reporting wrong-doing. Details of any wrong-doing, including names or events, shall only be divulged to the proper oversight authority

ANNEX IV: TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL CRITERION FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSALS

i. Technical evaluation

Part 1. Management Plan: Expertise of firm/organization submitting proposal		Points obtainable
1.1	Reputation of Organization and Staff (Competence / Reliability)	35
1.2	General Organizational Capability which is likely to affect implementation (i.e. loose consortium, holding company or one firm, size of the firm / organization, strength of project management support e.g. project financing capacity and project management controls)	20
1.3	Extent to which any work would be subcontracted (subcontracting carries additional risks which may affect project implementation, but properly done it offers a chance to access specialized skills.	20
1.4	Quality assurance procedures, sustainability	30
1.5	Relevance of: Specialized Knowledge Experience on Similar Evaluations / Assessments Experience on Evaluations / Assessments in the Region Work for other UN agencies/ major multilateral or bilateral programmes	70
Total part 1		*175*
Proposed Work Plan and Approach		*Points Obtainable*
2.1.	Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR?	85
2.2.	Is there a clear understanding of the intervention being evaluated, and its linkages to UN's mandate and priorities?	30
2.3.	Is the information about expected results – outputs, outcomes and impact addressed?	30
2.4.	Is the proposal based on a survey of the project environment and was this data input properly used in the preparation of the proposal?	30
2.5.	Have the important aspects of the task been addressed in sufficient detail?	30
2.6.	Is the conceptual framework adopted appropriate for the task?	30
2.7.	Is the role of stakeholders described and addressed?	20
2.8.	Is the requirement to develop lessons learned identified?	20
2.9.	Does the workplan include an outline/table of contents for the final report?	25
2.10.	Does the work schedule set out a logical progression of activities through to completion?	25
2.11.	Have timeframes/target dates been establish for all key tasks, milestones and deliverables	25
Total Part 2		350

Part 3. Resource Plan: Personnel			Points Obtainable
3.1.	Is the evaluation team composition relevant to the subject to be evaluated?		25
3.2.	Was the experience and expertise of team clearly explained?		25
3.3.	Have the primary roles and key responsibilities for all the individuals making a major contribution to the evaluation been adequately identified and accountabilities clearly stated?		20
3.4.	Task Manager / Team Leader	50	
3.4.1.	Professional Experience in the field of evaluation		35
3.4.2.	Knowledge of the subject area		15
3.5.	Senior Experts	35	
3.5.1.	Professional Experience in the field of evaluation		25
3.5.2.	Knowledge of the subject area		10
3.6.	Junior Experts/Field Coordinators	20	
3.6.1.	Professional Experience in the field of evaluation		15
3.6.2.	Knowledge of the subject area		5

			175
Total Part 3			175
GRAND TOTAL			700

During the technical evaluation all the proposals will be evaluated on the above mentioned criterions. All the proposals scoring 70% of 700 pts = 490 pts will be shortlisted for the financial evaluation.

ii. Financial Evaluation

Financial evaluation criterions – during the financial evaluation the financial proposals will be assessed on the basis of the following criterions:

Criteria
1. Personnel Cost
2. Travel Cost
3. Programme Cost
4. Administrative Cost

Please provide complete breakdown of the respective budget heads and sub heads along with the details. The budget heads and sub heads are mentioned in the below matrix:

	Budget Heads	Total No. of Units / Persons	Unit Rate	Total Budget	Justification (breakdown of cost)
1.	**Personnel Cost (Please mention Number of days involvement)**				
1.1.	Salary of each of the full time staff engaged in the evaluation (separately)				
1.2.	Salary of each of the part time staff engaged in the evaluation (separately)				
1.3.	Honorarium / consultancy payment to each of the consultants to be hired for the evaluation (separately along with the respective specialised field)				
2.	**Travel Cost**				
2.1.	Air / train Travel Cost				
2.2.	Boarding and Lodging cost				
2.3.	Subsistence allowance / per diem payment				
2.4.	Local Travel cost				
3.	**Programme Cost**				
3.1.	Expenses for Data entry / Data Compilation / Data Analysis				
3.2.	Printing				
3.3.	Expenses for meetings				
3.4.	Report writing				
4.	**Administrative Cost**				
4.1.	Stationary, Xerox				
4.2.	Communication				
4.3.	Accounting charges (audited statement)				

Note:

1. **Please provide footnotes wherever necessary**
2. **The cost of the dissemination workshop will be incurred by UN WOMEN**.