

FINAL EVALUATION - TERMS OF REFERENCE
INTEGRATING GENDER RESPONSIVE BUDGETING IN THE
AID EFFECTIVENESS AGENDA Programme

1. BACKGROUND

The 2005 Paris Declaration (PD) increased focus on aid effectiveness around the principles of national ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results, and mutual accountability between donor and partner countries for achievement of better development. The PD identified gender equality as a cross-cutting issue that “can be advanced through implementing the principles and partnership commitments of the Paris Declaration.”¹ The Accra High Level Forum (HLF) on Aid Effectiveness (2008) intensified attention to gender in the new aid architecture, stating, “developing countries and donors will ensure that their respective development policies and programmes are designed and implemented in ways consistent with their agreed international commitments on gender equality, human rights, disability and environmental sustainability.”² At the close of 2011, at the HLF4 in Busan, Korea more than 3,000 delegates gathered to address the importance of maintaining focus on aid effectiveness in the face of the current global financial crisis. The HLF4 outcome document stated, “We must accelerate our efforts to achieve gender equality and the empowerment of women through development programmes grounded in country priorities, recognising that gender equality and women’s empowerment are critical to achieving development results. Reducing gender inequality is both an end in its own right and a prerequisite for sustainable and inclusive growth.”

Two important changes have occurred since the start of the *Integrating Gender Responsive Budgeting in the Aid Effectiveness Agenda* programme that has implications for its implementation and evaluation. At the start of the programme, neither the Accra nor the Busan HLFs had taken place and as it closes, the two forums have occurred placing gender equality high on the development cooperation agenda. Furthermore, the establishment of the UN Entity for Gender Equality and Empowerment (UN-Women), which merges the work and mandates of four agencies focused on gender equality and women’s empowerment in the UN system, brings greater political urgency to addressing issues of gender.³ UN-Women, established by General Assembly Resolution in July 2010, is mandated to assist Member States and the entire UN system to progress more effectively and efficiently toward the goal of achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women globally.⁴

This programme sets out to address a recognized need to “focus on linking the aid effectiveness agenda with the far-reaching commitments that countries have made to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment, in line with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the Beijing Platform of Action (PFA), the UN Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against women (CEDAW), and UN Security Council Resolution 1325,” (Project Document 2007). The programme is an integral part of efforts to respond to the demand for tools that facilitate the practical application of the principles and

¹ Workshop on Development Effectiveness in Practice – Applying the Paris Declaration to Advancing Gender Equality, Environmental Sustainability and Human Rights (Dublin, April 2007)
<http://www.povertyenvironment.net/files/dublin%20workshop%2026-27%20April%202007.pdf>

² The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf>

³ UN-Women brings together: UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW), Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women (OSAGI), and UN International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (UN-INSTRAW).

⁴ UN Women Strategic Plan (2011-2013)

partnership commitments of the PD toward the achievement of gender equality. Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB) is identified as a key strategy toward the achievement of gender equality and efficient gender mainstreaming and a key requirement for promotion of GE within General Budget Support (GBS).

2. JUSTIFICATION AND PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The final, end-of-programme evaluation will be conducted by an independent, external team. It is mandatory, undertaken as agreed with the European Commission (EC) in December 2007. It will assess programmatic progress (and challenges) at the outcome level, with measurement of the output level achievements and gaps and how/to what extent these have affected outcome-level progress. The evaluation will examine the global-level efforts, particularly in the areas of advocacy and policy, as well as programmatic implementation in five focal countries. It will consist of a desk review, country-level visits, in-depth interviews with UN Women staff (at HQ, regional and country levels), and in-depth interviews with EU Delegation staff at country level, donors, and partners. It will contribute to results-based management through a participatory approach that documents results achieved, challenges to progress, and contributions to the creation of a more conducive environment for addressing gender equality in the aid effectiveness agenda.

In October 2010, the mid-point of programme implementation, the EC conducted an external Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) exercise - a rapid assessment of the programme to determine whether it would be able to achieve the expected results. The EC ROM assessed progress to date, potential for impact and sustainability of the programme. The findings and recommendations provide a useful, mid-point review that will support the final evaluation. Its recommendations will be fully integrated in the evaluation process.

Evaluation Objectives

The specific evaluation objectives are to:

- a) Analyze the relevance and effectiveness of the programmatic strategy and approaches;
- b) Validate programme results in terms of achievements and/or weakness toward the outcomes and outputs at country level, with a critical examination of how/to what extent the programme contributed to the creation of an enabling environment for the application of GRB in the context of new aid modalities;
- c) Assess the potential for sustainability of the results and the feasibility of ongoing, nationally-led efforts in GRB in the five programme countries;
- d) Document lessons learned to inform future work of various stakeholders in addressing gender equality within the context of the aid effectiveness agenda; and
- e) Document and analyze possible weaknesses in order to improve next steps of GRB implementation.

The information generated by the evaluation will be used by different stakeholders to:

- Contribute to building the evidence base on effective strategies for gender responsive budgeting that can be utilized after the programme's completion, specifically as lessons for the new EU/UN partnership programme *Increasing Accountability in Financing for Gender Equality* (FfGE). For the 5 countries involved in the FfGE programme, a deeper analysis will be required.

- Support implementing countries to contribute to strategic planning to convert the programme outputs into sustainable outcomes.
- Facilitate UN Women’s strategic reflection and learning for programming on GRB in support of the implementation of outcomes of the UN Women’s strategic plan (2011-2013) including the outcome dedicated to ensure that “budget processes fully incorporate gender equality” as well as other outcomes with reference to the application of GRB in support of UN Women’s work.
- Support knowledge building for EC – both at headquarters and in delegations - in the area of applicability of GRB as a strategy to effectively address gender equality in the aid effectiveness agenda and methods to further develop complementarities between such efforts in programme countries and other countries beginning to use GRB tools.
- Provide necessary information about how the programme affected the working relationship between UN Women and the EC at the country level.

3. PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION⁵

The programme implementation period is 48 months (March 2008 – March 2012) with a total budget of €2,731,127.00. The EC contribution was €2,610,537.00.

The programme development impact is to *enhance accountability for gender equality and women’s empowerment of donor and partner countries in the aid effectiveness agenda*. The programme seeks to contribute to the overall objective by demonstrating how gender responsive budgeting (GRB) tools and strategies contribute to enhancing a positive impact of GBS and SWAps on gender equality.

The programme identifies the following specific outcome-level objectives:

1. To deepen understanding of EU decision makers and national partners of effective uses of gender responsive budgeting (GRB) tools and strategies in the context of General Budget Support (GBS) and sector-wide approaches and programmes (SWAps)
2. To improve country capacity to institutionalize the application of GRB in the context of the aid effectiveness agenda

The programme includes two phases (Phase I (March 2008-March 2009) and Phase II (July 2009 – March 2012)) that correspond to the achievement of the two programme outcomes:

1. A multi-country research review towards the achievement of Outcome 1.
 - The research study culminated in an in-depth analysis of how GRB engaged with the key instruments that are relevant to GBS. Countries included in the review were: **Cameroon**, Ethiopia, India, Morocco, Mozambique, **Nepal**, **Peru**, **Rwanda**, **Tanzania**, and Uganda.⁶
 - The knowledge generated from the studies was to be used to: 1) advocate for policy support for practical tools and strategies that enhance accountability to gender, specifically GRB, at the Accra High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, and 2) improve country capacity to generate good practices around the use of GRB in new aid modality instruments.

⁵ See Annex 2 for the detailed programme description

⁶ Countries in bold are the five focal countries selected (based on specific criteria) for targeted capacity strengthening in Phase II.

2. Targeted and tailored technical support to Ministries of Finance in five countries towards the achievement of Outcome 2.
 - At country level, to enhance technical and organizational capacity of Ministries of Finance and line ministries on incorporation of gender in GBS instruments; GBS instruments incorporate gender responsive measures.
 - At global level, facilitate shared learning of good practices on institutionalization of GRB in the context of the aid effectiveness agenda.

A one-year no-cost extension (NCE) request was submitted in February 2010 and was granted by the EC in July 2010 to ensure that there was a full two-year country-level programmatic implementation period. The primary reasons for the NCE request were:

- Delays in the launch of country implementation, due to the time required for in-depth analysis of country research studies and stakeholder consultation to select the five countries for phase II,
- The transition period required between the completion of country research studies and country implementation to facilitate partnerships and ensure the programme was aligned with national planning and budgeting processes.

4. EVALUATION SCOPE & POTENTIAL QUESTIONS

The scope of the evaluation will be defined along the lines of timeframe, geographic coverage, and thematic scope.

Timeframe: the evaluation will cover the 48-month programme implementation period of March 2008 – March 2012.⁷

Geographic scope: the evaluation will assess the two programmatic phases:

- Phase I that included the multi-country research in 10 countries and corresponding regional and global advocacy and policy efforts⁸, and
- Phase II - implementation at country level in the five focal programme countries (Cameroon, Nepal, Peru, Rwanda, and Tanzania) as well as continued global advocacy and policy work.

The evaluation team will conduct field visits in three of the five programme implementation countries, to be selected collaboratively by the evaluation team and Core Reference Group, based primarily on criteria: i) regional/sub-regional balance, ii) appropriate mix of countries where implementation can be deemed “strong” and “challenging”, and iii) at least one country where new aid modalities are well developed.

There will also be an assessment of the global management over the lifetime of the programme.

Thematic scope: the evaluation will examine how the programme contributed to the creation of an enabling environment for GRB efforts, methods used to address existing obstacles to progress, and the contributions made by the programme to national, regional and global dialogue on gender equality in aid effectiveness. It will also address the ways in which this programme complemented (or competed) with other similar initiatives and analyze the roles of different stakeholders in programmatic implementation

⁷ The timeframe includes the initially planned 36-month programme period and the 12-month no-cost-extension.

⁸ For the Phase I assessment, more in depth attention will be paid to countries not participating in Phase II but involved in the FfGE programme (Ethiopia).

and potential sustainability. The evaluation will provide a timely opportunity to take stock of the reasons behind identified weaknesses, if any. Finally, the evaluation will address the ways in which the global efforts (during Phase I and Phase II) influenced country implementation (Phase II) and vice versa.

Evaluation Criteria & Sample Questions

The evaluation will address the five criteria of *relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact*.⁹ As this is a final evaluation to be conducted at the end of the programme, there will be limited ability to assess long-term impact. However, the evaluation will endeavor to make informed statements about the anticipated sustainability and immediate impact of the programme.

The following potential evaluation questions are organized by each of the main five evaluation criteria. They are focused on the main, planned areas of programmatic achievement as described in the Project Document (2007). Under each criterion, questions are categorized as “global” or “country” to emphasize whether the question aims to assess a global or country-level component. Where a question may be pertinent to both levels, it will be indicated as global/country. Where feasible, questions have been adapted from the assessment framework used in the EC-ROM exercise.

It is expected that the overall analytical framework will be revised by the evaluation team during the Inception Phase.

A. Relevance

Global

- How has the programme taken into account findings and recommendations from previous monitoring/evaluations to improve the relevance of the programme?
- Has the programme contributed to increased policy-level coherence on gender equality in the aid effectiveness agenda or not?

Country

- Did the sharing of the Phase I findings at national and regional levels support the building of consensus on the importance of gender equality in GBS instruments?
- How were the findings and baseline data from the Phase I research studies integrated into the Phase II country implementation plans?

Global/Country

- Were the programmatic approaches and strategies appropriate to address the identified needs for the agreed-upon beneficiaries?
- What were the benefits (and challenges) of the two-phase programme design and how did this design affect programme implementation?
- Can it be said that there is no overlap between this programme and other interventions in the partner country and/or other donors' interventions?

⁹ The evaluation criteria build upon the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) evaluation criteria and align with the DAC/OECD criteria. They also include questions that capture coherence and inclusion/participation, listed under relevance and effectiveness respectively.

B. Effectiveness

Global

- Have EC policy makers and partner country decision makers increased their knowledge of the use of GRB tools and strategies to enhance action on gender equality in the aid effectiveness agenda?
- What specific advocacy and policy contributions were made at the HLF3 and HLF4 in regard to gender equality within the aid effectiveness agenda? How did these contributions influence the aid effectiveness agenda?
- How effectively has the programme management monitored performance and results and supported communication of these results internally and/or externally?

Country

- How did the recruitment of Technical Advisers in each of the five countries (Phase II) affect the programme implementation?
- How have the technical and organizational capacities of Ministries of Finance in each of the five countries been modified to effectively integrate gender into GBS and/or SWAps?
- Is a comprehensive country-level capacity building action plan in-place in each of the five countries? Have these plans been integrated into the Ministry of Finance capacity strengthening efforts and have they also addressed the capacity needs of other line ministries, and how?
- What documented changes have occurred since the start of the programme in GBS instruments, and do they illustrate a positive, negative or neutral shift in the incorporation of gender equality?

Global/Country

- What influence have contextual factors (political, social, economic, and other) had on the effectiveness of the programme? (Consider conducting cross-country comparison based on country case study findings).
- How has the programme disseminated learning on good practices (country, regional and/or global levels) on institutionalization of GRB in the aid effectiveness agenda and through what means?
- Has the programme adapted (when necessary) to changing external conditions to ensure benefits for target groups?
- How did the programme involve women's organizations and organizations advocating for gender equality over the course of the programme?

C. Efficiency

Country

- Did the programme contribute positively to the work between the EC and UN Women in each of the five countries?
- Did the hiring of Technical Advisers in each country improve the cost-benefit ratio of capacity strengthening activities?

Global/Country

- Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the programmatic outcomes?
- Are programme resources managed in a transparent and accountable manner (at all levels) which promotes equitable and sustainable development?
- To what extent has the programme management structure facilitated (or hindered) good results and efficient delivery?

D. Sustainability

Global

- How effectively is GRB institutionalized in global policy dialogue addressing the aid effectiveness agenda?

Country

- What is the level of programme ownership by intended beneficiaries at country level and how will it likely be after the end of external support?
- Are national partners in each of the five countries committed to the continuation of the programme (or some its elements) after funding ends?
- Is there a phase-out strategy defined in each of the five countries? If yes, what is its stage of implementation?

Global/Country

- To what extent have relevant target beneficiaries actively involved in decision-making concerning programme orientation and implementation?
- How has the global policy and advocacy work informed country implementation in the five countries? How have country experiences and lessons been integrated into global level advocacy messages?
- How have the five programme countries been included in the planning and implementation of global policy efforts?

E. Impact

Global

- How has increased understanding among EC decision makers and partner countries on the effective uses of GRB tools and strategies in the context of GBS and SWAs affected the global policy dialogue on aid effectiveness?

Country

- What measurable changes have occurred, as a result of increased national capacity to institutionalize GRB, in the inclusion of gender equality in the application of GBS instruments in each of the five countries?

5. AVAILABLE INFORMATION SOURCES

All available information will be shared with the selected evaluation team in a timely manner. The available information sources include (but are not limited to):

- Country mapping studies and 10-country synthesis report
- Country strategy papers (CSPs)
- Project Documents
- Programme Management Guide
- Logframes and implementation plans (overall and country-specific)
- Monitoring frameworks & reports
- Annual reports
- Donor reports
- Regional consultation documents
- Steering Committee documents
- Mission reports

- EC Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) documents (synthesis report, country-specific reports, tabular ratings (overall and by country))
- Skills building workshop documents (agenda, presentations, report)
- Previous evaluations (as pertinent)
- Evaluability assessment
- Accra and Busan HLF documents (outcome documents, policy briefings, advocacy messages)
- Knowledge products (fact sheets, brochure, case studies, etc.)
- Global meeting documents (agenda, presentations, logistics planning, report)

6. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology will assess Phase I and Phase II of the programme, examining how (and to what extent) the two phases achieved agreed-upon results and recognizing the relational components between Phase I and Phase II. Phase I (March 2008-March 2009) focused on research efforts, regional consultation, and global level advocacy and policy work, specifically aimed at Accra HLF3. This phase generated country-level and synthesized evidence, tools and global advocacy that influenced the inclusion of gender at Accra HLF3. Phase II focused on country-level implementation in five countries, while continuing to build the evidence base and deliver global advocacy and policy contributions. The global efforts of Phase II culminated in the contributions made at the Busan HLF4. Therefore, the final evaluation methodology will document and analyse the distinct achievements of each programmatic phase, while also assessing the ways in which global efforts contributed to national implementation and country-level work influenced global advocacy and policy.

The evaluation will use a mixed-method approach that aligns to the final question matrix (to be completed by the evaluation team in consultation with the Core Reference Group). An initial desk review and brief discussions with key stakeholders will support the refinement and finalization of the methodology and analytical framework. Upon completion of the Inception Phase, country case studies will be completed in three of five programme countries. The in-depth research period will include country visits as well as further document review and in-depth interviews with UN Women staff, EU staff, and partners at national, regional and global levels. The entire methodology will ensure a fully participatory process, engaging multiple stakeholders from the planning to the final reporting stage. It will also ensure that human rights and gender equality are considered throughout.

The evaluation will draw on the findings of the EC-ROM. The resulting review matrices, country and synthesis reports provide useful information about the programme relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and potential sustainability (as of October 2010). This information will help the evaluation team assess what actions have been taken to address the ROM findings and recommendations.

An initial evaluability assessment is another tool available to the evaluation team. This assessment was conducted through a review of the Project Document, country monitoring reports, multi-country research study, individual country research studies, and annual reports. A first draft was prepared by the UN Women *Gender Mainstreaming in National Systems* (GMS) team and then shared with the Evaluation Unit, country-based colleagues, and EC. The evaluability assessment provides summary information about the programme design, information availability, and contextual factors affecting the evaluation.

It is expected that the evaluation methodology will be refined by the selected evaluation team and validated by the Core Reference Group.

The main suggested phases of the evaluation methodology are:

a) Inception Phase:

- Conduct an initial desk review of available documents.
- Conduct brief interviews (via skype or phone) with key stakeholders to refine the evaluation scope and methodology.
- Draft an Inception Report that will be reviewed by the Core Reference Group.
- Refine the evaluation methodology/question matrix based on Core Reference Group's feedback and integrate proposed changes (as appropriate) into the final evaluation report.

b) Intensive Research Phase:

- A more in-depth review of documents.
- Review existing baseline data (primarily from individual country-based research studies) to determine available data (or could be reframed) against which to measure progress.
- Conduct three field visits (one per country).
- Collect survey data from beneficiaries and select sectoral ministries.
- Deliver PowerPoint presentation of key findings for each country visited.
- Conduct in-depth interviews with global, regional, and national UN Women staff, partner organizations, donor representatives, and others as necessary.

c) Analysis and Report Writing Phase:

- Review and analyse all available data.
- Prepare first draft of the synthesis evaluation report and submit to Core Reference Group for comments.
- Share main findings/recommendations through a meeting with Core & Broad Reference Groups and other key stakeholders (TBD).
- Revise report based on the feedback from Core Reference Group and debriefing session (as appropriate).
- Submit final report.

7. MANAGEMENT OF EVALUATION

The evaluation will be managed by UN Women, specifically the UN Women *Gender Mainstreaming in National Systems* (GMS) team. The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with UN Women evaluation guidelines and UNEG norms and standards.¹⁰ Upon completion of the evaluation, UN Women has the responsibility to prepare a management response that addresses the findings and recommendations to ensure future learning and inform implementation of their relevant programmes, especially the FfGE programme.

The evaluation management structure will be comprised of one coordinating entity and two consultative bodies: the **Management Group**, the **Core Reference Group**, and the **Broad Reference Group**. The HQ-based Programme Specialist (evaluation manager) will manage the day-to-day aspects of the evaluation. This evaluation will be a participatory process and the evaluation manager will ensure consultations with the European Commission, the UN Women GMS team, relevant geographic sections and regional and country offices as required.

¹⁰ Annex 3 contains the full UNEG evaluation norms and standards.

The **Management Group** will be responsible for management of the evaluation. It will coordinate the selection and recruitment of the evaluation team, manage contractual agreements, budget and personnel involved in the evaluation, support the reference groups, provide all necessary data to the evaluation team, facilitate communication between the evaluation team and the reference groups, and review draft and final reports and collate feedback to share with the evaluation team. The **Management Group** will include:

- UN Women (Programme Advisor, GMS; Programme Manager, GMS; Evaluation Manager)
- European Commission

The **Core Reference Group** will provide direct oversight, safeguard independence, and give technical input over the course of the evaluation. It will provide guidance on evaluation team selection and key deliverables (Inception Report and Evaluation Report) submitted by the evaluation team. It will also support dissemination of the findings and recommendations. The **Core Reference Group** will include:

- Representatives, UN Women
- Representatives, European Commission
- Independent experts (1-2 persons)

The **Broad Reference Group** will be informed throughout the evaluation process and will be asked to participate at strategic points during the evaluation, including briefings by the evaluation team of findings and recommendations. It will also support dissemination of the findings and recommendations. The **Broad Reference Group** participants will be:

- Regional Programme Directors, UN Women
- National Programme Coordinators, UN Women, for programme countries¹¹
- EU Delegation Programme Officers for respective programme countries
- Representative, Evaluation Unit, UN Women
- Representative, ITC/ILO

8. TIMEFRAME & DELIVERABLES

Following the in-depth preparatory work, the evaluation will be conducted from 30 March – 15 August 2012. The primary evaluation deliverables are:

- Inception Report: this report will include a detailed evaluation methodology, revised evaluation question matrix, proposed data collection tools and analysis approach, and final evaluation work plan (with corresponding timeline);
- PowerPoint Presentations to each country at the close of each field visit;
- First draft of the Evaluation Report;
- PowerPoint Presentation to Core Reference Group & Broad Reference Group on main Findings/Recommendations and proposed dissemination strategy; and
- Final Evaluation Report.

¹¹ National Programme Coordinators will liaise with pertinent multi-stakeholder groups, including EU delegation staff, at national level to inform them of the evaluation process.

Indicative Timeframe	Primary Activities	Deliverable
Preparatory Stage		
10 Jan-mid Feb 2012	Review and finalize evaluation TORs	
Mid-February 2012	Post evaluation RFP	Evaluation TOR & RFP
Mid-February 2012	Finalize Core and Broad Reference Groups and send first email communication, including proposed evaluation schedule and expected responsibilities	
Early March 2012	Review evaluation team submissions	
March 2012	Begin arrangements for country-level visits; Schedule first Core Reference Group meeting; Send all pertinent documents to selected evaluation team	
30 March 2012	Convene 1 st Core Reference Group meeting; Complete evaluation team selection and notify applicants of decision	
Inception Phase		
20 April 2012	Evaluation team submits Inception Report, including proposed methodology, workplan, and agreed-upon deliverables/timeframe	Inception Report
End of April 2012	Convene Core Reference Group to discuss Inception Report, provide feedback to evaluation team, finalize methodology, questions, and workplan.	Final Evaluation Methodology, Question Matrix, and Workplan
Intensive Research Phase		
1 May – 1 June 2012	Evaluation team conducts 3 country visits	PowerPoint presentations to each country with summary of main findings.
1May – 30 June 2012	Evaluation team conducts further document review, interviews with global, regional UN Women staff, partner organizations, donors, etc.	
Analysis & Report Writing Phase		
20 July 2012	Evaluation team submits first draft Evaluation Report.	1 st draft evaluation report
30 July 2012	Convene Core & Broad Reference Groups for debrief (virtual) by evaluation team on preliminary findings, main recommendations, challenges, and opportunities.	PowerPoint Presentation on findings and recommendations
15 August	Submission of Final Evaluation Report	Final Evaluation Report

9. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION & SKILLS

The evaluation will be conducted by an external evaluation team composed of 3 experts with the requisite skill set (individually and jointly) to conduct a complex, outcome-level final evaluation. The evaluation team leader will demonstrate experience and expertise in leadership and coordination of evaluations. The team leader will be responsible for internal evaluation team coordination, preparation of the workplan, and the presentation of the evaluation deliverables.

Specifically, the **evaluation team leader** is expected to have the following expertise:

- At least a master's degree; PhD preferred, in any social science, preferably including gender, evaluation or social research;
- Technical expertise in gender, aid effectiveness, and national planning and budgeting;
- A minimum of 12 years of working experience applying qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods, particularly at the outcome level of a final evaluation;
- A strong record in designing and leading evaluations;
- Strong ability to translate complex data into effective, written reports;
- Experience in gender analysis and human rights. Detailed knowledge of the role of the UN and EU and their programming is desirable.
- High level data analysis skills;
- In-country or regional experience in at least one of the identified regions;
- English language proficiency, with ability in another UN language preferred.

The Evaluation Team Leader will be responsible for coordinating the evaluation as a whole, the evaluation team, the work plan, delivery of the expected evaluation outputs and all presentations. The Team Leader is required to **submit two examples of evaluation reports** recently completed where she/he contributed significantly as the lead writer.

The **evaluation team members** should have skills in the following:

- At least a master's degree related to any of the social sciences, preferably including gender studies, evaluation or social research;
- Significant experience in gender and/or aid effectiveness;
- Familiarity with national planning and budgeting;
- Extensive knowledge and experience in the application of quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods;
- A minimum of 7 years of working experience in conducting evaluations;
- High level data analysis skills;
- In-country or regional experience in at least one of the identified regions;
- English language proficiency, with ability in another UN language required.

The evaluation team should be multicultural with gender balance and geographic representation. The language skill composition should reflect the official languages of the countries to be evaluated: English, French and Spanish.

Annex 1: Criteria for Assessment of Evaluation Team

Annex 2: Detailed programme description

Annex 2: Broad Outline – Final Evaluation Report format

Annex 3: United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Evaluation Ethical Code of Conduct

ANNEX 1: Evaluation Team Selection Criteria

The selection of the Evaluation Team will be based on the fulfillment of the specification 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 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 financial proposal 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 UNEF 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.

ANNEX 2:

UN Women contributes to strengthening technical capacity, political support and commitment for Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB) through support of initiatives focused on the integration of strategic and sustainable changes into planning and budgetary processes, such as assistance for governments to introduce measures incorporating gender into public finance management systems, capacity strengthening for officials to apply GRB to ensure that planning and budget policies and outcomes are gender-responsive, and inclusion of gender equality advocates, parliamentarians and other stakeholders in the planning and budgeting processes. This approach is a long-term process that requires incremental efforts and multiple strategies to ensure effective progress and the engagement of a wide range of stakeholders.

The overall *Integrating Gender Responsive Budgeting in the Aid Effectiveness Agenda* programmatic theory of change argues that there are inadequate linkages between new aid modalities and commitments made by countries to gender equality and women’s empowerment. The programme posits that GRB is a key strategic approach that can influence specific policy-level changes that serve as “entry points” toward influencing overall national budgeting processes. The programme focuses on increasing donor and partner country understanding of the uses of GRB strategies in the new aid modalities and also strengthening national capacity to apply GRB within the new aid architecture. All of the programmatic efforts are ultimately aimed at improving women’s lives, through the development and support of gender equitable systems. The programme description lays out the major elements, identified through UN Women’s and other organizational reviews and evaluations of support to GRB, that create conducive conditions for gender equality.

The main programme activities can be categorized as **research, policy, advocacy, capacity strengthening, and knowledge building/sharing**. The multi-country research (Phase I) resulted in an in-depth, comparative analysis of GRB application as well as country-specific reports. The research was shared through regional consultation and also contributed to the formulation of policy recommendations for High Level Forums on Aid Effectiveness, namely Accra and Busan. Capacity strengthening occurred through the hiring of Technical Advisers in each of the five focal countries (Phase II), selected through consultative review and based on the multi-country research, and the formulation and implementation of a capacity building action plan in each country. Advocacy efforts included global consultation and advocacy at HLF3 and 4, particularly related to the use of GRB as a tool to enhance action on gender equality. Knowledge was generated through the research and through case study documentation of promising practices and lessons learnt in each country. Major components of the generated knowledge were shared at a global workshop in Kigali, Rwanda (2011) on GRB good practices.

The primary programmatic partners are: Ministries of Finance and other line ministries, women’s organizations, gender equality advocates, research organisations engaged in work on new aid modalities and gender equality, the European Commission (at HQ and country-level), and UN Women national and regional offices.

The programme was designed to build upon other development programmes that sought to address gender equality mainstreaming in the aid effectiveness agenda and build complementarity with them, including “sharing the generated knowledge, coordinating on country selection, and contributing to a coherent advocacy strategy to enhance attention to gender equality in preparation for the Accra High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness and beyond,” (Project Document 2007). There was a focal effort to ensure complementarity between this programme and the EU/UN *Partnership on Gender Equality for Development and Peace*.

ANNEX 3: Outline – Final Evaluation Report Format

The evaluation team can refine the final evaluation report format as necessary, to be done in consultation with the Core Reference Group. Overall, the evaluation report should have the following structure:

1. Executive Summary (maximum 5 pages)
2. Programme Description
3. Evaluation Purpose and Primary Objectives
4. Evaluation Methodology, including the final analytical framework
5. Main Findings
 - a. Global
 - b. Country Level (include country-specific findings and cross-programme analysis)
 - c. Cross-cutting
6. Lessons Learnt
7. Conclusions
8. Recommendations
9. Annexes
 - a. Documents reviewed
 - b. Interviews conducted
 - c. Data collection tools/analysis approach
 - d. Visual presentation of the programme theory of change/logic framework
 - e. Evaluation Terms of Reference

ANNEX 4: United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Evaluation Ethical Code of Conduct

It is expected that the evaluators will comply fully with the ethical code of conduct of the United Nations 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, of themselves or their immediate family, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise. Before undertaking evaluation work within the UN system, each evaluator will complete a declaration of interest form (see Annex 3).
- **Honesty and Integrity:** Evaluators shall show honesty and integrity in their own behaviour, 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. Evaluators shall make themselves aware of and comply with legal codes (whether international or national) governing, for example, interviewing children and young people.
- **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 minimise 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 judgements, 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.