

# Final Report

---

Mid-Term Review of the CEDAW  
South East Asia Programme II

**PREPARED BY:**

INTERNATIONAL SOLUTIONS GROUP

---

**PREPARED FOR:**

UN Women

July 22, 2014

**Contact Us**

Brian O' Callaghan, Director ·

+1.202.709.5856 ·

[bocallaghan@theisg.com](mailto:bocallaghan@theisg.com) ·

[www.theisg.com](http://www.theisg.com) ·

## Acknowledgement

International Solutions Group would like to thank the staff and many stakeholders and partners of UN Women South East Asia, particularly the staff of the UN Women Regional Office and the UN Women Country Offices in the research countries, for their time, assistance and efforts in supporting the field research, providing feedback and inputs, and overall contributions to the preparation of the findings in this report.

Acronyms.....	3
Executive Summary .....	4
1. Background.....	4
2. Purpose and objective .....	4
3. Methodology .....	4
4. Key findings and conclusion .....	4
5. Key Recommendations.....	11
A. Introduction .....	14
B. Purpose, Objectives & Scope .....	15
C. Methodology.....	17
Research Methods Used .....	17
Field Visits .....	17
Data Synthesis and Analysis .....	18
Limitations.....	18
D. Findings.....	20
1. Progress towards results .....	20
1.1 Programme’s Performance Monitoring Framework validity, relevance and adequacy. ....	20
1.2 Use of the PMF: indicators, baseline data and assumptions. ....	20
1.3 Monitoring and reporting mechanisms .....	21
1.4 Progress on Outcomes.....	22
1.5 Challenges & Opportunities.....	35
1.6 Unintended Results.....	37
2. Relevance of Programme strategy and approaches.....	39
2.1 Consistency of results with needs, priorities and capacities .....	39
2.2 Appropriateness of capacity-building activities and plans. ....	39
2.3 Appropriateness of results, mechanisms, strategies, approaches and activities. ....	41
2.4 Engagement with civil society and government institutions. ....	42
2.5 Partner/stakeholder roles, engagement, support, consultation and satisfaction. ....	43
2.6 Risk mitigation strategies.....	43
2.7 Areas where results are not likely to be achieved.....	44
3. Sustainability of results .....	45
3.1 Programme stakeholders commitment to achieving programme outcomes. ....	45
3.2 Effectiveness of sustainability plans/strategies.....	45
3.3 Resource commitments by partners/stakeholders to sustain benefits/results. ....	46
4. Partnership with other stakeholders.....	47
4.1 Stakeholder participation in planning, design, implementation, monitoring, and consultation. ....	47
4.2 Roles and responsibilities of Project participants and stakeholder input .....	47
4.3 Relationship with programme stakeholders/partners, including UN agencies .....	47
5. Appropriateness of resource utilisation .....	49
5.1 Allocation of CIDA/DFATD’s financial contribution throughout the Programme. ....	49
6. Institutional structure and programme management .....	49
6.1 Programme management arrangements at regional and project office levels. ....	49
6.2 Coordination, communication and monitoring. ....	50
7. Informed and timely action .....	51
7.1 Appropriateness of action to manage risks, opportunities and challenges.....	51
8. Visibility of the Programme .....	52
E. Conclusion and Summary of Recommendations .....	53
Annex 1: List of Stakeholders Consulted .....	56
Annex 2: Key Questions for the Mid-Term Review .....	60
Annex 3: Field Work Interview Schedules.....	62
Annex 4: Narrative Biographies Of Project Team Members .....	64

## Acronyms

A2J	Access To Justice
ACWC	ASEAN Commission on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children
AHRD	ASEAN Human Rights Declaration
AICHR	ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights
AIJ	Alliance of Independent Journalists (Indonesia)
AIPP	Asia Indigenous People's Pact
APWLD	Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women
CHR	Commission on Human Rights (Philippines)
CIDA	(former) Canadian International Development Agency
CNCW	The Cambodian National Council for Women
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CSW	Commission on the Status of Women
CWGI	CEDAW Working Group Initiative
DFATD	Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development
DV	Domestic Violence
EDGE	Women's Empowerment and Development towards Gender Equality (Philippines)
EGM	Expert Group Meeting
ESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia-Pacific
FGM	Female Genital Mutilation
FLTP	Feminist Legal Theory and Practice
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
GDA	Gender and Development Association (Lao PDR)
GEL	(Indonesian) Gender Equality Law
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
IDS	Institute of Development Studies
ISG	International Solutions Group
IWRAW	International Women's Rights Action Watch Asia Pacific
LGBT	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender
LRCT	Law Reform Commission of Thailand
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NCAW	National Commission for the Advancement of Women (Laos)
NCDD	The National Committee for sub-national Democratic Development (Cambodia)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NHRCT	National Human Rights Commission of Thailand
NHRI	National Human Rights Institution
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
OP	(CEDAW) Optional Protocol
PCW	Philippine Commission on Women
PDR	People's Democratic Republic
PKKK	National Rural Women Coalition (Philippines)
PMF	Performance Monitoring Framework
PO	Programme/Project Office
RBM	Results-Based Management
SEAP	South East Asia Programme
SEPI	Secretary of State for the Promotion of Equality (Timor Leste)
SIGI	OECD Social Institutions and Gender Index
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
VAC	Violence Against Children
VAW	Violence Against Women
WLB	Women's Legal Bureau (Philippines)

## Executive Summary

### 1. Background

The CEDAW SEAP Phase II programme aims to promote, through continuous dialogues and capacity development, policy and programmatic measures to ensure compliance by State Parties with the obligations set out in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). The project also aims to build an awareness of the centrality of CEDAW compliance to the achievement of the MDGs.

International Solutions Group (ISG), a Washington DC-based international development consulting organisation with specialist expertise in the areas of policy development and M&E, undertook a Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the programme in 2014.

### 2. Purpose and objective

The purpose of the mid-term review of the CEDAW SEAP II Programme is to assess progress made on the planned results achieved to date and to validate the appropriateness of the key programme management documents (the Performance Monitoring Framework (PMF), Logic Model (LM)), assumptions, risks, baseline, methodology, implementation strategies and approaches described in the Programme Implementation Plan.

Specific objectives of the MTR are to:

- Assess progress being made on the planned results achieved to date;
- Validate the appropriateness of the PMF, LM, assumptions, risks, baseline, methodology, implementation strategies and approaches described in the Programme Implementation Plan;
- Provide guidance on the strategic direction of the Programme with respect to appropriate/effective/relevant strategies, and stakeholder effectiveness;
- Provide key recommendations on appropriate revisions or adjustments to the Programme;
- Provide recommendations on adjustments/refinements/new approaches as required in support of findings and accountability for improved performance, better-informed decision-making, and promote learning for the remainder of the programme period (2014-2016).

### 3. Methodology

ISG utilised a participatory approach to measure programme progress/impact, relevance, sustainability, partnerships, appropriateness, institutional structure/management, action and visibility. The review engaged stakeholders from seven ASEAN member States: Cambodia, Laos, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam, countries to which Review Team members undertook field visits, and Timor-Leste, from which stakeholders were interviewed remotely.

The review relies on a methodological approach that collected predominantly qualitative data. These include a desk review of documentation, key informant interviews, and focus group interviews with stakeholders and selected UN Women staff in Country, Regional and Headquarters Offices

### 4. Key findings and conclusion

There is broad evidence that output level results in each of the eight programme countries have contributed to good progress towards all three outcomes. The main programme achievements of CEDAW SEAP Phase II under each outcome are summarised below, and followed by details on country examples at the output level.

#### **Outcome 1: Increased knowledge and skills to apply CEDAW compliance in the development and monitoring of new and revised legislative frameworks**

The baseline data available as of 2011 (PMF June 2012) illustrated limited but growing capacities in all programme countries to review legislation from a CEDAW and gender-based perspective. The

Review Team identified evidence of the use of CEDAW by ministries of Justice and Law in assessment of legislation, and most stakeholders interviewed expressed willingness to incorporate CEDAW principles into their work pending further capacity development and understanding of these principles. To date, there is considerable evidence that the CEDAW SEAP has contributed to positive changes:

- Stakeholder consultations and desk reviews show that all countries in some measure have supported reviews, screening, and advocacy for new laws to strengthen the legislative climate for gender equality. These include laws on GBV and human trafficking, (e.g. Lao PDR) domestic violence (e.g. Cambodia), gender equality and elimination of FGM (e.g. Indonesia) discriminatory retirement laws, Land Law, and Marriage and Family Law, Civil Status Law (e.g. Viet Nam) and land and decentralization (e.g. Timor-Leste). Using CEDAW as a reference point, gender activists and civil society are working together with Government partners – in particular with national women's machineries – to push for stronger gender equality provisions and guarantees for women. This goes beyond CEDAW awareness-raising to putting in place the legislative frameworks compliant with CEDAW, for example, the Ministry of Justice in Timor-Leste has integrated women's human rights/CEDAW into the Ministry's Guidelines on Drafting Laws.
- There is evidence that the programme has enhanced the capacity, knowledge and skills of civil society, members of the justice system, and government partners (including legislators) to have an enhanced awareness of CEDAW and the ability and methodology to review and draft legislation that is gender responsive. The programme is contributing to creating a legal culture supportive of women's human rights and non-discrimination. It is also being widely recognised that laws give legitimacy to women's concerns and that laws mean little if not properly implemented.
- An important achievement across the region has been the development of relevant tools, knowledge products, guidelines, protocols, and publications for improving understanding on CEDAW and undertaking CEDAW compliant reviews. These materials have been produced both nationally in many instances in the language of the country, and also regionally supported by UN Women materials and publications which have been widely disseminated, translated into local languages (e.g. Thai, Lao, Bahasa Indonesian) and are currently used. Additionally there is in each country a growing pool of national resource persons and trainers competent in supporting CEDAW based legal reviews.
- Another significant achievement under this outcome has been the concerted focus given by NGOs in some countries (e.g. Philippines, Thailand, Viet Nam), to ensure that the rights of excluded and marginalised groups are brought to centre stage, including rural and indigenous women, tribal women, LGBTs, disabled and HIV-positive women, and migrant workers. Several organisations are developing the capacities of leaders from excluded women's groups to use CEDAW and other human rights treaties to articulate and advance their rights. Examples include the Life Stories Project of tribal women in Thailand, and UN Women-supported PKKK in the Philippines actively focussing on capacity development of marginalised groups of women and also applying a *multi treaty* approach.

#### **Outcome 2: Increased awareness among formal, semi-formal and informal justice system actors of CEDAW Commitments**

- The justice system and the legal frameworks are the most important means to eliminate gender discrimination. While results under Outcome 2 have lagged those of the other outcomes, UN Women has, in the past year, made considerable efforts to make up lost ground with respect to this outcome. Indeed, one notable achievement is that CEDAW SEAP Phase II has propelled access to justice for women to the forefront of the policy discourse

among multiple UN Women stakeholders (all branches of government, academe, civil society, media, representatives of marginalised groups of women) through national forums such as in the Philippines and Viet Nam, and through the regional launch of the UN Women Report on 'Progress of the World's Women-In Pursuit of Justice'.

- At the regional level, through a 'Learning and Planning Workshop on Women's Access to Justice and Legal Pluralism', the programme has enhanced capacities of government and civil society to better understand the dynamics of the informal and formal justice systems, the linkages between them, and women's access to justice through plural justice systems.
- In the Philippines, the discourse on gender sensitivity in the judiciary is most advanced in the region and a Committee on Gender Responsiveness in the Judiciary exists in the Supreme Court. UN Women is examining opportunities to partner with this committee though no definite results were evident at the time of the field visits. The CEDAW and Women's Human Rights training module for judges, which was developed in the CEDAW SEAP Phase I and adopted by the Philippines Judicial Academy, is currently being used in the regular training course for judges, lawyers, judicial sector personnel and family court judges. Its impact on gender sensitive rulings, however, has yet to be determined.
- In Timor-Leste, women's human rights has been integrated into the curriculum outline of the Legal Training Center and approved by the Pedagogical Board. Modules on women's human rights has subsequently been developed and will be used by the LTC accordingly.
- Engagement with the justice sector and Ministries of Justice in several countries has been *strategic* in this project and a critical entry point in the quest for greater access to justice for millions of women. It has contributed to strengthened capacity, awareness, knowledge, and skills on the need for a gender-sensitive and CEDAW-compliant judiciary and implementation of gender-sensitive justice delivery, and helped mitigate the risk of resistance from the judiciary. A regional judicial colloquium held in Thailand promoted regional peer exchanges, which have been welcomed in terms of learning on gender jurisprudence.
- Achievements under Outcome 2 are a work in progress. With the rollout of the Feminist Participatory Action Research on access to justice in all programme countries (through national partners), an important result is that the South-East Asia region now has a framework and guidelines for participatory research on access to justice. It is anticipated that research results will yield critical information on how best to address women's access to justice in the traditional informal and formal justice systems.

### **Outcome 3: Strengthened monitoring and accountability mechanisms for implementation of CEDAW commitments**

- UN Women support to multi-sectoral coordination and CEDAW implementation, monitoring and reporting has strengthened National Women's Machineryes. This has increased understanding that implementation and monitoring of CEDAW is an 'all government' (all branches of government at national and sub national level) responsibility. This interagency process has involved multiple government agencies and consultations with civil society groups. It has improved the visibility and institutional authority of NWMs (given that they have a lower status in the bureaucratic hierarchy) and fostered gender sensitivity among government partners. This is clearly demonstrated e.g. in the recent development of the Women's EDGE Plan in the Philippines. The exercise has also highlighted the importance of sex disaggregated data collection and gender analysis in monitoring CEDAW implementation.
- The programme has enhanced capacity of state delegations to meaningfully engage in a constructive dialogue with the CEDAW Committee through structured participation in mock sessions (e.g. Cambodia, Indonesia), and to substantively and appropriately respond to

questions from the CEDAW Committee. Beyond this exercise, the process has brought about greater understanding among government partners of the significance of state obligations towards and role in CEDAW implementation.

- NGOs are increasingly using CEDAW reports and Concluding Observations as a basis for their advocacy work. They have developed capacity, skills, and in some cases (e.g. Cambodia), specific tools for use in CEDAW reporting and preparing of shadow reports including data collection and report writing. They have also sharpened their advocacy skills and ability to better monitor policies and programs that encourage CEDAW compliance. Across the region, there is greater convergence of women's NGO groups around monitoring CEDAW implementation and using the CEDAW reporting mechanism to demand state accountability.
- Another important achievement is that the programme has enhanced and enabled key national institutions and partners, government ministries, CSOs, national human rights institutions, and others involved in the promotion and protection of women's human rights to improve their knowledge on the application of CEDAW norms and standards in protecting women's rights during *conflict and post conflict*. This has been of benefit to the corresponding duty of the State towards protection and realisation of women's human rights in diverse situations of conflict and post conflict. This achievement is the result of a consultation organised by UN Women in collaboration with OHCHR at the regional level.
- NGOs in the Philippines are leading the way in using the OP-CEDAW Protocol to address violations of women's human rights, and Thailand is building its capacity to use this instrument. A significant achievement and good practice has been evidence gathering and monitoring of CEDAW violations in regard to the reproductive rights of urban poor women in the city of Manila in order to advance rights claiming of disadvantaged women's groups.

### Stakeholder Capacity Development

Capacity development is the project's cornerstone for achieving impact and sustainability and for bringing about systemic changes in favour of women's human rights and gender equality in the CEDAW context. As such the project has made considerable investments in this area.

The concept of capacity and capacity development has been explicitly articulated by UN Women in the Prodoc<sup>1</sup> in terms of a Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) to programming that develops the capacity of duty bearers, rights holders, individuals, and organisations that are the primary change agents. In UN Women's theory of change, this is achieved through addressing *individual competencies, collective capabilities and system (or institutional) capacity*. The types of competencies and capabilities required by different partners are also elaborated.

In the context of CEDAW SEAP Phase II capacity development has focused around specific programme dimensions namely:

- Strengthening legal frameworks to comply with CEDAW;
- Gender responsive justice sector; Formal and informal/traditional justice systems;
- Enhanced government coordination for CEDAW implementation, monitoring and reporting;
- Enhanced NGO monitoring and advocacy for CEDAW implementation.

In keeping with the Rights-Based Approach and theory of change, UN Women has supported and facilitated an impressive and comprehensive number of activities and interventions centred on

---

<sup>1</sup> Prodoc UN Women Regional Programme on Improving Women's Human Rights in South-East Asia - CEDAW SEAP Phase II (2011-2015). Final PRODOC April 2011



building the capacities of a wide and diverse spectrum of partners at regional, national, and sub national level in the short three-year programme implementation period. The capacity development activities have primarily aimed at enhancing specific capacities on the above-mentioned programme dimensions and contributed to the overall goal of the project and effective implementation of the Convention.

Project activities and achievements on capacity development have been detailed under the section on Outcomes 1, 2, 3 and output level results and throughout various sections of this report and will not be therefore repeated. Capacity development has been directed at strategic actors and key duty-bearers and rights holders, including Government (executive, legislative, and judicial branches), civil society, training institutions, academe, NHRIs and various regional and international partners, and to some extent with the media. A wide range of capacity development initiatives were completed: training workshops, dialogues, seminars, conferences, forums, national consultations, informational products/materials, consultancy support, south-south exchanges, experience sharing and 'learning from one another', and funding support.

**Examples of capacity development approaches:**

- Training workshops on specific thematic areas and application of participatory approaches
- Organizing conferences, dialogues and roundtables and providing a platform for stakeholders to have a voice including marginalized women
- Training of Trainers (ToTs) for multiplier effect, and building a pool of national experts on CEDAW
- Regional colloquia including peer learning approaches with justice sector actors and parliamentarians
- Conducting mock sessions for government and NGO partners for capacity development in CEDAW Proceedings
- Developing capacity and skills in preparation of State and alternate/shadow reports including skills in data collection, report writing
- Facilitating dialogue between government and civil society partners at national level
- Providing partners funding support for supporting initiatives in line with CEDAW SEAP Phase II
- Developing and disseminating relevant materials research materials, publications, guidelines and tools e.g. to support understanding of CEDAW, CEDAW compliance in legal reviews and effective CEDAW implementation
- South-South exchanges for sharing experiences and expertise on women's human rights at national and regional level
- Supporting broad based networks of NGOs in the region

Stakeholder consultations confirmed that capacity development initiatives as described above, and not simply training workshops, have been most relevant and have strengthened skills, knowledge and expertise and professional competency of the partners/persons and institutions to better address women's human rights and gender equality and coordinate on said issues.

Capacity development of 'change agents' and institutional partners is assessed by the MTR as a powerful strategy in creating new perceptions and mindsets to effectively address women's human rights and gender equality and contribute to a gender responsive and enabling environment. There are clear indications that the project developed individual and institutional competencies. Besides the conceptual and knowledge strengthening support provided, capacity-building activities have also included support with training materials and knowledge products, which have enhanced the capacity of partners. The key outcome of this lies in the extent to which stakeholders and partners will transfer the learning in their own work and portfolios. This needs to be monitored.

However, given that there has been limited systematic tracking of the results of capacity development initiatives, it is difficult to assess to what extent the individual, collective, and systems competencies envisaged in the Prodoc have been fully achieved. What is also not evident is how knowledge, skills, and expertise developed are actually applied by individuals and institutions and

whether or not this is leading to systemic changes as a result. As pointed out in the report and recommendations, more systematic follow up and tracking work is required in this area.

The analysis also shows that there are challenges in applying new knowledge and skills. While individual competencies may have increased, consulted stakeholders repeatedly pointed out that the environment, with traditional mindsets, cultural attitudes and customs, pose a barrier in effective application.

### Partnerships

Partnerships and a multi stakeholder undertaking (dialogue, pooling knowledge, expertise and resources, and drawing on comparative advantage of actors) has been a core and underpinning theme in the CEDAW SEAP Phase II and has contributed towards building a broad base of support for women's human rights and gender equality in the region. Diverse partners have forged strategic partnerships and alliances at regional, national and local levels to maximise the impact of women's human rights and GE interventions at these levels.

A key approach has been to identify and work with strategically selected organisations on issues of women's human rights in the CEDAW context. The programme shows that partnerships have required a favourable policy environment and capacity-building of *all partners* for commonality of vision and collective action around CEDAW implementation. Based on an initial mapping of key organisations carried out in the Inception phase and reflected in the PIP, UN Women selected relevant partners at the regional and national level.

Stakeholders consulted during the field missions expressed that partners selected by UN Women are *appropriate and relevant* and have included: governmental organisations, women's national machineries, executive, legislative and judicial actors, national and regional CSOs, academic and training institutions, local communities, regional organisations, UN and other international agencies. UN Women moved proactively and seized opportunities to build synergies and partnerships with the following stakeholders:

- **Government Partners:** National Women's Machineries, National Ministries of Planning and Development, Ministries of Justice, National Assembly, Managing Agents for Gender Equality and Prevention and Control of Domestic Violence (Viet Nam: MOLISA, MOCST) are critical in fostering national ownership and promoting and protecting the rights of women, albeit that they have bureaucratic and slower procedures. Women's National Machineries coordinate CEDAW implementation, monitoring, and reporting. The MTR assessed that such partnerships require concomitant leadership and political commitment at high levels of Government Ministries and agencies for a gender aware approach in all policies and programmes. This is work in progress as reflected in increasing and improved coordination among key ministries on CEDAW implementation and monitoring.
- **Justice Sector actors** and informal traditional and formal justice systems across countries are key partners in the governance system which have strong impact on women's access to justice, women's human rights, and gender equality. Partnerships with justice sector actors have promoted peer learning and networking in the region. The impact of these partnerships, however, has yet to be fully played out given the evidence during the field visits that the infrastructure for implementation and enforcement of laws remains weak in most countries and is often subject to the political, cultural, and religious environment that prevails including at the provincial and local level.
- **Local government** and governance structures are key actors at the community level. As overall trends in the region portend towards greater local autonomy and decentralisation, partnership building at the community level is critical. In this context, the programme will need to make greater efforts to reach out in building partnerships with local government, local leadership, local communities and CSOs, and traditional governance and justice

systems, and community based organisations. This is beginning to happen but will need far more deliberate efforts to ensure the partnerships are meaningful not only in exchanges and dialogue but in realising far deeper changes in how justice is meted out to women and their human rights protected.

- **Regional Civil Society Organisations** partnerships have included:
  - International Women’s Rights Action Watch Asia Pacific (IWRAP AP), which is engaged in CEDAW advocacy, monitoring and capacity-building of NGOs;
  - Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD), a regional network NGO with membership comprised of national and grassroots women’s human rights groups;
  - AIPP and the Forest People Programme;
  - Asian Indigenous Women’s Network (AIWN) an NGO of indigenous and ethnic minority women that carries out advocacy campaigns among indigenous women.

Partnerships and engagement with all of these institutions have supported different capacity development activities in the region and improved networking among the organisations.

- **National CSOs** and their networks have access to a broad and diverse range of women's organisations. They have taken a lead in advocacy and monitoring of CEDAW and ensuring the involvement of grassroots groups of women from disadvantaged sectors. Partnerships with CSOs and NGOs at regional and national level have proven to be very promising with far-reaching implications for the promotion and protection of women’s human rights and gender equality.
- Partnerships with **training institutions** have helped to institutionalise CEDAW and gender equality, e.g. with the Legal Training Institute in Timor-Leste that works with judges, prosecutors and lawyers.
- **National Human Rights Institutions** (NHRIs) are recognised human rights actors in the system responsible for upholding human rights, including women's human rights. In the Philippines, for example, the Commission on Human Rights (CHR) assumes the role of Gender Ombud. UN Women has partnered with the CHR on a short-term basis. At this point, however, CHR has limited capacity on gender perspectives. This capacity needs to be enhanced in fulfilling its important role.
- **Academic institutions** have supported knowledge development, assessments, and research, and have worked well in partnerships with government and civil society.
- **UN agencies:** Partnerships with UN agencies have included OHCHR collaboration in the conduct of capacity development initiatives, e.g. in the consultation organised on CEDAW application to women’s human rights in conflict and post-conflict situations. Also (in Timor-Leste) a partnership with UNDP in legal training curriculum development and integration of women’s human rights into MOJ’s Law Drafting Guidelines – the Timor-Leste MOJ noted that training in CEDAW/women’s human rights was key to their drafting of gender-sensitive laws.
- **Other partners:** The project may wish to consider partnering with the media more effectively to support and reach a wider audience, building on good practices demonstrated in Indonesia and other countries.

**Capacity-building with partners** – Partners consulted by the ISG Review Team<sup>2</sup> reported that capacity-building activities provided have been appropriate, but as highlighted in this report, it is important that UN Women closely track and follow-up on capacity development initiatives to ensure results are relevant and contribute to project goals. The management of partnerships is critical in a project that is working with diverse actors at the local, national, and regional levels.

The analysis shows that a complex, multi-stakeholder approach requires that roles and responsibilities of each partner be clearly defined for maximum effectiveness and resource efficiency, avoiding overlap while at the same time encouraging collaboration and cooperation amongst them and facilitating synergies. The types of partnership across the region vary, and the roles and responsibilities of the institutional partners have been clearly set out in the project through Letters of Agreements (LOA) with Government partners and Cooperation Agreements with CSOs.

Partner NGOs/CSOs at the country and regional level shared that they have entered into project contractual arrangements with UN Women to carry out specific activities reflected in their Cooperation Agreements. These follow an RBM model with clearly stated outcomes and outputs to be achieved and indicators for measuring progress and activities in the context of the overall regional project framework.

Particularly in the case of the CSOs/NGOs at the country level, the RBM models have proven to be effective as:

- It has given NGOs a structure and a time framework for obtaining results, rather than conducting activities in an ad hoc manner;
- It supports the overall project goal while at the same time allowing flexibility for the NGO to contribute to the work by designing programmes relevant to the national and local context, based on their individual competence, experience, networks, and relationships with the national government and other women organisations and human rights organisations; and
- It has provided national NGOs flexibility in shaping project interventions based on their organisations' goals and coinciding it with the objectives of CEDAW SEAP Phase II

UN Women has entered into both long and short-term partnership arrangements. Most of the key partnership arrangements on a long-term basis are initially for period of a year and often UN Women has renewed and continued with almost the same partners for purposes of consistency and continuity given that they have the necessary technical expertise.

While specific partnership dynamics depend on individual contexts and the performance of NGO partners, stakeholders expressed that they prefer to have long-term partnership arrangements as it allows them to have an overall time framework and provides a more flexible way of thinking and planning for long-term results to meet specific objectives, rather than short event-oriented activities. Shorter-term partnership arrangements often tend to be piecemeal or ad hoc interventions and may not lead to sustained partnerships.

## 5. Key Recommendations

*R.1. While the Programme PMF is fit for purpose in terms of its structure, outcomes, outputs and indicators, UN Women should devote resources to developing its monitoring and reporting tools and systems whereby data from the activities that take place across the eight programme countries can be systematically collated, analysed, and reported on, with an appropriate mix of quantitative and qualitative data. This should include data on the*

---

<sup>2</sup> ISG maintains a gender balanced approach to its evaluation work. The team composition, plus a brief biography of each Review Team member is provided in Annex 4

*effect of key assumptions/risks on programme performance. UN Women should also give consideration to development of periodic tools that assess the translation of knowledge and expertise that is transferred via the Programme activities into behaviours and practices.*

- R.2. A renewed focus on the balance of programmatic workplans with reference to each outcome is recommended, i.e. implementation of additional efforts to implement activities under Outcome 2 to ensure similar progress across all three programme outcomes<sup>3</sup>.*
- R.3. Capacity-building activities (trainings, study visits, workshops, seminars etc.), where appropriate (given the nature of the specific participants), where possible/appropriate, should include structured action-oriented outcomes as part of the training methodology with associated process and outcome indicators. This has been emphasised by several stakeholders these events to translate into concrete activities, practices, and behaviours. To complement this more systematic approach to capacity development, small, medium-term evaluations (i.e. 6-months/1 year post-activity) of the effect of capacity-building/training activities on practices and behaviours of participants of their events should be applied more widely across the Programme to assess the contribution of the trainings to the Programme outcomes.*
- R.4. Notwithstanding UN policies on partnerships/grant management, provision of additional technical assistance to partners with respect to preparation of proposals and/or reporting could pay dividends with regard to the quantity and quality of CSO partnerships in the Programme, as well as support sustainability of the Programme initiatives post-completion;*
- R.5. UN Women should consider how its advocacy efforts and technical capacity can be utilised to support the formation and strengthening of new NHRIs in programme countries and to provide support for strengthening of networks of women's rights advocates and their associated movements. In particular, UN Women should support key 'champions' who are working to counter regressive trends and working towards empowering women at grassroots levels to understand the impact of CEDAW (and ASEAN) on their livelihoods and human rights.*
- R.6. Further efforts are required to generate ownership among partners and strategies to internalise support for many of the Programme initiatives among programme country governments (such as more communication efforts regarding the programme objectives and goal and/or an ICT/social media strategy), which in turn will encourage resource commitments by stakeholders and support sustainability of the Programme outcomes post-completion. A potential strategy is the implementation of longer term agreements (including phase-out strategies that include alternative resourcing models) with partners in order to enhance efficiency in project management, and to ensure that partners view the project and their engagement in a holistic manner and enhance ownership.*
- R.7. An ongoing process of consultation and reflection is required by UN Women with respect to the overall context and vision for the Programme. While initial consultations set the early direction of the Programme, efforts since have been focused on rolling out activities and outputs with less emphasis on the overall contribution of these outputs to programme outcomes and the ultimate goal. UN Women should develop its communications strategy that can provide disparate partners and stakeholders (including the public) with information on the Programme outcomes and goal and progress towards these.*

---

<sup>3</sup> The evaluators note that the Programme workplan for 2014 includes a much stronger focus on activities under Outcome 2. Should these activities be successfully implemented, it will largely meet this recommendation.

- R.8. *Given the multiplicity of stakeholders, sources of funding and strategic approaches, attribution of positive policy changes in Programme countries to CEDAW SEAP II interventions is an ongoing challenge. The evaluators recommend identification of key policy changes in each Programme country that are to be specifically targeted via the Programme outputs and a periodic (e.g. annual) reconciliation of the contribution of these outputs to the specific policy changes<sup>4</sup>. Quantitative attribution of results among different stakeholders is not a practical strategy for the Programme. Recognition of individual stakeholder contributions is an appropriate strategy.*
- R.9. *There is a need for strategies that facilitate greater adoption of responsibility for management and creation of synergies between the CEDAW SEAP programme and the ASEAN project, and, in countries where UN Women does not have senior country-level representation, greater coordination and synergies between UN Women and other UN agencies at country-level.*
- R.10. *UN Women should proactively prepare a strategy to mitigate the ongoing risk to programme outcomes/the Programme goal presented by stakeholder unwillingness to translate knowledge gained under the Programme interventions into action or to be open to reform, particularly at community levels. Should a strategy to mitigate this risk not be possible due to limited leverage with government partners, expectations of programme outcomes/impact should be moderated accordingly.*

---

<sup>4</sup> Such an approach is methodologically similar to Outcome Mapping, a methodology for planning, monitoring and evaluating initiatives that aim to bring about policy or behavioural change.

## A. Introduction

The CEDAW SEAP Phase II programme aims to promote, through continuous dialogues and capacity development, policy and programmatic measures to ensure compliance by State Parties with the obligations set out in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). The project also aims to build an awareness of the centrality of CEDAW compliance to the achievement of the MDGs.

Specifically, the programme undertakes the following:

- It advances and facilitates regional processes for knowledge generation, exchange, and stock-taking at national and regional levels for furthering implementation of CEDAW,
- It deepens awareness and knowledge of CEDAW among governments and civil society to promote the continued incorporation of CEDAW principles in laws, policies, and programmes.
- It focuses on working with the justice system actors to use the Convention to provide better access to justice for women.
- It supports countries in South-East Asia region in strengthening their accountability mechanisms to report on achievement of gender equality using the CEDAW Convention, including strengthening monitoring and reporting systems.

The Programme supports regional peer-learning for governments and NGOs in collaboration with existing regional institutions or by encouraging the formation of new networks and forums. It provides targeted support to: Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Viet Nam, Indonesia, Philippines, Timor-Leste. Myanmar was added in October 2012.

## B. Purpose, Objectives & Scope

The purpose of the mid-term review of the CEDAW SEAP II Programme is to assess progress made on the planned results achieved to date and to validate the appropriateness of the key programme management documents (the Performance Monitoring Framework (PMF), Logic Model (LM)), assumptions, risks, baseline, methodology, implementation strategies and approaches described in the Programme Implementation Plan.

Specific objectives of the MTR are to:

- Assess progress being made on the planned results achieved to date;
- Validate the appropriateness of the PMF, LM, assumptions, risks, baseline, methodology, implementation strategies and approaches described in the Programme Implementation Plan;
- Provide guidance on the strategic direction of the Programme with respect to appropriate/effective/relevant strategies, and stakeholder effectiveness;
- Provide key recommendations on appropriate revisions or adjustments to the Programme;
- Provide recommendations on adjustments/refinements/new approaches as required in support of findings and accountability for improved performance, better-informed decision-making, and promote learning for the remainder of the programme period (2014-2016).

The ISG Review Team collected, analysed and assessed relevant data, drawing on external and internal (UN Women) documentation and informants over the course of the field research, including the following:

1. A review of external and internal frameworks, standards and emerging good practices in the area of women and girl's rights, including a review of relevant literature and evidence, as well as engagement with other organisations and experts.
2. Assessment of UN Women's current performance with respect to the Programme, including:
  - Surveying UN Women's activity regarding the programme across all eight Programme countries;
  - A review of relevant programme work carried out by or supported by UN Women and/or key stakeholders. This was based on a review of internal documents and consultations with key stakeholders across the Programme countries; and
  - Field visits to six of the Programme countries: Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Thailand, Philippines, and Viet Nam. This included visits with key programme stakeholders, as well as a comprehensive document review<sup>5</sup>.

In conducting the MTR the review team responded to the substantive scope set out in the assignment Terms of Reference. The review team analysed the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency of all programme outcomes/outputs in terms of results achieved against those that were planned. It analysed the sustainability of the programme, and the adequacy of the management structure and communication (both internal and external) and provides recommendations based on the analysis.

---

<sup>5</sup> A full list of stakeholders interviewed is provided in Annex 1



Given that the initiatives of this project and its activities are closely linked with the ongoing activities of the Project on Regional Mechanisms to Protect the Human Rights of Women and Girls in South-East Asia, the Review Team examined to what extent these linkages reinforced the effective implementation of the CEDAW SEAP II Programme and what further actions are needed to strengthen this relationship.

The MTR field visits to six programme countries provided opportunities to:

- Test hypotheses about programme practice derived from the desk reviews;
- Explore opportunities and constraints that stakeholders, implementers and beneficiaries face; and
- Identify and discuss impact and results and potential ways forward to sustain and build on the benefits of both programmes.

## C. Methodology

### Research Methods Used

The mid-term review is based on the foundation of CEDAW and the programmatic documents (particularly the Programme LM and PMF). To ensure that the Programme contributes to the effective implementation of CEDAW in all programme countries, it follows that all of the activities, initiatives and systems of the programme, as described in the respective LMs and PMFs, should be well aligned towards their achievement.

ISG aligned the key review questions to ensure the ISG team was able to specifically assess the expected outcomes and longer-term sustainable impact of UN Women's (and its stakeholders') women's and girl's human rights programming.

ISG utilised a set of review questions (a list of the key questions is provided in Annex 2), developed by UN Women in the Terms of Reference for the assignment, that is aligned directly with the intended outcomes of the MTR.

The review relies on a methodological approach that collected both qualitative and quantitative data. These include a desk review of documentation, key informant interviews, and focus group interviews with stakeholders and selected UN Women staff in Country, Regional and Headquarters Offices<sup>6</sup>.

The data collection methods the team used were:

- **Focus Group Discussion (FGD):** FGDs among groups of key stakeholders were conducted in each visited country;
- **Key Informant Interviews (KII):** KIIs, of a wide range of stakeholders, were conducted within and outside UN Women;
- **Desk Review (DR):** An extensive DR of documentation from all countries participating in the Programme in all was performed;

### Field Visits

ISG formulated a series of research tools containing the key questions to be addressed by stakeholders, which formed the basis of the interview guides in the KIIs and FGDs. Copies of these interview schedules are provided in Annex 3. In total, the field work comprised 37 KIIs and 24 FGDs or group interviews across the six Programme countries.

The following field missions (not including international travel) were conducted by the ISG team:

Country	Dates	Evaluator
Cambodia	20-30 January	John Vighen
Indonesia	17-21 February	Suvira Chaturvedi
Lao PDR	24-28 February	Brian O' Callaghan
Philippines	11-15 February	Suvira Chaturvedi
Thailand	10-18 February	Brian O' Callaghan
Viet Nam	19-22 February	Brian O' Callaghan

<sup>6</sup> In addition to the above methods, the Review team initiated a quantitative survey of participants of activities under Outcome 2 of the Programme. However, ISG did not receive sufficient responses to this research by participants to draw valid conclusions. Supplementary data from the field research and desk review were utilised instead.

Additional data was gathered via email and telephone conversations with UN Women stakeholders in Timor-Leste. Myanmar was not visited due to logistical constraints.

The Review Team consisted of a gender-balanced team of evaluation experts with extensive thematic and geographical experience (see Annex 4 for biographies of each team member). Individual field visits (three of four team members conducted field research) were conducted by individual team members. As field research was being conducted with stakeholders at institutional/organisational level (i.e. *not* at community level), there was no requirement for equal representation of men/women in field teams. However, the development of key questions of the field research tools was undertaken by a gender-balanced team to ensure gender sensitivity in data collection.

## Data Synthesis and Analysis

The Review Team synthesised data gathered over the course of the review by:

- Highlighting key information following each interview; and
- Reviewing and summarising essential information, themes, findings and issues to further pursue at the end of each day during country visits.

Issues and themes were shared with the ISG Review Team members visiting other countries so that these could be followed up and to provide an additional level of gender balance and sensitivity in the analysis of data. At the end of each country visit, findings under each of the review sub-questions were summarised and shared. The team conducted multiple reviews of data on a rolling basis as fieldwork was completed, as well as at the end of each field visit.

ISG coded qualitative interview data into meaningful categories using MS Excel, enabling organising of notes and determining themes or patterns common among KIIs and FGDs.

The team then finalised the analysis of the data by extracting the meaning and significance of the coded themes and integrating these with the themes, findings, and lessons learned from the different data collection methods.

## Limitations

- Logistics with respect to the field work implementation by ISG team members were challenging, given the large number of stakeholders (approximately 61 separate interviews/discussions, many involving multiple stakeholders), the six programme countries visited, the competing schedules of stakeholders, travel constraints (flight delays, traffic jams in Manila and Jakarta) and public holidays;
- The majority of respondents were not familiar with the conceptual framework and components of the Programme outside their own activities, thus limiting the relevance of some of the ISG evaluators' questions;
- Access to all key stakeholders was not possible, specifically:
  - Cancellation of two important meetings with key Government Ministries in Indonesia: Ministry of Law and Human Rights and the Ministry of National Planning and Development (BAPPENAS), due to conflicts with national planning processes and CRC report preparation;
  - Poor responses to an email survey of attendees of the 2013 judicial colloquium, with no usable data collected;
- Given the large number of questions in the Terms of Reference for the MTR, time constraints were a factor in some interviews;

- Lack of available and/or reliable data (notably quantitative data) on programme progress (e.g. with respect to the programme Logframe), and/or a lack of available time of the part of the Review Team to review the extensive programme documentation provided a challenge to the Review Team in identifying outcomes and achievements. ISG mitigated this limitation by undertaking an extensive process of stakeholder review, validation and feedback;
- Given that the ISG evaluators were constrained by logistics to undertake field visits to six of eight countries, the remaining two countries (Myanmar and Timor-Leste) may be under-represented in the findings. ISG mitigated this limitation through interviews with UN Women Timor-Leste via telephone.

## D. Findings

### 1. Progress towards results

#### 1.1 Programme's Performance Monitoring Framework validity, relevance and adequacy<sup>7</sup>.

The Programme theory of change as set out in the Programme document (Prodoc) clearly elicits the proposed programmatic logic. That said, the Programme PMF, while reflecting the theory of change in terms of specification of outcomes, outputs and selection of indicators, has conceptual gaps between the outcomes/outputs and indicators that make measurement and tracking of change of knowledge, attitudes and/or practices difficult. This is exacerbated by the different dynamics of programme implementation, differing stakeholders, and wide variety of modalities of programme implementation. However, as the primary accountability document for the Programme, the ISG evaluators consider the PMF to be fit for purpose and do not recommend any changes other than in the measurement of indicators (discussed below).

#### 1.2 Use of the PMF: indicators, baseline data and assumptions.

While individual programme indicators are weighted towards outputs vs. outcomes, UN Women has chosen an appropriate mix of outcome and output indicators that reflect the Programme intervention logic and theory of change.

However, baseline data – particularly related to quantitative indicators – is not presented or collated in numerical format, nor is it disaggregated by the indicator parameters (e.g. by type and gender of participants). In addition, no interim or final targets are presented in the PMF for programme performance. Lack of targets makes it challenging to determine the level of success of the Programme on an ongoing basis.

In addition, the primary impact indicator, the Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) rankings<sup>8</sup>, may not be suitable as the sole indicator for measurement of programme impact, as:

- They have only been updated once during the life of the Programme (2009-2012);
- The SIGI rankings are a composite of different variables, some of which UN Women does not address;
- Such a macro-level indicator is unlikely to be influenced by UN Women's limited intervention.

2009/2012 SIGI ranks and values were<sup>9</sup> (Timor-Leste is not yet included in the SIGI rankings):

2012 SIGI Rank (out of 86)	Country	SIGI Value 2012	SIGI Value 2009	Value Change	2009 SIGI Rank (out of 102)	Rank Change
12	Philippines	0.119287	0.0078831	+0.111404	7	↓-5
13	Cambodia	0.120539	0.0221888	+0.09835	27	↑+14
25	Thailand	0.14658	0.010677	+0.135903	16	↓-9
32	Indonesia	0.174232	0.127761	+0.046471	55	↑+23
42	Viet Nam	0.2387	0.0300619	+0.208638	31	↓-11
44	Myanmar	0.240282	0.0462871	+0.193995	41	↓-3
49	Lao PDR	0.259261	0.0357687	+0.223492	38	↓-11

As the table indicates, all of the Programme countries have experienced increases in discrimination as measured by the SIGI composite indicator, with only two countries moving up in ranking during the Programme period.

<sup>7</sup>MTR headings/subheadings in this section reflect each of the key questions as put forward in the Review Terms of Reference. See Annex 2 for a list of the key questions.

<sup>8</sup> This impact indicator was included at programme inception on request of the programme donor.

<sup>9</sup> OECD, 2014; see <http://genderindex.org/>

While the SIGI ranking has relevance to the overall trends towards improvement of women’s human rights, more detailed analysis of the indicator’s constituent variables with respect to the Programme countries would be required to indicate change in the specific areas that this programme addresses.

Other indicators (outcome and output) were appropriate to monitoring progress on results, although the project could have benefited from inclusion of additional indicators related to capacity/behaviour/practices change among key stakeholder groups, for example:

- Cognitive variables such as attitude and knowledge change among stakeholders;
- Saliency/Relevance of key women’s human rights issues among stakeholders;
- Assessment of social norms through measurement of stakeholder attitudes;
- Specific policy/programmatic changes that contribute towards women’s human rights;
- Have new or changed laws or policies been elaborated and publicized?
- Implementation of new laws/policies by institutions responsible for offering the services provided for in the new laws/policies;
- Effective enforcement of new laws/policies.

Additionally, measurement timeframes for outcome indicators, set at the conclusion of the project, were not sufficiently timely to assess progress of the project and make appropriate adjustments. Output indicators were measured more frequently (quarterly, biannually or annually), but are typically not in and of themselves sufficient to track progress of the project. While mid-term reviews and end-of-project evaluations are useful to determine initiative outcomes/impacts, they should be supported by consistently collected data on a sufficiently periodic basis to permit management to make timely corrections to activities and outputs.

The Programme assumptions as articulated in the Programme Log Frame correctly identified many of the risks that the Programme faces in implementing its activities, some of which are:

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>
Stakeholders may be unwilling to translate the knowledge gained under the Programme interventions into action;	High
Stakeholders identified under the Programme may be unwilling to participate in the initiatives and activities and be open to reform, if necessary;	Low
That the same stakeholders cannot be consistently worked with to achieve long-lasting change;	Medium
Insufficient resources will be provided to sustain the Programme initiatives;	Low
That learning at regional levels may not translate into action/learning at national levels	High

While these assumptions are valid, the evaluators saw little evidence of either mitigation of the risks associated with these externalities, or of assessment of the impact of these risks on programme performance. Via the field work, the ISG Review Team has determined that many of these risks led to slower progress than was expected at programme inception.

### **1.3 Monitoring and reporting mechanisms**

Consideration in the PMF with respect to data collection and analysis tools is limited to specification of external reporting and to the MTR and final programme evaluation. While the PMF does specify some methods for gathering data (surveys/interviews with/assessments of participants etc), there has been no preparation of a range of tools that translate the indicators into systematic and generalisable data that can be used to report on outputs and outcomes. Thus the PMF data collection processes rely on periodic narrative reporting and partners that do not necessarily paint an accurate picture of programme progress, may be prone to bias (as they rely on partner reports), and risk missing results as data is not captured systematically, although the Review Team did not find any evidence of this in practice.

Purely narrative reporting has value in painting the picture of programme progress across disparate countries with different stakeholders and dynamics. However, limited tracking of quantitative data and no systematic application of monitoring tools to determine changes in the indicators in the Programme PMF leads to challenges in disaggregating activities or outcomes from different activities supported under different budget lines and attributing outcomes/results to specific outputs.

These issues combined have resulted in a situation where it is difficult to determine overall progress and impact of the Programme without in-depth knowledge of the nuances of programme implementation, and an over-reliance on outputs (e.g. Number of trainings, networking events, exchanges etc) as a proxy of programme outcome. In addition, differences in terminology (e.g. 'training' vs. 'colloquium', 'networking' vs. 'peer learning', 'attendance' vs. 'participation'), levels of participation by different stakeholders, and differing levels of input of UN Women to specific outputs (often in combination with other UN stakeholders) challenge the ability to measurably link outputs to specific outcomes that can be attributed to this programme.

#### **Key Recommendation:**

**R.1.** While the Programme PMF is fit for purpose in terms of its structure, outcomes, outputs and indicators, UN Women should devote resources to developing its monitoring and reporting tools and systems whereby data from the activities that take place across the eight programme countries can be systematically collated, analysed, and reported on, with an appropriate mix of quantitative and qualitative data. This should include data on the effect of key assumptions/risks on programme performance. UN Women should also give consideration to development of periodic tools that assess the translation of knowledge and expertise that is transferred via the Programme activities into behaviours and practices.

#### **1.4 Progress on Outcomes**

Overall, UN Women is making good progress on the achievement of programme outputs and outcomes, although activities under Outcome 2 has not matched progress of the other two outcomes to date (see below for further analysis of the causes and consequences of this). There has also been variable programme progress across the eight implementation countries. An initial lag between the closing on SEAP Phase I (2009) and the start of SEAP Phase II (2011) led to a loss of programme momentum, and turnover of UN Women programme staff at regional and national levels, and the need to re-establish relationships with stakeholders on commencement of Phase II. These constraints meant that much programme activity did not start until 2012. However, UN Women management undertook extensive efforts to regain lost ground on the Programme, with many ongoing and planned activities that are contributing to achievement of programme outcomes.

#### **Key Recommendation:**

**R.2.** A renewed focus on the balance of programmatic workplans with reference to each outcome is recommended, i.e. implementation of additional efforts to implement activities under Outcome 2 to ensure similar progress across all three programme outcomes<sup>10</sup>.

#### ***Outcome 1: Increased knowledge and skills to apply CEDAW compliance in the development and monitoring of new and revised legislative frameworks***

Across the Programme countries, a range of initiatives have taken place to increase knowledge and skills on CEDAW compliance in legislative frameworks. UN Women offices have instituted partnerships with government, educational/training sector, policy, and civil society stakeholders on

---

<sup>10</sup> The evaluators note that the Programme workplan for 2014 includes a much stronger focus on activities under Outcome 2. Should these activities be successfully implemented, it will largely meet this recommendation.

a range of capacity-building activities geared towards improving knowledge and skills related to CEDAW. On a regional basis, UN Women has added to the range of publications and materials produced and translated under Phase I of the programme and disseminated them widely to country-level partners to assist them in reviewing and implementing CEDAW-compliant legislation.

**Indonesia** shows good progress on Outcome 1. MOWECP/Government and key implementing partner Kalyanamitra expressed satisfaction with progress in their activities despite the challenges faced. A major focus under this outcome has been on the Gender Equality Law. UN Women supported a round table and advocacy forum with NGO networks and gender advocates on the government proposed Gender Equality Law (GEL). The forum resulted in recommendations to ensure that the law is CEDAW compliant and the recommendations were presented to the legislative board of the parliament for finalising the bill. The bill, however, has yet to be passed and work is in progress. The draft of the law is currently being hotly debated in the House of Representatives especially among community groups/Muslim and conservative groups who consider the GEL to be against Islamic values.

CSO advocacy on the GEL particularly by the CEDAW Working Group Initiative (CWGI) has been heightened to support the law, including collaboration with journalists. CWGI in partnership with the *Aliansi Jurnalis Independen* (AJI - Alliance of Independent Journalists) provided fellowships for journalists and strengthened their interest and capacity through a series of training and mentoring of junior journalists by senior journalists on women's human rights and gender equality. The Programme resulted in the development of news and articles that created public opinion in favour of the law, and 15 articles were published in various news papers, social media, and radio.

In **Lao PDR** UN Women is supporting ongoing consultations regarding the upcoming (due in 2015) gender-based violence law through provision of international expertise and working through key partners (such as the Ministry of Justice, Lao PDR National Assembly and the Women's Parliament Caucus) to promote CEDAW-compliant legislation and maintain awareness among parliamentarians of CEDAW and its provisions. UN Women in Lao PDR is also promoting a range of studies of current legal/customary law practices in Lao PDR, and works closely with the Lao PDR Women's Union on access to justice at community level, and the Gender and Development Association (GDA) to promote CEDAW awareness.

The **Philippines** PO focused its programming efforts primarily on Outcomes 2 and 3 including its allocation of resources. This contributed mainly to increasing awareness among formal and informal justice system actors of CEDAW commitments (Outcome 2) and strengthening monitoring and accountability mechanisms for CEDAW implementation (Outcome 3). The strategy was to place emphasis on implementation and monitoring of the Magna Carta. Stakeholder perceptions in the Philippines are that they have revised and amended many laws, but the real challenge and current focus is on implementation, and hence the rationale to focus on Outcomes 2 and 3.

However in 2014, the Programme office is shifting focus to also address Outcome 1 and include advocacy for gender integration into the legislative process particularly in relation to CEDAW compliance in drafting the Basic Law in Bangsamoro and strengthening women's participation in this process. Institutional involvement to address access to justice lies primarily with NGOs, and partnerships are being considered with the Supreme Court Committee on Gender Responsive Judiciary, but there is no evidence as yet of specific activities

Government (PCW) and key implementing partners PKKK and WLB expressed overall satisfaction with progress in their activities despite the challenges and some delays encountered (by PCW, and PKKK).

In **Thailand**, UN Women also works with a range of governmental and civil society partners and has instituted good progress on Outcome 1, for example with respect to advocacy work with the Law



Reform Commission of Thailand (LRCT), which is related to the Thai Government's Gender Equality Bill. UN Women has been very successful in bringing together stakeholders from civil society and government to network on law reform advocacy and receive training on CEDAW compliance and monitoring, and in developing training material and tools that can be used by legal professionals to apply CEDAW concepts in their work.

In **Timor-Leste**, the UN Women programme team is focusing on building a pool of expert trainers from civil society, legal drafters of the Ministry of Finance, other line Ministries and Parliament who can address jurisprudence elements of CEDAW and integrate women's human rights into law reform and legal training. At the request of the Ministry of Justice, UN Women has provided training to the Ministry's staff on CEDAW compliant drafting of legislation. In addition, UN Women has provided technical support to the MoJ for integrating women's human rights into their Guidelines on Drafting of Legislations.

The civil society sector in Timor-Leste is strong, as is the women's movement. However, the post-conflict nature of the country means that there is a fragmentation of efforts, leading to a lack of synergies and increasing competition for a dwindling pool of resources.

UN Women's programme in **Viet Nam** is also achieving on this outcome. Partners have increasing capacity to propose law revisions using CEDAW as the basis, although the country programme office reports that the ultimate compliance with laws that are finally adopted is beyond the control of UN Women and is difficult to assess in the short-term. Key partners, such as the Parliamentary Committee on Social Affairs, expressed their satisfaction with UN Women's technical input that helps them to mainstream CEDAW into a given legislation review (Constitution, Marriage and Family Law, Civil Status etc.). The sense among the Programme team is that the Government of Viet Nam wants to comply with CEDAW as much as possible through upcoming legislation revision. For example, the Government makes specific requests for provision of financial and technical support to provide training for MPs on CEDAW. However, Viet Nam is a highly centralised one-party state that has little tradition of external consultation, so UN Women finds it challenging to effectively access key decision-makers. For example, despite many recommendations for change from the UN, Viet Nam's amended 2013 constitution, in which HR is placed in Chapter II, but it did not fully incorporate proposed amendments to promote and protect human rights. Viet Nam's focus on its economy means that while politicians are willing to discuss the issues, in reality human rights are not given a high priority. That said, a range of dialogues are underway to amend a number of key legislative issues, such as family and marriage laws, unequal retirement ages, and women's access to land.

As a legacy of the centralised government, Viet Nam's civil society sector is still small in size and with only a limited number of organizations with the capacity to develop proposals. Therefore the uptake of grants from UN Women has been poor. UN Women currently has a strategy of engagement with CSOs and is working (with other sources of funding) with three CSO networks (some member of which are working with ASEAN project regional CSO partners).

***Output 1.1: Programs and arrangements for sustained capacity development on women's human rights compliant law making are adopted by and integrated into work of Parliament, relevant executive agencies, and CSOs***

Specific examples of achievements supported by UN Women among programme countries to date are:

**Regional:** Publication of a 2012 study entitled, "Gender Assessment of National Law-Making Mechanisms and Processes in selected South-East Asian Countries: A CEDAW Perspective", which presents detailed information on the legislative structures and processes in targeted programme countries, provides a review of global good practices in gender mainstreaming in legislation, and serves as a reference to identify strategic institutions for targeted capacity development support in gender-based legislative reviews

Global and national expert lawmakers, practitioners and academics on GBV legislation from the Philippines, Cambodia, Viet Nam, Lao PDR and China convened in 2013 to share experiences of development of DV and VAW laws in their country.

**Cambodia:** Focal points from Gender Mainstreaming Action Groups received training on gender and social accountability, and on women's human rights and CEDAW-based legislative reviews. The Ministry of Interior's Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan and Strategy 2011–2015, developed in December 2012, serves to promote gender equality and women's empowerment within the Ministry. In 2013, UN Women supported a training of trainers of NCDD officials, provincial councillors, and governors on CEDAW implementation and legislative review.

**Indonesia:** UN Women facilitated a series of consultation meetings throughout the year 2013 conducted among government (MOWE, MOH), religious leaders, women's rights advocates and professional health practitioners in order to urge and to support government to repeal the Ministry of Health's FGM guidelines/regulations. On 6 February 2014, the Ministry of Health announced repeal of the regulation.

**Lao PDR:** Support to the National Assembly in 2012 on an assessment of Lao laws that address violence against women, violence against children, and human trafficking, as well as to identify gaps in law and conflicts with international human rights treaties. In 2013, a national consultation took place among Parliamentarians on such laws, including the need for specific decrees on specific forms of violence against women. With contributions from UN Women in training and awareness-building, the National Assembly, Ministry of Justice, national women's machinery, and Lao Women's Union have agreed to cooperate to develop a comprehensive GBV/Domestic Violence law, with assistance from UN Women.

**Philippines:** UN Women has supported PKKK in capacity development activities among rural and indigenous women in Mindanao on women's human rights international standards and the roles of duty bearers and rights holders, as well as legislative advocacy and reform.

**Thailand:** The Life Stories project of tribal women highlighting the various forms of discrimination women face. Also, the adoption by the LRCT of a strategy for the promotion of gender equality, rule of law and good governance and LRCT endorsement of recommendations on the four-year LRCT Strategic Plan (2013-2016).

A UN Women-supported analysis of the proposed gender equality law and a draft law prepared by CSO actors (in consultation with women's groups and representatives of different groups of women) were submitted to the Thai Prime Minister by the LRCT in 2013. A series of promotional/educational materials around the gender equality bill were also distributed in print and electronic form to various government agencies, parliament, CSOs, and the public.

**Timor-Leste:** UN Women-supported trainings in 2012 and 2013 for key justice actors, including the Ombudsman Office, the Ministry of Justice, legal drafters of line ministries and parliament, as well as CSOs on CEDAW monitoring and reporting, women's human rights-compliant lawmaking, gender-responsive budgeting as a tool for gender mainstreaming, gender sensitivity in laws and policies, and review of government allocations to the National Action Plan on Gender-Based Violence.

In 2013 the Timor government approved facilitated discussions on the draft Land Law. UN Women worked through the Land Network organization, Rede ba Rai to mobilize civil society and women's organizations to incorporate gender equality and women's human rights recommendations into the draft Land Law. Following this initiative, the Ministry of Justice requested for UN Women's technical support for several upcoming law reviews (trafficking law, mediation law, civil registration code, customary law) regarding integration of women's human rights.

**Viet Nam:** The Ministry of Justice (MOJ) and the Parliamentary Committee for Social Affairs (PCSA) were provided and trained on CEDAW and HR treaties, introduced with a Gender Impact Assessment Tool to review legislation with a view to integrating gender issues and proposing amendments. UN Women also undertook advocacy on Viet Nam's discriminatory retirement law, supported participation by a CEDAW Committee member in a forum on these issues, drafted a position paper advocating revision of the Labour Code on this issue. Although Labour Code or other laws being revised have been taken into account of CEDAW principles, there are few substantive changes. Nevertheless, the discussion papers contributed to improving duty bearers' awareness on women human rights, enabling them to become more active in the revision of laws and better facilitating the discussion process.

Guidance for using training modules on CEDAW will be published in 2015 by PCSA, which will contribute to institutionalise CEDAW/HR training for MP and legal officers of the Training Center of National Assembly

*Output 1.2: Strategies and approaches developed and tested, especially those that focus on disadvantaged sectors, that a) promote integrated and coherent systems-wide perspectives on law making; and b) promote sustained and evidence-based, women's human rights-based legislative advocacy*

Examples of achievements supported by UN Women among programme countries are:

**Regional:** The South-East Asia Regional Consultation on Development, Access to Justice and the Human Rights of Indigenous Women organised by programme partner AIPP in 2012, which increased capacity of indigenous women's groups from nine countries to understand the links between access to justice and women's rights.

Regional UN Women partners IRAW Asia-Pacific undertook consultations in 2013 in Lao PDR, Cambodia, and Thailand with CSOs and academic institutions on CEDAW analysis of laws and policies, known as the CEDAW Compliance Framework.

AIPP, the Forest Peoples Programme, and APWLD submitted statements to the 57th session of the Commission on the Status of Women on the elimination and prevention of all forms of violence against women and girls, focusing on the rights of indigenous women.

**Cambodia:** UN Women provided training on CEDAW-based legislative reviews to staff from government agencies, using case studies and materials related to Cambodia's domestic violence law. CSO representatives were trained on OP-CEDAW and, in 2013, NGO-CEDAW undertook analysis of the Law on Prevention of Domestic Violence and Protection of Victims using the CEDAW Compliance Framework.

**Lao PDR:** Training on the CEDAW Compliance Framework resulted in the Faculty of Law at Lao PDR University institutionalising CEDAW monitoring in their training centres and research agenda on gender equality.

**Philippines:** Workshops on strengthening the capacities of legislators and CSOs to use CEDAW as the standard for initiating or advocating legal reform and to serve as a platform for advancing the "Women's Priority Legislative Agenda" developed by the PCW.

UN Women supported a consultation (2013) on strengthening NGOs role in Women's Human Rights Advocacy and Monitoring of CEDAW, which gave particular attention to the rights of excluded and marginalised groups, including persons with disabilities, LGBTs, women living with HIV/AIDS, and domestic and migrant workers.

**Thailand:** A women's legislative network was formed in 2012 by five Thai NGOs (representing disabled women, indigenous women, children and women from the southern provinces) with the aim of setting the women's legislative agenda, drafting/reviewing legislative proposals, and drafting position papers on proposed bills via a women's human rights and gender lens. Female legal

volunteers from northern provinces were trained in conducting women's human rights-based legislative analysis and advocacy. Consultative meetings on the draft gender equality legislation were held with representatives of women's NGOs and networks, women's human rights activists, and judges.

A series of national advocacy forums on the gender equality bill were organised by LRCT, the Foundation for Women, Law and Rural Development (FORWARD), and the Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) in 2013. Trainings were also provided to key government agencies and women's groups on the CEDAW Compliance Framework who will utilise it to assess the domestic violence law and gender equality bill.

**Viet Nam:** CSO consultations took place on the rights of, and challenges faced by, LGBT, HIV-positive, and disabled people. UN Women also funded the translation and distribution of a United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees publication on sexual orientation and gender identity in international human rights law, entitled *Born Free and Equal*. The publication was widely disseminated to CSOs, government agencies, research institutions so that more duty bearers and rights holders know better the human rights and LGBT rights. Advocacy and training on LGBT as HR was taken place for mass media, government officers, members of civil society to enhance properly understanding LGBR rights and their issues. This advocacy contributed to enhance capacity of LGBT people and enable them actively vocalise their legitimate rights in a range of policy dialogues with government on Marriage and Family Law, Civil Status Law.

UN Women, UNDP, and UNAIDS made recommendations to the Parliamentary Committee for Social Affairs on the proposed 2014 amendment of the 2000 Marriage and Family Law to ensure its CEDAW-compliance. These recommendations were on the basis of an analysis that identified a number of discriminatory provisions and human rights discrepancies. The findings were also disseminated at policy dialogues and discussions with Members of Parliament, Ministry of Justice officials, beneficiary groups, policy makers and lawyers, NGOs and development partners. The most recent draft issued in 2013 demonstrates the government's efforts to address inequality and discrimination in the law and bring the law closer to international standards.

**Timor-Leste:** As a part of the UN Women's efforts to create a pool of local women's human rights experts capable of advocating for women's rights-based legal drafting and review, a series of capacity development events were implemented in 2013, targeting CSOs.

### ***Outcome 2: Increased awareness among formal, semi-formal and informal justice system actors of CEDAW commitments***

Although a number of activities have been undertaken to date, overall, Outcome 2 has been less comprehensively addressed than the other two outcomes, although current UN Women efforts are underway to focus on the area of justice system actors' CEDAW awareness<sup>11</sup>. Examples of outputs under this outcome are workshops, seminars and exchanges between civil society actors, national human rights institutions, government officials and agencies, and some local-level leaders. However, there has been little follow-up on the outcomes of these events.

In 2013, a judicial colloquium took place in Thailand that sought to provide judges and legal professionals from all eight programme countries with increased awareness of CEDAW and promote a gender-responsive judiciary. Attendees interviewed felt that it was a valuable forum for exchanging ideas among peers from different countries. In this regard, the independence of the judiciary will require careful consideration when implementing capacity-building activities

---

<sup>11</sup> Building on the women's access to justice focus of UN Women globally, spearheaded with the 2011 release of the *In Pursuit of Justice* report.

(particularly when building the capacity of established judges, as opposed to integrating CEDAW into the curriculum of legal training academies, which Timor Leste achieved). The colloquium had benefits beyond building capacity of judges. In Viet Nam, for example, the colloquium helped establish a partnership with the Vietnamese Judicial Academy for potential capacity development work with a list of initial interventions aiming to increase the capacity of legal professionals (judges, prosecutors, lawyers, solicitors etc.) from a human rights and CEDAW perspective.

In 2013/2014, UN Women has been conducting extensive participatory action research across all programme countries on women's Access to Justice via a range of national partners. This research is an important initiative under this outcome that will provide data and guidance for UN Women and national stakeholders on the justice systems available to and utilised by women at community level. It will also create awareness of plural legal systems among stakeholders and build/reinforce partnerships between UN Women and the implementing organisations/agencies in each of the implementing countries. This initiative also will help identify advocacy strategies for women's human rights and CEDAW at the national and regional level. Importantly, the participatory action research methodology, if applied effectively, will also create positive change among community-level stakeholders with respect to their awareness of and appreciation for women's human rights and CEDAW, and build conceptual understanding of plural legal systems. This is a valuable potential positive outcome of the study. The effectiveness of this participatory action research methodology hinges on researchers receiving sufficient training. In some countries (e.g. Timor-Leste), while there are research organisations able to conduct participatory research, knowledge and understanding of the gender dimensions of plural legal system is nascent, though Timor-Leste is able to draw expertise from the region. (e.g. from the Philippines, Indonesia or Malaysia).

An example of a strong positive outcome related to UN Women's work in this area is the work of the Chief Judge of the Juvenile Family Court in Thailand, who has been working with UN Women for a number of years and is a strong advocate for gender-sensitive policies and procedures in Thailand's court system. Her work, supported by UN Women, has resulted in a range of initiatives that exemplify gender-sensitive practices. She is also promoting further training of judges in CEDAW and women's human rights issues.

### *Outputs 2.1: Core group of actors in plural justice systems with enhanced knowledge and skills on women's human rights-compliant justice delivery (formal system)*

**Regional:** The Regional South-East Asia Judicial Colloquium on Gender Equality Jurisprudence and the Role of the Judiciary in Promoting Women's Access to Justice brought together senior judges from eight South-East Asia programme countries. During the Colloquium, the judges agreed to encourage the establishment of gender equality committee within judiciaries; and encourage the formation of a regional network of judges to promote continuing dialogue, knowledge, and information sharing. One of the strong components of that colloquium was the reflection on the use of culture to justify harmful gender norms. This was a very 'political' and important statement given the context of the 2012 ASEAN Human Rights Declaration.

**Lao PDR:** Representatives from Lao Women Union trained on feminist legal theory and practice training. The Ministry of Justice also held National and Provincial Consultations on Women's Access to Justice for village mediation units and judicial institutions to strengthen their capacity on Gender Equality and VAW.

**Philippines:** Women's access to justice was brought to the forefront as a priority issue for policy discourse through the conduct of a National Forum on Women and Justice in May 2012. The recommendations from this Forum served as inputs to the Philippines WEDGE Plan described under Outcome 3. Further, in 2012, following the launch of the progress of world's women report on access to justice, three country level events on women's access to justice took place, two of which were wholly supported by the CEDAW programme and the other at which UN Women was considered as a partner.

**Timor-Leste:** UN Women works with the Legal Training Center of the Ministry of Justice on integration of women's human rights into curriculum, a strategic entry point for promoting women's human rights and mainstreaming gender into legal education. The LTC provides compulsory training for magistrates, prosecutors, public defenders and private lawyers prior to law practice. The outline of the curriculum for LTC which was recently approved by the Pedagogical Board contains modules on women's human rights. Corresponding modules on women's human rights have been developed and will be field tested in 2014 with the students of LTC.

**Thailand:** Partnership with the National Human Rights Commission of Thailand (NHRCT) to raise awareness of government agencies, judges, and CSOs on the OP-CEDAW. The Teeranat Kanjanauksorn Foundation, a CSO partner, initiated development of training modules for judges and public prosecutors in 2013.

**Timor Leste:** While the Timor-Leste government prioritises women's human rights and gender equality, the capacity of the government to implement laws is limited. The limited capacity is exacerbated by a historical over-reliance on external consultants, leading to poor government ownership. An example of this is the existing domestic violence law and associated national action plan which is unevenly implemented by various sectors. The challenge in Timor-Leste is made more complex as the laws are written in Portuguese and access, particularly at district levels, is limited. UN Women works through women's national machineries as much as possible to increase ownership of results.

### *Output 2.2: Legal support systems and advocacies enhanced for effective and women's human rights – promoting access to justice particularly by disadvantaged women*

Some specific achievements noted by UN Women on this output are:

**Regional:** An Expert Group Meeting (EGM) on Muslim women was held in May 2013 in Bali, Indonesia. Twenty-four participants from Muslim communities in Cambodia, Indonesia, Myanmar, the Philippines, and Thailand attended the EGM. Participants were activists or academics focused on various aspects of women, conflict, and Islamic law. The EGM provided an overview of women's human rights issues and protection frameworks and the relationship of these frameworks to Muslim Family Law, the causes and consequence of conflict on women in South-East Asia, access to justice for victims and survivors of violence against women, restrictions on women, and the role women can and should play in peace negotiations.

Regional partner APWLD undertook Feminist Legal Theory and Practice training of trainers in 2013 to strengthen the knowledge and capacities of women's rights advocates in the conduct of FLTP training at the regional/national levels and to prepare for National FLTPs in South-East Asia.

Regional partner IRAW Asia-Pacific undertook national level trainings on CEDAW with NHRIs in Philippines and Timor-Leste in 2013 on state CEDAW obligations and the role of NHRIs in monitoring and promoting protection of women's human rights. IRAW also organised a dialogue between NHRI and ASEAN mechanisms on access to legal recourse and the protection mandates of NHRI and ASEAN mechanisms.

**Indonesia:** Exchanges have been held between customary and village leaders in West Papua and Aceh provinces in order to share lessons learned on ensuring that community-based justice mechanisms comply with CEDAW. However concrete examples of how justice is meted out to women require further elaboration.

**Cambodia:** Training for young women leaders on feminism, equality concepts and conceptualising and pursuing justice for women, which was independently replicated for young women working in garment factories and entertainment venues.

**Philippines:** A Public Forum on Women's Access To Justice highlighted the CEDAW Optional Protocol cases filed by women, giving attention to experiences of disadvantaged women (particularly deaf women) in claiming their rights.

A 2012 workshop on Women's Human Rights in Conflict and Emergency Situations for duty-bearers and rights-holders resulted in increased awareness of women's human rights, especially as guaranteed under the Magna Carta of Women, and of CEDAW and its applicability in conflict and emergency situations. UN Women supported a workshop with the Commission on Human Rights to monitor women's human rights in conflict and emergency situations in Mindanao and fulfil its mandate as Gender Ombudsman.

**Viet Nam:** Advocacy and training on human rights, CEDAW and LGBT issues for media representatives, government employees, UN staff and NGO representatives. The contents of the advocacy and training portrayed a strong message to the audience in recognising LGBT rights as HR. Importantly correspondents from different media agencies will later disseminate LGBT related news on LGBT from HR perspective, rather than from their own biases or subjective perception.

UN Women and UNODC sponsored joint research entitled *Assessment of the Situation of Women in the Criminal Justice System in Viet Nam*, which looked at women survivors of domestic violence, women in conflicts with Viet Nam's laws, and women working in the justice sector from a CEDAW and human rights perspective. The findings were shared with government and CSO stakeholders, and will support revisions of the Viet Nam penal code and procedures.

**Thailand:** Partnership with the NHRCT to train government representatives and CSOs on the OP-CEDAW.

***Output 2.3: women's human rights-based perspectives and frameworks on Women's Access to Justice in plural justice systems deepened and promoted/shared across region by regional institutions and national governments***

**Regional:** The Programme contributed to dissemination of UN Women's inaugural 2011 annual report, *Progress of the World's Women: In Pursuit of Justice*, through forums in the Philippines, Timor-Leste, and Viet Nam that raised stakeholders' awareness on how the legal system intersects with women's access to their rights.

In 2012, UN Women supported a roundtable discussion in Thailand attended by 22 experts on the need to utilise formal and informal mechanisms to deliver justice for women, and on critical and emerging areas for research.

In 2012 and 2013, UN Women initiated a research framework on Access to Justice for Women in Plural Legal Systems of South-East Asia that will be used to guide future regional research on access to justice.

The research was initiated with a peer review workshop to develop its guidance framework paper on A2J in plural legal systems, a valuable knowledge product in the analysis and awareness-building of the plurality of legal systems in South-East Asia. The A2J fieldwork that is being conducted in 2013 and 2014 was supported by a range of workshops by implementing partners IDS and APWLD. The workshops are training national researchers and focusing on concepts and practices related to access to justice, ethical issues in conducting the research, the formation of communities of practice and platforms for sharing, and research planning for the eight programme countries. All programme countries were undertaking the field research (using national CSOs as research implementers where available) at the time of the MTR.

In mid-2013, IWRAW hosted a regional consultation for justice sector, women's machineries and civil society stakeholders from all programme countries on CEDAW implementation in the context of A2J. Key workshop outputs were a paper on trends in access to justice in South-East Asia that was shared

with participants and disseminated in public, a set of indicators on access to justice issues for women, and plans on translating the indicators into specific national contexts.

**Cambodia:** UN Women provided training on CEDAW-based legislative reviews to staff from government agencies, civil society organisations and rights-holders using case studies and materials related to Cambodia's domestic violence law. CSO stakeholders were trained on OP-CEDAW in 2013, specifically analysing cases that were reviewed by the CEDAW Committee.

**Viet Nam:** UN Women, UNDP, UNFPA, and UNODC supported the "Fourth Legal Policy Dialogue on Gender Mainstreaming in Law Making and Implementation: The Justice Sector's Response to Gender Inequality and Protection of Women's Rights", which involved representatives of the justice system, members of the National Assembly, and representatives of mass organisations and civil society. UN Women also supported a 2011 conference entitled "Challenges and Solutions to Effectively Respond to Domestic Violence and Enhance the Protection of the Victims of this Form of Crime in Viet Nam" for representatives of the police force, Ministry of Justice, civil society, unions, and other international organisations.

Viet Nam took part in the regional research on women access to justice in plural legal systems. Institute of Sociology under Ho Chi Minh Political Academy was selected to be a UN Women partner. New research method (FPAR) brought about new perception to shift the passive respondents to active respondents. The impact of the research will reach far beyond the findings because Ho Chi Minh Political Academy has function to provide training for potential leaders in Viet Nam. The findings and recommendations later will be shared with its trainees to raise their awareness how hard women access to both state and non-state legal systems and facilitate them to think of policy/law changes more responsive to women's rights.

### *Outcome 3: Strengthened monitoring and accountability mechanisms for implementation of CEDAW commitments*

Achievements in this outcome are also progressing well. UN Women has developed a range of useful and relevant materials that have been/are being translated into local languages and are freely available to stakeholders in the Programme countries. Regional partner AIPP is using UN Women-published material to disseminate information related to its mandate widely. For example, governments in the Philippines and India are using material produced by AIPP in developing their policies and procedures on women's human rights. Most government and civil society stakeholders report improved and improving awareness of, and commitment to, implementing and monitoring the provisions of CEDAW. However, some government and civil society respondents, as well as UN Women staff, expressed that strengthening of monitoring mechanisms for implementation of CEDAW commitments warrants more attention than currently is the case. For example, in the Philippines, Government stakeholders report that although it is among the leaders in ASEAN (and the world) in implementing the CEDAW in law (e.g. 2009 law RA 9710, the "Magna Carta of Women"), the Philippine Government lags in its implementation and still requires much work to strengthen the legislative framework to make it gender responsive.

UN Women also provides extensive support in tool development, coordination, and implementation of the monitoring and reporting on CEDAW implementation via the regular reporting process, the Universal Periodic Review by national women's machineries, and also to CSOs that undertake CEDAW shadow reporting. UN Women maintains good partnerships with CSOs in all programme countries in this regard.

Specific examples of programme achievements over the course of the Programme to date are:

**Regional:** Support to national women's machineries to implement gender equality commitments under CEDAW and other international obligations. In addition, APWLD, a key regional partner, was supported to attend the 2012 Asia Pacific Regional Consultation on Women's Public and Political Life in Asia Pacific in Nepal.



**Indonesia:** UN Women support strengthened the Indonesian Government's coordination of the monitoring and reporting on CEDAW during preparation of the government delegation for the dialogue with the CEDAW Committee in July 2012, and follow-up on implementation of the Concluding Observations. The Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection initiated discussions involving Islamic scholars, academia, women's rights advocates, and medical professionals to review the discriminatory practice of female genital mutilation (FGM).

**Philippines:** the Women's Empowerment and Development towards Gender Equality Plan (Women's EDGE) Plan was set up to strengthen Government capacity to implement and monitor the CEDAW-based Magna Carta of Women and other international and national gender equality commitments, using a rights-based approach, over the next five years.

To develop the plan, the Philippine Commission on Women initiated a participative and consultative planning process involving workshops and focus group discussions with duty-bearers and rights-holders (including marginalised women) to formulate goals and strategies for 18 thematic areas. Launched in 2012/2013 The *Women's EDGE Plan 2013 – 2016* addresses the country's gender commitments in the different sectoral goals, objectives and strategies as provided by the Magna Carta of Women.

**Timor-Leste:** Government ministries and key agencies contributed to the Secretary of State for the Promotion of Equality (SEPI)-led monitoring work on CEDAW implementation, including design of tools to collect data required for the next periodic report of Timor-Leste.

**Myanmar:** Using UN Women core funding, and in cooperation UNDP and UNFPA, UN Women supported training on CEDAW for parliamentarians, judiciary, and high-level decision makers of the executive branch of government in support of the Inter-Ministry Committee on CEDAW. Additionally, CSOs in Myanmar received basic training on CEDAW monitoring and implementation.

**Viet Nam:** UN Women supported a CEDAW Committee member's participation in a CEDAW consultation with senior members of the government, embassies, funding partners, CSOs, mass organisations and the media.

### ***Output 3.1: Knowledge resources that support better implementation, monitoring, and reporting on CEDAW and women's human rights related***

Specific examples of programme achievements over the course of the Programme to date are:

**Regional:** From programme inception in 2011, UN Women commenced an assessment of NGO CEDAW monitoring reports and processes in seven programme countries (excluding Myanmar). The aim was for the NGOs to take stock of the previous monitoring activities, lessons learned, and plan for the next phase. The study reported an increase in CEDAW monitoring over the course of the previous decade, with sharing of good practices and strategies at the regional level, partially as a result of UN Women's support to NGOs. However, it also noted unevenness of programming, reporting capacity and tensions among the various regional and national groups.

In collaboration with OHCHR, technical support and funding was provided in 2012 for a CEDAW committee consultation with representatives of 16 South Asian/South-East Asian/Pacific countries entitled "Asia-Pacific Regional Consultation on the CEDAW Committee's proposed new general recommendation on women in conflict and post-conflict situations", part of a series of region-based global events.

**Cambodia:** In 2013, a CEDAW monitoring tool was developed for annual monitoring of missions by Cambodia National Council for Women (CNCW) staff to Cambodia's provinces. UN Women also supported CNCW in its development of the combined 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Periodic Report to the CEDAW Committee, and CSOs in their finalisation of the 2013 NGO Shadow Report

UN Women conducted a study in 2013 on young women's participation in the democratic process, leadership, and decision making roles. The study findings will be used to develop strategies to increase the level of young women's participation.

**Lao PDR:** UN Women organised a 2011 seminar on women migrant workers and consultation on CEDAW reporting. Additionally, UN Women provided support to the Lao National Commission for the Advancement of Women (NCAW) to strengthen their monitoring and reporting in line with the CEDAW Concluding Observations to Lao PDR's 2009 Periodic Report.

UN Women also supported translation of CEDAW general recommendations and other materials on women's rights into the Lao language in 2013 and disseminated them to national stakeholders to assist in drafting laws and promote national ownership of international human rights treaties.

**Indonesia:** UN Women supported the Indonesian Government in 2013 in coordinating the monitoring and reporting on CEDAW implementation, including provision of support to workshops and consultations among key line ministries. UN Women also worked with Indonesia's NHRI (Komnas Perempuan) to develop AICHR & ACWC capacity in developing human rights mechanisms in the region.

It is also develop dialogue mechanism between NHRIs and civil society that effectively promote and protect women's rights in Indonesia.

**Philippines:** Two National Consultations with NGOs were conducted in January and October 2013 to facilitate an exchange of good practices, identify strategies and possible areas for collaboration, support efforts to strengthen networking among NGOs, and focus on women's human rights.

**Timor Leste:** UN Women provided technical support to government partner SEPI in the Second and Third Periodic Report to the CEDAW Committee, including collection of data and guidance on how to write the report and organise consultative workshops.

In addition UN Women supported SEPI on the design, translation, simplification, and dissemination of resource materials on women's human rights, including CEDAW General Recommendations for the Government of Timor-Leste. SEPI was also supported in 2013 on a survey of government ministries related to CEDAW implementation and in preparation of the second and third periodic report to the CEDAW committee. The data collected through the Second and Third Periodic Report has been used for the development of the Timor-Leste Country Gender Assessment, supported jointly by UN Women and ADB. In addition, capacity building on gender statistics has been conducted with key line ministries on how to use data for gender-responsive planning and budgeting.

### *Output 3.2: Capacity development programmes conducted and modelling undertaken of integrated, harmonised women's human rights and coordinated approaches to CEDAW implementation and monitoring*

**Regional:** Regional partner IWRAP undertook one national consultation (in Indonesia) with women's machinery on CEDAW implementation. The consultation aimed to identify and explore strategies to support the implementation of priority issues identified during the 52nd Session and the 2012 Indonesian CEDAW Concluding Observations.

**Cambodia:** The Cambodian National Council for Women trained Deputy Provincial Governors in 2012 on CEDAW implementation, compliance, and advocacy skills. In addition, key staff of the National Committee for Sub-national Democratic Development (NCDD) and its staff from two provinces were part of a national ToT and two provincial-level trainings on CEDAW-compliant implementation aimed at building a national-level pool of trainers.

Also in Cambodia, UN Women designed a capacity-development programme for young women's leadership, trained young women's groups on women's human rights and participated in workshops on advocacy and feminist leadership. Innovative campaigns, publications and social media initiatives by young women were also supported by UN Women.

UN Women supported trainings and events in 2013 on Human Rights Principles, CEDAW, CEDAW monitoring and reporting, the Optional Protocol, and gender mainstreaming for a range of provincial-level officials, provincial NGOs, young women's leaders, the Young Women's Leadership Network and Cambodian Women's Caucus. UN Women also supported the establishment of the young Women's Cross Party Political Network, which undertook joint advocacy actions to increase women's participation in politics and decision-making prior to the 2013 National Assembly Elections.

In 2012, UN Women supported the Ministry of Interior to develop the Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan 2012-2013 and associated trainings to mainstream the concepts of gender equality.

**Lao PDR:** UN Women provided trainings on CEDAW implementation in 2013 to high ranking officials of government officials and academics.

**Timor-Leste:** UN Women provided technical support to SEPI to designing tools for collecting information and systematising the CEDAW reporting process.

Similarly, With UN Women technical assistance, the Secretary of State for the Promotion of Equality developed 15 CEDAW compliant sectoral Gender Mainstreaming checklists for line Ministries and Secretary of States to support integration of gender equality activities in the process of 2014 Annual Action Plans formulation. The NWM then spearheaded the training of the members of inter-ministerial Gender Working Group followed by guiding in Annual Action Plans formulation. The analysis of 2014 Annual Action Plans submitted to the Parliament for review indicated that 65% of ministries (11 out of 17) and 14% State Secretariats (3 out of 22) included gender equality provisions and actions in their Plans.

**Viet Nam:** UN Women developed and piloted training material on CEDAW and human rights to reflect national circumstances and alignment of relevant national strategies. The material was rolled out in 2012 via MOLISA-organised training for central and provincial-level staff and other relevant institutions and academies, including labour institutes, youth unions, trade unions, and the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism. Training was also provided in late 2012 to MOLISA central and provincial-level government officers on promoting implementation of CEDAW. Not all government staff working on Gender Equality have received awareness-building on CEDAW nor understand its substantive contents as the programme does not have sufficient coverage for government staff at provincial and lower levels, and government has not prioritised this in their budgets.

### *Output 3.3: Enhanced methods and tools by CSOs for holding governments accountable for women's human rights shared across region*

**Regional:** In 2012, NGO representatives from six countries, (Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam) and five regional NGOs (APWLD, Women of Asia Pacific Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS, Asian Indigenous Women's Network, International Land Coalition, and IWRAP) attended the NGO Regional Conference on Advocacy and Monitoring of CEDAW Implementation in Indonesia.

**Cambodia:** Trainings took place under UN Women's Young Women's Leadership Initiative for young Cambodian women's human rights advocates, leading to the establishment of a new young women's network. In addition, UN Women provided technical and financial support to a civil society coalition on mapping activities, two cross-party dialogues on the need to promote women in politics, and cross-party trainings for women candidates from all major political parties in two pilot provinces for 2012 commune elections and 2013 National Assembly elections.

UN Women supported the finalisation of the 2013 NGO Shadow Report. UN Women also supported the CNCW in leading the process of developing the combined 4th and 5th Periodic Report to the CEDAW Committee and a CEDAW Mock Session for government delegates to the CEDAW Session 56 and for civil society representatives. CSOs working on protection and promotion of women's human rights also received training on OP-CEDAW with UN Women support for the translation and the

dissemination of the OP-CEDAW. UN Women also supported a series of community dialogues in 2013 for citizens to share their inputs on women's human rights issues and generate support at community level.

**Lao PDR:** In 2013, CSO partners were trained as trainers on legal review for CEDAW compliance and monitoring. These representatives will further train others in the other organisation.

**Philippines:** UN Women provided support to EnGendeRights, the Center for Reproductive Rights, and IRAW to gather evidence of reproductive rights violations among urban poor women in Manila City, and to coordinate investigative and fact-finding activities for the CEDAW Committee experts' inquiry in 2012. Partnerships were also developed for capacity development and training activities (including monitoring tools) for rural, indigenous and marginalised and excluded groups of women.

**Thailand:** UN Women provided support via an external consultant to the NHRCT to develop the indicators under CEDAW and other international treaties affecting women's human rights in order to enhance methods and tools for NHRCT planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting of State implementation to relevant Convention Committees.

**Timor-Leste:** UN Women supported training for staff from local NGOs and an NGO network who are part of the CEDAW Watch Group on CEDAW, GRB, women's human rights/CEDAW-compliant law monitoring, and gender mainstreaming. In addition, UN Women supported Rede Feto, the only national women's network, in data collection in preparation for the Fourth Women's Congress. This data will be used for the drafting of the Alternative Report.

UN Women also trained Timor-Leste's NHRI, the Office of Provedoria, on the use of CEDAW to monitor and promote domestic implementation and enforcement of women's human rights, including through monitoring of the Concluding Observations issued by the CEDAW Committee. As a result, the Deputy Ombudsman requested further UN Women support in development of capacity in applying gender-responsive budgeting tool in their monitoring of CEDAW implementation by the government.

**Viet Nam:** UN Women in Viet Nam face challenges in identifying relevant NGOs to be partner in implementation of CEDAW monitoring. At the time of research, the country office was reviewing proposals from, and selecting partner NGOs for the programme.

### 1.5 Challenges & Opportunities

**Challenge:** The administrative/management transition of UNIFEM to UN Women in 2010/2011 presented organisational and administrative challenges to the Programme with downstream effects on project stakeholders that limited the timely achievement of outcomes.

- **Actions Taken:** UN Women accelerated efforts to implement activities and partnerships, and the regional office provides extensive technical assistance to national offices as and when needed.
- **Results:** UN Women has addressed most of these issues over the 2012/2013 period.
- **Recommendations/Opportunities:** There are still some gaps in staff capacity and engagement, particularly in countries where UN Women does not have senior country-level representation. There is a need for strategies for improved communications, coordination, and synergies between UN Women and other UN agencies at country-level, while also providing programme officers in national offices strong technical support on programmatic and content issues (see Recommendation R.9.);

**Challenge:** The implementation of CEDAW needs to incorporate a substantial number of institutional stakeholders across eight programme countries, with wide variation in capacities, levels of responsibilities, autonomy, vertical, and horizontal integration across these many stakeholders.

- **Actions Taken:** Informed by a strong understanding of individual country contexts by national UN Women programme staff, UN Women has effectively implemented formal and informal partnerships and implemented activities with a wide variety of stakeholders across all programme countries.
- **Results:** UN Women's wide range of activities with diverse partners has resulted in a significant level of reach across government bodies, national human rights bodies and civil society organisations and networks. Significant and ongoing capacity-building activities with actors at many levels has resulted in demonstrated improvements in knowledge of CEDAW principles and practices and commitments by stakeholders to a range of initiatives to implement CEDAW and other measures to improve women's human rights.
- **Recommendations/Opportunities:** None

**Challenge:** Building capacity of numerous and diverse stakeholders in an ongoing, systematic, and progressive manner.

- **Actions Taken:** UN women has made efforts to improve knowledge, skills, attitudes and practices of stakeholders in the Programme via a wide range of diverse activities and initiatives that cover all aspects of women's human rights and CEDAW and reach all rights-holder groups. In addition, UN Women has sought to utilise its influence to reach all key stakeholders and decision-makers in the Programme countries with its activities.
- **Results:** UN Women has successfully established good working relationships with most, if not all, key stakeholders and decision-makers, sometimes in challenging circumstances. Further, its ability to gain access to high-level policymakers has provided other stakeholders (typically civil society) with opportunities to access these entities or individuals that they would not otherwise have. However, UN Women has not demonstrated a systematic and progressive approach to building the capacity of all stakeholders. The wide variety of stakeholders across the eight countries, the limited motivation of many key decision-makers to implement change and ongoing turnover of key decision-makers means that activities appear ad-hoc. This is exacerbated by a lack of granularity of the programmatic strategic approach which makes linking of individual outputs to specific indicators of successful programme outcomes challenging.
- **Recommendations/Opportunities:** As noted by UN Women itself, capacity-development needs to be pursued through systematic, sustained, and strategic interventions based on the demonstrated and measureable need to increase, expand, and deepen the capacity of duty-bearers and civil society to implement and monitor CEDAW. This must be supported by deliberate and systematic efforts to capture, generate and share knowledge.

**Challenge:** Bridging the disconnect between high-level commitment to CEDAW and actual implementation of its provisions at national, provincial, and community levels.

- **Actions Taken:** In a number of programme countries, UN Women has initiated activities to roll out capacity-building among government duty-bearers at sub-national levels. In addition, numerous civil society actors with extensive links to and direct activities at local levels (including advocacy with government) have been supported through the Programme. Further, UN Women's A2J study in 2013/2014 will create a baseline of findings on which a strategy for future targeted action can be based.
- **Results:** While a number of activities supported by UN Women have been targeted at provincial levels, and the CSOs supported through the Programme are undertaking local-level activities with demonstrable positive outcomes, there is limited provision made for ensuring or assessing the outcomes of the Programme activities at community levels in the Programme.

- **Recommendations/Opportunities:** While not the primary focus, the outcomes of programme initiatives on women at the community level merits assessment in order to validate the link between the Programme outputs/outcomes and the Programme goal (possibly via pilot communities). Greater community-level outreach and a deliberate strategy to target male audiences could also result in positive outcomes. The A2J study may provide a potential baseline for efforts in this regard. Consideration should be given to a follow-up study at a later stage of the Programme to assess whether the Programme outputs are indeed reaching community levels.

**Challenge:** Uneven capacity, space, and opportunities for civil society organisations engaged in women’s human rights work at national level, given the diversity of political structures and the difference in availability of democratic space for CSOs, particularly in Mekong countries. Individual capacities of civil society organisations to engage in activities with UN Women to the required standard is limited, excluding potentially productive partnerships.

- **Actions Taken:** UN Women gauges on an ongoing basis the political climate and the readiness of CSOs and has engaged in active efforts to engage with CSO partners, though a minimum standard of institutional capacity is required for accountability purposes.
- **Results:** UN Women has undertaken potential support and partnership discussions with a range of civil society women’s groups across the Programme countries, particularly in countries where civil society is constrained. However, the ongoing limited capacity of many CSOs presents a challenge to their effective engagement with UN Women. CSO partners place significant strategic value on the information and technical support available to them from UN Women and the access it offers them to other key stakeholders, notably government stakeholders.
- **Recommendations/Opportunities:** UN Women engagement with CSO partners should seek to assist them in their administrative/grant management challenges by increasing the capacity of (particularly smaller) stakeholders to manage and report on individual grants. UN Women should strive to maintain its support to CSOs, particularly smaller CSOs, and use its high-level influence to convene stakeholders in appropriate forums.

**Challenge:** Political instability (even changes resulting from national elections) can lead to a lack of momentum to institute new or changed policies, regime or key individual changes, unwillingness to engage with external actors, or social suppression.

- **Actions Taken:** UN Women has taken a flexible approach to implementation of programme activities in response to a range of political changes in many of the Programme countries.
- **Results:** Some of the changes have resulted in delays to programme activities (e.g. in Thailand and Cambodia) or have required changes to advocacy initiatives to reflect the changing political realities. Activities that required postponement have been undertaken at a later date, and the overall progress of the Programme has not been significantly hindered.
- **Recommendations/Opportunities:** None

### 1.6 Unintended Results

- The CEDAW SEAP Phase II interventions as mediated by UN Women have resulted in good networking and relationships among disparate stakeholders that would otherwise have found it difficult to initiate partnerships. A specific example of this was cited by stakeholders in Lao PDR who are engaged in the Access to Justice research.
- The Programme is also spurring the formation and growth of CSOs engaged in women’s human rights work. In Lao PDR (a challenging environment for independent CSOs to operate), a student gender group that was assisted under SEAP Phase I has become an independent women’s NGO working on CEDAW and women’s rights issues – one of the few in Lao PDR to

do so. While such nascent NGOs do not yet have the capacity to formally engage with UN Women in partnerships, the technical assistance and non-financial support provided to them by UN Women can develop their capacity, motivation, and confidence. Given the relatively small number of CSOs engaged in women's human rights work in many of the Programme countries, this is an important unintended outcome of the Programme.

- As a result of programme-supported initiatives, women's groups/NGOs, including those working with marginalised groups, have been empowered and have gained the confidence, skills, and opportunity to actively lobby with governments, with demonstrated results. An example cited by stakeholders is the inclusion of CSO stakeholders from the Philippines in a delegation attending the meeting of the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) to New York in March 2013.
- Gender-budgeting activities in Indonesia supported in 2010 were spearheaded by those participants/ministries who received training during the CEDAW SEAP Phase I including the Indonesian Ministry of Public Works. Now the Ministry of Public Works is recognised as a gender champion and has effectively integrated gender in its plans and budget.
- As a result of working together on the CEDAW Committee Concluding Observations, the Indonesian Ministry of Home Affairs and Ministry of Law and Human Rights, which previously did not communicate with each other, have enhanced their working relationships and communications. The Ministry of Home Affairs reviewed discriminatory laws and the and Ministry of Law and Human Rights has now a platform from which they can review their policies and regulations and build stronger relationships related to Outcomes 1 and 3. The two ministries are 'talking to each other'.
- As a result of the project, initiatives are being taken by Philippine Local Government Units, to train each other in gender sensitivity and, for the first time, they are including gender in local policies.

## 2. Relevance of Programme strategy and approaches

### 2.1 Consistency of results with needs, priorities and capacities

Stakeholders in all countries confirmed that CEDAW SEAP II is highly relevant in the national, regional and global context in promoting women's and girl's human rights, seeking *de jure* and *de facto* equality and ensuring State Obligations in the implementation and monitoring of CEDAW. At programme inception, UN Women undertook a multi-country round of consultation workshops with available stakeholders in the development of programme strategy in 2011, and all UN Women offices surveyed expressed that they try to ensure a participatory and consultative process when designing various programme activities, consulting regularly with partners for their inputs and perspectives.

Many government stakeholders noted that UN Women has uniquely contributed greatly to provision of a space for new dynamics between government and CSOs, which they hope will be sustained in the future. UN Women's broad approach to creating awareness of CEDAW and women's human rights via this programme and the ASEAN Regional Mechanisms project have promoted a very wide-ranging understanding and appreciation that CEDAW implementation is a 'whole government' approach. In addition, UN Women's focus on creating and sustaining relationships among legislative and judicial stakeholders across national boundaries has been highlighted as a strong positive outcome of the Programme, permitting peer legislators and members of judiciaries to learn from each other in a context in which they are comfortable.

CSO stakeholders noted UN Women's particular added value to the discourse on gender and women's human rights to be strong in the expertise that it makes available to all partners, and UN Women's willingness to leverage its position as the only UN agency with a dedicated gender mandate to bring disparate stakeholders from civil society and government together to share knowledge and discuss key issues. While other UN agencies have gender mandates, they are diluted by their focus on other areas. UN Women is exclusively occupied in the 'gender space', and as such is considered to be the definitive stakeholder within the UN system by many stakeholders.

The project is also very relevant in the context of efforts to institutionalise religiously-motivated discrimination in a number of the Programme countries (e.g. Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines), and the presence of many pluralistic legal systems across the many minority ethnic groups in all programme countries. CEDAW, in its context as an internationally ratified convention, directly addresses the need for local, national, and regional compliance in discriminatory laws against women. It also addresses persistent gender inequalities in the social, cultural, economic, and political sphere.

CEDAW SEAP Phase II is highly relevant to the mandate of UN Women as a global champion of gender equality, women's empowerment, and human rights, as well as to its strategic priorities. It is also relevant to the DFATD mandate including the South-East Asia Development Assistance Programme. The enabling environment for gender equality and human rights is being facilitated and broadened in the Programme countries through the project.

### 2.2 Appropriateness of capacity-building activities and plans.

Capacity-building is a core element in the Programme and highly appreciated by all partners both in government and civil society. The majority of stakeholders interviewed consider that capacity-building activities are useful to their work/institutional responsibilities. UN Women has supported capacity development through varied approaches: training workshops, consultations, networking, roundtables, research, and production of relevant training materials at both national and regional level. These have been well received by most stakeholders, but there is an ongoing demand and an ongoing need amongst government and other institutional stakeholders for such activities that looks unlikely to be sustainably met beyond completion of the Programme. Positively, UN Women has instituted a range of productive partnerships in many of the programme countries for provision of



capacity-building of many key stakeholders. These partnerships should be maintained and encouraged, Specific examples of some of the benefits of capacity development activities expressed by stakeholders are:

- **Regional:** UN Women regional partner IWRAP undertakes training of NHRIs in the region on an ongoing basis, contributing to their understanding of women’s human rights issues and CEDAW. These organisations only exist in Philippines, Timor-Leste, Malaysia, Myanmar, and Thailand, although Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam are discussing establishment of NHRIs.
- **Philippines:** The Women’s Legal and Human Rights Bureau stated that it is benefitting greatly from the training and guidance for research on access to justice in the Philippines. It hopes to share its training and research outcomes with national partners and other countries in the region. In 2014, Miriam College International Studies Department in the Philippines (a short-term training provider) will conduct a post-evaluation (6 months) of the UN Women-supported training provided to the Commission on Human Rights to assess the capacity developed among CHR staff at national and sub national levels.
- **Indonesia:** MOWECP acknowledged a better understanding on RBM and the importance of monitoring after receiving a UN Women supported RBM training.
- **Thailand:** Stakeholders cited an example of a public prosecutor whose UN Women-sponsored CEDAW training has resulted in CEDAW being cited in ongoing cases, resulting in better judicial outcomes and faster case processing.
- **Cambodia:** Civil society partners, with UN Women support, have founded a range of networks that train and motivate young women activists at community levels and provide them with material related to women’s human rights and CEDAW. Despite the challenges of women becoming community leaders in Cambodia, four such activist groups have been formed since programme inception.
- **Timor-Leste:** UN Women staff report ongoing follow-up to integrate recommendations from consultations into a draft Land Law via work with a group of legal experts who have received women’s human rights training to review draft land and decentralisation laws. Modules of the women’s human rights, legal review, and litigation trainings will also be integrated into the curriculum of the Timor-Leste Legal Training Centre.
- **Viet Nam:** UN Women has established a partnership with the Viet Nam Judicial Academy, which trains judicial stakeholders such as Judges, solicitors, prosecutors and lawyers.

Some stakeholders have criticised the modality of the capacity development activities in that there is little systematic tracking of results in terms of if/how the recommendations of these workshops have been followed up, by whom, and the extent to which the learning is applied by the partners/trainees. UN Women conducts little follow-up on the impact/outcomes/results of these activities other than immediate pre-post testing of participants<sup>12</sup>.

The Programme capacity development activities needed by many stakeholders should focus more on action-oriented outcomes and focusing on participant efforts to implement the agreed-upon actions, though carefully structured to take into account the hierarchical nature of government entities. Capacity-building processes, if not sufficiently thought through, can become self-perpetuating as an outcome in itself, i.e. without articulation of how this training/information sharing, etc. will be used for concrete outcomes. This has been reflected in the many calls by stakeholders during the MTR research for further trainings, seminars, etc. An example of such grounding is a Timor-Leste ToT on

---

<sup>12</sup> Pre-post testing, while offering some useful information on capacity-building activities, are prone to response bias and do not assess behaviour or practices change.

women's human rights that looked specifically at the draft Land Law and draft Decentralization Law, resulting in recommendations submitted to key government bodies, including the Ministries of Justice, State Administration as well as the Office of the Prime Minister.

The Philippines Miriam College International Studies Department training evaluation cited on the previous page provides a good example of evaluations of the outcomes of trainings/capacity-building activities. Such evaluations, conducted after an appropriate post-training period, should be applied more widely across the Programme.

#### **Key Recommendation:**

**R.3.** Capacity-building activities (trainings, study visits, workshops, seminars etc.), where appropriate (given the nature of the specific participants), where possible/appropriate, should include structured action-oriented outcomes as part of the training methodology with associated process and outcome indicators. This has been emphasised by several stakeholders these events to translate into concrete activities, practices, and behaviours. To complement this more systematic approach to capacity development, small, medium-term evaluations (i.e. 6-months/1 year post-activity) of the effect of capacity-building/training activities on practices and behaviours of participants of their events should be applied more widely across the Programme to assess the contribution of the trainings to the Programme outcomes.

#### **2.3 Appropriateness of results, mechanisms, strategies, approaches and activities.**

While challenges were experienced in project activity implementation and project management due to the transition from UNIFEM to UN Women and personnel changes in individual countries, UN Women has delivered the project outputs and contributing towards outcomes in an appropriate manner, notwithstanding the concern/recommendation under 2.2 above. The varied and hierarchical nature of stakeholders involved in women's human rights issues across the region necessitates a structured and varied approach to implementation of capacity and capability development in order to achieve effective change<sup>13</sup>, and in this, UN Women has adopted an appropriate mix of approaches and activities. As discussed above, this brings its own challenges with respect to the monitoring, reporting and measurement of outcomes related to the Programme goal.

#### ***Project flexibility***

As discussed further in Section 6 below, UN Women staff in all countries concurred that the UN Women regional project management team was responsive to challenges and opportunities. However, while they received good guidance from the Regional Office on project management areas (e.g. work plans, reporting procedures etc.), there was not enough technical content and substantive guidance in view of changing priorities in the country/region. While UN Women project staff demonstrated a high level of commitment to their responsibilities and strong efforts to create and maintain relationships with stakeholders and partners, their heavy work load and limited numbers (1-4 staff per project country) limited their flexibility, particularly where approval for initiatives or changes required review or approval from the regional office.

In addition, at the national level, each of the ASEAN countries exhibits a very different mix of factors that contribute to implementation of the project, the type and number of potential partners, the interaction with government, and the nature of ASEAN commission representatives' role. This variation precludes a 'one-size fits all' approach. While UN Women has striven to be adaptable to individual and changing national circumstances, the quality and quantity of resources available in a

---

<sup>13</sup> For example, the 2013 Judges Colloquium in Thailand – the activity was not a formal 'training' in consideration of potential sensitivities regarding judicial independence.

given country did not necessarily reflect these circumstance. For example, Indonesia, the largest and most diverse of the ASEAN countries, has limited UN Women country representation (the Timor Leste Country Representative acts also for Indonesia, starting in 2014) and a new complement of staff members. Lao PDR, a country with some of the poorest indicators on women's human rights (it is last of the seven ASEAN countries in the SIGI rankings) and with a newly emerging civil society sector, also does not have country representation.

#### **2.4 Engagement with civil society and government institutions.**

As discussed above, UN Women has undertaken very strong efforts to comprehensively engage with a very wide range of stakeholders across the women's human rights space in South-East Asia.

Stakeholders confirmed that the partnership choices both of government and NGO partners have been strategic and relevant, and that selected partners have the necessary expertise and competence in women's and girl's human rights and gender equality. UN Women's profile ensures that it has good access to key partnerships at government levels, which is a valuable point of connection for non-governmental partners who do not enjoy the same access. Many such stakeholders noted the value of UN Women as a facilitator in this regard, and are keen to maintain links to UN Women for this added value.

The eight individual countries in which UN Women works all have very different CSO dynamics necessitating individual approaches, ranging from countries with strong civil society and many capable CSOs (such as Indonesia and Philippines) through countries that implement harsh restrictions on CSOs (such as Cambodia and Myanmar). There are also countries that are less restrictive but still impose state control on, or have poor traditions of, independent civil society (e.g Viet Nam and Lao PDR). In each case, an approach tailored to the individual national circumstances is being taken by UN Women (where the Country Office has the independence to do so).

However, the administrative requirements of undertaking a Project Cooperation Agreement with the UN as a CSO partner can pose a challenge for smaller CSOs with poor technical capacity (or language skills). In Viet Nam, two rounds of proposal requests were required before a partner for project activities was identified. Many CSO partners noted the challenges involved post-agreement with reporting to UN Women. The ISG evaluators recommend a degree of flexibility on the part of UN Women with respect to administrative/reporting requirements for smaller partners, coupled with prompt provision of technical assistance to partners with respect to preparation results reporting.

In addition, there are a range of increasingly active, empowered, and capable stakeholders (both governmental and non-governmental) operating across the Programme's countries of operation, presenting good opportunities for collaboration for UN Women. Such support can be vitally important for organisations that are engaged in the struggle for women's human rights, particularly in the face of regressive policies or trends in specific countries (e.g. increasingly conservative Islamic influence in Indonesia and Southern Thailand, and the opposition of the Catholic Church in the Philippines to the Reproductive Health Law). CSOs in all countries visited were keen to engage in peer networks and develop/refine their strategies for movement building among their constituencies (for example, via dissemination of a range of technical materials/communications to other actors and the wider public) nationally and regionally. Stakeholders noted that UN Women support would be strategic in continuing to strengthen CSOs in movement building/constituency building to create solidarity, facilitate coordination and networking, and undertake collective action to push for women's human rights and ensure they are at the forefront of government agendas.

An example of such an opportunity was cited by partners in Thailand, who expressed concern that to date, UN Women has only supported the formation of a 'loose' network of women's organisations, and should now focus more on building the capacity of a core group of 'champions' that understand CEDAW well and can use it as a tool to advocate for action more effectively.

Of particular note are the moves towards establishment of NHRIs in Cambodia and Lao PDR. UN Women's partnership with IWRAW to strengthen the capacity of existing NHRIs (in the other five programme countries) could be leveraged to advocate for establishment of these NHRIs, or other strategies developed to encourage their establishment and appropriate integration of women's human rights principles.

#### **Key Recommendations:**

**R.4.** Notwithstanding UN policies on partnerships/grant management, provision of additional technical assistance to partners with respect to preparation of proposals and/or reporting could pay dividends with regard to the quantity and quality of CSO partnerships in the Programme, as well as support sustainability of the Programme initiatives post-completion;

**R.5.** UN Women should consider how its advocacy efforts and technical capacity can be utilised to support the formation and strengthening of new NHRIs in programme countries and to provide support for strengthening of networks of women's rights advocates and their associated movements. In particular, UN Women should support key 'champions' who are working to counter regressive trends and working towards empowering women at grassroots levels to understand the impact of CEDAW (and ASEAN) on their livelihoods and human rights.

#### **2.5 Partner/stakeholder roles, engagement, support, consultation and satisfaction.**

As discussed above, partners and stakeholders interviewed generally expressed satisfaction with the results and capacity-building activities of the Programme. However a consistent area where many stakeholders saw opportunities for action (and echoed by the ISG Review Team) is the ad-hoc nature of the capacity-building activities and the lack of follow-through on specific activities to determine whether they were resulting in behaviour change. The networking/relationship-building elements of the projects capacity-building strategy, while popular among stakeholders (particularly government stakeholders) can be an inefficient means of developing capacity and could be balanced with more structured trainings and/or linked to commitments to action by participants related to specific project outcomes.

#### **2.6 Risk mitigation strategies**

As discussed in Section 1.2 above, the original programme proposal identified a number of risks that the Programme faces in implementing its activities, some of which are:

1. Political instability;
2. Turnover of stakeholders/personnel leading to inconsistent work and gains;
3. Unwillingness of stakeholders to translate the knowledge gained under the Programme interventions into action;
4. Unwillingness of stakeholders to participate in the initiatives and activities and be open to reform, particularly at community levels;
5. Lack of resources to sustain the Programme initiatives;
6. Lack of coordination with other initiatives leading to duplication;
7. Natural disasters affecting programme implementation;

In addition, UN Women identified the major challenges that were (or potentially) impacting implementation in its annual reporting on the Programme (see Section 1.5 above). The desk review of programme reports and field research has demonstrated that the risks identified at the proposal stage were valid, and indeed many of the risks noted at the inception stage have indeed materialised. Via the field work, the ISG Review Team has determined that many of these risks led to slower progress than was expected at programme inception.

This area is discussed further in Section 7 below.

## 2.7 Areas where results are not likely to be achieved

As discussed in the preceding section, the lack of leverage of UN Women over government stakeholders, and the lack of penetration of the Programme to local/community levels makes the Programme vulnerable to external trends that are competing with the reforms it promotes. Notably, there is an unwillingness of stakeholders to institute reforms, due to inertia or conservatism. Some examples of trends in programme countries are:

- Stakeholders in Indonesia and Thailand highlighted that increasing trends in religious fundamentalism and the politicisation of gender issues negatively impact women. In Indonesia, the gender equality law is still pending, although the withdrawal of the government regulations on female genital mutilation has recently been announced. The upcoming elections in April and July 2014 may further determine the course the country takes on gender equality and women's human rights. The process of decentralisation in Indonesia also makes the country vulnerable to increasing levels of discrimination in specific areas (e.g. application of Sharia Law in some districts/provinces)
- In the Philippines, the Catholic Church and conservative groups have attacked the newly passed Reproductive Health Law as being unconstitutional, although the Supreme Court decision in mid April 2014 to uphold the law is a strong positive step.
- CSO stakeholders in all field visit countries highlighted the ongoing discourse on gender, Islam, and CEDAW, and the perceptions by conservatives that CEDAW is a 'western concept' and not easily accepted.
- In Lao PDR, the issue of violence against women is exacerbated by the emphasis on traditional forms of justice (village mediation units), which are highly patriarchal and discriminatory (villages are encouraged not to bring legal cases before the courts). A gender-based violence law is due for enactment by 2015.
- In Viet Nam, traditional values focusing on family harmony and the reproductive role of women to maintain the family make gender equality commitments and associated laws and action plans nominal.
- In Timor-Leste, while women's human rights are prioritised, the organisational and institutional capacity to draft and implement appropriate laws and effectively monitor CEDAW is limited.
- In all countries included in the MTR, members of minority ethnic groups are disproportionately discriminated against or suffer violations of their rights and have significantly less access to means of justice, support, and information. In ASEAN countries, the substantial heterogeneity of cultures, ethnic groups, and populations makes implementation of CEDAW a substantial challenge.

As such, the Programme is unlikely to see significant results in the short-term in indicators of women's empowerment and human rights at grass-roots levels (such as measured via the SIGI gender equality index), though it is contributing to changing knowledge and attitudes at higher levels and supporting a growing civil society constituency that is improving the quantity and quality of its advocacy for change amongst decision-makers.

### 3. Sustainability of results

#### 3.1 Programme stakeholders commitment to achieving programme outcomes.

In its programme implementation plan, UN Women undertook creating commitment among partners and stakeholders to achieve the outcomes of the Programme and contribute to the overall programme goal through the following mechanisms:

- Internalisation by duty bearers of knowledge and understanding of substantive equality and non-discrimination and practice it in their work;
- Increased knowledge of rights holders of their rights and improved the means to claim them;
- Institutional structures and processes in place with governments for monitoring violations of women's human rights and instituting corrective action;
- Policy and legal frameworks in place in government promoting and protecting the rights of women's human rights in line with provisions in CEDAW; and
- Maintenance of pressure and accountability for CEDAW implementation on governments by international organisations.

The fieldwork has demonstrated that the Programme's activities are indeed contributing to achieving many of these mechanisms. The substantial level of activity that has been conducted since programme inception has been reported by most stakeholders to have contributed to changing attitudes and practices with respect to women's human rights, and these changing attitudes are resulting in changes in policies and legal frameworks that are increasingly in line with CEDAW and women's human rights principles. Even countries that are more limited in their actual implementation of policies that support women's human rights are reported by stakeholders to be increasingly 'speaking the language' of CEDAW and women's human rights. While knowledge does not necessarily translate into action and behaviour, it is a necessary prerequisite, and the advances in policies and legal frameworks that are exhibited by some of the ASEAN countries prove a powerful incentive to their peers.

However, the pace of change among stakeholders varies, limited by political commitment to change and capacities for creating change. In this, UN Women's ambitions for the Programme are unlikely to be achieved comprehensively within the Programme timeframe. The momentum, however, that is there is sustained by increasingly empowered and vocal rights-holders and their representatives despite risks of regressive policies in specific circumstances discussed above.

Overall, therefore, programme stakeholders are increasingly committed to achievement of the Programme outcomes, driven by indirect pressure from their peer stakeholders (in the case of ASEAN governments), direct advocacy from a growing civil society movement on women's human rights, and facilitated by the technical support and funding from UN Women.

#### 3.2 Effectiveness of sustainability plans/strategies

UN Women's strategy to create sustainability of the Programme is to internalise the momentum of the Programme initiatives and changes among key stakeholders, generate motivation among rights-holders and their representatives to sustain the pace of change, and provide knowledge products that ensure sustainable gains. In addition, the Programme has adopted the following strategic approaches as laid out in the Programme implementation plan:

- Use of local resources and local institutions to strengthen the national capacity;
- Promotion and support to integration of international human rights standards and gender equality into national legal frameworks;
- Support to national and systemic CEDAW implementation processes, such as parliamentary committees and changes to judicial procedures;
- Develop training modules and curricula in local languages using national and regional experts and strengthening national capacity for accessing information on CEDAW;

- A consultative and responsive approach to enhance ownership; and
- Sharing of programme results and expanding partnerships in the UN and donor community to ensure financial resources for governments and NGOs post-programme.

The Programme has been largely successful in implementing most of these strategies. Stakeholders were consistent in their view that UN Women's specific technical skills and knowledge has been freely available and valuable in enhancing capacities, providing support, creating and supporting networks, and creating and maintaining consultation between different stakeholders (particularly the civil society and government sectors).

However, the extent of ownership of the Programme and sub-projects varied among stakeholders in terms of overall programme and project planning, specific activities, strategic development, and budget allocations. Ownership was difficult to gauge as many stakeholders and partners lacked information regarding the entire programme. Although country partners only need to know their respective country project more deeply and the regional programme in broad strokes, respondents expressed a wish for more general programme overview-related information. The challenges of individual CSO partner capacities in meeting the UN system's accountability requirements and the slow progress of the Programme in its initial stages exacerbate this issue.

### 3.3 Resource commitments by partners/stakeholders to sustain benefits/results.

Stakeholder commitment to provide ongoing resources to continue interventions beyond completion of the Programme is very varied. While the dynamic of resource-capture varies between civil society and government stakeholders, many stakeholders emphasised to the Review Team that financial and technical resources are required to sustain momentum of the advocacy, networking, and collaboration processes with diverse groups that are geographically spread across the region.

Stakeholders also identified a need for resources to consolidate and build on the gains that have been made, to broaden networks and coalitions and build solidarity with diverse women's groups including those who are marginalised. In addition, the ongoing rotation and movement of staff within government departments, ministries, and CSOs was identified by stakeholders as a major challenge in maintaining momentum in activities and affects sustainability. This leads to an ongoing resource requirement for capacity development among stakeholders.

Other stakeholders (both government and civil society) are more capable in their ability to generate resources, or benefit from greater government commitment to CEDAW and women's human rights principles. These stakeholders have varied sources of support (beyond UN Women) or national budgetary allocations enabling them to conduct their activities. However, among the developing economies of South-East Asia, they are in the minority. All stakeholders agreed, however, that they value the technical support and knowledge products provided by UN Women in the furtherance of CEDAW across the region.

#### Key Recommendation:

- R.6.** Further efforts are required to generate ownership among partners and strategies to internalise support for many of the Programme initiatives among programme country governments (such as more communication efforts regarding the programme objectives and goal and/or an ICT/social media strategy), which in turn will encourage resource commitments by stakeholders and support sustainability of the Programme outcomes post-completion. A potential strategy is the implementation of longer term agreements (including phase-out strategies that include alternative resourcing models) with partners in order to enhance efficiency in project management, and to ensure that partners view the project and their engagement in a holistic manner and enhance ownership.

## 4. Partnership with other stakeholders

### 4.1 Stakeholder participation in planning, design, implementation, monitoring, and consultation.

Overall, stakeholders were positive regarding the level of consultation and participation in ongoing activities and support offered to them by UN Women. Many of the partners in the Programme were not involved at the design phase, so were not available for consultation. Other partners (some of whom were involved in implementation of the SEAP Phase I) have been involved since programme inception and have evolved in line with the Programme and derived significant benefit from the Programme.

While the majority of stakeholders emphasised that UN Women support was crucial to continue to strengthen capacity, knowledge building, and technical competence, the dynamics of different country programmes mean that the participation of different partners and the support available to them (in terms of specific thematic areas) varies. Countries with less representation (e.g. Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines) have less access to technical support (or less timely access, where it is mediated via the Regional Office), while countries with a UN Women Country Representative had more immediate access to support. The turnover of UN Women programme staff at regional level was another factor highlighted by partners who felt that, in some cases, UN Women staff were still adjusting to the nuances of the individual national situations vis-à-vis CEDAW and women's human rights.

### 4.2 Roles and responsibilities of Project participants and stakeholder input

UN Women implemented a series of consultations in individual programme countries in 2011 with government and civil society stakeholders, United Nations agencies, and development partners to identify strategic partners and activities. However, despite these consultations, many stakeholders interviewed stated that they are unfamiliar with and do not have adequate information about the overall conceptual framework, outcomes, and components of CEDAW SEAP Phase II. The main implementing partners are focused on their specific sub-project activities and do not situate them in the overall context of the project, its strategy, and the theory of change. Some of those stakeholders who are aware of the Programme framework confuse the activities of SEAP Phase I with Phase II.

Indirect beneficiaries and those associated through UN Women short-term activity contracts typically (though not inevitably – the Ministry of Justice, Timor-Leste noted good communication of programme objectives) have a lesser understanding of the project though all are generally familiar with the CEDAW Convention. All expressed a need to become familiar with the full project framework and see where and how they fit and contribute to the project.

### 4.3 Relationship with programme stakeholders/partners, including UN agencies

While relationships between other UN agencies (primarily UNICEF, UNDP, OHCHR and UNFPA) and UN Women are generally genial and open, strategic collaboration and partnership between UN Women and UN agencies on the Programme is very variable across different countries. UN partners stated that there is good communications between agencies to avoid duplication or overlap of activities (for example, activities and information on the Access to Justice research project is shared via the A2J working group, which UN Women chairs at regional level), but implementation of joint activities at regional level is challenging. A range of coordination mechanisms are in place, including UN Women's co-chairing (with ESCAP) of the UN Thematic Working Group on Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women, which meets several times per year for coordination purposes.

As noted above, UN Women programme officers in countries without more senior representation have limited capacity to engage and may not play a lead role on gender in the UN System due to systemic issues. For example, in Lao PDR, work that UNDP is undertaking under its governance programme overlaps with UN Women's work. The UN Women Lao PDR staff, however, cannot



effectively engage with UNDP, as programme staff have insufficient authority to do so. Similarly, in Indonesia and Philippines, the UN Women offices have no partnership arrangements or collaboration with UN agencies on the Programme. Opportunities for collaboration do exist and are encouraged and welcomed by other UN stakeholders.

In other countries with UN Women country representatives (such as Cambodia, Timor-Leste, and Viet Nam), there are a range of specific joint initiatives underway or completed. Viet Nam is a UN *Delivering as One* country which implements joint strategic planning process with linked RBM-based outputs and outcomes. The activities of all of the UN agencies in Viet Nam (including UN Women) are contained within this plan, which is then agreed with the Vietnamese Government. UN Women Viet Nam's activities are contained in outline in the *Delivering As One* plan (currently 2012-2016) and are implemented on a more detailed basis with partners via Detailed Project Outlines (DPO). Viet Nam's Joint programme on Gender Equality between UN agencies and government partners is an example of a *Delivering as One* initiative.

In Timor-Leste, UN Women is part of an initiative called "Friends of Legal Training Center" where a coordinated approach to supporting the LTC as well as the justice sector is facilitated by UNDP in partnership with UN Women, UNICEF, and the UN's HRU (Human Rights Unit).

This approach promotes a 'big picture' and joint initiatives between UN agencies and the government of Viet Nam. It also permits use of joint UN funding sources for different activities and synergies between outputs of initiatives that are leveraged for achievements in other areas, e.g. governance reform work can be leveraged to create change in discriminatory family law (a key issue in Viet Nam) of directly consequence for women.

However, such an approach, while benefiting from the joint approval of all stakeholders, can take time to finalise and does not necessarily reflect the priority due to areas such as gender.

A challenge with respect to these joint activities is the issue of attribution of results to individual agencies or interventions. Where a number of stakeholders have contributed resources to a given outcome it is important that no one single stakeholder claim sole responsibility for the outcome, as recognition of all stakeholder contributions should be made.

#### Key Recommendations:

**R.7.** An ongoing process of consultation and reflection is required by UN Women with respect to the overall context and vision for the Programme. While initial consultations set the early direction of the Programme, efforts since have been focused on rolling out activities and outputs with less emphasis on the overall contribution of these outputs to programme outcomes and the ultimate goal. UN Women should develop its communications strategy that can provide disparate partners and stakeholders (including the public) with information on the Programme outcomes and goal and progress towards these.

**R.8.** Given the multiplicity of stakeholders, sources of funding and strategic approaches, attribution of positive policy changes in Programme countries to CEDAW SEAP II interventions is an ongoing challenge. The evaluators recommend identification of key policy changes in each Programme country that are to be specifically targeted via the Programme outputs and a periodic (e.g. annual) reconciliation of the contribution of these outputs to the specific policy changes<sup>14</sup>. Quantitative attribution of results among different stakeholders is not a practical strategy for the Programme. Recognition of individual stakeholder contributions is an appropriate strategy.

---

<sup>14</sup> Such an approach is methodologically similar to Outcome Mapping, a methodology for planning, monitoring and evaluating initiatives that aim to bring about policy or behavioural change.

## 5. Appropriateness of resource utilisation

### 5.1 Allocation of CIDA/DFATD's financial contribution throughout the Programme.

A majority of stakeholders from the government and CSOs stated that the resources provided by UN Women have been adequate for their sub-projects and activities and had been well utilised, as reflected in their quarterly financial reports.

As noted above, greater focus could be placed on action-oriented trainings, workshops, meetings etc, rather than these events as an end in themselves. Linking of these outputs to longer-term capacity-building or sustainability plans would have been a more efficient use of project resources and resulted in greater and longer-lasting change.

Some stakeholders, while satisfied with the achievements of the Programme to date, were of the opinion that much of the work in familiarisation, knowledge-generation and capacity-building with respect to CEDAW and women's human rights work at national and regional levels has been achieved, and the introduction of the AHRD and Declarations on VAW and VAC (though not without flaws) has created the policy foundation for women's human rights. The more pressing needs are now transitioning to ensuring accountability among governments with respect to the commitments that they have already made, via advocacy on more effective implementation of policies at government levels, and work with communities to empower and enfranchise rights holders to demand their rights. However, as this is not the primary focus of the CEDAW SEAP II Programme, ISG does not make a recommendation in this regard.

## 6. Institutional structure and programme management

### 6.1 Programme management arrangements at regional and project office levels.

Programme offices in all countries concurred that the UN Women regional management team is responsive and provides good guidance on management areas, e.g. work plans, reporting procedures etc. Some offices, however, expressed the need for better technical content and substantive guidance in view of changing priorities in the country/region. UN Women programme teams in all countries visited (including the Regional Office) have a high level of commitment and dedication to their responsibilities. They also have a heavy work load but very limited staff.

Programme Officer-only offices (i.e. without a Country Representative) experience challenges engaging with other UN agencies in the same country who may be undertaking similar activities. Attempts to do so may be delegated to subordinates who may not have the decision-making power or access to relevant information, stymieing efforts at coordination and risking duplication.

UN Women internal processes are lengthy in terms of facilitating timely delivery, with the period between the inception of a proposal and its signature potentially varying between 6 weeks and 6 months. This is primarily a result of UN agencies' accountability obligations to their donors, requiring rigorous contract and reporting procedures. Meeting these due diligence requirements imposes a timeline on project delivery that may result in partner dissatisfaction, particularly if expectations regarding timelines are not managed or if partners are not aware of the processes and procedures involved with accountable and transparent management of donor funds. As high levels of accountability are a positive outcome, and as UN Women undertakes a range of administrative training with partners (including the RBM training), no recommendation is made regarding this issue.

The UN Women Regional Office has undertaken efforts to develop the capacity of programme staff and partners (for example in results-based management and in the use of tracking tools for monitoring). It is currently supporting this process with trainings for partners. However, as noted above the PMF does not have associated monitoring tools and embedded systems, leading to an over-reliance on narrative reporting and running the risk of results not being captured.

The turnover of UN Women project staff and restructuring arrangements were reported by internal and external stakeholders to have had an impact on the project. Efforts by UN Women to overcome this challenge in the past year have been considerable, however, and partners report renewed momentum with respect to relationships and processes.

## **6.2 Coordination, communication and monitoring.**

UN Women has conducted RBM training (most recently in February 2014) for partners. Similar to other capacity-building activities, medium-term follow-up is recommended to elicit changes in actual practices as a result of these trainings.

Stakeholders concurred that all CSOs follow UN Women procedures for monitoring and reporting on the sub-projects, (i.e. quarterly narrative and financial reports). However, many (CSO) stakeholders who were receiving UN Women grants expressed challenges with respect to their administrative dealings with UN Women, specifically around management and reporting on grant funding.

UN Women programme staff expressed the perception that in many cases they need to continuously follow up with the partner to obtain timely reports, and that competing demands made on NGOs by other donors are in some part responsible for the delays encountered in reporting. This is a structural issue around the capacity of many of the stakeholders to manage and report on individual grants (of which they may have many from different donors). The administrative requirements may also exclude potential partners (particularly smaller CSOs) who do not have the technical skills related to UN Women grant management.

However, all stakeholders reporting these difficulties were willing to accommodate these challenges due to the value UN Women brings to their organisations through informational and technical support, access to other key stakeholders, mediation between civil society and government stakeholders, and convening stakeholders in forums where decisions can be made. In addition, the accountability and transparency standards to which the UN is obliged to adhere with respect to funding, while challenging to meet, set a laudable example for partners and other stakeholders.

### ***Synergy with the ASEAN Regional Mechanisms Project***

Given that the SEAP Phase II programme and the ASEAN human rights mechanisms project operate in the same conceptual space and with many of the same partners (e.g. the Women's Caucus, regional CSO partners, and some national CSO/government partners such as Kalyanamitra in Indonesia, WLB in the Philippines) there are some synergies in terms of the creation of awareness and improvement of knowledge and skills of stakeholders with respect to CEDAW and women's human rights. Examples of this were seen in Cambodia and Thailand, where regional and national partners of the SEAP and ASEAN Regional Mechanisms initiatives regularly interact with each other to share knowledge and training. Additionally, in Cambodia, the National Committee for Sub-national Democratic Development reported that the increasing profile of women's human rights issues in both ASEAN countries and nationally contributed to gender mainstreaming as one of three cross-cutting issues in its ten-year national program in 2013.

Further synergy between CEDAW SEAP Phase II and the ASEAN project may be limited by the fact that UN Women offices in some countries perceive limited direct responsibility for the ASEAN programme and hence do not make the appropriate linkages. Programme staff did express eagerness to create synergies between the two initiatives, and the Regional Office is keen to provide guidance to national offices to take on greater responsibilities with respect to oversight of the two initiatives. Such opportunities from the Regional Office to engage with the ASEAN project have not been integrated into the work of all national offices. At the ASEAN level, adoption of the proposed terms of reference for engagement of AICHR with CSOs may provide further opportunities for greater coordination between regional and national levels.

**Key Recommendation:**

**R.9.** There is a need for strategies that facilitate greater adoption of responsibility for management and creation of synergies between the CEDAW SEAP programme and the ASEAN project, and, in countries where UN Women does not have senior country-level representation, greater coordination and synergies between UN Women and other UN agencies at country-level.

## 7. Informed and timely action

### 7.1 Appropriateness of action to manage risks, opportunities and challenges.

While no formal risk mitigation strategy was put in place in the initial programme documents (unlike the ASEAN Regional Mechanisms project), individual UN Women country offices and the regional office undertook efforts to respond appropriately in most cases to the challenges that these risks presented.

Risk ref.	Action taken
<b>1. Political instability</b>	In cases where political instability occurred (e.g. Cambodia), UN Women delayed/deferred programme activities until a suitable time.
<b>2. Personnel turnover</b>	UN Women has sought to minimise the impact of turnover of external stakeholders by ongoing and comprehensive relationship-building and capacity-building in different dimensions and levels, and through prompt recruitment of replacement staff.
<b>3. Poor stakeholder action</b>	UN Women has limited leverage over programme stakeholders who are not subject to partnership agreements.
<b>4. Stakeholder unwillingness to implement reform</b>	As above
<b>5. Lack of resources for sustainability</b>	UN Women has sought to internalise the momentum of the Programme initiatives and changes among key stakeholders, generate motivation among rights-holders and their representatives to sustain the pace of change, and provide knowledge products that ensure sustainable gains.
<b>6. Duplication</b>	UN Women has worked closely with other actors in the women's human rights sphere to ensure activities are complementary and avoid duplication
<b>7. Natural disasters</b>	Affecting individual countries primarily, the most significant natural disaster to impact the Programme was Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines. This had the result of delaying certain programme activities only.

While the absence of a formal risk mitigation strategy meant that there was little evidence of assessment of the impact of these risks on programme performance, UN Women has responded appropriately to the challenges as they presented themselves. A more proactive approach to such risks may have led to more efficient allocation of resources to address the challenges, particularly with respect to the risk of stakeholder unwillingness or inability to institute needed reforms and/or translate new knowledge or changing attitudes into practices.

#### 4.1 Does CIDA/DFATD respond effectively and in a timely manner to Programme challenges and opportunities?

Despite DFATD's limited representation in many of the programme countries, UN Women stakeholders expressed satisfaction with the ongoing and regular support provided by DFATD representatives to the programme since inception. In-country DFATD representatives also maintain

good working relationships with programme stakeholders, thus providing another level of engagement and expertise.

From DFATD's perspective, cooperation with UN Women is regarded highly and is a relationship that has been built over a long term, including on CEDAW Phase I. DFATD is very clear regarding its emphasis on the need to demonstrate tangible results, value for money, improving access to justice and reducing poverty.

**Key Recommendation:**

**R.10.** UN Women should proactively prepare a strategy to mitigate the ongoing risk to programme outcomes/the Programme goal presented by stakeholder unwillingness to translate knowledge gained under the Programme interventions into action or to be open to reform, particularly at community levels. Should a strategy to mitigate this risk not be possible due to limited leverage with government partners, expectations of programme outcomes/impact should be moderated accordingly.

## 8. Visibility of the Programme

Consulted stakeholders shared that programme visibility is limited, particularly at local/community levels and needs to be enhanced through wider communications and use of media. Stakeholders also stressed the importance of information sharing with the public, and developing and implementing an active strategy for communications to improve visibility at different levels. Working with strong partners in government can also enhance project visibility.

In particular, the use of information and communications technology (ICT) (i.e. the internet/social media) can greatly enhance the visibility of the project and stakeholders. Stakeholders acknowledge that much needs to be done to keep pace with the increasing penetration of internet technologies in ASEAN countries.

Stakeholders viewed donor visibility as adequate, with sufficient acknowledgement in publications, communications and events of CIDA/DFATD. Additionally, the majority of active stakeholders were aware of the source of the project funding.

## E. Conclusion and Summary of Recommendations

This review of UN Women's CEDAW SEAP Phase II programme by ISG has generated considerable evidence from the field work conducted by the Review Team across the participating countries that the activities conducted in each of the eight programme countries have contributed to good progress towards all three outcomes.

The different circumstances that pertain in different programme countries have resulted in variable progress across the outcomes and the individual participating countries. However, UN Women teams have made considerable efforts to ensure that programme momentum is being maintained, to ensure productive relationships with key partners and stakeholders, and to ensure that activities are linked to the overall programme logic.

UN Women has successfully undertaken many important activities related to building the capacity of stakeholders in CEDAW and women's human rights, built strong partnerships between disparate actors across the government and civil society space, and initiated a number of innovative activities related to provision of justice to women and girls (e.g. the women's access to justice surveys).

However, challenges remain for the programme with respect to ensuring the most effective balance of programmatic activities, partner engagement, stakeholder advocacy, programme management and visibility. Successful implementation of CEDAW in Southeast Asia will take time, and needs to incorporate many institutional stakeholders with wide variation in capacities, responsibility, autonomy, vertical and horizontal integration, and willingness to engage substantively with the key women's human rights issues. At the same time, UN Women must seek to ensure that it is following its own roadmap for change, so as to ensure that it is indeed effecting positive change where and when it is needed, and that the programme's key stakeholders can see these changes.

With the successes and challenges of the programme in mind, the Review Team make the following key recommendations to UN Women for consideration as the programme moves forwards:

**R.1.** While the Programme PMF is fit for purpose in terms of its structure, outcomes, outputs and indicators, UN Women should devote resources to developing its monitoring and reporting tools and systems whereby data from the activities that take place across the eight programme countries can be systematically collated, analysed, and reported on, with an appropriate mix of quantitative and qualitative data. This should include data on the effect of key assumptions/risks on programme performance. UN Women should also give consideration to development of periodic tools that assess the translation of knowledge and expertise that is transferred via the Programme activities into behaviours and practices.

**R.2.** A renewed focus on the balance of programmatic workplans with reference to each outcome is recommended, i.e. implementation of additional efforts to implement activities under Outcome 2 to ensure similar progress across all three programme outcomes<sup>15</sup>.

**R.3.** Capacity-building activities (trainings, study visits, workshops, seminars etc.), where appropriate (given the nature of the specific participants), where possible/appropriate, should include structured action-oriented outcomes as part of the training methodology with associated process and outcome indicators. This has been emphasised by several stakeholders these events to translate into concrete activities, practices, and behaviours. To

---

<sup>15</sup> The evaluators note that the Programme workplan for 2014 includes a much stronger focus on activities under Outcome 2. Should these activities be successfully implemented, it will largely meet this recommendation.

complement this more systematic approach to capacity development, small, medium-term evaluations (i.e. 6-months/1 year post-activity) of the effect of capacity-building/training activities on practices and behaviours of participants of their events should be applied more widely across the Programme to assess the contribution of the trainings to the Programme outcomes.

- R.4.** Notwithstanding UN policies on partnerships/grant management, provision of additional technical assistance to partners with respect to preparation of proposals and/or reporting could pay dividends with regard to the quantity and quality of CSO partnerships in the Programme, as well as support sustainability of the Programme initiatives post-completion;
- R.5.** UN Women should consider how its advocacy efforts and technical capacity can be utilised to support the formation and strengthening of new NHRIs in programme countries and to provide support for strengthening of networks of women's rights advocates and their associated movements. In particular, UN Women should support key 'champions' who are working to counter regressive trends and working towards empowering women at grassroots levels to understand the impact of CEDAW (and ASEAN) on their livelihoods and human rights.
- R.6.** Further efforts are required to generate ownership among partners and strategies to internalise support for many of the Programme initiatives among programme country governments (such as more communication efforts regarding the programme objectives and goal and/or an ICT/social media strategy), which in turn will encourage resource commitments by stakeholders and support sustainability of the Programme outcomes post-completion. A potential strategy is the implementation of longer term agreements (including phase-out strategies that include alternative resourcing models) with partners in order to enhance efficiency in project management, and to ensure that partners view the project and their engagement in a holistic manner and enhance ownership.
- R.7.** An ongoing process of consultation and reflection is required by UN Women with respect to the overall context and vision for the Programme. While initial consultations set the early direction of the Programme, efforts since have been focused on rolling out activities and outputs with less emphasis on the overall contribution of these outputs to programme outcomes and the ultimate goal. UN Women should develop its communications strategy that can provide disparate partners and stakeholders (including the public) with information on the Programme outcomes and goal and progress towards these.
- R.8.** Given the multiplicity of stakeholders, sources of funding and strategic approaches, attribution of positive policy changes in Programme countries to CEDAW SEAP II interventions is an ongoing challenge. The evaluators recommend identification of key policy changes in each Programme country that are to be specifically targeted via the Programme outputs and a periodic (e.g. annual) reconciliation of the contribution of these outputs to the specific policy changes<sup>16</sup>. Quantitative attribution of results among different stakeholders is not a practical strategy for the Programme. Recognition of individual stakeholder contributions is an appropriate strategy.
- R.9.** There is a need for strategies that facilitate greater adoption of responsibility for management and creation of synergies between the CEDAW SEAP programme and the ASEAN project, and, in countries where UN Women does not have senior country-level

---

<sup>16</sup> Such an approach is methodologically similar to Outcome Mapping, a methodology for planning, monitoring and evaluating initiatives that aim to bring about policy or behavioural change.

representation, greater coordination and synergies between UN Women and other UN agencies at country-level.

- R.10.** UN Women should proactively prepare a strategy to mitigate the ongoing risk to programme outcomes/the Programme goal presented by stakeholder unwillingness to translate knowledge gained under the Programme interventions into action or to be open to reform, particularly at community levels. Should a strategy to mitigate this risk not be possible due to limited leverage with government partners, expectations of programme outcomes/impact should be moderated accordingly.



## Annex 1: List of Stakeholders Consulted

Cambodia	Organisation	Date	Research Tool
UN Women CR Ms. Wenny Kusuma	UNW Pnomh Penh	20-Jan	KII
UNW Programme Team	UNW Pnomh Penh	20,22 Jan	FGD
OHCHR	UNW Pnomh Penh	20-Jan	FGD
NCDD Secretariat Staff	NCDD office	21-Jan	FGD
GMAC	GMAC office	21-Jan	KII
GADC + other CSO partners	UNW Pnomh Penh	21-Jan	FGD
CNWC Sec of State	CNWC office	22-Jan	KII
YWLN Representatives	YWLN office	23-Jan	FGD
Cara Rothery (UN Women)	UNW Pnomh Penh	23-Jan	KII
KYA Staff	KYA office	23-Jan	FGD
UNW Programme staff and partners	UNW Pnomh Penh	24-Jan	FGD
<b>Indonesia</b>			
UN Women, DFTAD, CSOs	Jakarta	17-Feb	FGD
MOWECP	Jakarta	17-Feb	FGD
- Ms. Erni Agustina: Head of Planning Bureau, - Mr. Muhammad Ihsan: Head of Cooperation Division			
Gender Studies Centre, University of Indonesia	Jakarta	17-Feb	FGD
- Ms. Kristi Poerwandari: Chairperson			
- Ms. Shelly Adelina: Academician – Gender and Politics - Ms. Ikiliah Muzzayanah: Academician – Gender and Islam			
Ms. Sajamsiah Ahmad: -Former Commissioner on Violence Against Women, Komnas Perempuan	Jakarta	18-Feb	KII
ASEAN CSO partners	Jakarta	18-Feb	FGD
- Ms. Aida Milasari, Rumpun Gema Perempuan			
- Ratna Batara Munit, LBH-APIK (Women’s Legal Aid Organisation) Jakarta			
- Estu R. Fanani, CWGI			
- Listyowati, Kalyanamiitra			
- Rena Herdiyani, Executive Director, Kalyanamitra			
DFATD:	Jakarta	19-Feb	FGD
- Mr. Jacob Thoppil: Director of International Cooperation /Counselor (Development)			
- Mr. Andrew Smith: Programme Manager for Canada's Regional Development Assistance Programming in Asia			
- Mr. Matthew Straub: First Secretary, DFATD			
- Ms. Lily Purba: Gender Consultant DFTAD			
Ms. Leena Ghosh: ASEAN Secretariat			
Ms. Nurina Widagdo: Team Leader Democratic Governance, UNDP	Jakarta	19-Feb	KII
Ms. Astrid Gonzaga Dionisio: Child Protection Specialist, UNICEF	Jakarta	19-Feb	KII
Ms. Tringtyasasih: National Programme Officer for Gender, UNFPA	Jakarta	19-Feb	KII

Dr. Nur Rofiah, ALIMAT	Jakarta	19-Feb	KII
UN Women Indonesia Project Staff:	Jakarta	20/21 Feb	FGD
- Ms. Tiurma Siregar: National Programme Officer, Governance/CEDAW:			
- Ms. Dwi Faiz: National Programme Officer on Economic Security and Rights & OIC (focal point)			
- Ms. Ramot Aritonang : Programme Associate			
- H.E. Daw Mya Mya, Myanmar ACWC Rep. (Women's Rights)			
<b>Laos</b>			
Syvongsay Changpitikoun, UNW PO Laos	UNW Vientiane	24-Feb	KII
Penelopa Gjurchilova, UNW consultant			
Prof. Ket Kiattisack, Deputy Minister of Justice	MoJ	25-Feb	KII
Ms. Chompeng Phoumpanya, General Director of Personal Organization Department, Lao Women Union	LWU	25-Feb	KII
Ms. Soukphaphone Phanit, International Relations Division Head, Laos Women's Union			
Phouvanh Vougsouthi, Deputy Director General, Department of External Relations, Ministry of Education and Sports	MoE	26-Feb	KII
Ms. Bouaphanh Ratthida, Head of Advancement of Women, Mother and Children Division, Cabinet, Ministry of Education and Sports			
Ms. Sudha Gooty, Assistant Resident Rep; , Ms. Viengmala Phomsengsavanh, Governance Programme Specialist; Ms Phouthamath Sayyabounsou, Programme Analyst, UNDP	UN Bldg Vientiane	26-Feb	FGD
Social and Cultural Affairs Committee, Laos National Assembly	National Assembly Vientiane	26-Feb	FGD
- Ms. Sabine Miehlau Senior Advisor to the Social and Cultural Committee of the National Assembly of the Lao PDR			
- 3 other national staff			
- Women's Caucus Rep			
Ms Souknida, a coordinator of Gender Development Association (GDA)	GDA office	26-Feb	KII
Ms. Bounphone Heungmany, General Director Legislation Department, Ministry of Justice	MoJ	27-Feb	KII
Ms. Inthana, ADWLE, Director of Association for Development of Women and Legal Education (ADWLE) (National Non-Profit Association)	UNW Vientiane	27-Feb	KII
Ms. Chansoda Phonethip, General Director, Head of Secretariat of National Commission for Advancement of Women (NCAW) and 3 technical staffs	NCAW office	28-Feb	KII
<b>Philippines</b>			
Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC)	Manila	11-Feb	KII
- Ms. Mae Buenaventura: FDC Vice President			
MCW and NISA	Manila	11-Feb	KII
- Ms. Irene Santiago: Chair Emeritus Mindanao Women's Commission (MCW)			
- Attorney Ms. Alpha Pontanal: NISA UI Haqq Fi Bangsamoro			

Philippine Commission on Women (PCW)	Manila	12-Feb	KII
- Ms. Manuela Silva, Deputy Executive Director for Operations			
Women's Legal and Human Rights Bureau, Inc. Manila	Manila	12-Feb	FGD
- Jelen Paclarin- Executive Director			
- Chang Jordan- Programmer Officer for ASEAN - Jeremi Pangamban - Programme Officer for CEDAW SEAP II			
Rural Women Congress	Manila	12-Feb	FGD
- Ms. Mary Concepcion de los Santos: President Amparo Miciono - Ms. Amparo Miciono: Secretary General			
Miriam College International Studies Department (MCISD)	Manila	13-Feb	FGD
- Ms. Gigi Francisco, Chair - Ms. Claire Luczon, Programme Officer DAWN			
House of Representatives Committee on Women and Gender Equality (CWGE)	Manila	13-Feb	FGD
- Beatriz Sanga—Committee Secretary - Joy Elena C. Piccio—Supervising Legislative Staff Officer II			
- Attorney Ruby Castra-Posadas—Political Affairs Officer VI - Rosemarie V. Cunanan—Supervising Legislative Staff Officer			
Commission on Human Rights (CHR) (NHRI)	Manila	13-Feb	KII
- Attorney Liezl Barajas: OIC Women's Human Right's Centre and Gender Focal Point			
Philippines Judicial Academy	Manila	13-Feb	KII
- Honorable Justice Adolfo Azcuna: Chancellor, Judicial Academy - Justice Delilah.V.Magtolis: Chief of Office, Academic Affairs			
UN Partners	Manila	14-Feb	KII
- Baicon C. Macaraya: Programme Officer WFP - Pamel Godo Averion: Programme Officer UNFPA			
- Mr. Ray Paolo Santiago - Secretary-General Working Group for an ASEAN Human Rights Mechanism - Ms. Ma. Patricia Cervantes-Poco - Programme Manager			
- Ms. Josephine Sandoval - Programme Officer - Ms. Jaymie Ann Reyes - Communications Officer			
UN Women Project Staff:	Manila	14 Feb, 10 Mar	FGD
- Ms. Aida Jean Manipon, National Coordinator - Mr. Willie Descalzo, Programme Associate			
- Ms. Trisha Mendoza, Programme Assistant			
<b>Timor Leste</b>			
Janet Wong, Country Representative UNW Timor Leste (& acting CR UNW Indonesia)	Skype	13-Mar	KII
Mr. Nelinho Vital	Skype	22-May	KII

National Director for Legislation Department, MoJ			
<b>Thailand</b>			
UN Women Regional and Thailand Programme staff	UNW Bangkok	10-Feb	FGD
Ms. Pattama Vongratanavichit DFATD	UNW Bangkok	10-Feb	KII
Judge Suntariya Muanapawong (Thailand Juvenile & Family Court Chief Judge)	Skype (Thailand)	11-Feb	KII
Law Reform Commission of Thailand:			
Ms. Sunee Chairose	LRCT office Bangkok	12-Feb	FGD
Mr. Somchai			
Ms. Areewan			
LRCT research coordinator from south Thailand, Ms. Sahala Sala	Skype	12-Feb	KII
CSO + Govt Stakeholders			
- LRCT	UNW Bangkok	12-Feb	FGD
- Attorney General's Office of Thailand			
- Foundation For Women			
- TKF			
- Women and Men's Progressive Foundation			
Mr. Kwanpadh, UNDP	Skype	12-Feb	KII
Prof Amara Pongsapich, Chair NHRCT	Bangkok	13-Feb	KII
Antje Kraft, Justice and Human Rights Specialist, and Grace Agcaoili, UNDP/UNICEF	UNW Bangkok	13-Feb	KII
Indigenous Women's Network of Thailand, LRCT Researcher (A2J study)			
- Chairperson of IWNT and Hmong Women's Network	Chiangmai	16-Feb	FGD
- Researcher and Volunteer			
<b>Viet Nam</b>			
Shoko Ishigawa, Country Representative, UNW Viet Nam	Hanoi	19-Feb	KII
Thuy Thi Nguyen, Programme Officer, UNW Viet Nam			
MOLISA – Dept of Gender Equality	Hanoi	19-Feb	KII
Mr. Thin + 2 x MOLISA staff			
MOLISA – Dept of Intl. Cooperation			
- Ms Duong, Director	Hanoi	19-Feb	KII
- Ms Angzawan, Programme Officer			
Parliamentary committee on Social Affairs			
- Nguyen Thuy Anh, Vice-chair & Dep. Head of PCSA + 3 staff	Hanoi	20-Feb	KII
Gencomnet + Network for Empowerment of Women			
- Ms. Thuy, NEW President + three other NEW staff	Hanoi	20-Feb	FGD
- 1 staff member from Gencomnet			
MoJ			
- Vu Van Anh, Intl. Cooperation Department + 3 staff	Hanoi	20-Feb	KII
Judicial Academy			
- Le Lan Chi, Head, Intl. Cooperation Department + colleague	UNW Hanoi	21-Feb	KII
Institute of Sociology (2 x staff)	UNW Hanoi	21-Feb	KII

## Annex 2: Key Questions for the Mid-Term Review

<b>1. Progress towards / achievement of results</b>	
1.1	Validate that the Programme's PMF is relevant and adequate for assessing progress towards and achievement of planned results at the output and outcome levels and that the PMF is being appropriately used to date.
1.2	Assess whether the indicators and baseline data are appropriate to monitor progress on results
1.3	Assess if appropriate monitoring and reporting mechanisms are in place
1.4	Validate Programme assumptions and assess if these are appropriately captured in the PMF.
1.5	Assess progress being made toward the achievement of the results at the output, outcomes levels. Identify variances, gaps, challenges, unintended results and any new opportunities/factors that should be considered.
1.6	Provide recommendations as appropriate
<b>2. Relevance of Programme strategy and approaches</b>	
2.1	To what extent have the results (output, outcome levels) been attained to date?
2.2	Are these expected results, implementation mechanisms, strategies and activities based on a sound understanding and analysis of partner and stakeholder capacities/gender equality-women's rights capacities (individual and organizational/institutional)? Are the capacity-building activities and plans appropriate for building the required capacities?
2.3	Assess the appropriateness of the Programme expected results, implementation mechanisms, strategies, approaches and identified activities in support of the achievement of the Programme's expected results
2.4	Are the actual and planned results consistent with the needs and priorities identified by UN Women regional and country offices and other stakeholders? Are the planned results realistic based on information and analysis available at this stage?
2.5	Is the engagement (current and planned) of the civil society networks and organizations, women's groups, related justice sector and other government ministries, institutions including NHRIs, sufficient to achieve expected results?
2.6	To what extent are Programme partners and stakeholders satisfied with the results achieved so far, or the progress being made towards their achievement? To what extent is the Programme improving the capacity of stakeholders to promote gender equality?
2.7	Assess the relevance of the Programme's risk register, and the effectiveness of the risk mitigation strategies. Are these appropriately reflected in Programme activities and internal monitoring mechanisms?
2.8	Assess areas where results are not likely to be achieved and make recommendations.
<b>3. Sustainability of results</b>	
3.1	Is there evidence that Programme stakeholders are committed to achieving programme outcomes and are in agreement with the methodologies used by the Programme to do so?
3.2	How effective were the sustainability plans/strategies given the Programme's scope, resources and timeframe
3.3	Is there evidence that There is or will be commitment of sufficient human and financial resources by Programme partners/stakeholders to sustain benefits/results?
<b>4. Partnership with other stakeholders especially UN agencies and other Development Partners and key CSOs</b>	
4.1	Has there been, and does there continue to be, as appropriate, active and inclusive participation of Programme stakeholders and partners in work planning, design of activities, implementation, and monitoring of activities? Are consultation processes adequate, does more need to be done? If yes, what are the recommendations?
4.2	Is there a clear definition, understanding and acceptance of the roles and responsibilities of Programme participants for achieving results?

4.3	Are stakeholders providing their inputs in an efficient, effective and timely manner?
4.4	Assess the working relationship between the UN Women and the Programme stakeholders/partners, including other UN agencies working on the issue.
<b>5. Appropriateness of resource utilization</b>	
5.1	Assess whether CIDA's financial contribution is appropriately allocated throughout the Programme and if not, provide recommendations to improve allocation of funds.
<b>6. Institutional structure and programme management</b>	
6.1	Examine project management arrangements to ascertain the efficiency of the institutional arrangements at regional and project office levels for efficient delivery of the project.
6.2	Is there sufficient coordination, communication and monitoring? What improvements need to be put in place in the remaining project duration?
<b>7. Informed and timely action</b>	
7.1	Does the Programme take appropriate action to manage risks and deal with unexpected opportunities and challenges?
7.2	Does CIDA respond effectively and in a timely manner to Programme challenges and opportunities?
<b>8. Visibility of the project/programme</b>	
8.1	Get a sense of the degree of visibility the Programme has (UN Women and CIDA/Canada), and provide suggestions for improvement

## Annex 3: Field Work Interview Schedules

### 1. Interview/Discussion themes and questions: UN Women Programme Staff

1. In your view what are significant results and achievements of the ASEAN Project/CEDAW Project Phase II?
2. To what extent have the outputs and outcomes been achieved? Please provide specific examples. Which of the project results have not been achieved and why?
3. What are **unintended** results if any?
4. What are the challenge/gaps/variances you have encountered in project implementation?
5. What are the factors that have influenced project performance (either enabling factors/negative factors)?
6. To what extent have you used project indicators for measuring progress? How do you track indicators for planning and monitoring? How useful are tracking tools prepared for the project?
7. To what extent are project results (output, outcome level) relevant to the needs and priorities of stakeholders?
8. In your view which of the programme strategies, methodologies and activities contributed most to achieving the outcomes? Which were less successful?
9. Were partners/ stakeholders consulted in the design and implementation of the programme? What is your own practice in consulting stakeholders and partners?
10. To what extent have capacity development activities been appropriate in strengthening the capacity of stakeholders in promoting gender equality and women's human rights? Please provide examples. To what extent are knowledge and skills acquired by trainees/participants been effectively applied in their respective work in the project?
11. How do you rate the level of satisfaction among stakeholders with capacity building activities on a scale of 1-4? Please make the appropriate choice and elaborate: 1=High, 2=Good, 3 =Somewhat satisfied, 4=Not At All
12. To what extent has the programme balanced investments in developing capacities of right-holders including marginalized women's groups, as compared to investments in capacity development for duty bearers?
13. To what extent have ASEAN-AICHR, ACWC engaged with CSOs NHRIs, WNMs, government institutions, to achieve the expected results? Has this led to developing good relationships and mutual trust building? Please provide examples.
14. How has the ASEAN Project focused initiatives on girls? How could this be strengthened, and more particularly in a second phase?
15. What synergies have developed through linkages and coordination between the ASEAN project and CEDAW SEAP Phase II?
16. What process do you follow in monitoring and reporting on the project? What is your understanding of RBM and how do you apply this approach? Have you received training on the use of RBM? Do you face challenges in monitoring and reporting? Please elaborate.
17. To what extent has the Regional Office and RPMT /HQ provided timely and adequate support in project implementation?
18. How satisfied are you with the relationships with DFTAD? Has the donor responded to project issues in a timely and supportive manner?
19. How adequate were resources for the project to achieve planned results? What adjustments do you think may be required?
20. To what extent have partnership choices been appropriate in the project context? Are there other partners you think could be involved for potential future programming e.g. in the ASEAN project?
21. To what extent have stakeholders developed ownership in the project (project activities, strategic development, and budget allocations) and what is the likelihood that project activities can be sustained?

22. What are the main challenges to project management and implementation? Has the project taken appropriate actions to manage risks? How was this managed by you?
23. In what way has visibility for UN women and CIDA been promoted in the project? (e.g. through media, PSC, regional/national exchanges, dialogue mechanisms, etc).
24. How do you assess the working relationships between the UN Women and project stakeholders and development partners including UNICEF, OHCHR, and UNDP?
25. Kindly share the good practices and lessons learned that have emerged in the project? What opportunities do you perceive that could be considered for a second phase of the ASEAN project?

Interview questions - CSOs, NHRIs and Gender Equality Advocates (double click to open)



Microsoft Office  
Word 97 - 2003 Docu

Interview questions - DFATD (double click to open)



Microsoft Office  
Word 97 - 2003 Docu

Interview questions - Government Training and Academic Institutions (double click to open)



Microsoft Office  
Word 97 - 2003 Docu

Interview questions - Legislators (double click to open)



Microsoft Office  
Word 97 - 2003 Docu

Interview questions – Justice Sector Actors (double click to open)



Microsoft Office  
Word 97 - 2003 Docu

Interview questions - Parliamentarians (double click to open)



Microsoft Office  
Word 97 - 2003 Docu

Interview questions – UN Agencies (double click to open)



Microsoft Office  
Word 97 - 2003 Docu

Interview questions – WNM and Ministries (double click to open)



Microsoft Office  
Word 97 - 2003 Docu



## Annex 4: Narrative Biographies Of Project Team Members

### **Brian O' Callaghan – Review Analysis Lead**

Brian O' Callaghan is an international development professional with 20 years of field-based expertise program appraisal and management with a range of partners and donors in South and South-East Asia, including time spent managing with women's empowerment programs in Indonesia, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea and Timor-Leste, as well as program evaluation experience in Afghanistan, Haiti, Iraq and Sierra Leone. He has worked on issues of women's empowerment, entrepreneurship and capacity development of disadvantaged women. His specialist skills include organizational and program development and assessment; monitoring, evaluation & reporting; statistical/quantitative and qualitative analysis, survey & research techniques; design, implementation and evaluation programs. He holds a Master of Public Health from the University of London and both a Master and Bachelor of Sciences in International Development Studies from University College Cork, Ireland.

### **Suvira Chaturvedi – Field Research Team Leader**

Suvira Chaturvedi has excellent experience, demonstrated skills and a strong record in leading and facilitating participatory evaluations integrating a human rights-based and gender sensitive approach. She has undertaken evaluation work for UN Women, UNDP, ILO, UNIFEM, UNICEF, USAID, DANIDA e.g. in Moldova, Bangladesh, Kosovo, Thailand, Zimbabwe, Pakistan. Her extensive experience in international development spans over 25 years with UN agencies, NGOs, state and non-state actors in countries in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Europe. She has held a multitude of positions including Head of Office, Chief Technical Adviser, and Team Leader.

Gender equality, women's empowerment and rights have been a major focus of Ms. Chaturvedi's professional work including gender analysis and gender integration across sectors: economic empowerment and employment, governance and leadership, gender based violence, conflict prevention, post conflict reconstruction and development, and the energy sector. She has a deep understanding of and field experience on issues of women's human rights and has knowledge and understanding of key international conventions and commitments such as CEDAW, the Beijing Platform of Action, MDGs, UNSCR 1325, and ILO Conventions pertinent to the rights of women.

### **John Vijghen – Field Research Consultant**

John Vijghen possesses over 20 years' experience conducting studies, evaluations, and other assignments in Bangladesh, Cambodia, Laos, Viet Nam, Philippines, Indonesia, India and Myanmar (border area) on human (women & child) rights and good governance issues. Over the years, Mr. Vijghen has worked for/with UN agencies (e.g. WFP, ILO, IOM, UNIAP), the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, CIDA, SIDA, CARE International, Save the Children, World Vision, Oxfam Quebec Asia, Groupe Developpement Bangladesh/India, and many local NGOs in the SEA region, among others. During this time his focus has centred on gender and child protection issues; in particular on education and vocational training, preventing sexual violence against children, and mainstreaming gender and child protection. Mr. Vijghen is very experienced with participatory mid-term and impact evaluations. He has a Bachelor's level in Psychology and a Master's degree in Cultural Anthropology.

### **Esther Velasco – Gender Specialist Advisor**

Esther Velasco is a development professional with over a decade of work experience in international development projects. Ms. Velasco's expertise is mainly focused in the fields of gender and women's empowerment; education; social protection as well as governance and democracy. From a technical point of view, she also possesses a strong skills set and experience in research and policy analysis and development, program planning and implementation and monitoring and evaluation.