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<td>PBC</td>
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<td>PBF</td>
<td>Peacebuilding Fund</td>
</tr>
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<td>PBSO</td>
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<td>PSVI</td>
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<td>SCR</td>
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Executive Summary

Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation
As the From Communities to Global Security Institutions (FC2GSI) Programme draws to its conclusion (in June 2014), International Solutions Group (ISG), an international monitoring and evaluation (M&E) firm, has been contracted to conduct an evaluation to determine if the programme achieved the results envisaged at the inception stage and those revised over the course of the programme. The purpose of this evaluation is to identify the successes and challenges over the implementation period and help UN Women and partners chart a course for the subsequent phase of programming and policy work.

FC2GSI Background
A tripartite partnership between UN Women’s predecessor entity, UNIFEM, women’s international and national civil society, and forward-thinking governments picked up the momentum created at previous international events such as Beijing +5 and the Namibia seminar: ‘Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective in Multidimensional Peace Support Operations’ which led to the Windhoek Declaration.

Security Council resolution (SCR) 1325 was ground-breaking in its scope, its strategic vision and the level of support it garnered. Governments that had shown little interest in addressing the gender dimensions of violent conflict became strong advocates, as well as those who had direct experience of the failure of the ‘business as usual’ approach. The ‘Women, Peace and Security’ agenda was born and for the first time, the world’s most powerful body asserted that both the victimisation of women and their exclusion from peace building was a matter of international peace and security.

Since the passing of SCR 1325, there have been varied responses to the WPS agenda. A series of further UN SCRs and the creation of various positions within multilateral institutions dealing with WPS have been positive steps. On the other hand, women continue to be victimised in ways that are gender-specific (particularly sexual violence) and are still almost comprehensively excluded from peace negotiations and peacebuilding in times of conflict and its immediate aftermath.

On a positive note, however, there is increasing evidence of governments’ recognition of the link between women’s participation in peacebuilding and conflict management and gender-based violence against women and girls. This has been expressed through National Action Plans on women, peace and security, in programmes supported by donor governments and other commitments, the Preventing Sexual Violence Initiative (PSVI), including the Declaration of Commitment to End Sexual Violence in Conflict (2013) and the Global Summit, ‘Time to Act’ in 2014.

In 2010, UNIFEM sought and obtained support from the UK and other donor governments to embark on a programme that would build on two of the tenets of foundational international human rights law and the UNSC resolutions of the 1990s. The ‘From Communities to Global Security Institutions (FC2GSI)’ programme was designed to target actions and results in three key deficit areas:

a. Strengthening women’s security and voice in peacebuilding at community, national and international levels;

b. Institutionalizing protection of women in national security services and in peacekeeping forces;

c. Building accountability for 1325 via production and population of indicators on 1325/1820.

In order to fulfil the above aims, the programme adopts four main strategies:

a. Capacity-building for women’s peacebuilding initiatives through financing local initiatives, technical support for project management and monitoring of initiatives, and creation of upstream advocacy opportunities to influence national, regional or international peace and recovery initiatives;

---

1 From Communities to Global Security Institutions also built on two previous phases of DFID support to UNIFEM’s Women, Peace and Security global programming. Australia, Korea, the United States and Austria subsequently made contributions to the programme.
b. **Technical support** for security sector reform and for indicator design and monitoring at the national and global levels;

c. **Partnerships** with institutions that can enable women’s organizations and UNIFEM to maximize impact with limited resources: Ministries of the Interior, Defence, Foreign Affairs, Finance; regional security institutions notably the AU and EU, UN Agencies and inter-governmental bodies such as the PBC, international and national peace-building NGOs and women’s peace coalitions;

d. **Evidence-based advocacy** channelling country-level findings to international policy-making forums such as donor conferences and to national peacebuilding processes such as peace negotiations and post-conflict needs assessments.

The programme was designed to be piloted in four post-conflict countries: Haiti, Liberia, Timor-Leste and Uganda. While these four countries have different characteristics, apart from their geographical distribution, they also have much in common. They are all impoverished but with abundant natural resources; there is a distinct urban/rural divide in terms of access to services including education and justice; sexual, gender-based violence was a feature of the conflict in all four countries, and there has been a significant UN presence in all four countries.

The programme started in 2010, with the additional support from Australia coming on line in May 2011. The DFID contribution concluded in June 2014, after a 15 month no-cost extension.

**Evaluation Process and Methodology**

The evaluation aims to provide a practice-based analysis of UN Women’s achievements to date. While an ‘end of programme’ evaluation, it also seeks to exhibit characteristics of both formative and summative evaluations, in that it will, via appropriate recommendations, strive to inform future work of UN Women and its partners promoting the women, peace and security agenda (for the former) and assess the level of its success or achievement at the end of this phase of the programme, by comparing it against the standards/benchmarks posited via the programme results frameworks/logframes (for the latter). While the ISG research team collected, analysed and assessed relevant quantitative and qualitative data, drawing on external and UN Women internal documentation and informants, the evaluation is necessarily restricted in its scope and intent. In particular, ISG seeks to complement, rather than duplicate, other relevant evaluations. This approach entails the following:

- A broad-brush review of external and internal frameworks and standards in the areas of women and girls’ security, protection and rights and a snapshot of some emerging good practices in these areas

- Assessment of UNW’s current performance with respect to the programme, including:
  - Reviewing UN Women’s activity regarding the programme across the four programme countries and at global level. This was based on a review of internal documents and consultations with key stakeholders across the programme countries;
  - Field visits to the four main programme countries (Haiti, Liberia, Timor-Leste and Uganda). This included discussions with key stakeholders, as well as a comprehensive document review relevant to each country.

The ISG team analysed the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and impact of the programme. In particular the team analysed the relevance of the programme conceptualisation; assess the efficiency of the administration and management of the programme across all main outcomes – including UN Women’s ability to record evidence of impact; assess the effectiveness and immediate impact of the programme based on results achieved against those that were planned; and identify and assess any other unanticipated results or unintended consequences.
Data collection methods used for the evaluation were as follows:
- Document Review of reports, proposals, plans, financial documents, policy and programme documents, Terms of Reference, minutes, training materials, Power Point presentations etc.
- Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews with approximately 350 people from beneficiary groups, representatives from INGOs, NGOs, local associations, municipalities, government structures, and UN agencies. The KIIs and FGDs used a thematic discussion guide developed specifically on the basis of the evaluation questions. This was reviewed by the evaluation team prior to each country visit and adapted to each setting as required.

Findings - National Level

Relevance
The evaluation found the FC2GSI programme to be relevant in each country studied. All the country programmes benefit from a long-standing UNIFEM/UN Women presence in the respective country and strong connections to women’s civil society. This means that each office was able to design their programme to meet the particular national context. Each programme is based, therefore, on in-depth analysis of the capacity of local (sub-national) civil society and national institutions, awareness of the local contexts and cultural sensitivity.

Each country programme is firmly grounded in the theory of change that says that violence against women and girls is an obstacle to their participation in peacebuilding at the community, sub-national and national levels. (a) If this obstacle is removed, then women are more likely to participate meaningfully in peacebuilding. (b) If women participate more – and more meaningfully – in peacebuilding, then peace is more likely both in the short and longer term. Given the prevalence of gender-based violence (particularly domestic violence) in the communities targeted by the programme and in the programme countries as a whole, this approach is relevant to the programme contexts.

Effectiveness
Each country programme has been effective in strengthening women’s civil society and reducing the incidence of gender-based violence in the targeted communities. The achievements in terms of contributing to a gender-sensitive security sector reform have been more varied. In Liberia, the programme has overcome numerous obstacles to strengthen the national police Gender Unit and is instrumental in supporting a coherent gender policy. In Uganda the police believe that the training they have received under the auspices of the programme have helped them to perform more professionally in dealing with gender-based violence. In Timor-Leste, the evaluation team found less evidence that the programme has had a positive impact on security sector reform, while in Haiti, the programme had limited focus on changes at the institutional level.

In terms of promoting and supporting women’s participation, all country studies showed that the programme has been effective in strengthening women’s ability to engage on peacebuilding issues at the local level as well as their credibility when doing so. At the national level, however, there was less evidence of women’s participation in peacebuilding initiatives and equally variable evidence that women who do take part in peacebuilding at the national level are truly representing the realities or voices of marginalised, rural women. As with many civil society organisations (whether or not autonomous women’s organisations), there is often a risk that those who purport to represent their constituencies come from the urban, educated elite and may not truly represent their constituencies.

The programme is designed, at global and country level, to maximise synergies between the programme components. Evidence of this can be found where women and men who have benefitted from programme activities are able to exert some influence at the institutional or national level to improve local security. Again, the evaluation findings varied across the four countries.
**Efficiency**

Across the country programmes, UN Women demonstrated that it makes good use of FC2GSI resources.

The evaluation team noted evidence, however, of a relationship between the size of the budget and the efficiency of programme performance. For instance, due to resource constraints, the programme coordinator in each country is limited in their ability to monitor use of funds and performance of activities at the community level, relying on reports from partners with limited reporting capacity. The country offices lack dedicated monitoring and evaluation or communications and reporting capacity. Having little explicit provision for regional coordination or advisory support has also diminished the extent to which each country programme could both learn from and influence other programmes in their region. Whilst each country programme endeavours to avoid wastage, there is a risk that resource constraints can result in less than optimal use of the resources that are available. Larger budgets, managed effectively, can result in economies of scale and stronger (and hence more efficient) project management systems.

The staff team in each country programme is small and therefore has to make the best use of available personnel. Positions of national programme coordinator were only filled in every country subsequent to implementation of the Baseline study and the first DFID annual review.

All the country programmes, except Liberia, have suffered from hiatuses in senior management and leadership, which have had an impact on programme staff’s ability to plan and maximise the use of resources. This issue has been resolved since the 2012 DFID annual review; with national programme coordinators, deputy country representatives and three out of four country representatives in place in all targeted country offices.

The transition from UNIFEM to UN Women also involved moving from a structure where every payment had to be authorised by the regional offices to one of greater delegated authority. This has created efficiencies in that partners do not have prolonged waiting times for funding, staff time is no longer wasted waiting for regional office approvals, and the regional office can more efficiently respond to bigger requests as they are also not required to approve and process numerous small payments.

**Impact**

The programme has made significant progress against its aims in each programme country evaluated. In all four countries, women’s civil society partners have been strengthened vis à vis their capacity to engage in peacebuilding. Security actors at the local or national level have been influenced positively regarding women’s security and the information from country-level programming has been able to inform UN Women and others’ global interventions within the women, peace and security agenda.

Some prominent examples of impact at the country level include:

*Changes in men’s behaviour:* In target communities, the evaluation teams found that men spontaneously spoke about their own changed behaviour and changing social norms towards violence against women, particularly domestic violence.

*Women’s participation:* Women supported by the programme in Liberia, Timor-Leste and Haiti have used their new or strengthened confidence and organisational capacity to engage at local or – less often – national level on issues of community security as well as gender-based violence.

*Communities of practice:* In Timor-Leste the programme has developed ‘communities of practice’ where government representatives, civil society, security sector personnel and others including international organisations come together to learn and ensure that this learning is put into practice.

*Local security institutions:* In Haiti, women’s organisations have been instrumental in forming and shaping the local security committees. Given the lack of state provision and the remote nature of some of these communities, they rely largely on deeply localised institutions.
Policy level: In Timor-Leste, the process for developing a National Action Plan (NAP) on women, peace and security has been intensely collaborative and locally-owned. UN Women and its partners are helping the government to draw up a NAP which draws on good practice elsewhere, while remaining firmly ‘Timorese’.

The issue of attribution of impact presents a challenge for UN Women and its donors – particularly in a result-focused era where donors increasingly need to demonstrate that money has been well spent.

The challenge of attribution arises from the following sources:

- Implementing partners are often funded by other donors or by other UN Women programmes and, by their nature, are not focused on sufficiently micro-level reporting to enable disaggregation of their funds. This was the case in Uganda and Haiti. It also arises, paradoxically, where the programme has been successful either in leveraging other support or in imparting knowledge, to the extent that a ‘pro-1325’ approach becomes the norm;

- The tension between alignment with national priorities and institutions and ‘outsourcing’ peace and security work and has arisen as a consequence of UN Women’s mandate, where the beneficiaries may attribute the gains to the institution, rather than the donor;

- In post-conflict situations it is important that the government is both capable and seen to be capable of delivering effective peace and security to its citizens. UN Women’s mandate is to support national governmental capacity as well as civil society. This will often mean adopting a ‘back seat’ or almost invisible approach, with concomitant challenges in attribution of outcomes/results.

- Good donorship dictates that aid (including in the security and justice sectors) is aligned with national priorities and that programmes are directed towards building the capacity of national institutions (government or non-state). This means that donor visibility should take second place – whether channelled through multi-lateral organisations or otherwise.

Despite these considerations, the evaluation team found that all four country offices are relatively weak both in documenting progress and in measuring change. While this is understandable for busy programme officers who are engaged in implementing activities rather than reflection and report-writing, these tasks are important for the sustainability of the programme and for building a body of knowledge on the women, peace and security agenda. It is also important for making the case that work on women, peace and security is catalytic for change across peacebuilding.

This gap in capacity has implications for resourcing. Either within country offices or at least at regional offices, UN Women should have the capacity to investigate, capture and communicate examples of promising practice, positive (or negative) unintended consequences and evidence of what works well with regard to the women, peace and security agenda.

Sustainability

All country programmes are making efforts to ensure sustainability after the life of the FC2GSI programme. This takes the form both of securing future international funding and in building national capacity. Examples of ongoing and future funding secured are:

- Liberia; the UN Women team has secured both funding from the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) and a commitment from the PBF to apply the 15% target for allocation of funds to gender equality, ensuring that all funded projects address the women, peace and security agenda.

- Timor-Leste and Liberia: Partnership with UNDP on a concurrent two-year, EU-funded women and peacebuilding programme.

- Uganda: Ongoing commitments from Australia and France, although the country office will need to cover additional demands due to the sudden influx of South Sudanese refugees in the north.

- The Haiti office has not secured follow-on funding, although it is starting discussions with UNFPA about collaboration activities.
All country offices have made good progress in building national capacity, particularly with civil society and, to a more limited extent, the security sector. Realistic expectations regarding sustaining gains among civil society organisations or security sector institutions are required. Capacity, skills and knowledge built via trainings tend not to be sustained unless they are reinforced on an ongoing basis: staff members change roles and institutional memory is lost, and changes in management may either increase or decrease motivation levels among subordinates. UN Women appears to have been careful not to invest too heavily in infrastructure, machinery or other ‘perishable’ items. While all the programme countries are moving out of the ‘post-conflict’ phase that spurred introduction of the FC2GSI programme, the need for active peacebuilding is present in the light of current (varied) threats to their security.

**Value for Money**
The FC2GSI programme was designed before the discipline of developing ‘value for money’ metrics became prevalent in development programmes, and so these are not apparent within the programme documents. While the headquarters and country programme teams have a basic understanding of the DFID’s approach to value for money the focus is more on the concept of value rather than money.

Adopting DFID’s paradigm for measuring value for money, nevertheless, it is apparent that the FC2GSI programme meets all “3 Es plus Equity” criteria. Where there have been weaknesses, these do not undermine the overall finding.

**Findings - Global level**
FC2GSI programming at the global level falls, broadly, into the following two categories:

a) Amplifying the achievements, lessons and information from country level programmes to the global security institutions, particularly the UN Security Council and other multi-lateral bodies such as the Commission on the Status of Women and the Peacebuilding Commission;

b) Building the body of evidence regarding implementation of the women, peace and security agenda through the use of indicators at global level, again with an emphasis on how the agenda is implemented in conflict-affected contexts.

**Relevance**
Despite limited wider implementation of the WPS agenda to date, at a global level the programme was highly relevant in its design and remains so. Across the peace and security community, it is increasingly accepted that the exclusion of women’s knowledge and capacities from conflict management and peacebuilding has led - and will continue to lead – to resurging violence in countries such as Iraq and Libya while they continue to be targeted as a strategy of war in countries such as South Sudan and Syria.

However, funding deficits that are a significant constraint on the FC2GSI and similar programmes were evident in 2009/10 when the programme was conceived and continue to be so today.

**Effectiveness**
The programme has been effective in meeting its global aims and in creating synergies with work across UN Women’s Peace and Security section as well as that by other actors in the area.

The most significant factors that have led to these successes, in the view of the evaluators, are:

- UN Women’s mandate to represent the views of women and their experiences of violent conflict across the globe and the readiness of UN Women Executive Directors to exercise this mandate;
- Growing attention and momentum by key governments in conflict-affected areas as well as traditional donors to address, particularly, sexual violence in conflict;
- Strong women’s civil society operating at the international level and supported by UN Women, to ensure that successive UNSC resolutions are directional and contextually appropriate;
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- Knowledge and information from FC2GSI country programmes - and other country offices - that has informed UN Women’s representational role at global security institutions.

The FC2GSI programme could have been even more effective in achieving its aims at the global level if it had been able to produce more coherent and systematic, documented evidence of changes that are have been achieved and could be achieved at the national level.

Efficiency
The evaluation team sought to determine whether investment at the global level has had a multiplier or catalytic effect. Strong partnerships and imaginative interventions have yielded results from relatively small investments. Key relevant results include increases in funding to The Peacebuilding Fund, national-level implementation of the ‘1325 indicators’, and UN Women’s training materials on sexual violence in conflict, adopted and utilized by troop-contributing countries and peacekeeping training centres.

Impact
Creating a mechanism by which global, regional and national institutions and governance structures can be held to account for the implementation of the women, peace and security agenda has been crucial for prompting and sustaining action. The ‘indicators’ work under this programme has been instrumental in promoting the Secretary General’s Seven Point Action Plan and in holding the rest of the UN family to account, constructively, on the implementation of the UN Strategic Results Framework on WPS.

Since the programme was launched, Security Council resolutions and reports are more frequently including language on women’s participation and the protection of women and girls from sexual violence. It is now more common than not to have gender advisers and ‘women protection advisers’ in appropriately senior positions within UN Missions in conflict-affected countries.

As the global body mandated to lead on gender equality and women’s empowerment, UN Women is expected to move away from single-issue projects to a more strategic and influential position, not least at the global level. The challenge this creates for UN Women is to demonstrate the impact of single programmes, particularly where, as here, there are positive synergies between the different areas of its work. In hindsight (and notwithstanding the organisational and strategic change from UNIFEM to UN Women), it would have been easier to demonstrate concrete impact of this programme if the programme design had included more reference to leveraging change across UN Women’s work or influencing other members of the Organisation.

Progress against the logframe
Overall (i.e. with respect to the programme goal) the programme recovered from a uncertain start, largely due to the change of mandate from UNIFEM to UN Women, a lack of capacity among (government and civil society) implementing partners, and overly-optimistic expectations of what was possible in the early years of post-conflict programming.

Constraints remain, mostly regarding budgetary restrictions which have restricted the level of oversight, technical input and knowledge management that has been possible within the programme.

Nevertheless, UN Women has undertaken good strategic partnerships with relevant organisations at community and global levels and has made a robust contribution to realising this goal. UN Women is implementing its mandate at the global level well, via the FC2GSI programme. It is demonstrating notable successes in all programme countries and particularly strong success in Liberia and Timor-Leste.

With respect to the key (revised) logframe metrics, many of the programme indicators were initially assessed via a detailed baseline study at programme inception. However, UN Women took the view that a repeat of the baseline would not constitute good value for money. UN Women applied the lesson that conducting intensive, in-depth primary research (as conducted for the baseline) was of limited informational value in relation to the cost and so determined that that baseline survey would
not be repeated at endline. In order to determine programme performance per the programme logframe, the evaluation team combined analysis of available secondary quantitative and qualitative data with primary qualitative data from the field research. This has indicated that UN Women has met or exceeded its targets in the logframe across all three programme outputs.

**Programme Constraints**

Some of the key constraints that the FC2GSI programme faced were:

**National level**

**Partner organisations:** UN Women attempted to maximise the opportunities of working with national and sub-national partners, rather than through large international NGOs. However, in many cases, the FC2GSI programme focused on building the capacity of the implementing organisations to do ‘peace and security’ work, rather than building the core organisational capacity of the leadership or membership. This is reflected in the paucity of documentary evidence of successes or impact.

**UN Women human resources:** FC2GSI programme staff members are few in number, lack formal training in monitoring and evaluation (except in the case of Uganda) and are stretched across a variety of national programmes, placing a heavy burden on peace and security staff.

**Monitoring and evaluation capacity:** Except for Uganda, no country office has a dedicated monitoring and evaluation staff member. While the programme’s actual achievements are solid, these are often unable to be demonstrated and reported per the country level logframes.

**Government capacities:** While all four programme countries have benefited from years of international support and are moving steadily towards greater economic and institutional stability, some government representatives are reluctant to engage with the WPS agenda or held back by political constraints. Institutional capacity of governmental counterparts also remains a challenge in all four countries.

**Global level**

**Balance between the pillars of the agenda:** Although two UNSC resolutions subsequent to 1820 focus on women’s participation (1889 and 2122), they generally have had a lower international profile.

**Funding:** The programme budget has not been commensurate with the expectations either from the donors or from UN Women itself. The imperative to ‘do more with less’ or to ‘make do’ has resulted in false economies, no dedicated monitoring and evaluation capacity for the programme and little by way of extra logistical support to run the programme at national level.

**Organisational**

UNIFEM designed the FC2GSI programme which has been implemented largely by UN Women, so its approach at country level, even more than at the global level, has had to adapt. Programme partners and country office staff members have had to change from being a Fund which works almost exclusively with women’s civil society to a more significant actor within the UN family.

In the 2012 annual review, DFID found that delays in recruiting the country representatives as well as programme staff were holding back programme delivery.

None of the FC2GSI country offices have their own website or webpage within regional websites. Nor do they produce separate communications materials highlighting or analysing their work. This constraint means that the programme staff cannot publicise their work at country level except through the headquarters website nor can other UN Women country offices and other organisations easily learn from the lessons or achievements of the FC2GSI country programmes.
Conclusions

National

- **Programme planning:** It is important to be realistic about partners’ capacities, both in government and civil society and to be clear about expected results. Agreeing a time-frame and ensuring that there is adequate monitoring with ‘break clauses’ if necessary is likely to reduce tensions between UN Women and its partners and to enable more efficiency in spend.

- **Monitoring and Evaluation:** it is apparent that the programme would have benefited from country offices having an M&E capacity, either in the country office or readily available and able to dedicate time to country level programmes from the regional office. This will ensure that the indicators and benchmarks are clear and that they are achievable while stretching.

- **Knowledge Management:** Future monitoring and evaluation frameworks should include a ‘learning’ or knowledge-management dimension, so that the programme systematically transmits information and lessons learned across the programme countries and to policy level.

- **Communication:** The evaluation team found that partners (civil society, government counterparts and UN entities) and communities would have benefited from knowing more about the women, peace and security agenda and how this relates to their own contexts.

- **Regional Office Support:** UN Women’s regional offices are well-placed, in theory, to provide technical support to country programmes. The evaluation team did not find, however, that country offices benefited from this either regarding WPS or on violence against women and girls.

- **National Institution Alignment:** In descending order, the Timor-Leste, Liberia, Uganda and Haiti programmes all exhibit need to align with emerging/potential national institutions & processes.

- **Work with Men:** The country-level programmes have worked to a greater or lesser extent with men to recruit them into promoting the women, peace and security agenda. This has been particularly effective at community level in Liberia. In Timor-Leste, the programme has (tacitly) acknowledged that men are in the majority of leadership positions and works with them in their professional capacity rather than ‘as men’. The advantage of the latter approach is that it encourages people to do their job well, rather than doing something ‘for women’; it makes promoting the women, peace and security agenda a matter of good practice and ‘common sense’ rather than additional work.

- **Partnerships:** For programmes in emerging contexts such as South Sudan, there is an important lesson to be learned on working closely and in partnership with gender advisers and substantive, security sector actors in UN Missions, as well as with the rest of the UN Country Team.

Global

- **Technical Expertise:** UN Women has established itself as a technical leader in the field of WPS. It has also created strong partnerships with the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) and the DPA, amongst others. These partnerships could benefit from a review of joint strategies. This will help future programmes to build collaboration and synergies and can be rolled out to build linkages with other areas such as justice, economic empowerment and women’s political participation.

- **Communication:** It will be important for UN Women to develop communications and knowledge products and to publicise these quite aggressively. As the FC2GSI programme comes to its end, it would be useful for successor programmes and for others working on the women, peace and security agenda to have a ‘Lessons Learned’ review, including successes and findings.

- **Monitoring and Evaluation:** The programme’s monitoring and evaluation framework baseline survey revealed some interesting results and helped to direct the programme to an extent, but was cost and labour intensive. UN Women took the decision that this ‘end-line’ evaluation would not replicate the baseline survey which has saved programme costs but also meant that the results are not directly comparable. It also did not help to reflect desired changes at the global level.
Further Recommendations

For UN Women to embed the work of the programme and to take it forward

i. Invest now in documenting lessons learned and best practices and creating knowledge products for dissemination. These knowledge products should include a comparison between this programme and the UNDP/EU project in Timor-Leste and Liberia.

ii. The Security Council will conduct a review of the Strategic Results Framework for implementing the women, peace and security agenda in 2015. UN Women should be ready with knowledge products and strategic visits from programme beneficiaries. This will also be an opportunity to consolidate partnerships across the UN family as well as with international civil society.

iii. UN Women should explore and exploit opportunities to work with other global institutions such as the Human Rights Council and the human rights treaty monitoring bodies.

iv. UN Women should make a stronger connection between international and regional human rights instruments and the women, peace and security agenda, e.g. country office reviews of the implementation of Maputo Protocol provisions and the Belem do Para Convention.

v. Future country programmes should strengthen their focus on security sector reform, either as part of a UN Mission, it or with national counterparts where there is none.

vi. Country programmes must take account of obstacles to women’s participation in peacebuilding and connections between peacebuilding, poverty and women’s political engagement.

vii. UN Women’s strong global indicators work should be used by governments as they draw up or review national action plans. UN Women should liaise more robustly with the EU and AU to help develop indicators for these to work in turn with their member states and as regional bodies.

viii. UN Women should systematise its engagement with regional peace and security bodies as well as the gender machinery in the AU and EU. This should be budgeted in future programmes.

To DFID and other donors with a particular commitment to the WPS agenda

ix. Invest sufficient resources to ensure value for money. Keeping budgets small (reducing the cash spend on a programme) may in fact result in poorer value for money.

x. Support women’s civil society in conflict-affected countries, e.g. via a country-level fund for administration, monitoring and oversight of support. This is consistent with DFID’s “How To” note on addressing violence against women and girls and is recognised as good practice.

xi. Use diplomatic and political capital to sustain gains made in terms of women’s leadership in on-going peace processes and agreements. The two key leadership positions currently held by women (in Darfur and in the Great Lakes) should be regarded as a start. At the same time, these women in leadership positions will continue to need gender advisory support.

xii. Engage with women’s participation in peacebuilding as much as with addressing sexual violence in conflict. Ensure that there is sufficient capacity within donor government agencies to understand and contribute substantively to this agenda.

To national governments in conflict-affected countries

xiii. Invest in women’s civil society, particularly in front-line service delivery so that organisations can get on with the work and be freed up from constantly fund-raising.

xiv. Ensure that gender units in police services are adequately resourced with qualified and motivated personnel as well as logistical support.

xv. Make the ‘WPS agenda’ a beacon for more professional security institutions and other government structures. For instance, ensure that police officers nominated to drive forward gender-sensitive reform are vetted and are able to set an example across the police service.
CHAPTER ONE: Introduction and Background

1.1. Purpose of the Evaluation

As the From Communities to Global Security Institutions (FC2GSI) Programme draws to its conclusion (in June 2014), International Solutions Group (ISG), an international Monitoring and Evaluation firm, has been contracted to conduct an evaluation to determine if the programme achieved the results envisaged at the inception stage and those revised over the course of the programme. The purpose of this evaluation is to identify the successes and challenges over the implementation period and help UN Women and partners chart a course for the subsequent phase of programming and policy work. The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Evaluation are presented in Annex 1.

1.2. Overview of the FC2GSI Programme

History and Rationale

The last decade of the 20th century saw violent conflict across the globe. In Africa, Europe and Asia, women, men and children were subjected to egregious violations of international humanitarian and human rights law; girls and boys were used to fight adult wars while women and girls of all ages were victims of opportunistic or strategic sexual violence. Whole communities were decimated in genocides, displaced and impoverished by conflict, while those responsible enjoyed widespread impunity. At the same time, the perpetrators of violence (or those who directed it) were the ones who sat at the negotiating table to settle on peace agreements and often took up positions of power and influence in government structures, including the security sector, while others, equally culpable of human rights violations, were recruited into national armed forces. The victims of the conflicts, however, were conspicuous by their absence at the negotiations and in post-conflict governance. It was usual to see women completely absent from decision-making structures. Women from Rwanda, the Balkans, Ireland and Sri Lanka whose bodies and lives had been the battlefields found themselves marginalised, rejected and excluded from rebuilding their communities. Moreover, many women found that ‘traditional’ norms imposed up them worse situations than in which they had been before the conflict.

At the same time, member states of the UN Security Council were becoming more alert to the thematic nature of violent conflict and its impact on civilians. The advent of the ‘protection of civilians’ and ‘children affected by armed conflict’ agendas further exposed the gap in both the protection of women during violent conflict and their absence from peacebuilding.

A tripartite partnership between UN Women’s predecessor entity, UNIFEM, women’s international and national civil society, and forward-thinking governments picked up the momentum created at previous international events such as Beijing +5 and the Namibia seminar: ‘Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective in Multidimensional Peace Support Operations’ which led to the Windhoek Declaration. Security Council resolution 1325 was ground-breaking in its scope, its strategic vision and the level of support it garnered. Governments that had shown little interest in addressing the gender dimensions of violent conflict became strong advocates, as well as those who had direct experience of the failure of the ‘business as usual’ approach. The ‘Women, Peace and Security’ agenda was born and for the first time, the world’s most powerful body asserted that both the victimisation of women and their exclusion from peace building was a matter of international peace and security.

The next 14 years have seen a varied response to this agenda. On the one hand, there have been a series of further UN Security Council resolutions (largely in response to growing outrage at the enduring prevalence and brutality of sexual violence against women and girls in situations of violent conflict), the creation of the positions of a Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG) on sexual violence in conflict and a Special Envoy in the African Union on women, peace and security.
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On the other hand, women continue to be victimised in ways that are gender-specific (particularly sexual violence) and are still almost comprehensively excluded from peace negotiations and peacebuilding in times of conflict and its immediate aftermath. On a positive note, however, there is increasing evidence of governments’ recognition of the link between women’s participation in peacebuilding and conflict management and gender-based violence against women and girls. This is expressed both through National Action Plans on women, peace and security, in programmes supported by donor governments and other commitments.  

The UK and Australia’s support to the FC2GSI programme is indicative of their long-standing support to this agenda. The UK was instrumental in the early days of the women, peace and security agenda. It championed implementation at the UN Security Council, funded UNIFEM’s early work on peace and security and supported the ‘Friends of 1325’ informal group of Missions to the UN. The UK launched its first National Action Plan (NAP) in 2006 and has revised and re-launched NAPs on a continuous basis ever since. From 2012 – 2014, the UK led UN Member States’ work against sexual violence in conflict through the Preventing Sexual Violence Initiative (PSVI), including the Declaration of Commitment to End Sexual Violence in Conflict (2013) and culminating in the Global Summit, ‘Time to Act’ in 2014.

Australia launched its first NAP in 2012, although it had been actively supporting the women, peace and security agenda since at least 2004 and published documents relating to the agenda in 2006. The NAP runs from 2012 – 2018 and contains commitments to using its bilateral relationships with countries in the Pacific region to promote the agenda as well as providing support domestically to enable women’s full participation in peacekeeping operations.

It was against this backdrop that, in 2010, UNIFEM sought and obtained support from the UK and other donor governments (and subsequently Australia) to embark on a programme that would build on two of the tenets of foundational international human rights law and the UNSC resolutions of the 1990s: (a) that peace and security (or the lack thereof) is experienced at the local level; by individuals, households and communities and (b) that women do engage in peacebuilding at all levels, depending on the space they can carve out for themselves or – conversely – the obstacles placed in their way.

Programme Design
The programme ‘From Communities to Global Security Institutions (FC2GSI)’ was designed to target actions and results in three key deficit areas: women’s engagement in decision-making on peacebuilding, gender-responsive security sector reform, and accountability for SCR 1325/1820. It has, therefore, three aims:

a. Strengthening women’s security and voice in peacebuilding at community, national and international levels;
b. Institutionalizing protection of women in national security services and in peacekeeping forces;
c. Building accountability for 1325 through improved production and population of indicators on 1325/1820.

The design of the programme has continued to be relevant to UN Women’s mandate and to be consistent with the Human Rights-Based Approach to Development as articulated in the Common Approach. It is designed to support national capacity – both governmental and civil society; to promote gender equality by addressing the protection of women – particularly from gender-based violence and to ensure accountability – an international human rights principle. The programme aligns more tangentially with UN Women’s mandate to coordinate gender equality programming
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4 Examples include: Time to Act Global Summit (2014), Nigeria Stability and Reconciliation Programme (DFID), Senegal National Action Plan on the implementation of UNSC resolution 1325
5 In describing programming stages that occurred before UN Women was formed, reference is made to UNIFEM.
6 The basis of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights is that rights are enjoyed or violated at the most local level.
within the United Nations (UN) family at country level while the work on indicators (aim (c)) explicitly brings the UN Organisation together with national governments and human rights institutions to monitor progress with implementation.

In order to fulfil the above aims, the programme adopts four main strategies:

a. **Capacity-building** for women’s peacebuilding initiatives through financing local initiatives, technical support for project management and monitoring of these initiatives, and creation of upstream advocacy opportunities to influence national, regional or international peace and recovery initiatives;

b. **Technical support** for security sector reform and for indicator design and monitoring at the national and global levels;

c. **Partnerships** with institutions that can enable women’s organizations and UNIFEM to maximize impact with limited resources: Ministries of the Interior, Defence, Foreign Affairs, Finance; regional security institutions notably the AU and EU, UN Agencies and inter-governmental bodies such as the PBC, international and national peace-building NGOs and women’s peace coalitions;

d. **Evidence-based advocacy** channelling country-level findings to international policy-making forums such as donor conferences and to national peacebuilding processes such as peace negotiations and post-conflict needs assessments.

**Complementarity:** FC2GSI is not the only work carried out by UN Women’s Peace and Security Section. Since the formation of UN Women, its work on peace and security has transitioned from being part of the ‘Governance, Peace and Security’ section in UNIFEM to a more focused, resourced section able to provide advisory support to country offices as well as global institutions. This programme, therefore, sits within a suite of activities and approaches that are complemented both within and outside UN Women.

For instance, in addition to the work that is directly attributable to the FC2GSI programme, UN Women has taken steps to promote gendered transitional justice mechanisms through its partnership with the Justice Rapid Response mechanism (in collaboration with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights) and supports regional organisations (in particular the African Union) on women, peace and security. The Executive Director briefs the UN Security Council on the situation for women in countries on its agenda. While this work may not fit within the parameters of the FC2GSI programme, it is informed by the knowledge gained at country level and promotes the agenda of promoting accountability for violations of women’s human rights committed during violent conflict.

In designing the programme, UNIFEM took the view that the advancement of the women, peace and security agenda is a responsibility to be shared by national governments, civil society, inter-governmental organisations and armed groups; that it does not fall to one entity alone. In this regard, the programme was designed to complement the work that others do (or should) undertake. Examples of such similar work within the UN system include that of UNFPA in responding to sexual and gender-based violence in humanitarian emergencies, the UN stand-by mediation team established by the Department for Political Affairs in 2008 and the gender advisory team of the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations. As much as this introduces the complexities of attribution, it also raises the issue of the extent to which UN Women can be held accountable for the failings of others. In the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, for instance, women report that men from armed groups have been taken to other countries for training in leadership, political organising and military strategy, while the women remain behind, holding families together and dealing with displacement and violence. The men in these countries often return with an advanced Islamist agenda and the skills to put this into practice, leading to regression in women’s rights. While
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8 This document uses the distinction between ‘armed forces’ and ‘armed groups’ in the Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict to the Convention on the Rights of the Child
UN Women can support women’s organisations in these situations and advocate with the ‘host’ governments, its influence in these situations is limited.

It was in recognition of the multiplicity of actors in the women, peace and security field and their respective advantages and mandates that FC2GSI was designed with a clear strategy to build, support and take advantage of partnerships with other multi-lateral agencies and organisations, local and international non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and national governments – both conflict-affected and donors.

UN Women’s own role within the women, peace and security agenda has shifted even since it was formed. For instance, whereas in 2010/11 UN Women did not claim a space in the humanitarian field, it is increasingly taking on a role vis-à-vis the main providers of humanitarian assistance. The FC2GSI programme does not include a role for UN Women in this area and so this does form part of this evaluation. UN Women does now, however, take the lead within many UN Country Teams for gender equality and women’s empowerment. In a number of countries worldwide, for instance, UN Women leads the Gender Task Force while UNFPA still leads on sexual and gender-based violence.

Regional organisations: The programme does not have a clear focus on regional organisations, despite their important role. This detracts from its relevance. While it could be argued that regional organisations have become stronger and more viable partners in this field since the inception of the programme, it is likely that greater support from UN Women would have bolstered their capacities earlier. For instance, greater collaboration between this programme and the European Union may have resulted in the latter developing more coherent indicators for measuring implementation of the WPS agenda.³

The fit between FC2GSI and the global women, peace and security agenda: UNSCR 1325 is commonly described as having four ‘pillars’: Protection, Prevention, Participation and Peacebuilding. As the international community turns attention more to preventing and responding to gender-based violence against women and girls, especially in times of violent conflict, the emphasis has tended to shift towards the protection and prevention pillars rather than participation and peacebuilding. The FC2GSI programme, however, is predicated on the belief that there is an intimate relationship between gender-based violence and women’s participation in peacebuilding and conflict management. Within this, UN Women believes that conflict-related rape and other sexual violence is one form of gender-based violence amongst others and that tackling all forms of gender-based violence is crucial to ensuring women’s full and effective participation in all stages of peacebuilding.

This tenet of the programme runs alongside the belief that women’s effective participation is not only ‘good for women’ but is a pre-requisite of effective, sustainable and productive peace. While women have the right to be present and to be heard (the ‘imperative’ view to inclusion), peace that is built without women’s contribution is likely to fail.

Impact of mandate change: An indication of UN Women’s more mature approach to its identity and its activities is that work has become less ‘project-based’ or ad hoc and more strategic, with a clearer influencing approach. This is a continuing effort and may be evidenced more at the headquarters level than in country offices. Country offices have a long-standing relationship with civil society as well as national governments; the former (particularly) expects UN Women to behave more like a large, funding women’s organisation – a donor – than as a core UN entity. The country case studies found this to be particularly acute for the four country offices as the programme was conceived under the UNIFEM mandate and implemented largely under the UN Women mandate; requiring the country offices to balance planned activities and the expectations of partners with the reality of the UN Women mandate.

Geographical choice: The programme was designed to be piloted in four post-conflict countries: Haiti, Liberia, Timor-Leste and Uganda. While these four countries have different characteristics,
apart from their geography, they also have much in common. They are all impoverished but with abundant natural resources; there is a distinct urban/rural divide in terms of services access, including education and justice; sexual, gender-based violence was a feature of the conflict in all four countries, and there has been a significant UN presence in all four countries. Peacebuilding takes a different form in each country, however. In Haiti and Uganda, there is a level of organised violence which, while not meeting any criteria for ‘armed conflict’, still threatens the lives and security of affected populations. The independence conflict in Timor-Leste has no chance of resurgence, whereas in Liberia the government and communities are constantly aware that the factors leading to the conflict could re-emerge. Gender-based violence is all four countries has shifted from conflict-related sexual violence to highly prevalent domestic violence as well as sexual violence – both related to the legacy of the conflicts\(^\text{10}\) and otherwise.

The programme is now also operating in South Sudan and Zimbabwe. As this evaluation relates to the programme since its inception, South Sudan and Zimbabwe were not included as country case studies.

In addition, other UN Women country offices have programmes that promote the women, peace and security agenda, including Nepal where there is a fully-developed programme of support to Nepal’s National Action Plan (NAP).

Timing: The programme started in 2010, with the additional support from Australia coming on line in May 2011. The DFID contribution concluded in June 2014, after a fifteen month no-cost extension.

Budget
The programme received GBP 3,250,000 from DFID for work in the four countries and globally. This averages at £162,500 per annum for each country and the global work. Although this was not unusually small for UNIFEM, the modest size of this budget is likely to have been responsible for some of the programme constraints addressed below, particularly the limited number of programme staff members. The funding was initially divided more or less equally between the four countries and the global programme, although the headquarters post has been funded from core resources in the latter part of the programme. The creation of South Sudan as an independent nation created an opportunity (and need) for the FC2GSI programme to be extended. UN Women raised funds accordingly. In Zimbabwe, a promise of funding [from Norway] allowed UN Women to take advantage of an opportunity which arose to work on women, peace and security.

It appears that all the above ‘non-DFID’ funds were raised by UN Women. The evaluation could find no evidence that DFID took action to encourage funding by others. Greater, more consistent and more substantive donor engagement with programmes such as FC2GSI would enable donors to be more confidently promote the programme to other donor governments.

It is important to distinguish those findings relating to the programme budget from the outcome-level target of 15% of ‘selected UN programming budgets (Peace Building Funds (PBF)) allocated to women’s empowerment and gender equality (WEGE)’. The outcome target is designed to ensure mainstreaming of the women, peace and security agenda across the work of the UN - in line with global commitments – rather than to raise money for this programme, or even for UN Women alone. The women, peace and security agenda is the responsibility of the whole UN Organisation as well as member states. As with other areas of gender equality and women’s empowerment, progress is better demonstrated where it becomes ‘common practice’ across all entities than when it stays within the purview of the dedicated entity alone.

Results Framework
UN Women’s first logframe was developed jointly by DFID and then UNIFEM to support the programme design, in 2010. It was amended in 2013 to take account of programming realities and
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\(^{10}\) Sexual violence through prostitution, for instance, subsists in Liberia largely as a legacy of the conflict and the large international peacekeeping operation, according to women interviewed in the evaluation.
recommendations from DFID’s 2012 annual review. The logframe as amended constitutes the results framework for the whole programme, while country offices have developed their own. In turn, these were revised during the life of the programme to take account of programming realities and national contexts. The programme’s performance against the revised logframe is detailed in Section 3.4 below.

1.3. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation aims to provide a practice-based analysis of UN Women’s achievements to date. While an ‘end of programme’ evaluation, it also seeks to exhibit characteristics of both formative and summative evaluations. Via appropriate recommendations, it strives to inform future work of UN Women and its partners promoting the women, peace and security agenda (for the former) and assess the level of its success or achievement at the end of this phase of the programme, by comparing it against the standards/benchmarks posited via the programme results frameworks/logframes (for the latter). While the ISG research team collected, analysed and assessed relevant quantitative and qualitative data, drawing on external and UN Women internal documentation and informants, the evaluation is necessarily restricted in its scope and intent. In particular, ISG seeks to complement, rather than duplicate, other relevant evaluations. This approach entails the following:

- A broad-brush review of external and internal frameworks and standards in the areas of women and girls’ security, protection and rights and a snapshot of some emerging good practices in these areas. A list of documents reviewed as part of this assignment report is provided in Annex 2.

- Assessment of UNW’s current performance with respect to the programme, including:
  - Reviewing UN Women’s activity regarding the programme across the four programme countries. This was based on a review of internal documents and consultations with key stakeholders across the programme countries;
  - Field visits to the four main programme countries (Haiti, Liberia, Timor-Leste and Uganda). This included discussions with key stakeholders, as well as a comprehensive document review relevant to each country.

The ISG team analysed the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and impact of the programme. In particular the team analysed the relevance of the programme conceptualisation; assess the efficiency of the administration and management of the programme across all main outcomes – including UN Women’s ability to record evidence of impact; assess the effectiveness and immediate impact of the programme based on results achieved against those that were planned; and identify and assess any other unanticipated results or unintended consequences.
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11 These included relevant internal programme reports, donor reports and reviews, reports from implementing partners and relevant evaluations.
CHAPTER TWO - Evaluation Process and Methodology

2.1. Overview of the Evaluation Process
The evaluation consisted of five phases as shown in Figure 3 below:

Figure 3: Phases of the Evaluation

1) Preparation phase (May 2014 – June 2014)
   This phase further specified the approach and methodology for the evaluation. A Document Review was conducted to develop the evaluation framework, evaluation questions, detailed approach and methodology. An Inception Report was delivered and validated by the FC2GSI SC. It is included in Annex 7.

2) Data Collection and Fieldwork phase (June 2014 – July 2014)
   This phase included field visits to the four FC2GSI programme countries, consultations with key informants at global and country level, and further literature and document review and production of mission debriefs.

3) Individual Country Reports (June-July 2014)
   This phase consisted of the preparation of individual reports produced by the research country teams on the initial findings of the country field visits. The reports were presented to the UN Women evaluation SC and back to the respective COs for review and validation.

4) Analysis and Draft Report (July-August 2014)
   This phase focused on developing evaluation findings and on formulating conclusions and recommendations. These were presented in a draft report.

5) Final Report Presentation (September 2014)
   A final workshop with the UN Women EAG and FC2GSI SC was held for validation purposes and to discuss recommendations and their feasibility and implications for a next phase of the programme. The input from the final presentation workshop is incorporated and presented in this final evaluation report.

2.2. Evaluation Design

Overall Approach
The evaluation used a consultative and utilisation-focused approach that is responsive to gender and human rights and sensitive to culture. The evaluation also used a mixed-methods approach for its investigation.

Consultation and utilisation focused: During the Inception phase the evaluation team consulted with the FC2GSI SC to ensure focus from the outset on a final product of maximum value and utility to end users. Throughout the evaluation process the evaluation team involved pre-identified key stakeholders with refining or correcting findings as they emerged, conclusions and recommendations from the country case studies, and drafts of the final evaluation report. Drafts of the inception report, the country case studies and global report were shared with the UN Women country offices and the evaluation reference group which includes DFID. The draft inception report was also shared with the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT).

Gender and human rights responsive and culturally sensitive: The evaluation is guided by the UN Evaluation Group’s (UNEG) ‘Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System.’ Other reference
points are the UNEG guidance document on integrating human rights and gender equality perspectives in evaluations in the UN system, and the UN Women guidance document ‘Concept note on Integrating Gender, Human Rights and Culture in UN Women programmes’.

**Mixed Methods:** The evaluation team utilised a mix of data-collection and data analysis methods. This enhances the quality and credibility of findings and conclusions through the triangulation and overlapping of different data sources and methods of data collection. These are outlined in detail in sections 2.3 and 2.4.

**Evaluation Criteria and Questions**
Based on the original TOR the evaluation team, in consultation with the FC2GSI Evaluation SC, developed a set of key evaluation questions and sub questions to guide data collection, data analysis and report writing. These are presented in Annex 3.

**2.3. Methods and Tools used for Data Collection**

**Data Collection Methods**
As is usual for an evaluation of this kind – conducted at country and global level, a preliminary documentary review was conducted for the inception report which outlined the proposed methodology for both country studies and the global level study.

**Document Review**
A detailed document review was undertaken, guided by the agreed evaluation questions. Reviewed documents included reports, proposals, plans, financial documents, policy and programme documents, Terms of Reference, minutes, training materials, Power Point presentations etc. For a full list of documents reviewed at both global and country level see Annex 2.

**Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGD)**
A total of approximately 350 people were consulted as part of the evaluation via semi-structured Key Informant Interviews (KII), Focus Group Discussions (FGD), and meetings with coordination groups. Representatives from INGOs, NGOs, local associations, municipalities, government structures, and UN agencies were consulted. Respondents for FGDs and KII were selected using a convenience sampling methodology, utilised due to limited resources that precluded a true random sampling. The sampling frame for the evaluation consisted of two sub-groupings:

1. Programme beneficiaries: individuals (women and/or men) interviewed separately representing households participating in programme activities. The evaluation teams selected programme communities to provide a representative spread of the diversity of programme activities, locations and dynamics, e.g. rural vs. urban locations, ‘best-performing’ communities vs. underperforming communities.

2. Programme organisational/government stakeholders: representatives of organisations (UN agencies, NGOs) and governments involved in the programme. Individuals were selected on the basis of the relevance of their role in the programme, their formal relationship to the WPS agenda in a given country context (e.g. representatives of women’s ministries) and their availability to be interviewed by the evaluation team (availability of all key stakeholders could not be assumed as a given due to the time constraints of the evaluation).

The limitations on the findings imposed by the sampling were counterbalanced by triangulation of field research findings with each other and with the findings of the desk review. Respondents were selected based on consultations between the evaluation team, the FC2GSI SC and the UN Women country offices. A full list of respondents is included in Annex 4.

In-person KIIs were conducted in the programme countries with individuals or with small groups, depending on circumstances. 12 FGDs were held with programme beneficiaries/participants at community level as part of the fieldwork. The KII and FGDs used a thematic discussion guide developed specifically on the basis of the evaluation questions. This was reviewed by the evaluation team.

---

12 For example, when two or three individuals presented at meetings scheduled as individual KII
team prior to each country visit and adapted to each setting as required. The interview protocols and generic guide is included in Annex 5.

**Country Case Studies**
The evaluation included field visits comprising 6-10 working days to each of four programme countries: Haiti, Liberia, Timor-Leste and Uganda, comprising the core data of the evaluation. Individual country briefs and more detailed reports were prepared after each country field visit as a means of documenting and sharing emerging findings with the FC2GSI SC and also providing feedback to UN Women in each programme location.

The two-member evaluation team jointly conducted the field visits in close partnership with UN Women country offices. The in-country stakeholders assisted in preparation of locations, the list of informants and the schedule for the visits. A general outline of the field visits itineraries was:

- An introductory meeting with the relevant UN Women programme staff;
- Data collection through KII, FGDs and observation;
- Prior to the departure of the evaluation team, a debriefing was held with key representatives in each programme country to corroborate the emerging findings, fill in any information gaps, cross check information gathered so far, and explore the feasibility of the recommendations.

**2.4. Methods and Tools Used for Data Analysis**

**Overall Approach**
The following methods of analysis were used in this evaluation:

**Descriptive analysis** was used to understand the contexts in which the FC2GSI has evolved, and to describe its implementation at the global and national level;

**Content analysis** constitutes the core of the qualitative analysis. Documents, records of interviews, observations from the field, etc. and qualitative data emerging from the FC2GSI field work were analysed by the evaluation team to identify common trends, themes, and patterns for each of the key evaluation criteria. Content analysis was also used to highlight diverging views and opposite trends. Emerging issues and trends constitute the basis for developing preliminary observations and evaluation findings.

**Comparative analysis** is used to examine findings across different countries, themes, or other criteria; it is also used to identify best practices, innovative approaches, and lessons learned. This type of analysis was used throughout the process to examine information and data from stakeholder consultations and document and literature review. This analysis has been used to compare the findings across the four programme countries, as will be found later in the report.

**Triangulation** of findings was undertaken by the evaluation team across data collection methods (document review, KII, FGD, observation and review of GBVMS tools and reports) where possible to corroborate and increase the quality and credibility of the evaluation findings and conclusions. A breakdown of data collection methods is outlined in Table 2.

Data sources (persons and places) were triangulated as outlined in Tables 1 and 2.

**Table 1. Triangulation by data sources - places**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Session</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrief Session with UN Women</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Triangulation by data sources – people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Haiti</th>
<th>Liberia</th>
<th>Timor-Leste</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN Women Programme Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC2GSI Beneficiaries</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC2GSI Partners</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Officials</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-FC2GSI Stakeholders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethical considerations
The evaluation followed relevant guidelines for ethical research on violence against women and on research with children. With regard to the latter, each team took care that only adult women and men were to be interviewed. Where girls and boys were present in focus group discussions in communities, interviewers ensured that discussions paused so they could be taken away in case sensitive issues were discussed in their presence.

With regard to issues of violence against women, the evaluation teams ensured that women interviewed women unless the interviewees had given their explicit consent for a man to be present. Interpreters (where necessary) were female for discussions or interviews with community women.13

Quality Assurance
ISG ensured the quality of all deliverables through the following:

Clarity: During the inception phase, UN Women and stakeholder needs and expectations were clarified. Data collection tools were developed from the evaluation framework and discussed. These tools were reviewed to ensure appropriateness.

Communication: The evaluation team met regularly to review progress on the assignment. The team critiqued all drafts and products and sought input from other in-house experts as required.

ISG provided regular status progress briefings to the UN Women representative of the FC2GSI SC to share information on work completed, next steps, as well as any areas of concern such as difficulties, possible solutions, and important events affecting the evaluation.

Timing: The timeline for the evaluation ensured there is sufficient time for review of all draft deliverables and for revisions to these deliverables to make sure that feedback was acted upon.

Global Standards: ISG ensures that its work complies with standards set by UNEG, UN Women and professional associations, such as ALNAP.14

---

13 Relevant ethical guidelines include: The UNEG Ethical Guidelines, DFID’s How to note on monitoring and evaluating violence against women programming, Raising Voices ‘Ethical Monitoring and Evaluation for Violence Against Women Prevention’.

14 See http://www.alnap.org
## 2.5. Limitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk / Limitation</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research was conducted in diverse linguistic and cultural settings and interpreters were used. The evaluation team made all efforts to identify interpreters who had experience of WPS thematic issues, but this was challenging.</td>
<td>Research questions were work-shopped with interpreters prior to qualitative research, as well as providing background documents/reading on the FC2GSI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and personnel constraints on the evaluation dictated that the evaluation team utilise a convenience sampling methodology for the field research.</td>
<td>Triangulation of the findings from the field research with data from multiple sources and with desk review data to verify validity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaps in M&amp;E systems, services, staff, documentation and M&amp;E data posed a constraint to sources of secondary data and limited analysis of the rationale for changes in programme logic, strategies, design elements, frameworks and implementation</td>
<td>Extensive consultation with stakeholders to identify available data and emphasis on more general findings supported by qualitative research, rather than quantitative data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While the four programme countries were representative of the different contexts where the FC2GSI is implemented, these countries in themselves were diverse and geographically spread out. The limited time allocated for case studies meant the team were only able to obtain a ‘snapshot’ from each.</td>
<td>In consultation with the FC2GSI SC and UN Women COs, efforts were made to identify a good sample of informants to cover the research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was limited access to financial documentation. Not all country-level documentation was provided in the time permitted for the individual country research, limiting the comprehensiveness of the desk review in some settings</td>
<td>The limitations for analysis were discussed with the FC2GSI SC. Flexibility in approach to the research at individual country level and on combining individual country data, with successive rounds of validation of findings with country teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High staff turnover in DFID and AusAID/DFAT has resulted in poor institutional memory across the programme’s main donors.</td>
<td>The reference group included key DFID staff members who should be able to access relevant data held institutionally. AusAID/DFAT was invited to comment on the inception report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THREE – Findings

3.1. Country-based findings - general

As mentioned in the methodology section, country studies were conducted in each of the four pilot countries. The country reports are to be found at Annex 6.

The programme’s activities are determined by country-level logical frameworks (logframes). These adapt the global programme logframe to the national context. The broad aims and strategies remain, therefore, consistent across all four countries.

Each country programme adopts a twin approach of supporting women’s peace and human rights activism at the community level and working with national and international institutions to strengthen the gender dimensions of the national security sector. Each country programme also aims to increase the extent and effectiveness with which women participate in conflict management and peacebuilding.

Relevance

The evaluation found the FC2GSI programme to be relevant in each country studied. All the country programmes benefit from a long-standing UNIFEM/UN Women presence in the respective country and strong connections to women’s civil society. This means that each office was able to design their programme to meet the particular national context. Each programme is based, therefore, on in-depth analysis of the capacity of local (sub-national) civil society and national institutions, awareness of the local contexts and cultural sensitivity. For instance, in Haiti, the office was able to identify a partner organisation whose activities were threatening to compromise the integrity of the programme and withdraw programme support before any real damage was done. In Timor-Leste, the programme team has always been aware of the strength of the Catholic Church and the need to engage with the religious leadership to effect change. In Uganda the programme was already aware of the situation facing the post-conflict Acholi community and the different issues faced by the Karamoja communities, while in Liberia, the close connection with women’s peace organisations enabled the programme to support the catalytic ‘Peace Hut’ initiative in many communities.

Each country has a significant UN presence. In Timor-Leste, this consisted of an interim administration between independence and self-governance and consisted of an integrated peacekeeping mission until 31 December 2012 (UNMIT) and a UN Country Team; in Liberia and Haiti it includes a peacekeeping force and associated civilian mission (MINUSTAH) and UNCT while in Uganda the UN has, since 2008, scaled back the immediate humanitarian response to focus mostly on supporting the national government to fulfil its obligations and maximise its opportunities, including in the realm of peacebuilding and stability in the conflict-affected north. In each case the UN has been supporting the reform or creation of the national security sector and has a clear commitment to addressing gender equality through the Development Assistance Framework or equivalent document.

As stated above, each country programme is firmly grounded in the theory of change that says (in short), that violence against women and girls is an obstacle to their participation in peacebuilding at the community, sub-national and national levels. (a) If this obstacle is removed, then women are more likely to participate meaningfully in peacebuilding. (b) If women participate more – and more meaningfully – in peacebuilding, then peace is more likely both in the short and longer term. Given the prevalence of gender-based violence (particularly domestic violence) in the communities targeted by the programme and in the programme countries as a whole, this approach is relevant to the programme contexts.

“Many NGOs are pulling out of Gulu and going to Karamoja. Can the people recover from a war that lasted 20 years in only 5 years?”

District Official, Gulu, Uganda
To maintain its relevance, however, the programme or its successor programmes will need to also focus on other obstacles that prevent women’s participation in public life, besides gender-based violence. These include the following:

**Poverty:** There is a well-documented connection between poverty and conflict. While not all poor countries descend into violent conflict and the loci of violent conflict are not always amongst the world’s poorest, violent conflict always has an impoverishing impact, destroying economic opportunities and pushing communities into subsistence or survival mode. Women bear the brunt of poverty, taking on the bulk of the economic burden as well as their caring responsibilities. This leaves little time for participation in public life. Support to women’s economic lives, therefore, can be both an opportunity itself for them to engage collectively and publicly and can free up their time to allow for public engagement.

**Gender-based discrimination:** Conservative, discriminatory norms emerge or re-emerge during and after crises, resulting in societal expectations that women will adopt more domestic, privatised roles while men who have returned from exile or armed groups are expected to take up decision-making roles in the community or in governance structures. The most extreme manifestation of this is of course violence against women who engage in political life but women in many countries who have participated in liberation struggles or revolutions find themselves excluded from public engagement purely on the basis of their gender.

**Skills gap:** Women in poor countries, particularly those from marginalised communities, often lack access to information, education or training. Illiteracy forms a major obstacle to participation both in practical terms and in diminishing women’s confidence to participate publicly – to ‘appear in public without shame’. Women in the FC2GSI programme identified that participating in the programme had given them some of the leadership experience they needed but that they could all benefit from targeted skills-based training in leadership, organisation, literacy and numeracy.

It will be necessary, therefore for UN Women’s future interventions to focus on women’s participation in other areas of governance including political decision-making, judiciary, policing, the private sector and in front-line service delivery.

“We see that other women trust us. We talk to them, we talk to the men in our suco, including our suco chief who understood what we are talking about - that makes us feel good”; “We feel lucky to have been trained more than the other women. We speak the same languages, we easily read the information provided in their training and so we share back the information with others”.

Community Training Participant, Timor-Leste

---

15 UN Women ‘Violence Against Women in Politics’ 2014
16 See ICAN Peacework policy briefs ‘What the Women Say’ [http://www.icanpeacework.org](http://www.icanpeacework.org)
17 The ‘Capability approach’ as espoused by Amartya Sen (Sen, A: Development as Freedom, Oxford University Press 1999)
Effectiveness

Each country programme has been effective in strengthening women’s civil society and reducing the incidence of gender-based violence in the targeted communities. The achievements in terms of contributing to a gender-sensitive security sector reform have been more varied. In Liberia, the programme has overcome numerous obstacles to strengthen the national police Gender Unit and is instrumental in supporting a coherent gender policy and training curricula for the entire security sector. In Uganda the police believe that the training they have received under the auspices of the programme have helped them to perform more professionally in dealing with gender-based violence. In Timor-Leste, the evaluation team found less evidence that the programme has had a positive impact on security sector reform, while in Haiti, the programme had limited focus on changes at the institutional level.

In terms of promoting and supporting women’s participation, all country studies showed that the programme has been effective in strengthening women’s ability to engage on peacebuilding issues at the local level as well as their credibility when doing so. At the national level, however, there was less evidence of women’s participation in peacebuilding initiatives and equally variable evidence that women who do take part in peacebuilding at the national level are truly representing the realities or voices of marginalised, rural women. As with many civil society organisations (whether or not autonomous women’s organisations), there is often a risk that those who purport to represent their constituencies come from the urban, educated elite and may not truly represent their constituencies. In Liberia, although some of the programme partners are themselves women from rural communities, some programme partners at the grassroots level were less well connected with the national governance structures. In Haiti, UN Women had to withdraw funding support from one organisation that lost its focus on representing women’s views. UN Women is aware of the potential for elite capture or for ‘token’ female representation and has taken appropriate, remedial steps.

The programme is designed, at global and country level, to maximise synergies between the programme components. Evidence of this can be found where women and men who have benefitted from programme activities are able to exert some influence at the institutional or national level to improve local security. Again, the evaluation findings varied across the four countries. In Liberia, women activists implement a degree of oversight of local police forces and are able to support initiatives such as the recruitment of more women police officers.

However, in Timor-Leste the evaluation found that women considered themselves to have fewer opportunities to advocate for the changes they need in policing. In Uganda, there seemed to be a weak connection between community-level activism and institutional reform efforts, while in Haiti and again Timor-Leste, there was little evidence to demonstrate this connection.
Efficiency
Across the country programmes, UN Women demonstrated that it makes good use of FC2GSI resources.

The evaluation team noted evidence, however, of a relationship between the size of the budget and the efficiency of programme performance. For instance, due to resource constraints, the programme manager in each country is limited in their ability to monitor use of funds and performance of activities at the community level, relying on reports from partners with limited reporting capacity. Having little explicit provision for regional coordination or advisory support has also diminished the extent to which each country programme could both learn from and influence other programmes in their region. Whilst each country programme endeavours to avoid wastage, there is a risk that resource constraints can result in less than optimal use of the resources that are available. Larger budgets, managed effectively, can result in economies of scale and stronger (and hence more efficient) project management systems.

The staff team in each country programme is small and therefore has to make the best use of available personnel. Positions of national programme manager were only filled in every country subsequent to implementation of the Baseline study and the first DFID annual review. In Liberia, the country office is able to monitor implementing partners’ work on only a limited basis which has limited the level of scrutiny over the use of resources such as equipment and grants. In Haiti, there are many grantees but only one programme manager who has insufficient time and resources to effectively monitor implementation on an efficiency basis in all programme communities. In Uganda, the evaluation team found efficiency difficult to measure as partners were often not aware of the specific programmatic funding source of their activities, be it from UN Women generally or from other donors. In Timor-Leste, where the economy has been distorted as a result of years of international presence, the UN Women team finds it challenging to determine the least expensive options, though makes significant efforts to make the best use of funds, for example by using national consultants wherever possible (as does the Liberia programme) and ensuring synergies with other programmes. In Haiti, while the geography and poor infrastructure contributes, to some extent, to weak coordination and communication between implementing partners, and between community organisations and national institutions, the programme would benefit from more investment in greater convening of partners, or at least creating ‘communities of practice’ as has been done in Timor-Leste.

All the country programmes, except Liberia, have suffered from hiatuses in senior management and leadership, which have had an impact on programme staff’s ability to plan and maximise the use of resources. This issue has been resolved since the 2012 DFID annual review; with national programme managers, deputy country representatives and three out of four country representatives in place in all targeted country offices. ¹⁸

The transition from UNIFEM to UN Women also involved moving from a structure where every payment had to be authorised by the regional offices to one of greater delegated authority. This has created efficiencies in that partners do not have prolonged waiting times for funding, staff time is no longer wasted waiting for regional office approvals, and the regional office can more efficiently respond to bigger requests as they are also not required to approve and process numerous small payments.

Impact
The programme has made significant progress against its aims in each programme country evaluated. In all four countries, women’s civil society partners have been strengthened vis à vis their

¹⁸ The Country Representative in Liberia died suddenly in early 2014.
capacity to engage in peacebuilding. Security actors at the local or national level have been influenced positively regarding women’s security and the information from country-level programming has been able to inform UN Women and others’ global interventions within the women, peace and security agenda.

The issue of attribution of impact presents a challenge for UN Women and its donors – particularly in a result-focused era where donors increasingly need to demonstrate to their home constituency that money has been well spent. It is also an issue that is shared by other, multi-lateral organisations that work with both national and global institutions.

In some part, the challenge of attribution arises because implementing partners are often funded by other donors or by other UN Women programmes and, by their nature, are not focused on sufficiently micro-level reporting to enable disaggregation of their funds. This was certainly the case in Uganda and Haiti. It also arises, paradoxically, where the programme has been successful either in leveraging other support or in imparting knowledge. In Liberia, for example, the UN Peacebuilding Fund personnel had learned so much from UN Women about the women, peace and security agenda that it had become ‘second nature’ or common sense to adopt a ‘pro-1325’ approach.

Secondly, it arises from the tension between alignment with national priorities and institutions and ‘outsourcing’ peace and security work and has arisen as a consequence of UN Women’s mandate. Where an agency works with a national institution such as the police service, it is more sustainable and more effective to support the police to provide their own training and for the police who are trained to see this as coming from their own institution, rather than being labelled ‘the UN Women (or similar) training’. This means that the beneficiaries of the training will attribute the gains to the institution, rather than the donor.

Thirdly, in post-conflict situations where the UN is engaged by the national government, it is important that the government is both capable and seen to be capable of delivering effective peace and security to its citizens. UN Women’s mandate is to support national governmental capacity as well as civil society. This will often mean adopting a ‘back seat’ or almost invisible approach, with concomitant challenges in attribution of outcomes/results.

Fourthly, ‘good donorship’ dictates that aid (including in the security and justice sectors) is aligned with national priorities and that programmes are directed towards building the capacity of national institutions (government or non-state) to adopt universal principles of good governance and human rights. This means that donor visibility should take second place – whether channelled through multi-lateral organisations or otherwise. Government institutions, let alone civil society are therefore unlikely to be able to describe their achievements in terms of what UN Women did and even less likely to be able to attribute it to any particular donor government. As UN Women’s peace and security work extends to situations where aid is also politicised, it may need to further downplay the disaggregation of its funds.

With hindsight – and a recommendation for future programming, the programme would have benefitted from a steering committee which included the main donors and other parts of the UN Organisation with an active involvement in the women, peace and security agenda. Such a structure may also help reduce the tension between UN Women’s own mandate (to support and coordinate work at the national and global level, rather than to ‘deliver’ or implement directly) and the needs of donors to attribute achievements to their ‘national’ money.

Notwithstanding the above, donors want to understand and account for the results of UN Women’s peace and security work on a more granular basis. Both UN Women and donors have struggled to articulate attribution of donors’ funds to specific achievements. It is recommended, therefore, that rather than maintaining the approach that asks ‘What happened with this dollar?’ UN Women articulates progress in terms of the counter-factual – asking ‘but for this dollar, would this gain have been made?’ which also allows for greater appreciation of the contribution that donors make, rather than trying to artificially disaggregate donor funds.
All the issues raised above about attribution should not, however, prevent UN Women from being able to document – at least internally – its own progress against its stated aims. The ISG evaluation team found that all four country offices are relatively weak both in documenting progress and in measuring change. While this is understandable for busy programme officers who are engaged in implementing activities rather than reflection and report-writing, these tasks are important for the sustainability of the programme and for building a body of knowledge on the women, peace and security agenda. It is also important for making the case that work on women, peace and security is catalytic for change across peacebuilding.

During the country visits, the evaluation team identified two examples that had not been documented by the country offices: Firstly, in Liberia, action by women from a Peace Hut\(^{19}\) had resulted in the removal of a local police commander who was known to be violent. The process of his removal made it clear that the community expected their local police to be accountable and the subsequent commander has taken a more community-friendly approach to policing. Secondly, in Timor-Leste, the programme invested or ‘frontloaded’ in building national capacity to lay the foundations for the National Action Plan. As well as ensuring more sustainability of the immediate programme aims than if expertise had been brought in from abroad, it has resulted in greater understanding of the need for cross-departmental support to security sector issues.

This gap in capacity has implications for resourcing. Either within country offices or at least at regional offices, UN Women should have the capacity to investigate, capture and communicate examples of promising practice, positive (or negative) unintended consequences and evidence of what works well with regarding to the women, peace and security agenda. The Uganda country office has recognised this and has recently (2014) recruited a Communications and Advocacy Specialist.

Some prominent examples of impact at the country level include:

**Changes in men’s behaviour:** In target communities, the evaluation teams found that men spontaneously spoke about their own changed behaviour and changing social norms towards violence against women, particularly domestic violence. In Liberia men who had been trained years ago by a national men’s organisation were still proud to espouse values of rights and non-violence. In Timor-Leste men spoke of their realisation that women are partners to be valued.

**Women’s participation:** Women supported by the programme in Liberia, Timor-Leste and Haiti have used their new or strengthened confidence and organisational capacity to engage at local or – less often – national level on issues of community security as well as gender-based violence. They perceive their security as bound up with the community and the country as a whole. Women in all the programme countries remember the violent conflict and the impact it had on their communities, as well as themselves individually.

**Communities of practice:** In Timor-Leste the programme has developed ‘communities of practice’ where government representatives, civil society, security sector personnel and others including international organisations come together to learn and ensure that this learning is put into practice.

---

\(^{19}\) Henry’s Town, Gbarpolou County

“I used to get drunk and beat my wife. The brothers from SOAP talked to me about it and now I have given up the drink so my wife and I live together in peace”

Community member, Gbengbeh village, Uganda

“Men and women are equal now. We [men] can serve as an advocate [for the WPS agenda]. We can meet with the aggressors to educate them”

Male community member, Borgne, Haiti
Local security institutions: In Haiti, women’s organisations have been instrumental in forming and shaping the local security committees. Given the lack of state provision and the remote nature of some of these communities, they rely largely on deeply localised institutions. For women’s own security and that of the entire community, it is crucial that these bodies are able to protect and promote women’s security. In Pader, Uganda, community activists’ work with local police officers has resulted in arrests and prosecutions that would not otherwise have happened, while in Liberia women activists supported by the programme mobilised the community structures to remove a criminal gang that was threatening to take over a whole community. Efforts to advance the recruitment of women into security institutions have been less consistent; in Liberia recruitment of women police officers seemed to have stalled for lack of immediately-available funds although in Uganda the use of gender-specific titles for women in the police was identified as indicative of their second-class status and removed as a result of advocacy related to the programme.

Policy level: In Timor-Leste, the process for developing a National Action Plan (NAP) on women, peace and security has been intensely collaborative and locally-owned. UN Women and its partners are helping the government to draw up a NAP which draws on good practice elsewhere, while remaining firmly ‘Timorese’. In Liberia, UN Women has been instrumental in the new Gender Policy for the national police force which is practical, user-friendly and includes provision for monitoring and evaluation.

Sustainability
All country programmes are making efforts to ensure sustainability after the life of the FC2GSI programme. This takes the form both of securing future international funding and in building national capacity.

In Liberia the UN Women team has secured both funding from the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) and a commitment from the PBF to apply the target of allocating a minimum of 15 per cent of all peacebuilding funding to women’s empowerment and gender equality, ensuring that all funded projects address the women, peace and security agenda. Moreover, as mentioned above, the PBF programme team have incorporated the agenda into their normal course of business. In Timor-Leste and Liberia, the programme has embarked with UNDP on a concurrent two-year, EU-funded women and peacebuilding programme as part of a three-country pilot (including Kosovo (1244)), due to end in October 2014. Through the ongoing commitment from Australia, more funds will be available in Uganda, although the country office will need more to cover the additional demands due to the sudden influx of South Sudanese refugees in the north as well as ongoing requirements. In building national capacity, all country offices have made good progress, particularly with civil society and, to a more limited extent, the security sector. In Uganda, police training through local partners has been successful and aimed at ensuring retention of learning. In Haiti, some of the many implementing partners have developed organisationally as well as technically and so are in a better position to continue this work. In Liberia, the work with the police force to secure an effective Gender Unit has been successful, although the Women and Children Protection Unit management appears less energetic about its mandate. Women in the Peace Huts expressed a need for further

> “Since the trainings, women have gained a sense of power because they know they can hold the leaders accountable”
> UWONET member, Uganda

20 The Uganda country office reports that it has submitted a project sheet to the UN Appeal for the South Sudan Refugee Response, using experience from Uganda and Liberia FC2GSI programme.

21 The French Embassy’s Social Development Fund is now supporting the Gulu Union of Women with Disabilities and the Gulu Women’s Economic Development and Globalization)
training and, particularly, for economic ‘empowerment’ (skills training and loans) which UN Women will fund via its economic empowerment programme and Savings and Loans Committees. In Timor-Leste, the communities of practice show potential to become self-sustaining through national ownership.

Realistic expectations regarding sustaining gains among civil society organisations or security sector institutions are required. Capacity, skills and knowledge built via trainings tend not to be sustained unless they are reinforced on an ongoing basis: staff members change roles and institutional memory is lost, and changes in management may either increase or decrease motivation levels among subordinates. UN Women appears to have been careful not to invest too heavily in infrastructure, machinery or other ‘perishable’ items. While all the programme countries are moving out of the ‘post-conflict’ phase that spurred introduction of the FC2GSI programme, the need for active peacebuilding is present in the light of current (varied) threats to their security.

3.2. Country-based findings – by location

Annex 6 contains the key findings for each country where the programme was evaluated. The following, therefore, is a synopsis of these findings.

Haiti

The programme operates within a complex environment. While security is improving, the mandate of the UN Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH) continues until at least October 2014, with the Mission sitting alongside the UN Country Team. Haiti is prone to climate-induced humanitarian crises and epidemics. It is the poorest country in the Americas.

The reform of the security sector is mainly the domain of MINUSTAH, which has its own gender unit. This unit also embraces the women, peace and security agenda and works closely with relevant government bodies to promote both the protection and participation sides of the agenda.

Most of Haiti is out of the reach of government or state security mechanisms. In rural or marginalised areas, Local Security Committees play a more significant role than the police in the lives of community members. It is at the community level that the Haiti programme is mostly focused and where its impact is greatest.

The FC2GSI programme in Haiti is mainly focused on supporting the activities of women’s organisations across the country, largely through funding. There are many grantees, of varying capacity. The FC2GSI programme manager is relatively new in position and is spread thinly across the programme. This limits her ability to both monitor and mentor each programme partner to the extent necessary to ensure that each is performing to a sufficient standard. It also reduces the level of coordination, cross-learning and cooperation between the partners. Those with greater, pre-existing capacity appear to have a greater impact, while those who might do well but lack organisational capacity are sometimes struggling.

Despite these constraints, the Haiti programme is making a difference in terms of the incidence of gender-based violence, particularly domestic violence and, thus, increasing women’s security. In terms of the relationship between gender-based violence and peacebuilding, the evaluation found that women who are active in combating gender-based violence are also playing a significant part in the Local Security Committees.

Liberia

It is a decade since the end of Liberia’s long civil war, yet the country remains poor, with limited infrastructure, weak state capacity to provide security and high prevalence of gender-based violence. Most of the population lives in rural areas. The extractive industries have the potential, on the one hand, to improve Liberia’s economic situation, or to cause or exacerbate inequalities, asset-stripping and insecurity.
The FC2GSI programme in Liberia has focused both at the community level and in institution-building with the police as primary security providers. As with Haiti, most of the community has limited contact with the state security apparatus and so communities are dependent on themselves for promoting or maintaining their own security.

The community aspect of the programme has been successful in reducing the incidence of domestic violence and increasing accountability of local police and others to the community – largely through the women involved in the programme. These initiatives have built on traditional means of dispute resolution and women’s existing activism (Liberia is fortunate to have a history of strong women’s peace activism). Women who have benefitted from the programme are quick to describe how their new confidence and ability to understand peace and security issues has enabled them to take action on behalf of the security of their entire communities.

At institutional level, UN Women works in tandem with the UN Mission in Liberia and the rest of the UN Country Team to strengthen the police service through training, policy and support to dedicated structures. Success in these areas is dependent on long-term relationship-building and adopting an incremental approach.

As in Haiti, the programme coordinator is stretched thinly. She has also had to learn quickly about programming in peace and security, planning for results and managing difficult relationships.

Liberia’s successes have included being nominated as one of the 12 pilot countries for the UN Secretary General’s Seven Point Action Plan, a series of cross-country learning visits (e.g. from Mali and to Sierra Leone) and the influence of one of the ‘Peace Hut women’ at the Commission on the Status of Women in 2014.

Timor-Leste

After years of colonialism then occupation, followed by two years of UN transitional administration, Timor-Leste became a new member state of the United Nations in 2002. The national government has ratified all the major international human rights treaties and has put in place a set of policies to address gender-based discrimination, particularly violence. The National Action Plan on women, peace and security is under development.

Women’s civil society organisations in Timor-Leste vary in their longevity and capacity. The Policy Framework and Mapping of Women, Peace and Security study conducted in 2013 found that some local organisations have functioned for over a decade, while others have sprung up to meet specific needs. Local capacity to design, implement and monitor programmes also varies across the country.

Although women were active in the liberation movement, this has not resulted in gender equality across the current society. There are few women village chiefs, women are under-represented in the civil service, ‘bride price’ is still prevalent in most communities and domestic violence is recognised as endemic.

Since 2001, UNIFEM (subsequently as UN Women) has been supporting women’s organisations to engage with state-building and in creating the conditions for women’s security. At the beginning of the FC2GSI programme, high levels of staff turnover within UN Women impeded progress. The arrival in mid-2012, however, of the current UN Women-TL senior management team and FC2GSI-TL project staff in Sept 2013 has resulted in fast-tracking national and policy level project components & tangible forward momentum. Notable results include the following:

- An unprecedented degree of exchange and engagement. There now exists a positive on-going dialogue wherein security institutions are not only receptive to the perspectives and concerns of women, but actively and visibly encourage the participation, engagement and leadership of women and women's advocacy organisations in key national policy and SSR processes;

---

The development of the NAP has been led by the Secretary of State for Security within the Ministry of Defence and Security, with active participation across the security sector, including the military. This is unusual for NAP development which traditionally sits within gender or ‘social’ ministries. The centrality of security sector ministries and departments lays the foundation for a NAP that is better implemented and more sustained;

Civil society organisations that have participated in the NAP process have spearheaded intra-regional dialogue. Initially controversial, this includes Timorese/ Indonesian dialogue. In turn, this dialogue has led to mutual learning between the two countries’ security sector institutions;

UN Women and its partners in government and civil society have created ‘Communities of Practice’ whereby women’s civil society organisations and the security sector collaborate to provide institution-building training and implementation of the women, peace and security agenda.

Areas where UN Women’s future work on peace and security would benefit from improvements include greater clarity with partners about UN Women’s mandate to support national capacity, to influence and coordinate activity, rather than to act as a more micro-level donor to ad-hoc community activism. The reality, however, is that strong women’s civil society is central to peacebuilding at all levels and requires consistent support.23 Work is still needed on helping government and civil society in Timor-Leste to fully understand the connection between tackling gender-based violence and peacebuilding per se. While many understand that there is a human rights imperative to the former, the relationship between the two is less-frequently articulated, including by women.

Uganda

While Uganda is now striving for middle-income status, a significant proportion of the population lives in poverty. Most Ugandans live in rural areas where there is still limited access to government security services. The relationship between the population and the government is not always benign; the police are known to have been heavy-handed in public order situations, for instance. The government’s approach to the protection of women from gender-based violence has at times been punitive (of women and girls) rather than constructive.24 Although the main humanitarian crises of the conflict years are over, Uganda is affected by refugee flows from neighbouring countries, particularly South Sudan.

The programme operates in rural communities in Uganda, mostly in areas affected by the long conflict in the north and in Karamoja in the Northeast. The FC2GSI programme has operated mostly to strengthen women’s civil society in these areas both to increase women’s security at the household and community level and to enable these organisations to influence the national security sector to promote women’s security. Notable successes have included the following:

- In Gulu, Kitgum and Pader districts, close cooperation between different civil society organizations and local authorities have resulted in the development of policy position papers that highlighted major security concerns in regard to women, peace and security issues and resulted in local government drafting ordinances against consumption of alcohol, GBV and protection of women’s land rights;

- In programme communities, there have been Town Hall meetings between community members, police and local governance structures that provided space for women and men to raise security issues, including the poor police response to gender-based violence;

- Programme partners have embarked on contextually-specific training of the police to improve how the latter deals with gender-based violence. In particular, this has been motivated by a

23 DFID How to note on Tackling Violence Against Women and Girls 2012
24 The President signed into law in February 2014 the ‘Pornography Act’, forbidding women from revealing their legs, breasts or thighs in public.
tendency of police to ‘mediate’ gender based violence rather than treat it as a crime under national law;

- The evaluation found that women and men reported reduced incidence of gender-based violence in programme communities. It appears that in these communities men have a greater understanding about women’s human rights.

However, the position papers and protocols mentioned above have yet to be acted upon by the concerned agencies. As with the other countries, the programme manager is stretched thinly and cannot be expected to follow each and every initiative. In future work on peace and security, therefore, the ISG evaluation team recommends that the UN Women country office carefully prioritise within the mandate to ensure it maximises the impact, and builds upon the gains, of previous work.

Again as with the other programme countries, many interviewees during the evaluation were not able to make an explicit connection between the work on gender-based violence and peacebuilding. Even those who had benefited from training on gender-based violence had little or no knowledge about the women, peace and security agenda, so it is not surprising that they were unable to make this connection. If programme partners, those trained and others benefiting from the programme are unable to make this connection, it risks diminishing the catalytic impact of UN Women’s work in the security sector as a whole.

It is hoped that the new role of UN Women as the leader of the UN Convergence Group on Gender Equality/Women’s Equality/ Gender-Based Violence will facilitate better coordination on these issues and will enable information about women, peace and security to be more easily channelled up to the UN Country Team.

3.3. Global level

FC2GSI programming at the global level falls, broadly, into the following two categories:

a) Amplifying the achievements, lessons and information from country level programmes to the global security institutions, particularly the UN Security Council and other multi-lateral bodies such as the Commission on the Status of Women and Peacebuilding Commission;

b) Building the body of evidence regarding implementation of the women, peace and security agenda through the use of indicators at global level, again with an emphasis on how the agenda is implemented in conflict-affected contexts.

Relevance

It is well documented\(^2\) that the women, peace and security agenda falls behind in implementation. While there has been much global-level attention to some areas, particularly sexual violence in conflict, women are still targeted for rape in conflicts across the globe and are excluded from formal and informal peacebuilding initiatives. At global level, the programme was highly relevant in its design and remains so today. Across the peace and security community, it is increasingly accepted that the exclusion of women’s knowledge and capacities from conflict management and peacebuilding has led - and will continue to lead – to resurging violence in countries such as Iraq and Libya while they continue to be targeted as a strategy of war in countries such as South Sudan and Syria.

The funding deficits that are a significant constraint on the FC2GSI and similar programmes were evident in 2009/10 when the programme was conceived and continue to be so today. For instance, protection (including the gender-based violence sub-cluster) continues to be the most under-funded area of any humanitarian appeal.\(^3\)

\(^2\) See, for example, the preamble to UNSC resolution 1820 (S/Res/1820), the Secretary General’s 2013 report (S/2013/525) and DFID’s annual review of the programme (2012)

\(^3\) Murray, J and Landry, J: Placing Protection at the Centre of Humanitarian Funding 2013
Effectiveness

The programme has been effective in meeting its global aims and in creating synergies with work across UN Women’s Peace and Security section as well as that by other actors in the area. For example, the global indicators on the implementation of UNSC resolution 1325, already published in 2010, have been refined and have to some extent influenced how UN Missions report against their progress on the women, peace and security agenda, as evidenced in successive Secretary-General reports to the Security Council on women, peace and security. In addition, UN Women has played an active part in driving implementation of the UN-wide gender marker\(^27\) and in the drafting of UNSC resolution 1325’s successor resolutions.

The most significant factors that have led to these successes, in the view of the ISG evaluation team, are the following:

- UN Women’s mandate to represent the views of women and their experiences of violent conflict across the globe and the readiness of successive UN Women Executive Directors to exercise this mandate;
- Growing attention and momentum by key governments in conflict-affected areas as well as traditional donors to address, particularly, sexual violence in conflict;
- Strong and continuing women’s civil society operating at the international level and supported by UN Women, to ensure that successive UNSC resolutions are directional and contextually appropriate;
- Knowledge and information from FC2GSI country programmes - and other country offices - that has informed UN Women’s representational role at global security institutions.

The FC2GSI programme could have been even more effective in achieving its aims at the global level if it had been able to produce more coherent and systematic, documented evidence of changes that are have been achieved and could be achieved at the national level. The lack of documentation of the positive links between women’s peace activism and peacebuilding, writ large, is a repeated theme of the recent Thematic Review on Gender for the Peacebuilding Support Office.\(^28\)

Efficiency

The evaluation team sought to determine whether investment at the global level has had a multiplier or catalytic effect. Key results in this regard include the following:

**The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF):** In 2010, the PBF allocated US$500,000 to UN Women. The technical input from UN Women through the FC2GSI programme (along with a small contribution from the Republic of Korea) has resulted in this allocation increasing to US$7m in 2013. This result shows that UN Women has been able successfully to make the case that investing in the women, peace and security agenda is central to the peacebuilding work of the UN across all areas.\(^29\)

UN Women has sought to use its technical capacity efficiently with regard to national level implementation of the ‘1325 indicators’, on addressing sexual violence in conflict and on security sector reform. UN Women has ensured that country offices are kept up to date with developments at the global policy level by extensive use of voice-over-internet protocol technology (at no extra cost), reducing the need for international travel from headquarters. Where technical support missions from headquarter are strictly necessary, they are ‘bundled’.

---

\(^27\) The gender marker is a UN-wide accountability framework on gender equality and women’s empowerment designed to provide a set of common measures with which to measure progress on its gender-related work, including the mainstreaming of the gender perspective across all of its operations. It aims to integrate, into all of the UN’s work, what women contribute and the impact of what the UN does on women.


\(^29\) For more information on the working of the PBF, see http://www.unpbf.org
Strong partnerships and imaginative interventions have yielded results from relatively small investments. For example, the scenario-based training materials on preventing sexual violence in conflict developed by UN Women have been adopted and utilized by troop contributing countries and peacekeeping training centres through the partnership with DPKO and other relevant entities.

In terms of the programme’s support from the global level to Zimbabwe, an investment in a technical expert at a strategic moment in time led to other donors coming on board to support UN Women’s work on security sector transformation in partnership with the Zimbabwe Peace and Security Programme.

Impact
Creating a mechanism by which global, regional and national institutions and governance structures can be held to account for the implementation of the women, peace and security agenda has been crucial for prompting and sustaining action. The ‘indicators’ work under this programme has been instrumental in promoting the Secretary-General’s Seven Point Action Plan and in holding the rest of the UN family to account, constructively, on the implementation of the UN Strategic Results Framework on Women, Peace and Security.

Global documents are only as effective as their implementation at national level. The more recent NAPs have shown an increasing tendency to include key performance indicators, demonstrating a growing acceptance that implementation is significantly supported by having an appropriate monitoring framework.

The tracking of Security Council resolutions and reports reveals that language on women’s participation and the protection of women and girls from sexual violence has become more commonplace since the programme was launched. There are Senior Gender Adviser positions in all multi-dimensional peace keeping operations and some political missions also have Gender Advisers or Senior Gender Advisers while all others have gender focal points. In addition, some missions now have ‘Women Protection Advisers’.

As the global body mandated to lead on gender equality and women’s empowerment, UN Women is expected to move away from single-issue projects to a more strategic and influential position, not least at the global level. The challenge this creates for UN Women is to demonstrate the impact of single programmes, particularly where, as here, there are positive synergies between the different areas of its work. In hindsight (and notwithstanding the organisational and strategic change from UNIFEM to UN Women), it would have been easier to demonstrate concrete impact of this programme if the programme design had included more reference to leveraging change across UN Women’s work or influencing other members of the Organisation.

---

30 The government of Norway has given around $800,000 towards a Gender and Security Sector Reform programme
32 17 NAPs now have monitoring and evaluation frameworks, many based on the global indicators.
33 http://www.peacewomen.org
### 3.4. Progress against the logframe

The programme goal (proposed impact) is as follows:

**Women in conflict and post-conflict contexts are empowered to contribute to the reduction of violent conflict through their involvement in peace-building, security sector reform, and increasing accountability for national and international commitments to SCR 1325/1820.**

By the end of programme implementation, UN Women expects to have changed the perceptions of the beneficiaries on physical security, improved women’s ability to participate in public life and reduced the tolerance of sexual and gender-based violence in targeted communities. The project will help to increase reporting of gender-based violence and referral to formal courts and services, improved police response, lower social tolerance towards violence, and greater participation of women in village mediation, local politics, post-conflict planning, and peace talks. Preventing and responding to violence against women is critical to development because, without security, girls will not enrol in schools and women will not resume farming or go to the market, nor will they participate in public life. Security sector reform which takes account of the particular role and needs of women is crucial.

**Key Finding**

Overall, the programme recovered from a shaky start, largely due to the change of mandate from UNIFEM to UN Women, a lack of capacity among (government and civil society) implementing partners, and overly-optimistic expectations of what was possible in the early years of post-conflict programming.

Constraints remain, mostly regarding budgetary restrictions which have restricted the level of oversight, technical input and knowledge management that has been possible within the programme.

Nevertheless, UN Women has undertaken good strategic partnerships with relevant organisations at community and global levels and has made a robust contribution to realising this goal. UN Women is implementing its mandate at the global level well, via the FC2GSI programme. It is demonstrating notable successes in all programme countries and particularly strong success in Liberia and Timor-Leste.

**Detailed Scoring**

**Purpose/Outcome:** To ensure that women (including the most marginalized in conflict contexts) are able to contribute to and benefit from security measures and peacebuilding, peacemaking processes at the community, national, regional and global levels through ensuring that:

1. the UN system is accountable to WPS frameworks
2. UN Women generates improved global and national mandate for WPS implementation and
3. security for women and girls is increased in selected communities

**Key Finding**

UN Women has contributed effectively, within its mandate, to achieving this outcome/purpose. The 15% allocation of Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) to women’s empowerment and gender equality is an important, outstanding aim which will be the subject of scrutiny at the 2015 review of the UN Strategic Results Framework. The number of peace agreements containing specific reference to women has increased from a baseline of 9 in 2010 to over 24 in 2014.

**Indicator 1:**
(a) Adoption of a UN system-wide implementation plan
(b) % of selected UN programming budgets (Peace Building Funds (PBF)) allocated to women’s empowerment and gender equality (WEGE)

**Target (a):** Two plans adopted
Target (b): PBF allocation to WEGE 15%; Selected programming allocating 15%

Performance:
(a) The Secretary General’s 7-point Action Plan (7PAP) has been adopted and piloted in 12 countries; The Strategic Results Framework has been adopted and will be reported on in 2015.
(b) PBF allocation to WEGE mid-term target of 10% was exceeded in 2012 but the global 15% allocation has not yet been met; Some programmes, however, have achieved 15% and some have exceeded this amount.

Indicator 2:
(a) # of National Action Plans (NAPs) on 1325 adopted by UN member states
(b) % of peace agreements worldwide with specific provisions related to women
(c) # of UN mediators who are women

Target (a): 45 NAPS
Target (b): 50 % peace agreements signed with specific provisions related to women
Target (c): 1 female UN mediator

Performance:
(a) 46 NAPs (47 including the Kosovo (1244) Action Plan)
(b) There are 24 peace agreements on record, signed since the programme’s inception, which have specific provisions relating to women. This is an aggregate figure for agreements which have multiple components (e.g. Philippines). Over the life of the programme there have been around 60 such peace agreements.
(c) In 2013, the Secretary-General appointed H.E. Mary Robinson as the Special Envoy to the Great Lakes. Three out of a total of seven members of the UN Stand-by Mediation Team are women. One of these women has responsibility for gender and social inclusion. Two women are now also in leadership positions in peace processes (Darfur and the Great Lakes). The UN Department of Political Affairs is creating a ‘talent pipeline’ of senior women for potential positions in peacebuilding positions.

Indicator 3: Change in women and girls’ attitude about security in targeted communities

Target: Reduced fear and stigma in selected communities (reduction of 10% on baselines)

Performance: The baseline survey was not repeated for due to resource constraints. Qualitative evaluation results, however, demonstrate that women and girls in programme communities are increasingly secure due to a decrease in domestic and sexual violence and that they are more ready to report violence to the local police.

Output 1: Increase civil society capacity to improve security and reduce VAWG in select communities in Haiti, Liberia, Timor-Leste and Uganda

Output 1: Performance assessment: The programme has exceeded expectations with regard to this output.

The evaluation team found that VAWG has decreased in the targeted communities due to changing social norms, increased community awareness of the fact that VAWG is a crime, improved follow up and referral of cases and enhanced support for survivors and women in the community.

Indicator 1: # of women and girls referred to support services.

Target: 2,080

Performance: A cumulative total of 2418 women have been referred to support services. This reflects a year-on-year increase in four countries. Moreover, the quality of referral has improved. In Liberia, the programme has improved police response at the local level; in Timor-Leste, the district referral network piloted in the two border districts, Bobonaro and Covalima, has been taken up by the Ministry of Social Solidarity since 2013 and is used as a model for coordinated community response to gender-based violence. The government began managing the network in 2013. In Uganda,
programme partners are focusing their referrals on the provision of legal aid by organisations competent in dealing with traumatised women and children.

Indicator 2: # of community-led initiatives to improve women’s security

Target: 8

Performance: UN Women supported 18 innovative initiatives defined and implemented at the community level. These include: Haiti: Local Security Committees which identify and take action on specific security threats, including against women and girls and ‘accompaniment’ processes to ensure that women and girls are able to follow the entire referral pathway. Liberia: 17 Peace Hut initiatives are running, adopting a traditional, alternative dispute resolution approach to cases of VAWG. If cases are serious or repeated, they are referred to the police who take the case through the prosecution process. Timor-Leste: The involvement of civil society partners in the development of the National Action Plan has led to cross-country dialogue, including with Indonesia. UN Women supported implementing partner Association of Men Against Violence (AMNK) to establish men’s networks in 13 targeted communities on prevention violence against women and girls. AMNK then organized dialogues and anti-rape football clubs for male youth to add a recreational component to the violence prevention efforts. Uganda: Town Hall meetings have been held in all programme target communities, bringing together women’s organisations, local police, traditional governance structures and other community members. Issues regarding women’s security are raised at these meetings and they are used for community sensitization on relevant national law. A set of ‘position papers’ have been written with the aim to become protocols or local bye-laws, including on issues such as alcohol abuse and women’s land ownership.

Indicator 3: # of partnership agreements that have capacity building initiatives

Target: 12

Performance: A total of 28 partnership agreements with specific capacity building initiatives are in place (eight in Haiti, nine in Liberia, three in Timor-Leste and eight in Uganda). In addition, country offices have held capacity building workshops for a larger group of women’s civil society organizations, focused on their roles in service provision and referral, as well as monitoring and evaluation.

Indicator 4: Capacity of women’s organizations to deliver services and coordinate GBV response

Target: 50 % increase in women’s rights organisations (WROs)’ caseload in target communities

Performance: This indicator had no baseline. The country programme evaluation teams found that WROs’ have increased their caseloads substantially over the life of the programme. For instance, in Liberia there is demand for Peace Hut interventions from women living far from the established Peace Hut, while in Haiti programme partners are attracting more cases than they refer. This latter indicates that referral pathways are becoming more sophisticated. Capacity to record every case remains a gap, however in all programme countries. Some programme partners only record when a literate member of the organisation is present while others take the view that they will only record cases where there is a legitimate grievance (decided subjectively). Learning packs have been developed by implementing partners in Timor-Leste to help systemize their work with village level self-help groups.

Learning exchanges between Uganda and Liberia, between Liberia and South Sudan, from Uganda to Ethiopia, from Timor-Leste to Indonesia and from Haiti to Canada have enabled UN Women’s civil society partners to avail of global good practice and promote South/South exchange. UN Women national staff have participated in regional and global learning events, such as Gender and Peacebuilding Training in New York, the Commission on the Status of Women, and a Rule of Law experts meeting in Oslo, thereby building their technical knowledge to provide capacity building to the civil society partners.
Output 2: Informal and formal security and justice actors are supported to create more secure environments for women in 4 focus countries

Output 2: Performance assessment: UN Women has exceeded expectations with regard to this output.

The momentum around the 10th anniversary of 1325 and passage of additional resolutions helped spur national security actors to enact initiatives and policies that were more gender-responsive. The evaluation confirms that the increasing the linkages, trust and communication between grassroots women and security actors is an effective strategy for improving women’s security.

Indicator 1: # of community forums established to strengthen links with formal security sector

**Target:** 16

**Performance:** A total of 37 forums are now active (8 in Haiti, 8 in Liberia, 13 in Timor-Leste and 7 in Uganda). In Haiti the local security committees are comprised mostly of men, including police officers. In Liberia, there are eight communities where the local police work directly with Peace Huts. In Timor-Leste, partner organisations have established dialogue mechanisms with traditional ‘socco’ chiefs and local security actors and through partnership with the National Department of Community Conflict Prevention (DNPCC) has established mediation mechanisms in 7 districts. In Uganda, UN Women has established a platform for addressing the justice and security needs of women with disabilities, in addition to the Town Hall mechanisms in seven communities.

Indicator 2: Change in perceptions about security sector actors in targeted communities

**Target:** 10% increase in satisfaction with police, judiciary and traditional leaders in target communities

**Performance:** The baseline survey was not repeated due to resource constraints. Qualitative evaluation results, however, show that women have increased confidence in the police in programme communities. The improved relationship between programme partners and traditional leaders should lead to improved confidence but there is a lack of evidence in this regard. There is no evidence of improved confidence in the judiciary, which is mostly outside the activities of the programme at country level.

**NOTE:** The evaluation suggests that this indicator is flawed. The programmes at country level have little to do with traditional justice mechanisms or influence over the judiciary. Women in the programme are likely, in fact, to be more dissatisfied with the judiciary as their exposure increases and their expectations are raised.

Indicator 3: # of Capacity building initiatives provided to security sector (e.g. training, provision of phone lines and vehicles, etc)

**Target:** 15

**Performance:** UN Women has developed 19 distinct capacity building initiatives over the life of the programme including police training (Liberia, Uganda, Haiti, Timor-Leste); security sector training curricula (Liberia, Timor-Leste); Handbooks/guides for police (Uganda, Timor-Leste); Gender Policy (Liberia); recruitment drives for female security sector personnel (Liberia); vehicles (Haiti, Uganda); Scenario-based training materials on sexual violence (global)

Indicator 4: # of Security Sector Institution policies supported

**Target:** 10

**Performance:** UN Women has supported 11 security sector institution policies. These include the establishment of a sub-commission in the Haitian National Police to create a specific registry for victims; the Gender Policy and recruitment campaign in the Liberian Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization; sector-wide gender policies through provision of senior technical support to the Timor-Leste Secretary of State for Security; elevation of the Ugandan Police Force Child and Family Unit into a police directorate and dropping – as a matter of policy – sex-specific nomenclature for
police officers. At global level, UN Women led the drafting and finalization of the Integrated UN Technical Guidance Note on Gender-Responsive SSR that was adopted by UN Principals in November 2012. The Note has since been disseminated to all UN peace operation working in the field of SSR to guide their interaction with national stakeholders in line with the international commitments on women, peace and security.

Output 3: UN Women influences stakeholders to implement 1325 within the UN and beyond

Output 3: Performance assessment: UN Women has exceeded expectations with regard to this output.

In addition to the results required under this output, UN Women has had some unexpected results. In September 2013, the UN Development Group adopted the “Gender Equality Marker Guidance Note,” meaning that the entire UN system moved forward in terms of tracking and accountability for gender equality. The Guidance Note calls on all entities to develop their own discreet targets for financial allocation to gender equality and women’s empowerment.

UN Women also made significant contributions to the adoption of two intergovernmental agreements in 2013, namely a Peacebuilding Commission Declaration of Women’s Economic Empowerment for Peacebuilding (PBC/7/OC/3) and Security Council resolution 2122 (2013). SCR 2122 (2013) mandates the Secretary-General to develop a Global Study on the implementation of 1325 that will be presented to the Security Council at the 2015 High Level Review to be held in the Security Council in October. UN Women has been tasked to lead and coordinate this process. The Global Study offers a crucial opportunity to further push Member State and UN accountability to Women, Peace and Security frameworks.

Indicator 1: 1325 Indicators developed and reported against

Target: Data is reported against at least 50 % of the indicators

Performance: In the 2013 SG’s Report to the Security Council on Women, Peace and Security, UN Women coordinated UN system wide reporting on 66 per cent of the indicators (22 out of 33). It is expected that three more indicators will be reported on in the 2014 report, which will be issued by the Secretary-General in September 2014.

Indicator 2: # of gender and peacebuilding plans adopted by the UN system that were driven by UN Women

Target: 2

Performance: UN Women drove the adoption and development of two system wide frameworks for accountability to WPS commitments, namely the Secretary-General’s Seven Point Action Plan on Gender-Responsive Peacebuilding (2010) and the UN Strategic Results Framework on WPS (2011). These two plans have become the accountability regime within the UN system, as they are the first frameworks to establish concrete and time bound targets. UN Women has completed several baselines studies to establish baselines for the various targets and progress against them will be a major component of the 2015 Global Study and High Level Review. UN Women’s guidance note to national governments and civil society for developing national action plans includes guidance on applying the global indicators at national level.

Indicator 3: # of UNCTs that self-nominate as Seven Point Action Plan pilots

Target: 12

Performance: Twelve UN Country Teams have nominated as Seven Point Action Plan targets, namely Liberia, Nepal, Kyrgyzstan, Guatemala, Sudan, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Comoros, Chad, DRC, CAR and Sierra Leone. UN Women has been providing technical support to most of them to assist with meeting their targets. Liberia, Nepal and Kyrgyzstan are all meeting or exceeding their targets, with the latest Liberia Peacebuilding Priority Plan allocating 20 per cent of the overall funding to women’s
empowerment and gender equality. Sudan, Guatemala, Guinea, Comoros and Sierra Leone are all on track to meet targets, while the remainder are held back by political and security issues.

**Indicator 4:** # of National Action plans on 1325/1820 that are supported by UN Women and have concrete indicators for tracking progress

**Target:** 22

**Performance:** UN Women provided technical assistance to development of the following **23 adopted** NAPs and one Regional Action Plan (Pacific): UK, Uganda, Liberia, Guinea, Chile, Sierra Leone, Rwanda, Philippines, DRC, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Nepal, Guinea-Bissau, Serbia, Croatia, Georgia, USA, Senegal, Australia, Nigeria, Macedonia, Kyrgyzstan, Iraq, Kosovo (within the terms of UNSCR 1244).

Of these, the following **17 have M&E frameworks** for tracking progress: Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Cote d’Ivoire, Croatia, DRC, Georgia, Guinea, Liberia, Macedonia, Nepal, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, UK, USA and Kosovo (1244).

UN Women has also been supporting governments of South Sudan, Cambodia, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Myanmar and Timor-Leste to elaborate NAPs with concrete indicators for tracking progress.

**Indicator 5:** # of knowledge products developed and disseminated related to indicators, NAPs, peacebuilding and SSR

**Target:** 17

**Performance:** UN Women has produced the following **18 knowledge products:**

3. “Women’s Participation in Peace Negotiations: Connections Between Presence & Influence”
5. “Gender and Conflict Analysis”
12. Reparations, Development and Government


15. **This Hut is Working For me:** Liberian women and girls making peace in their communities.” International Journal of Feminist Politics. February 2014
16. “**Peace in the Home, Peace in the Nation: Gender Responsive Security Sector Reform.**” Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of the Armed Forces (DCAF). **Forthcoming**
17. UN Integrated Technical Guidance Note on Gender-Responsive Security Sector Reform. November 2012
18. Guidance Note of the Secretary-General: Reparations for Conflict-Related Sexual Violence. June 2014
3.5. Constraints

National level

**Partner organisations:** Perhaps the main ongoing constraint facing all four country offices is the lack of capacity of implementing partners. UN Women has tried, where national capacity permits, to maximise the opportunities of working with national and sub-national partners, rather than through large international NGOs. This, done effectively, contributes to greater impact and sustainability. However, in many cases, the FC2GSI programme has focused on building the capacity of the implementing organisations to do ‘peace and security’ work, rather than building the core organisational capacity of the leadership or membership. This is reflected in the paucity of documentary evidence of successes or impact. In some cases, the partners themselves have not even recognised that they have had an impact as they are not accustomed to thinking in ‘results’ terms but are ‘just getting on with the job at hand’. In Liberia, for instance, when Peace Hut women barricaded logging trucks from their community until the company agreed to comply with its obligations, the women did not think to inform UN Women of this success, regarding it simply as a necessary task for them to do.

Partner organisations are, typically, under-resourced and so have been largely if not entirely dependent on UN Women to support their peace and security work. This means that they are not able to financially ‘front-load’ their work so when UN Women’s funds have been slow to come through, the work itself cannot start. In Uganda, this resulted in some projects having an implementation window of only a few months; too short to make any meaningful difference.

**UN Women human resources:** Linked to this constraint is that FC2GSI programme staff members are few in number and stretched across national programmes. In some cases, the programme coordinator is responsible for the entire peace and security portfolio and may also be tasked with other violence against women responsibilities. The programme coordinators are all hardworking, competent and dedicated professionals. Except for Uganda, they have had to learn almost everything they know about peace and security ‘on the job’. This places an extra burden on the headquarters’ staff to provide the requisite levels of technical support, particularly given that there is no dedicated expertise in the regional offices. Uganda is an exception, where there is in-house, formally trained technical expertise in peace and security (and monitoring and evaluation) and the Country Representative has a peace and security background.

As identified in an earlier evaluation of UN Women’s work on violence against women in the East and Horn of Africa, there is a paucity of expertise in this area across UN Women’s country offices. Again, this places an extra burden on peace and security staff who may not have the requisite expertise.

**Monitoring and evaluation capacity:** Except for Uganda, no country office has a dedicated monitoring and evaluation staff member. While this does not mean that the programme’s actual achievements are held back, it does mean that the programme manager is often unable to demonstrate and report on results. The country level logframes – particularly the indicators – are weak as a result and do not reflect actual programme achievements.

**Government capacities:** All four programme countries have benefited from years of international support and are moving steadily towards greater economic and institutional stability. Nevertheless, as with all governments, capacity and commitment to the women, peace and security agenda varies across the ministries, departments and agencies. The evaluation found some government representatives to be reluctant to engage with the agenda or held back by political constraints, while others were eager to promote WPS and women’s rights and recognised the catalytic nature of doing so. Even where interest and commitment exists, government capacities and staff time to engage and coordinate are insufficient.

---

34 Maguire, S et al (2012), Social Development Direct (unpublished)
Global level

**Balance between the pillars of the agenda:** Since UNSC resolution 1820 was passed in 2008, there has been a sustained upsurge of attention on the issues of sexual violence in violent conflict (for example SCRs 1960 and 2106). This has been reinforced by the UN Secretary-General’s UNite campaign, subsequent resolutions at the UN SC, the conclusions of the 57th Commission on the Status of Women (2013) and the CEDAW Committee’s General Recommendation 30, among others. Although two of the UNSC resolutions subsequent to 182035 (and, indeed, 1820 itself) also pay attention to women’s participation, this has generally had a lower profile on the international stage. The challenge for the FC2GSI programme and for UN Women and its partners generally is to ensure that the duality of participation and protection is maintained from a gender and women’s human rights perspective; to maintain the thrust of ensuring that women, their needs, rights and capacities are represented in decision-making at the community, national and global levels while – at the same time – striving to make the widespread and systematic use of sexual violence in times of conflict an historical fact.

**Funding:** The programme budget has not been commensurate with expectations either from the donors or UN Women itself. The imperative to ‘do more with less’ or ‘make do’ has resulted in false economies (such as having one programme manager per programme country), no dedicated M&E capacity for the programme and little by way of extra logistical support to run the programme at national level. In every programme country, partners state (and the evaluation has found) that they would benefit from more frequent, more intensive mentoring support from the UN Women country office.

The size of the budget has also meant that UN Women headquarters has had to spend time finding extra funds for the South Sudan and Zimbabwe operations, despite the urgent needs of the former.

**Organisational**

UNIFEM designed the FC2GSI programme which has been implemented largely by UN Women. It is important to remember that UN Women takes on the mandate of all its predecessor entities, not only UNIFEM, and so its approach at country level, even more than at the global level, has had to adapt. Programme partners and country office staff members have had to change from being a Fund which works almost exclusively with women’s civil society to a more significant actor within the UN family. Moreover, the corporate resources and facilities were not ready for the change in mandate and its implications, leading to delays in programme delivery and shortened time-scales, loss of credibility with some partners and a waste of (scarce) staff time, including the time taken to organise delegated financial authority. While every financial decision had to go through the regional office (itself overburdened and adjusting to the change of mandate), it was impossible for programme staff in the country offices to be efficient with disbursal of funds to programme partners. This has been resolved and has released staff time in both the country and regional offices.

In the 2012 annual review, DFID found that delays in recruiting the country representatives as well as programme staff were holding back programme delivery. This was particularly acute in Uganda where the government took a long time to consider – and then refuse - a proposed country representative.

None of the FC2GSI country offices have their own website or webpage within regional websites. Nor do they produce separate communications materials highlighting or analysing their work. This is not a corporate position as some country offices (such as Nigeria or the Multi-Country office in India) do have their own webpage which explains current events and campaigns. This constraint means that the programme staff cannot publicise their work at country level except through the headquarters website. It also means that other UN Women country offices and other organisations cannot easily learn from the lessons or achievements of the FC2GSI country programmes.

---

35 UN SC resolutions 1889 and 2122
3.6. Risk mitigation Measures

The programme design identified a set of assumptions for the successful delivery of the programme. At country level, these mainly relate to partners in government and civil society being able and willing to address the women, peace and security agenda while at policy level they mainly relate to UN Women being able to exercise sufficient influence in inter-governmental processes. Risk mitigation measures at country level comprised establishing positive relationships with government counterparts and directing the majority of the programme through local partners, building on existing mechanisms and approaches (in turn reducing the risk that the women, peace and security agenda would be seen as a cultural imposition). Risk mitigation measures at policy level were less robust; UN Women depended on its leadership of the agenda across the UN system and its mandate (supported as it was by many Member States). In addition, UN Women has established formal or semi-formal partnership agreements with other UN entities which lay the foundation for positive collaboration and mutual accountability. For future programmes, UN should build on these partnerships, conducting joint reviews where possible and should establish corporate partnership agreements with others who may be sharing the same territory such as UNFPA or OHCHR as well as the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the Department for Political Affairs (DPA) with whom UN Women already has joint programmes. These would build on existing arrangements such as the partnership with the Justice Rapid Response mechanism (jointly with OHCHR) and the Inter-Agency Standing Committee on WPS.

Working on peace and security always brings the risk of working in fragile contexts. As UN Women’s peace and security work is rolled out to other conflict-affected countries, it will need to have robust risk-management mechanisms in place to allow, for instance, for continued support to programme partners even where UN regulations prevent programme staff from conducting field work.

3.7. Unintended consequences

Working on women, peace and security in a fluid, post-conflict transitional context necessarily challenges programme design. The weakness of the original logframe makes it difficult to attribute results of the things that UNW intended to happen to the FC2GSI programme; hence, identifying unintended outcomes and reliably attributing them to FC2GSI is equally difficult. That said, a number of positive outcomes that took place among implementing partners that were not articulated at the programme outset are as follows:

- In Liberia, women in the target communities with greater capacity and confidence as a result of programme inputs are able to contribute to the work of other programmes e.g. distribution of commodities supplied by UNFPA through the Peace Hut mechanism, saving UNFPA from having to employ field-based extension workers.
- The decision of the government of Timor-Leste to pursue a NAP on 1325, which it had been reluctant to do prior.
- The engagement of the Henry’s Town Peace Hut women (Liberia) in protests over illegal logging that resulted in the Ministry of Forestry being sacked and was covered by the BBC and other international media outlets.
- The adoption of the position paper on disabled women’s land rights by the Gulu municipality as a local ordinance following the Town Hall meetings.
- Technical and organizing support provided to Member States and civil society that resulted in normative advancements such as the SGBV criterion in the Arms Trade Treaty and the adoption of Security Council resolutions 2106 (2013) and 2122 (2013), as well as the Peacebuilding Commission declaration on Women’s Economic Empowerment for Peacebuilding on 26 September 2013.

3.8. Value for money – DFID’s “3 Es with Equity”

The FC2GSI programme was designed before the discipline of developing ‘value for money’ metrics became prevalent in development programmes, and so these are not apparent within the

---

The global evaluation of the contribution of UN Women to peace and security also made this recommendation.
programme documents. While the headquarters and country programme teams have a basic understanding of the DFID’s approach to value for money the focus is more on the concept of value rather than money.

Adopting DFID’s paradigm for measuring value for money, nevertheless, it is apparent that the FC2GSI programme meets all “3 Es plus Equity” criteria. Where there have been weaknesses, these do not undermine the overall finding.

**Economy:** This measures the cost of inputs. The UN Women programme teams are aware of having a small budget and so pay close attention to how programme funds can be spent most effectively and efficiently. The ISG evaluation team saw evidence across all countries that UN Women has sought to reduce cost drivers and to prevent wastage of funds. In Liberia, for instance, the office the UN Women country office seeks to maximise the utility of field visits through use of all staff (including appropriately-skilled support staff such as drivers) in programme activities with partners while in Timor-Leste the programme team uses national consultants for technical assistance wherever possible. The issues raised in this report with regard to planning and robust monitoring would further increase UN Women’s performance in this regard by reducing any wastage.

It is also relevant to note that (as is often the case with programmes that rely on women’s organisations) FC2GSI has relied heavily on the unpaid work of women’s rights and women’s peace activists in all programme countries. DFID’s ‘How to’ note on tackling violence against women and girls (2012) recognises the importance of ensuring that women’s rights organisations are adequately resourced to maximise their potential and to ensure that women’s work is properly recognised.

**Efficiency:** This measures outputs relative to inputs. The UN Women programme has achieved against its milestones as described in the logframe and, further, has leveraged financial and other support from international organisations such as the Peacebuilding Fund and the European Union as well as national governments so that impact of the programme can be realised past the end-date of the programme’s funding. The country teams also demonstrate that they have used the convening power of UN Women to create synergies between programme resources and other resources – both national and international. This is demonstrated in Uganda through the Town Hall meetings, in Timor-Leste through a concerted drive to obtain national (state) ownership and in Liberia through leveraging funds from the Ministry of Gender and Development.

The evaluation team was interested to see an unanticipated result with regard to efficiency in Liberia, whereby women in the target communities who are more confident, able to make demands more positively and use organisational skills are better able to contribute to the work of other programmes (see Unintended Consequences, above).

**Effectiveness:** This measures the outcome relative to the inputs. It requires evidence that the money spent has led to the desired outcome. Across all four countries, the evaluation has found that the programme has achieved both a reduction in gender-based violence and greater participation by women in peacebuilding activities. By removing the obstacles to women’s greater involvement and influence over peacebuilding, UN Women has assured that more women are able to benefit from peacebuilding interventions. As the context – and drivers of insecurity – shift, the programme has laid the foundations to enable women in the four countries and the respective national security sector institutions better to respond.

At global level, the work of the FC2GSI programme has had a multiplier effect through its influence on global institutions. UN Women has demonstrated its value in terms of technical expertise and is likely to continue to do so, particularly with regard to the 2015 high level review of the Strategic Results Framework and through the work on indicators which both influence the response of the entire UN system and the development of national action plans. At country level, the cross-nation learning visits promise to result in a return on investment in countries that are not the subject of this programme.
**Equity:** The entire programme is focused on women living in conflict-affected contexts. Within this sector of society, the programme also focuses on those living in remote, rural or marginalised areas and is starting to address the most marginalised, such as women with disabilities in Uganda.

For the future, UN Women can improve on realising (and demonstrating) value for money by more investment in monitoring and evaluation, including value for money metrics and by producing more learning resources and knowledge products for use across the Organisation and by others in government and civil society. UN Women and its donor partners would also be well advised to focus on ‘effectiveness’ rather than over-emphasising ‘economy’. In particular, it will be important to ensure that there are adequate funds to ensure that programmes are able to realise their potential. Striving to keep costs down and ‘make do’ can be a false economy in ‘value for money’ terms.

### 3.9. Programme adjustments

**Implementation of recommendations from reviews**

In line with its current policy, DFID conducted an annual review of the programme in 2012 and made recommendations for change. Recommendations relating to the logframe were mostly taken on board, benefiting UN Women by focusing on indicators at output level for which UN Women could be held to account. The following are the main remaining recommendations:

i) That UN Women should focus on supporting Member States to operationalise their NAPs and track progress. UN Women has complied with this recommendation.

ii) That much of the focus of the programme so far has been on the community-led initiatives and the processes of establishing partnerships. For the rest of the programme, greater attention should be given to the policy level to ensure national reforms are responding to women’s security needs. UN Women has complied with this recommendation in terms of devoting resources to the global policy level but has not taken away from community-led initiatives to do so.

iii) That there should be greater staff capacity to increase day-to-day capacity-building support to local implementing partners, particularly for monitoring and evaluation and for reporting. While much was done by way of recruiting staff members at country offices, largely to support capacity-building, most of the country offices themselves still need capacity on monitoring and evaluation.

iv) UN Women should become the official convener of all gender marker data. This would give UN Women enhanced oversight and authority within the UN system to collect, collate and analyse data. UN Women is now the custodian of the System Wide Action Plan (SWAP) for the Implementation of the Chief Executive Board System Wide Policy on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment.

**Adaptation to changing contexts in the four programme countries under review**

Programmes in conflict-affected contexts need to be flexible and adapt to the changing environment. In three out of the four programme countries evaluated, there is good evidence of such adaptability.

In Liberia, threats to security today arise from the advent of the extractives industries with associated levels of transient (mostly male) labour. There is also an apparent increase in low-level organised criminality. At the same time, the UN Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) is drawing down, based on the belief that the Government of Liberia is now in a position - with continued support from the UN Country Team – to take care of issues such as security sector reform and necessary governance reforms. UN Women’s partners at community level have shifted to meet the changes they are experiencing. There is evidence of Peace Hut women using their organisational capacity and credibility with the communities’ leadership to adjust to these changes. The evaluation team saw examples of Peace Hut women taking on the extractive industries and recruiting the chieftain structure to protect their communities from security threats.

---
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UN Women has also adapted by ensuring that the new PBF adheres to the gender marker and in ensuring that all new PBF projects in Liberia meet the 15% target for addressing gender and women’s role in peacebuilding, in addition to the programme funds leveraged from the PBF and the government itself.

In future, UN Women will need to ensure that it continues to adapt to the actual drawdown of UNMIL, not least because this may mean a reduction in the availability of bilateral donors’ funds. It will also be important for successor programmes robustly to engage with the chiefdom structure and with new, state-level institutions on extractives and on decentralisation.

In Haiti, there have also been changes in the operating environment since the inception of the programme. While the humanitarian crises have now abated, the country is prone to major climate-induced events which have an impact on women’s security and on women’s ability to continue to participate in peacebuilding. UN Women and the gender unit in MINUSTAH should have a productive, synergistic relationship, respecting the division of labour. While there was evidence of the division of labour - UN Women focuses at the community level, while MINUSTAH focuses on security sector reform – the evaluation team found that is more ‘siloed’ than a partnership. This may be partly due to design of the Haiti country programme, where UN Women has a plethora of community-based implementing partners and the programme is still largely based on the UNIFEM model of a fund. Also, nationally led efforts at security sector reform have been delayed. If UN Women is serious about working on women, peace and security in Haiti, however, it will need to adjust to the eventual draw-down on MINUSTAH. A first step will be to review the relationship with MINUSTAH and with national government as well as with the implementing partners to ensure that UN Women is fulfilling its mandate at the country level. It is important that the new Peace and Security Advisor in the UN Women regional office provides some direction and leadership in this regard.

In Timor-Leste, Priorities and opportunities alike have moved within the programme’s lifespan. After the recovery and reconstruction phases, Timor-Leste is now in ‘transition to development’. The withdrawal of peace-keeping forces, elections & ensuing changes in government in 2012 presented critical challenges and risks that stretched capacity of key institutions - particularly national security institutions and FC2GSI’s key partner, the Secretary of State for Security (SES). SES staff characterise the period from 2010 to early 2013 as ‘exceptionally challenging’ with limited resources to allocate to FC2GSI-TL activities before the multiple challenges/risks of 2012 were managed and met. The Timor-Leste programme has adapted to these changes by investing in building relationships with the national government counterparts and bringing civil society and government together. The programme team has been careful to align with national priorities and pace, while introducing and encouraging the women, peace and security agenda.

In Uganda, the programme also operates in an environment of change. The acute humanitarian crisis in the north is now over and the vast majority of displaced persons either returned or resettled. Acholi communities in the war-affected areas are, however, still marginalised and living in poverty, as well as dealing with the impact of a war which has only been over for seven years. At the same time, the violence in South Sudan has resulted in an influx of refugees into an area which is already struggling to cope, leading to tensions between the two communities.

The operating environment is perhaps less conducive to the women, peace and security agenda than it was at the programme’s inception. The legislative context has become more conservative and restrictive of women’s freedoms. Issues are also emerging such as endemic levels of violence against women with disabilities.

UN Women’s response to these changes has been to continue to support women’s organisations as they adapt to the changing context and emerging issues and to be flexible about the priorities of their partners. Simultaneously, it has ensured a high level of transparency and collaboration with the government and between government and civil society.
Adaptation to UN Women’s changed mandate from UNIFEM

The change of mandate to UN Women during the currency of the programme has presented significant challenges to the programme, particularly at country office level. These have been described above.

UN Women has adapted to these changes by making the necessary corporate changes such as in delegated financial authority and in recruiting new (or re-recruiting) Country Representatives and deputies. It is more questionable, however, whether UN Women was able to communicate the change in mandate to implementing partners, government counterparts or the UN Missions (in Liberia and Haiti). As mentioned above, community organisations and government counterparts may still tend to expect UN Women to behave as a donor fund. This can mean that community organisations are unaware of UN Women’s capacity to coordinate and provide technical expertise, while government counterparts may be surprised that they are also expected to contribute financially, rather than being ‘bankrolled’ for work on women’s security.

The programme teams in country offices are demonstrating, however, that they understand and are ready to apply UN Women’s mandate. This is particularly clear in Timor-Leste and Liberia.

UN Country Teams (as distinct from the UN Missions) expect UN Women to adopt the role of coordinating and leading their work on gender equality and women’s human rights. With regard to women, peace and security, UN Women will have to ensure that it has sufficient staff (both in terms of numbers and seniority) to fulfil this legitimate expectation.

38 The evaluation in Liberia found that some government counterparts viewed ‘support’ from UN Women as substantive only where it was financial.
3.10. Conclusions

National

- **Programme planning**: It is important to be realistic about partners’ capacities, both in government and civil society and to be clear about expected results. Agreeing a time-frame and ensuring that there is adequate monitoring with ‘break clauses’ if necessary is likely to reduce tensions between UN Women and its partners and to enable more efficiency in spend. In Liberia, for example, over-optimistic planning has resulted in a set of police motorbikes sitting idle in the police station. While this may not be financially significant in the programme’s context, it diminishes the credibility of the programme and, obviously, frustrates the programme’s objectives.

- **Monitoring and Evaluation**: It is apparent that the programme would have benefited from country offices having a monitoring and evaluation capacity, either in the country office or readily available and able to dedicate time to country level programmes from the regional office. This will ensure that the indicators and benchmarks are clear and that they are achievable while stretching. Future programming monitoring and evaluation frameworks should also ensure that measurement does not depend on costly or labour-intensive means of evaluation. Programme level outputs should be clearly linked to the ‘outcome’ or ‘purpose’ level.

- **Knowledge Management**: Future monitoring and evaluation frameworks should include a ‘learning’ or knowledge-management dimension, so that the programme systematically transmits information and lessons learned across the programme countries and to policy level. This could also include knowledge management as an output in its own right (e.g. learning events or briefing papers). The previous point regarding documenting progress is also relevant to knowledge management.

- **Communication**: The evaluation team found that partners (civil society, government counterparts and UN entities) and communities would have benefited from knowing more about the women, peace and security agenda and how this relates to their own contexts. For instance, while personnel in UN Missions in Liberia and Haiti are aware of the imperative need to address gender-based violence and its importance in addressing women’s security, they are less cognisant of how this relates to peacebuilding and, therefore, their own work. Government counterparts, similarly, understand how having more women in the security sector is a ‘good thing’ *per se* and because it improves police response to gender-based violence but are less informed about how gendered security sector reform is catalytic for generic change.

- **Regional Office Support**: UN Women’s regional offices are well-placed, in theory, to provide technical support to country programmes. The evaluation team did not find, however, that country offices benefited from this support either regarding peace and security or on violence against women and girls. The latter is especially relevant as not all the programme officers in each country team are subject-matter experts.

- **Alignment with National Institutions**: In descending order, the Timor-Leste, Liberia, Uganda and Haiti programmes all demonstrate the need for alignment with emerging and potential national institutions and processes. In Timor-Leste, the programme has prioritised working with national institutions, using the opportunity and the urgency of the NAP process to make sure that there is cross-government support for implementation of the women, peace and security agenda. In Uganda, the Town Hall meetings at community level provide opportunities for bringing communities and government counterparts together and for understanding government priorities at the local level, as well as those of the communities they serve.

Linked to the above, UN Women country offices should in future adopt a political economy analysis approach to peace and security work (otherwise known as ‘thinking and acting politically’). Being aware of the developments in the political environment, the incentives for the various actors and the opportunities that may arise ensures that the programme is able to adapt the programme according to the emerging situation. This will entail active and deliberate
engagement with government and non-state institutions and processes, such as the traditional governance structures, national processes set up to deal with the changing economic situation (e.g. oil revenues in Uganda).

- **Work with Men:** The country-level programmes have worked to a greater or lesser extent with men to recruit them into promoting the women, peace and security agenda. This has been particularly effective at community level in Liberia. In Timor-Leste, the programme has (tacitly) acknowledged that men are in the majority of leadership positions and works with them in their professional capacity rather than ‘as men’. The advantage of the latter approach is that it encourages people to do their job well, rather than doing something ‘for women’; it makes promoting the women, peace and security agenda a matter of good practice and ‘common sense’ rather than an additional burden of work. It will be important for successor programmes to ensure that, at community level, working with men as *men* avoids the well-documented pitfalls (such as diversion of funds from women’s organisations or elite capture of civil society).

- **Partnerships:** For programmes in emerging contexts such as South Sudan, an important lesson can be learned about working in close partnership with gender advisers and substantive, security sector actors in UN Missions, as well as the rest of the UN Country Team. UN Women’s mandate should make this easier; it will rely on the Country Representatives establishing positive relationships with the UN Missions and in demonstrating (as well as asserting) the role that UN Women has to play.

**Global**

- **Technical Expertise:** UN Women has established itself as a substantive technical leader in the field of peace and security since the advent of this programme and the establishment of the Peace and Security section. It has also created strong partnerships with the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) and the DPA, amongst others. These partnerships can be further developed and could benefit from a review of the joint strategies. This will help future programmes to build collaboration and synergies with others in the Organisation and can then be rolled out to build linkages with other areas such as justice, economic empowerment and women’s political participation.

- **Communication:** Communication is key to good programme implementation and sustainability. It will be important for UN Women to develop communications and knowledge products and to publicise these quite aggressively. As the FC2GSI programme comes to its end, it would be useful for successor programmes and for others working on the women, peace and security agenda to have a ‘Lessons Learned’ review, including successes and findings. While it is always important for UN Women to promote its own good work, this review should be more of a global learning tool than a ‘showcasing’ opportunity.

Linked to the above, this programme has experience of bringing women from the community to global events. This is powerful and needs to be sustained and repeated. UN Women could learn from these initiatives and those of other organisations, particularly civil society, in bringing women from programme communities to regional as well as global forums.

- **Monitoring and Evaluation:** The programme’s monitoring and evaluation framework involved a baseline survey in all four programme countries. While this revealed some interesting results and helped direct the programme, it was intensive for the country offices in cost and labour. UN Women took the decision that this ‘end-line’ evaluation would not replicate the baseline survey which has saved programme costs but also meant that the results are not directly comparable. It also did not help to reflect desired changes at the global level. For future programming, it will be important to develop monitoring and learning frameworks that are realistic and tied to learning.
3.11. **Further Recommendations**

The following recommendations are separated into their target audience. The majority are for UN Women at global and country office level while there are a number for donors (particularly DFID as a major donor to the women, peace and security agenda) and a few for national governments in programme countries.

**For UN Women to embed the work of the programme and to take it forward**

The evaluation team recommends the following:

i. Invest now in getting ‘what worked’ stories from country offices (these four and others where the programme is operational), documenting them and creating knowledge products for dissemination. These knowledge products should include a comparison between this programme and the UNDP/EU project in Timor-Leste and Liberia.

ii. The Security Council will conduct a review of the Strategic Results Framework for implementing the women, peace and security agenda in 2015. UN Women will need to be ready with knowledge products and strategic visits from programme beneficiaries. This will also be an opportunity to consolidate partnerships across the UN family as well as with international civil society.

iii. UN Women’s work on peace and security is reflected to a significant extent within the ‘peace and security’ community in UN New York headquarters and the Security Council. It is recommended that UN Women explore and exploit opportunities to work with other global institutions such as the Human Rights Council and the human rights treaty monitoring bodies. A review – jointly with UN Women’s leadership and governance section of how countries have adopted CEDAW General Recommendation 30 on women in conflict could be a good start.

iv. Linked to the above, UN Women should make a stronger connection between international and regional human rights instruments and the women, peace and security agenda. For instance, attention by country offices to the implementation of relevant provisions in the Maputo Protocol and the Belem do Para Convention would strengthen the global work as well as that at country level.

v. At country level, UN Women’s future programmes should strengthen their focus on security sector reform. Where there is a UN Mission, it is important for UN Women to make a substantive contribution and where there is no UN Mission, it is crucial that UN Women engage with national counterparts in this regard.

vi. Again at country level, future programmes should take account of the multiple obstacles to women’s participation in peacebuilding and the connections between peacebuilding, poverty and women’s political engagement.

vii. UN Women’s work on the global indicators has been ground-breaking and should be helpful to governments as they draw up or review their national action plans. It is recommended that UN Women liaise more robustly with the EU and the AU to help develop the indicators for these organisations to work in turn with their own member states and as regional bodies.

viii. Linked to the above, it will be important for UN Women to systematise its engagement with regional peace and security bodies as well as the gender machinery in the AU and EU. This should be budgeted in future programmes and should use the capacities (or create capacities) within UN Women’s regional offices.

"In the future, there is a need to plan more strongly at the suco (village) and aldeia levels so that UN Women can see and know our situation".

Male community member, Timor-Leste
ix. The FC2GSI programme has made significant gains. It will be important for future programmes to prioritise these successes to maximise their impact over time.

To DFID and other donors with a particular commitment to the WPS agenda

x. Invest sufficient resources to ensure value for money. Keeping budgets small (reducing the cash spend on a programme) may in fact result in poorer value for money.

xi. Support women’s civil society in conflict-affected countries. Donors are reluctant to fund many small projects, so they should allocate a fund at country level for the administration, monitoring and oversight of this financial support. This is consistent with DFID’s own “How To” note on addressing violence against women and girls and is increasingly recognised as good donor practice. It will become increasingly important as UN Women’s mandate entails a risk that it could lose some of its connection with grassroots, civil society. Where funds are to be channelled through UN Women’s programme, there should be adequate staffing so that the substantive programme manager does not spend all her/ his time in administering grants.

xii. Use diplomatic and political capital to sustain gains made in terms of women’s leadership in on-going peace processes and agreements. The two key leadership positions currently held by women (in Darfur and in the Great Lakes) should be regarded as a start. At the same time, these women in leadership positions will continue to need gender advisory support.

xiii. Engage with women’s participation in peacebuilding as much as with addressing sexual violence in conflict. Ensure that there is sufficient capacity within donor government agencies to understand and contribute substantively to this agenda.

To national governments in conflict-affected countries

xiv. Invest in women’s civil society, particularly in front-line service delivery so that organisations can get on with the work and be freed up from constantly fund-raising.

xv. Ensure that gender units in police services are adequately resourced with qualified and motivated personnel as well as logistical support.

xvi. Make the ‘WPS agenda’ a beacon for more professional security institutions and other government structures. For instance, ensure that police officers nominated to drive forward gender-sensitive police reform are vetted and are able to set an example across the police service.
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Background

From 2010 to 2014, UN Women has been implementing the programme From Communities to Global Security Institutions (FC2GSI), with support from the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the Australian Agency for International Development (AUSAID), with small support from other donors. The programme has been instrumental in developing several flagship interventions at community and global levels over the past few years. As the programme draws to a close in June 2014, a final evaluation will take stock of the successes and challenges over the implementation period and help UN Women and partners chart a course for the subsequent phase of programming and policy work.

Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is the following:

1. Assess progress against the indicators and targets in the programmes logical framework at the global, national and community levels.

2. Help UN Women and partners plan for the next phase of global and country programming, taking into account the opportunities presented by the creation of UN Women and operationalisation of its new mandate and the implications for developments in the normative framework.

3. Provide input and analysis into UN Women’s positioning and priority setting in the context of the upcoming policy events in 2015, namely the twenty year review of the Beijing Platform for Action, the fifteenth anniversary of resolution 1325 and the negotiations of the post-2015 development framework.

The end users of the evaluation are UN Women Country Offices, Programme and Policy Division and UN Women’s donors and partners.

Context of the intervention

Implementation of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) is widely acknowledged to be inadequate as measured by low numbers of women participating in peace negotiations, increasing levels of extreme sexual violence in conflict, a persistent deficit in financing for women’s needs in post-conflict recovery processes, and the absence of mechanisms for either monitoring or taking action on violations of the resolution. This programme took the opportunities provided by the tenth anniversary of 1325, as well as by the six subsequent Security Council resolutions on women, peace and security (1820, 1888, 1889, 1960, 2106, 2122) to address these implementation and accountability barriers. It has three main areas of focus:

a. Strengthening women’s security and voice in peacebuilding at the community, national and international levels;

b. Institutionalizing protection of women in national security services and in peacekeeping forces;

c. Building accountability for 1325 through improved production and tracking of indicators on 1325/1820.

Description of the intervention

At the global level, the programme has focused on building the accountability system for the women, peace and security agenda in the fields of security sector reform, mediation, peacebuilding and rule of law and justice. At the country level, this programme works through targeted, practical and replicable interventions to ensure that peacebuilding and security sector reform efforts are more gender-responsive. Gender-sensitive institutional change necessitates the application of special measures, specialized expertise, and the introduction of targets and monitoring systems to
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ensure that organizations and institutions are responsive to women’s needs. From improving community security in selected rural areas, to increasing the amount of funding allocated to women’s needs out of the Peacebuilding Fund, UN Women works from the macro-level down to the grassroots to make change. However, it should be noted while the interventions are holistic and comprehensive, their geographic reach is very narrow.

With the small funds available through this programme, only a handful of communities in each country are targeted. In the future, successful practices should be brought up to scale nationally, as well as replicated in other post-conflict contexts. The programme was initially focused on community-based and national interventions in Haiti, Liberia, Timor-Leste and Uganda. South Sudan became an additional focus country after additional funding was made available but South Sudan will not be examined in this evaluation. The programme received approximately USD 6,000,000 from donors. With the delegation of authority process, Country Offices themselves took over the full management of the programme’s activities at the country level. The Global Programme management component was responsible for overall quality assurance, report, monitoring and delivery of globally led activities.

Scope and Methodology of the evaluation

The evaluation will measure progress against the logical framework of FC2GSI at the global and country levels over the period from March 2010 to March 2014. A detailed baseline study was undertaken at the inception of the programme in 2010 and 2011, which will inform the assessment of progress. It is expected that the evaluation team will visit programme activities in Haiti, Liberia, Timor-Leste and Uganda and conduct phone interviews with key interlocutors in headquarters to assess progress at the global level. It is expected that the evaluation will collect end-line data against the baseline undertaken in 2010 and 2011, which assessed both quantitative and qualitative data. Methodology will include inter alia desk reviews, target beneficiary interviews, stakeholder interview, focus groups and other means of collected data from individuals and groups at the community, national and international level.

Evaluation questions

1. What is the progress against the targets in the logical framework? What has been the progress towards achieving the expected outcomes and expected results and what are the results achieved against the indicators in the logical framework?

2. To what extent has change occurred at the community level based on the targets stated in the log frame and the intended outputs of the programme? Are project partners and beneficiaries satisfied with the results? What difference does it make?

3. How can change be sustained where it has occurred?

4. What have been the main obstacles to programme implementation and how can these be mitigated in future?

5. How can advances at the policy level be translated to the country level?

6. What should be the priorities for UN Women intervention in this area in the future?

7. Were the outputs delivered in a timely and effective manner and were the resources used efficiently?

8. How can future UN Women programming in this area meet DFID’s value for money criteria?

Management arrangements The evaluation will be contracted and managed by UN Women Peace and Security section in line with its financial rules and regulations. A reference group for the evaluation will be composed of the UN Women Global Programme Manager, the DFID Programme Manager, one of the focus country UN Women representatives and a member of UN Women’s Evaluation Unit. The exact composition of the reference group will be finalized when the selection process is complete. The reference group will be responsible for providing oversight and policy
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guidance to the evaluation team. The reference group will provide substantive feedback to the evaluation team on each of the deliverables and provide final quality assurance on the evaluation.

Evaluation approach and timeframe

The evaluation will assess relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, using OECD DAC criteria, and will use a gender and human rights approach complying with the UN Development Group Evaluation Guidelines. The evaluation will consist of a desk review of relevant programme and policy documents, stakeholder interviews and field visits to the four programme countries to assess progress at the community level. Stakeholder and beneficiary inputs will be gathered through field visits to the target communities, through focus groups and individual interviews where feasible and appropriate. The evaluation must comply with UN Evaluation Group Ethical Code of Conduct and UN Evaluation Norms and Standards. The evaluation will take place over four months from February to May 2014, with a final validation meeting to be held between the country offices and headquarters via webinar to ensure buy in of the findings and recommendations.

Deliverables

- An inception report (5 to 7 pages) delivered within 10 working days of the start of the contract, which details the precise methodology and schedule for the evaluation.
- End-line studies for each country and evaluation reports for each country (10 to 20 pages)
- Summary overall report (10 to 20 pages)
- Presentation to DFID and to UN Women management in New York, either virtually or in person.

Summary of qualifications and competencies required

UN Women seeks a firm with a solid track record of programme evaluation in the areas of women, peace and security and ending violence against women programming, especially in post-conflict contexts. Particular experience in Haiti, Liberia, Uganda and Timor-Leste is desirable.

The firm should have a team or network of experts to do this work at the community level.

Competencies:

- Strategic evaluation skills, especially in the field of women, peace and security, ending violence against women and gender responsive peacebuilding programming.
- Strong reporting and communication skills in English.
- French language skills will be essential for the team to evaluate the programme in Haiti.
- Excellent communication skills with various partners including donors
- Results Orientation

UN WOMEN inputs and Supplied Resources:

UN WOMEN will facilitate the field work, arrange meetings and interview, devise mission agendas, etc. in each of the four countries and supply all programme related materials and documents. The selected firm must organize and budget for all travel related costs, national consultants where required, and in-country travel expenses, printing costs, meeting costs, etc.
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Article: “Self-Help Groups Expand and Grow in Timor-Leste”
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Annex 3: Key Evaluation Questions/Sub Questions

1. Establish what 'the WPS agenda' means today
   - What are the key instruments in theory and practice in WPS?
   - Who are the key stakeholders in WPS globally? Regionally? In the programme countries?
   - How has WPS theory and framework evolved since 2000?
   - What are the regulatory frameworks, if any, that govern or define peace and security in programme countries?
   - What are the commonalities and differences in terms of key elements, scope and broad approaches to WPS?
   - Where are the gaps, challenges and emerging issues?
   - How does the WPS agenda promote value for money?
   - NOTE: Much of this information will be derived from (and reference) existing studies and evaluations.

2. Understand the realities of UN Women’s WPS programming in the four countries
   - Different capacities of various country/programme offices & staff and partner organizations;
   - The quality and volume of evidence held by different UN Women country offices, to demonstrate the impact of the programme;
   - Different legislative & policy environments in different programme countries;
   - Different social norms and other cultural factors in the programme countries;
   - Different approaches to WPS work across different stakeholders;
   - Different approaches to programming in different country contexts;
   - Different constraints upon UN and stakeholder staff.

3. Assess the strength of – and progress against - the logframe and theory of change
   - Is the theory of change still relevant and correct? Has it been confirmed by findings at the country level? How can it be adapted?
   - Is the theory of change consistent with UN Women’s mandate?
   - Does the logframe represent acceptable performance benchmarks that serve to demonstrate or measure achievement of programme goals?
   - Does the logframe represent a programmatic drive to meeting best practice?
   - How has the programme performed against the logframe’s benchmarks?
   - Have activities been completed as planned at the community/national/ international levels?
   - Are the programme outputs contributing to the programme purpose and goal?
   - Can the programme demonstrate quality and depth of responses?
   - Are there variations across the programme countries?
   - Are there any unintended achievements?
   - Does the programme represent value for money?
   - Are the risks and assumptions in the logframe both comprehensive and realistic?
4. (a) Identify the causes and consequences of the level of progress internal to UNW

- Management and organisation: Do UN Women and key stakeholders have appropriate structures in place to realize the programme goals?
- Resources: Do UN Women and key stakeholders have sufficient quality and quantity of human, financial and supply resources to realize programme performance goals? Were these resources used efficiently?
- Short and long term planning: Is short and long-term programming adequately supported by short and long term planning processes? Is M&E information fed back into programming? Does the programme measure value for money?
- Partnerships: Do UNW’s partnerships (government and civil society) optimally support the attainment of the programme outcomes? Do partnerships exist between these and other security programmes?

4. (b) Identify the causes and consequences of the level of progress external to UNW

- What other developments have taken place in the programme countries which have a bearing on P&S?
- What actions have others taken to promote the WPS agenda?
- What external factors have contributed (positively or negatively) to the achievement of the programme’s objectives?

5. Present findings and conclusions

- Against the logframe and theory of change
- Against UN Women’s mandate
- Against stakeholder expectations
- In comparison with past years
- Against the performance of other multi-lateral partners (where appropriate)
- Against DFID’s value for money criteria
- What is the gap between what has been achieved and what was intended OR what is best practice?
- What are the positive changes and how do stakeholders say they can be sustained?
- What are the unintended negative consequences and how do stakeholders say they can be mitigated or avoided in future?

6. Evidence-based, practical recommendations for UNW, donors, govt. partners, civil society & UN

- Ensuring that advances at the policy level are translated to the country level
- Ensuring that advances at the country level inform future policy shifts
- Recommend priorities for UNW’s future programming on WPS
- Propose strategies, processes, tools & requirements for implementing these priorities
- Suggest quality standards (or recognised benchmarks) for design and implementation of key outputs or outcomes;
- Identify the required organisational and programmatic efforts/investments for programme planning/implementation (including any support systems)?
- Identify how partners in governments and civil society can support UN Women’s mandate in promoting and implementing the WPS agenda.
## Annex 4: List of Evaluation Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Haiti</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunide Louise</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator, ONU Femmes, Haiti Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathassa Sanon</td>
<td>UN Women Haiti office-Monitoring and evaluation agent for north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia Paul</td>
<td>UN Women Haiti office-Monitoring and evaluation agent for Southeast-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Claude Muenda Kabisayi Nyanguila</td>
<td>UN Women Haiti Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galee Beauvais</td>
<td>Project Coordinator at OFAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Cesar</td>
<td>Secretary Accountant at OFAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Alcibidade</td>
<td>Member of OFAL and community member La Voulet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamita Beauvais;</td>
<td>Member of OFAL and community member La Voulet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metina Dory</td>
<td>Member of OFAL and community member La Voulet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vierjelie Pierre-Paul</td>
<td>Member of OFAL and community member La Voulet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Hector</td>
<td>Founder of OFAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugues Barreau</td>
<td>Member of Community Security Committee and community member in La Vouet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamote Duvertile Dory</td>
<td>Member of Community Security Committee and community member in La Vouet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Jovin</td>
<td>Member of Community Security Committee and community member in La Vouet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phavill Jean</td>
<td>Member of Community Security Committee and community member in La Vouet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamartine Saint-Louis</td>
<td>Member of Community Security Committee and community member in La Vouet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loriamar Jean</td>
<td>Member of Community Security Committee and community member in La Vouet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josena Dieudonné,</td>
<td>Founder member of OFAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonite Pierre</td>
<td>Accompanying resource for victims, employee of OFAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Cadet David</td>
<td>Secretary Comptable Famm Deside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine Lucia Flyrene</td>
<td>Famm Deside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwenlande Agella</td>
<td>Famm Deside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettelie Belizave</td>
<td>Famm Deside- Accompanies victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis Cleta</td>
<td>Gender Coordinator, National Haiti Police in Jacmel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-louis Wansy</td>
<td>Judge in Borgne, Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Verdieu</td>
<td>Community member, Borgne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sainyusma Dieufaite Casee</td>
<td>Community member, Borgne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janvier St. Smith Herve</td>
<td>Coordinator of Local Security Committee, Borgne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vadotto Junior</td>
<td>Resp. Local Security Committee, Borgne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune Jacuelin</td>
<td>Vice coordinator, Borgne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirom Nelson</td>
<td>Community member Borgne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon en Santi Fedma</td>
<td>Community member Borgne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charline Florvil</td>
<td>Member AFB Community member Borgne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Cilianne</td>
<td>Community member Borgne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenelus ______</td>
<td>Member AFB Community member Borgne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clairememlia Smoithe</td>
<td>Member AFB Community member Borgne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francia Orel Estimable</td>
<td>Coordinator of AFB and UNW project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilma Pierre</td>
<td>Secretary of AFB and accountant for project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulana Vainquer Appolon</td>
<td>Housekeeper AFB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettie Bonenfant</td>
<td>Accompanies GBV victims, AFB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Lorimer</td>
<td>Accompanies GBV victims, AFB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position and Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Claude Gilles</td>
<td>Staff at RADEM (coordinator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joachim Wendton</td>
<td>Staff at RADEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliette Etienne</td>
<td>Staff at RADEM (accompanies victims)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edilia Aristil</td>
<td>Staff at RADEM (accompanies victims)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Community Members</td>
<td>Milot Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas Paul</td>
<td>Director of Cabinet - Police Nationale Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Ziebell</td>
<td>PNUD-MINUSTAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rameau Normil</td>
<td>Director Central of the Judiciary Police (DCPJ – PNH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Elise Brisson Gelin</td>
<td>Director of Cabinet, Ministry of Feminine Condition and Women Rights (MCFDF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Marie Louise Gauthier</td>
<td>Director of Feminine Affairs Police Nationale d’Haiti (PNH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Eramithe Delva</td>
<td>Executive Secretary HCR-KOFAVIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Eudith Philistin</td>
<td>Project Coordinator HCR-KOFAVIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Moriceth Jean Lucien</td>
<td>Logistic Manager HCR-KOFAVIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Reginald Jean Baptiste</td>
<td>Administrator HCR-KOFAVIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Magneusie Dorvil</td>
<td>Call Center Agent KOFAVIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rose Andree Fong</td>
<td>Data Base Agent KOFAVIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wismide Flecher</td>
<td>Call Center Agent KOFAVIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Louloune Blaise</td>
<td>Accountant KOFAVIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gracien Jean</td>
<td>Political Analyst - Former Chief of Cabinet of NCFDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me Aly Jean Roudy</td>
<td>General Director - Ministry of Justice and Public Safety (MJSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henley's Town Peace Hut Chairlady</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henley's Town police post commander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henley's Town police district commander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henley's town commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD with peacehut women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with Henley's Town men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weala peace hut leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weala town chief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weala police post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD men in Weala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD with Weala peace hut membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD with Gbengbeh peace hut membership and soap members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of gender and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Minister of Gender and Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325 secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Police Security Reform Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totota Peace Hut chair and member of WIPNET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Focal Point Ministry Of Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV Point Person Ministry Of Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberian National Police Gender Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Of Liberian National Police Women and Children Protection Section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau For Immigration And Nationalisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacebuilding Support Office (UN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID Representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Partner SOAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Partner Children's Smile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP Rural women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Women Programme Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timor Leste</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Janet Wong                                                                         UN Women Country Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Anastasia Divinskaya                                                               UN Women Deputy Country Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sunita Caminha                                                                    UN Women PS-FC2GSI PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Vicenta Correia                                                                   UN Women NPO-FC2GSI PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Francisco da Costa Guterres                                                        Secretary of State, SES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Guilhermina Ribeiro                                                                Director General, SES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Anacleto Ribeiro                                                                  Senior Advisor + Gender FP, SES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lidia Carvalho                                                                    Director, DNPCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Antonio Viegas                                                                    Chief of Department, DNPCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Martinho Carvalho Sarmento                                                        M&amp;E Unit, DNPCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Umbelina Soares                                                                    Gender Officer, PNTL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Zinha Britu                                                                        Early Warning System Community Focal Point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Manuel Castro                                                                EWS Community Mediator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Obedia Soares                                                                      EWS Community Mediator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Martinho Ximenes                                                                  EWS Community Mediator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Francisco de Nasimento                                                             EWS Community Mediator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Enrique de Costa de Jesus                                                        EWS National Mediator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Antonio Silva de Soares                                                           EWS National Mediator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Carla Valente                                                                     SEPI Interim Chief of Dept. of Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jose Guterres                                                                     MSS Project Manager, SDR-CRP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Celito Cardoso                                                                    MOJ, Director, Human Rights &amp; Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Beba Sequira                                                                      Director, APSCTL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Laura Abrantes                                                                    Programme Coordinator, APSCTL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Filomeno Monteiro                                                                 Executive Director, AMKV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Julio da Costa                                                                     Communications Specialist, AMKV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Jose                                                                        Vice Director of programmes, FOKUPERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Honoria Lopes                                                                     Advocacy Coordinator, FOUKUPERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jose Belo                                                                          SDR Programme Manager, UNDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gregory Connor                                                                    Peace &amp; Dev Advisor, UNRCO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Manuela Pereira                                                                   ACBIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Marilia da Costa                                                            BELUN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Antonio Cruz                                                                       Holsa Suco Chief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 x Community Group Members                                                            PANAPAZ Group, Holsa Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 x Community Group Members                                                            Tunubibi village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Felicidade Santos                                                                  Saburai village MALITOLI group leader/suco council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 x Community Group Members                                                            MALITOLI Group, Saburai village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 x Community Group Members                                                           LIQBATME Group, Metagou village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Agusto de Jesus</td>
<td>Motaulun Chief of Suco/AMKV focal point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Francisco</td>
<td>Motaulun Youth Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uganda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hodan Addou</td>
<td>UN Women-Country Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Mutavati</td>
<td>UN Women-Deputy Country Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prossy Namale</td>
<td>UN Women-Project Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apolo Kyeyune</td>
<td>UN Women-M&amp;E Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Alalo</td>
<td>Uganda Police Force-Head of Child and Family Protection Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Mugume</td>
<td>Uganda Police Force-In charge of UPF/UN Women Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ochem</td>
<td>Uganda Police Force-Director Research and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Batema</td>
<td>Hon. Justice, Resident Judge, Fort Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kamya</td>
<td>Uganda Police Force-Commissioner Training and Planning Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Agwang</td>
<td>Uganda Police Force-Child and Family Protection Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyomukama</td>
<td>Uganda Police Force-Director of Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinah Rubimbwa</td>
<td>Center for Women in Governance-Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Angwech</td>
<td>Gulu Women Economic Development and Globalization (GWED-G) Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosco Enangu + 4 x staff members</td>
<td>GWED-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojara Martin Mapenduzi</td>
<td>Chairperson Gulu District Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okello Douglas Peter</td>
<td>District Speaker Gulu District Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akumu Christine Okot</td>
<td>Gender Officer Gulu District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paska Amono</td>
<td>Community Development officer Onyama Subcounty Gulu District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanyero Grace</td>
<td>Councilor, Secretary for Community Service Onyama Subcounty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opoka</td>
<td>DISO Onyama Sub county Gulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 x Community Members</td>
<td>Onyama Subcounty, Gulu District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women/Men’s groups (30 women, 10 men)</td>
<td>Onyama Subcounty Gulu District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Arach</td>
<td>Chairperson Peko Rewedo Peke women's group Onyama subcounty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmoi Okello</td>
<td>Gender focal person Cultural Institution of Acholi-Gulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teddy Luwar</td>
<td>Chairperson Gulu Women With Disability Union (GUWODU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arum Charles</td>
<td>Sign language interpreter -GUWODU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dortothy Abalo</td>
<td>Program Assistant Mitigating GBV towards girls and Women -GUWODU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Akello</td>
<td>Program Assistant -GUWODU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odong Emmy</td>
<td>Volunteer-GUWODU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Adong Bonny</td>
<td>Finance and administration -GUWODU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Laker</td>
<td>Treasurer-GUWODU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Nume</td>
<td>Program manager-Obur women with disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Adokorach</td>
<td>Secretary-GUWODU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys Canogura</td>
<td>Executive Director-Kitgum Women Peace Initiative (KIWEPI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aciro Virginia</td>
<td>KIWEPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position and Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baloke Fasto Emmy</td>
<td>KIWEPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Amone</td>
<td>KIWEPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Baker Okoth</td>
<td>KIWEPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Oguti</td>
<td>Speaker for Kitgum District local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Nyero</td>
<td>Kitgum Concerned Women Association (KICWA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Aboda</td>
<td>Speaker for Namokora Subcounty-Kitgum District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apio Hellen</td>
<td>Secretary-Namokora Subcounty-Kitgum District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Baker Okoth</td>
<td>KIWEPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabina Ouma</td>
<td>Woman Councilor-Namokora Subcounty-Kitgum District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Oryema</td>
<td>Community based facilitator-Namokora subcounty-Kitgum District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Auma</td>
<td>Beneficiary-Namokora Subcounty-Kitgum District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Oyella</td>
<td>Beneficiary-Namokora Subcounty-Kitgum District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottober Wellborn Odiya</td>
<td>District Vice Chairperson-Kitgum District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocen Morris</td>
<td>District planner-Pader District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amony Catherine</td>
<td>District Community Development Officer-Pader District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Akullo</td>
<td>Executive Director-Women and Rural Development (WORUDET)-Pader District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Lato</td>
<td>Councilor-Pader District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Bilan</td>
<td>Program officer-Women’s Rights- WORUDET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldo Olwoch</td>
<td>Program officer-Gender Equality-WORUDET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flocy Lamono</td>
<td>Social Worker WORUDET-Omot Subcounty Agago District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 x Community Members/Peer counsellors</td>
<td>Omot subcounty Agago District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Emiru Enyou</td>
<td>Secretary General, National Association of Women Organizations in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Kawamara</td>
<td>Chairperson, UWONET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Aciro</td>
<td>Executive Director, UWONET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Mabwijano</td>
<td>Ministry of Gender, Labor, and Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabet Dahlberg</td>
<td>Coordination Specialist, UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pius Araja</td>
<td>Former Post-Conflict Advisor, Uganda (DFID)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5: Interview Protocols/Questions

Annex 5(i): KII Questions for External (non-UN Women) Stakeholders

Introduction
KIIs will be conducted with the following and adapted accordingly:
- UN Country Team (Resident Representative & heads of agencies or delegates)
- Donor representatives
- Security sector personnel (police & armed forces)
- Justice sector personnel
- Senior national and international NGO personnel working on peace and security issues
- Community leaders and CSO staff in targeted communities.

The evaluation team member will give due attention to the protocol required for each interview. These interviews are semi-structured. The following is a guide, not a questionnaire. Some interviewees will know much more about the sector and about the programme than others. Some interviewees will have more useful insights than others. The interview is expected to be more of a discussion than an ‘interview’. Each interview will last 45 minutes – 1 hour. All answers must be recorded and interview notes retained and submitted to the team leader.

Questions
Introductory
Name
Organisation/ agency/department/job title
Date and time of interview
Name of interviewer

1. Security in [name of country]
   1.1. What do you think are the main security issues in [name of country]?
   1.2. What do you think are the main issues regarding women and girls’ security in [name of country]?
   1.3. What do you think is the role of your [agency, department, ministry, organisation] in bringing security to [name of country]?
   1.4. Do you think you have a particular role in promoting or protecting women and girls’ security?
   1.5. If so, what is this role?

2. The UN Women programme ‘From Communities to Global Security Institutions’
Are you familiar with UN Women’s work on peace and security, on peacebuilding or on security sector reform? [If no, go straight to question 3]
   2.1. If yes, what do you know about it?
   2.2. In your view, has this work made any difference in [name of country]?
   2.3. If so, what difference has it made?
   2.4. If not, why do you think it has not made any difference?
   2.5. What do you think UN Women’s work should have done to make a difference / more of a difference?
   2.6. Do you think there are any negative consequences of the work that UN Women has done in this area?
   2.7. If so, what are they and how did they come about?
   2.8. What (if any) have been the missed opportunities of UN Women’s work in this area that could be addressed in the future?
   2.9. What recommendations do you have about continuing the achievements made by UN Women’s work in this area?

3. Women, peace and security agenda - broadly
   3.1. What does the phrase ‘women, peace and security’ mean to you?
   3.2. Are you familiar with the UN Security Council resolutions on women, peace and security?
   3.3. If no, go straight to question 4
   3.4. How have you become familiar with these resolutions?
   3.5. What do you think they are about?
   3.6. Do you think they are being implemented in [name of country]?
   3.7. In what way are they being / not being implemented?

4. Violence against women and girls
   4.1. Do you think violence against women and girls is a problem in [name of country]?
   4.2. What makes you say so?
   4.3. If yes, what particular type of violence against women and girls is a problem? [domestic, rape, FGM, child marriage, sexual violence by armed forces or armed groups, other]
   4.4. What do you think should be done about it?
4.5. Who do you think should do something about it?
4.6. What is the role of your [agency, department, ministry, organisation] in doing something about it?

5. Women and peacebuilding
   5.1. Do you think [name of country] is secure or insecure?
   5.2. Why do you say so?
   5.3. Do you think women have any role to play in [peacebuilding] [making the country more secure]?
   5.4. What makes you say so?
   5.5. If yes, what role do you think this is?
   5.6. If yes, what do women need to become more involved in [peacebuilding] [making the country more secure]?
   5.7. Who do you think should help them?
   5.8. What is the role of your [agency, department, ministry, organisation] in making sure that women play a greater role in peacebuilding

6. Miscellaneous
   6.1. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about the UN Women programme, about violence against women and girls or about women’s participation in peacebuilding?
   6.2. Can we come back to you by e-mail or phone if we have follow-up questions?
Annex 5(ii): KII Questions for UN Women (Country Offices)

Name
Job title
Role regarding the F2GSI programme
Date & time
ISG interviewer

1. General questions about the programme
   1.1. What do you think has been the best thing about the programme?
   1.2. Do you think the programme aimed to do the right things in [name of country]?
   1.3. With hindsight, what do you think would have been more useful objectives?
   1.4. What areas have been easiest to implement?
   1.5. Why do you say so?
   1.6. What areas have been the most difficult to implement?
   1.7. Why do you say so?
   1.8. Do you see the programme as fitting within UN Women’s mandate?
   1.9. How/not?

2. Impact of the programme [prompt for violence against women, women’s participation and anything else the interviewee wants to raise]
   2.1. What impact do you think the programme has had at community level?
   2.2. Why do you say so?
   2.3. What evidence do you have that shows the impact of the programme?
   2.4. What impact do you think the programme has had at sub-national level?
   2.5. Why do you say so?
   2.6. What impact do you think the programme has had at national level?
   2.7. Why do you say so?
   2.8. What impact do you think the programme has had at regional or global level?
   2.9. Why do you say so?
   2.10. For each of the above, do you think the programme was essential for bringing about these changes?
   2.11. Have there been any unintended consequences of the programme? (Good or not good)
   2.12. What are they?
   2.13. Why did they happen?

3. Partnerships
   3.1. Who are the main partners for the programme in [name of country]?
   3.2. What benefits does UN Women derive from these partnerships?
   3.3. What benefits do the partners derive from UN Women?
   3.4. Have the partnerships been successful?
   3.5. In what way / not?

4. Resources & Management
   4.1. Do you think the programme has had the resources it needs? (human, financial, political)
   4.2. Why do you say so?
   4.3. Do you think the programme represents good value for money?
   4.4. Why do you say so?
   4.5. Has the programme been helped or hindered by any management issues?

5. Future
   5.1. What gains have the programme made that you would like to see continue in [name of country]?
   5.2. How do you think these gains can be continued?
   5.3. What were the missed opportunities of the programme that could be addressed in the future?
   5.4. How do you see the programme fitting with other global programmes on violence against women and girls and women’s political empowerment?
   5.5. How does this programme fit with your other programmes at national level?

6. Miscellaneous
Any other comments you would like to make about the programme, about women, peace and security?
Annex 5(iii): Focus Group Discussions: Community Members (divided into male and female)

Names
Ages
Marital status
Community
Date & Time of FGD (start and finish)
ISG facilitator

Introductory
1. Security in [name of country]
   1.1. What do you understand by the term ‘security’?
   1.2. What do you understand by the term ‘peace’? [hear this discussion out and allow the group to reach a consensus]
   1.3. What do you think are the main security issues in [name of country]?
   1.4. Are these the main security issues here in [name of community]?
   1.5. What do you think are the main issues regarding women and girls’ security in [name of community]?
   1.6. Do you think your community has become more or less secure over the last four years?
   1.7. Why do you say so?
   1.8. In what way has it become more or less secure?
   1.9. Is that the same for everyone (men, women, boys, girls)?
   1.10. Who do you think has responsibility for the people’s security in [name of country]?
   1.11. What role do you think they should play?
   1.12. As community members, do you think you have a particular role in promoting or protecting people’s security? Women and girls’ security?
   1.13. If so, what is this role?
2. The UN Women programme ‘From Communities to Global Security Institutions’
   Are you familiar with the work of [UN Women] [implementing partner] in [name of community]? [If no, go straight to question 3]
   2.1. If yes, what do you know about it?
   2.2. In your view, has this programme made any difference in [name of community]?
   2.3. If so, what difference has it made?
   2.4. Tell us an example of how it has made a difference.
   2.5. If not, why do you think it has not made any difference?
   2.6. What do you think the programme should have done to make a difference / more of a difference?
   2.7. Do you think there are any negative consequences of the programme?
   2.8. If so, what are they and how did they come about?
   2.9. What recommendations do you have about continuing the achievements that the programme has made?
3. Violence against women and girls
   3.1. Do you think violence against women and girls is a problem in [name of country]?
   3.2. Is it the same in this community?
   3.3. What makes you say so?
   3.4. If no, is that because you don’t think it happens or because it’s okay if it does happen?
   3.5. If yes, what particular type of violence against women and girls is a problem? [domestic, rape, FGM, child marriage, sexual violence by armed forces or armed groups, other]
   3.6. What do you think should be done about it?
   3.7. Who do you think should do something about it?
   3.8. As community members, what responsibility (if any) do you have to do something about it?
   3.9. If a woman or girl had experienced domestic violence /violence in her family, what would you suggest she does, where should she go? [without prompting, record all the following:]
      a. Police
         i. Any police
         ii. Female police
         iii. Special police units
      b. Chief/traditional leader
      c. Religious leader
      d. Family
      e. Friends
      f. Traditional justice mechanism
      g. No-one
3.10 Why do you think these would be good people to go to?
3.11 If a woman or girl had experienced rape, what would you suggest she does, where should she go?

[without prompting, record all the following:]

i. Police
   i. Any police
   ii. Female police
   iii. Special policy units
j. Chief/ traditional leader
k. Religious leader
l. Family
m. Friends
n. Traditional justice mechanism
o. No-one
p. Court

3.12 Why do you think these would be good people to go to?

4. Women and peacebuilding
   4.1 Do you think [name of community / town] is secure or insecure?
   4.2 Why do you say so?
   4.3 Do you think women have any role to play in making [name of community/town] more secure?
   4.4 What makes you say so?
   4.5 If yes, what role do you think this is?
   4.6 If yes, what do women need to become more involved in making the [name of community/town] more secure?
   4.7 Who do you think should help them?
   4.8 What about keeping the country secure? Do you think women have a role to play in keeping the whole country secure?
   4.9 What makes you say so?
   4.10 If yes, what role do you think this is?
   4.11 If yes, what do you think women need to become more involved in making [name of country] secure?
   4.12 Do you know of any laws that say something about women taking part in keeping their community secure? Either national or international?
   4.13 Have you seen women become more or less active in the community in the last few years?
   4.14 Have you seen women become more or less active in making the community secure in the last few years?
   4.15 Why do you say so?
   4.16 As community members, what is your responsibility (if any) in making sure that women play a greater role in peacebuilding?

5. Miscellaneous

Do you have any other comments you would like to make about the work of [UN Women] [implementing partner, about violence against women and girls or about women’s participation in peacebuilding?]
Annex 6: Individual Country Evaluation Reports

1) Haiti
(Double-click to open)

2) Liberia
(Double-click to open)

3) Timor-Leste
(Double-click to open)

4) Uganda
(Double-click to open)