



UN WOMEN

Regional Architecture Evaluation Inception Report: Annexes

December 2015

Points of Contact:

Tessie Catsambas
President
Tel: +1(301) 287-8707
Email: tcatsambas@encompassworld.com

Beeta Tahmassebi
Sr. Manager and Evaluation Specialist
Tel: +1 (301) 287-8715
Email: btahmassebi@encompassworld.com

LIST OF ACRONYMS

DER	Development Effectiveness Review
IEO	Independent Evaluation Office
MAR	Multilateral Aid Review
MOPAN	Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UN WOMEN	UN Women (United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNEX A: EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	1
ANNEX B: EVALUATION MATRIX	19
ANNEX C: EVALUATION WORKPLAN	27
ANNEX D: DATA COLLECTION TOOLS	32
ANNEX E: PROPOSED COUNTRIES SAMPLE	39
ANNEX F: CASE STUDY DRAFT OUTLINE	47
ANNEX G: STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION LIST- INCEPTION PHASE	50
ANNEX H: DOCUMENTS CONSULTED	53
ANNEX I: DISCUSSION OF EVALUATION QUESTIONS	59
ANNEX J: DRAFT CODEBOOK	63
ANNEX K: SYNTHESIS REPORT DRAFT OUTLINE.....	

ANNEX A: EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of UN Women's regional architecture

I. Background

In July 2010¹, the United Nations General Assembly established UN Women.² The creation of UN Women came about as part of the UN reform agenda, consolidating the Organization's resources and mandates on gender equality for greater impact. The mandate of UN Women brings together four pre-existing entities³, calling on UN Women to have universal coverage, strategic presence and ensure closer linkages between the norm setting inter-governmental work and operations at the field level. It entrusts UN Women with a leading role in normative, operational and coordination work on gender equality in the United Nations system.

The mandate of UN Women is guided by the Beijing Platform for Action, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the United Nations Millennium Declaration, relevant General Assembly, Economic and Social Council, Commission on the Status of Women and other applicable United Nations instruments, standards and resolutions. The work of UN Women is focused on three core mandates:

1. **Normative work:** to support inter-governmental bodies, such as the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) and the General Assembly, in their formulation of policies, global standards and norms;
2. **Operational work:** to help Member States to implement international standards and to forge effective partnerships with civil society; and
3. **Coordination work:** entails both work to promote the accountability of the United Nations system on gender equality and empowerment of women (GEEW), including regular monitoring of system-wide progress, and more broadly mobilizing and convening key stakeholders to ensure greater coherence and gender mainstreaming across the UN.

These changes required to adapt the organizational structure of UN Women to support effective and efficient implementation of the mandate. The founding GA resolution 64/289 stipulated that: "in its strategic plan, UN Women would describe as its highest priority the restructuring and upgrading of its effectiveness and presence

¹ UN Women was not operational until January 2011.

² United Nations, General Assembly Resolution 64/289: system wide coherence (A/RES/64/289), July 2010.

³ The Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW); the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW); the Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women (OSAGI); and the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM)

on the ground, at both regional and national levels.”⁴ In 2012 and pursuant to paragraph 8 of the Executive Board decision 2011/5 on the UN-Women biennial institutional budget, 2012-2013⁵ UN Women presented its plans for the new regional architecture. The overall goal of the regional architecture was to delegate authority to maximize the organization’s ability to deliver on its mandate in a more effective and efficient way and bring capacity closer to the field in order to increase contribution to the achievement of results. The full implementation of the regional architecture was envisioned to be functioning by the end of 2013.

II. Regional architecture

The regional architecture identified key elements that were necessary in order to better support Member States and to leverage the United Nations System. Those elements were informed by consultation with Member States, civil society partners, United Nations agencies and UN Women staff. UN Women commissioned an external study of options for its regional architecture including lessons from other organizations both within and outside the United Nations. Among the three options presented, UN Women choose to develop the new regional architecture that maximizes the organization’s ability to deliver on its mandate. The new institutional arrangement shifted decision-making and policy, programmatic and operational support to six regional centers and a select of multi-country, as well as country offices that would continue to be strengthened and report directly to regional centers. Five guiding principles were identified to strengthen the empowerment of countries by delegating responsibility to the field and operational support to increase efficiency. These included: (1) decentralize authority to the field with the required operational support functions; (2) get the maximum impact from existing resources and synergies with other organizations; (3) best serve the coordination function of UN Women in the United Nations system; (4) ensure quality and accountability across all levels of the organization; and (5) ensure coherence for the role, messaging and mandate for UN Women⁶.

The new regional architecture consisted of (1) the establishment of six regional offices and six multi-country offices; (2) the transformation of the existing subregional offices into one of the regional offices, a multi-country office or a country office; (3) the decentralization of day-to-day managerial oversight functions for UN Women country presences from headquarters to regional offices; (4) the transfer of some technical and operational functions from headquarters to the regional level; (5) accompanying changes at headquarters to support higher-level oversight and global technical and policy knowledge and support to the field, providing greater support to country and regionally focused inter-agency processes as well as UN Women normative role.

At the headquarters level, the main functional shift sought to be brought in by the regional architecture was in moving day-to-day activities and more detailed oversight functions and programmatic technical support and guidance functions to the regional level, while strengthening headquarters capacity to provide high-level strategic oversight and generate global technical and policy knowledge. At the regional level, the regional

⁴ UNW/2011/9, para 30.

⁵ UNW/2011/13

⁶ UNW/2012/5

offices overtook managerial and programme oversight, quality assurance, technical and operational support and policy advice for country offices in their region, including with regards to the normative function. Regional offices were also set to be responsible for UN inter-agency coordination. Delegation of authority for day-to-day activities included (a) signature of programmes, donor agreements and associated budgets; (b) approval of transactions and payments; (c) recruitment of national staff and (d) donor reports. Country and multi-country offices would deliver support to government and other partners upon their request in line with UN Women mandate, they were set up to have more delegated authority allowing for faster business processes at the country level to better support partners.⁷

The proposed institutional budget for the field totaled to \$74,330,000 for 2012-2013⁸, from which \$63,616,000 was allocated for staff and \$10,714,000 non-staff costs. The UN Women also proposed \$ 2.1 million core funds for staff for regional offices to support programming function in 2012-2013. The timeline for implementing the regional architecture and associated changes was planned to be fully completed by the end of 2013 putting the new structure in place for the implementation of the new strategic plan, 2014-2017.

III. Organizational assessments, reviews and evaluations of UN Women

During 2013-2015, UN Women underwent a series of organizational assessments that reviewed its overall organizational performance or focused on a specific element of organizational effectiveness and efficiency such as human resources or evaluation function. These are described in more detail below:

Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN): MOPAN is a network of 19 donor countries with a common interest to assess organisational effectiveness of and evidence of contributions to development and humanitarian results achieved by the multilateral organisations that they fund. UN Women was assessed by MOPAN in 2014. The assessment covered four areas of organizational effectiveness: a) strategic management; b) operational management; c) relationship management; and d) knowledge management. It was based on information collected through a survey of key stakeholders, document review, and interviews with the staff. The MOPAN assessment included an analysis of the decentralization process to increase country presence and delegate greater authority to improve effectiveness on the ground. However, its main objective was to look at the entire organizational performance of the entity and did not look in depth at the regional architecture as an adequate institutional arrangement in terms of efficiency and effectiveness to better contribute to results.

Multilateral Aid Review⁹ (MAR): The MAR is a systematic assessment that was first conducted in 2011 to examine the value for money that Department of International Development of the government of the U.K (DFID) get from putting funding through multilateral organizations. In 2013, DFID continued the exercise by scrutinizing the improvements multilateral organizations have made since 2011. UN Women was assessed as

⁷ UNW/2012/10

⁸ UNW/2012/10, Annex III

⁹ See more on the Multilateral Aid review at <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/multilateral-aid-review>

part of the 2013 MAR. The MAR looked at progress against four reform components: a) contribution to results; b) strategic and performance management; c) cost and value consciousness; and b) transparency and accountability from the perspective of DFID. Similarly to MOPAN, the MAR did not look specifically at the regional architecture of UN Women apart from acknowledging the progress of its implementation.

Development Effectiveness Review (DER): The DER is a development effectiveness review assessment conducted by the Department of Foreign Affairs Trade and Development Canada (DFATD)'s Development Evaluation Division, the Netherlands Foreign Affairs' Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB), and other bilateral donors. The DER analyzed the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and UN Women using the standard methodology developed under the Development Effectiveness of Multilateral Organizations Initiative of the Development Assistance Committee Network on Development Evaluation (OECD /DAC – EVALNET). The objective of the DER was to examine and assess the results achieved by UN Women during the period from 2011 to 2014 using the criteria of performance in achieving results, sustainability, relevance, environmental sustainability, gender equality, efficiency, and performance management. At the core of the DER approach is a systematic and structured meta-synthesis of the findings of a sample of evaluations performed by the organization. While the DER looked at results achieved and performance management, it did not specifically focus on the regional architecture process.

In addition to the organizational performance and effectiveness assessments conducted by donors, UN Women undertook other relevant assessments and evaluations. For instance, the UN Women global staff survey conducted in 2014 focused on investigating how staff experienced working at UN Women, levels of engagement and disengagement, and how UN Women compared with other organizations. The staff survey provided useful information on human resources and management practices of UN Women and serves as a baseline for mapping trends in the future. Elements pertaining to staff satisfaction in relationship to the institutional arrangement of UN Women provide useful inputs for analyzing the regional architecture in relation to staff.

Also, the evaluation function of UN Women was assessed by three external assessments (MOPAN, JIU, UNEG professional peer review) in 2014. These assessments, although with different goals and objectives, provided an in-depth analysis of independence, credibility, and utility of the evaluation function, including decentralized evaluation practices.

Finally, UN Women corporate thematic evaluations and meta-analysis reports conducted by the Independent Evaluation Office have included selected insights on the results of the regional architecture in relation to the thematic areas evaluated, and as part of the overall lessons extracted from all evaluations. These reports are nonetheless limited in scope as they do not analyze specifically the efficiency or effectiveness of the regional architecture.

This summary of UN Women's assessments demonstrates that MOPAN, DER and other reviews and evaluations provide findings on the overall UN Women's performance that include the regional architecture. Among assessments, the MOPAN has devoted more attention to the decentralization process, however, the overall organizational effectiveness and administrative efficiency of the regional architecture as the adequate institutional arrangement to fulfill UN Women's mandate at regional, multi-country and country office levels is

yet to be independently evaluated. Having said that, MOPAN, DER, staff survey and the reviews of evaluation function provide very useful information on the different aspects of UN Women's performance. The evaluation of regional architecture will aim to utilize this wealth of data and analysis in its framework.

IV. Purpose, scope and objectives

The corporate evaluation of regional architecture will be undertaken as part of the Corporate Evaluation Plan 2014-2017. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, organizational effectiveness and administrative efficiency of UN Women's regional architecture. The findings will be used for strategic decisions, organizational learning and accountability and will inform the midterm review of UN Women Strategic Plan. The targeted users of the evaluation are the UN Women Executive Board, UN Women senior management and staff and other agencies undergoing internal decentralization processes.

Given that regional architecture is relatively new, the evaluation will be *formative*. Formative evaluations provide feedback for improvement, are prospective and proactive in their orientation, and serve quality assurance purpose. In this evaluation, the formative element will focus on the implementation of the regional architecture after its roll-out to assess the functioning of the organizational set up as UN Women moves forward.

The evaluation will analyze the design, planning, and implementation of regional architecture from its launch in 2012 to the second quarter of 2015. The scope of the evaluation will include regional, multi-country and country offices and also divisions in HQ. It will focus on relevance, organizational effectiveness and administrative efficiency of regional architecture to deliver UN Women's mandate across all roles - normative, operational, and UN coordination – at regional and country levels, including its contribution to results at global level. The evaluation will analyze organizational structure and administrative systems, such as strategic and process management, financial and human resources, programme management, communications and knowledge management.

Considering the mandates to incorporate human rights and gender equality in all UN work and the UN Women Evaluation Policy, which promotes the integration of women's rights and gender equality principles, these dimensions will have a special attention in this evaluation. A specific evaluation objective on human rights and gender equality is included, and specific questions are mainstreamed across the evaluation criteria.

Evaluation Objectives

The evaluation has following objectives:

- 1) Assess the relevance of regional architecture, particularly, whether it meets the needs of key UN Women stakeholders at regional and country levels, including the needs of relevant global stakeholders.
- 2) Assess the organizational effectiveness of regional architecture to deliver UN Women's mandate across all roles – advocacy, normative, policy, UN Coordination and programmatic at regional and country levels, including their contribution to global results as well as HQ support to the field.
- 3) Assess the efficiency of regional architecture's administrative systems, structure and processes, including mechanisms to ensure efficient communication linkages between HQ and the field and within regional, multi-country and country offices.

- 4) Analyze how effective and efficient was the regional architecture in promoting gender responsive and human rights based approaches in programme management and administrative systems.
- 5) Provide forward looking recommendations for strengthening the effectiveness and efficiency of regional architecture.

Key evaluation questions

Relevance

- 1) How does the regional architecture respond to the needs of governments, civil society and UN agencies at regional and country levels, including the needs of actors at the global level?
- 2) What improvements and adjustments are needed to meet the needs of key stakeholders, including the most marginalized women?
- 3) How to ensure the regional architecture is fit to ensure the universality of SDGs and UN Women mandate?

Organizational Effectiveness

- 4) To what extent the objectives set in the Executive Board paper (UNW/2012/10) to establish an effective regional architecture have been met?
- 5) To what extent the regional architecture contributed to UN Women's achievements in the operational, normative and coordination mandate at global, regional and country levels in an effective manner? Do any improvements or adjustments to the institutional set up among regional, country and HQ divisions are needed to enhance effectiveness?
- 6) What are the systems in place to monitor and assess the effectiveness of regional architecture? Are they working adequately and feed the organization with useful lessons?
- 7) To what extent regional architecture enhances the linkages between normative, operational, and coordination work? What adjustments are needed to improve these linkages?
- 8) To what extent UN Women applies rigorous gender analysis and human rights approach in programme design, monitoring and implementation at regional and country levels?

Administrative Efficiency

- 9) To what extent the regional architecture has been designed and implemented in a way that is responsive to needs, changes and actions emerging at the different levels of organization (HQ, Regional Offices, Multi-country and Country Offices)?
- 10) How efficient is regional architecture in terms of delegation of authority, decision making process, and methods for setting direction? To what extent the roles and responsibilities, coordination of labour, and coordination of systems are clear and efficient?
- 11) How efficient is use of financial and human resources and IT systems in the framework of regional architecture?
- 12) To what extent the existing funding sources offer sustained support for the current staff structure and planned results of regional architecture?
- 13) Are the intervention resources used in an efficient manner to address human rights and gender equality (e.g. participation of targeted stakeholder, including the most marginalized groups, collection of disaggregated data)?
- 14) To what extent UN Women management and administrative systems promote gender sensitive approaches in day-to-day operations of regional architecture (for example, management and leadership

style, horizontal versus hierarchical structures, consultative and participatory decision making processes)?

15) To what extent the regional architecture is achieving the gender parity of staff?

V. Approach and methodology

The evaluation will be a transparent and participatory process involving relevant UN Women stakeholders and partners at the corporate, regional, and country levels. It will be based on gender and human rights principles, as defined in the UN Women Evaluation Policy¹⁰ and adhere to the United Nations norms and standards for evaluation in the UN System¹¹.

The evaluation will build on findings and assessment frameworks of MOPAN, MAR, DER but primarily will deploy Institutional and Organizational Assessment Model (IOA) as a guiding framework for evaluation¹² (See Figure 1). The performance of regional architecture will be assessed on its organizational effectiveness (contribution to the achievement of the Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Framework results and to development results), administrative efficiency (the quality and responsiveness of management systems and work processes), and relevance (the extent to which it has ability to adapt to changing conditions and environments).

The proposed evaluation approach draws on the concept of organizational effectiveness as applied by MOPAN in the organizational performance assessment of UN Women conducted in 2014¹³. Under the criterion of organizational effectiveness the evaluation will “examine the organizational systems, practices, and behaviours” that are important for achieving results of regional architecture as stated in planning documents. It will also analyze the contribution of regional architecture to the overall development results of UN Women, given its significance in delivering UN Women’s mandate on the ground. Meanwhile, the analysis of efficiency will focus on the efficiency of administrative systems and work processes¹⁴. The methodological choice to focus on administrative efficiency rather than cost-efficiency or cost-benefit analysis is based on two main reasons. First, the lack of rigorous efficiency indicators and detailed data that link resources such as funds, staff, time used to the results of UN Women. Second, the challenge of identifying meaningful comparator organizations for cost-efficiency analysis given the uniqueness of UN Women mandate and also UN Women being a new organization where regional architecture and decentralization were rolled out very recently.

¹⁰ UN Women, *Evaluation policy of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women* (UNW/2012/12)

¹¹ United Nations Evaluation Group, Norms and Standards for evaluation in the UN System, access at: http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp?doc_cat_source_id=4

¹² Organization Assessment: A framework for improving performance (2002). Lusthaus, Ch., Adrien, M., Anderson, G., Carden, F., and Montalvan, G. International Research center. Available at <http://www.idrc.ca/EN/Resources/Publications/Pages/IDRCBookDetails.aspx?PublicationID=241>

¹³ MOPAN, Technical Report Volume II p.3

¹⁴ The evaluation uses the definition of the IDRC and IADB: “administrative efficiency explores how different work processes contribute to the overall value added in an organization (...) how well an organization is managing its strategy and work processes.” IDRC and IADB, *Organization Assessment: A framework for improving performance*, p.81

Following gender responsive evaluation approach, it will also assess the transformative potential of UN Women’s results on the ground and the integration of gender equality and human rights principles in strategic and programme management practices. The evaluation will analyze the dimensions of organizational motivation and environment as important contextual forces that drive the performance of regional architecture but primarily it will focus on assessing the dimension of organizational capacity and needed improvements for greater effectiveness and efficiency of UN Women at global, regional and country levels.

Figure 1. Regional Architecture Evaluation Framework based on IOA model.



The evaluation methodology will be based on mixed methods and will deploy a variety of evaluation techniques ranging from desk review, interviews, participatory workshops, surveys, observation and comparative case studies. The logic model based on the Organizational Efficiency and Effectiveness Framework of UN Women Strategic Plan 2014 -2017 and relevant regional architecture documents will be developed by the evaluation team to guide the assessment. A baseline of performance will be established based on the monitoring and reporting information and results of previous organizational performance assessments and reviews, evaluations, staff survey and the databases of financial and human resources.

The evaluation will have three levels of analysis and validation of information. *Level 1* will start with a desk review of information sources on regional architecture available through corporate UN Women’s reporting and information systems such as regional architecture documents presented to the Executive Board, Results Management System, Annual UN Women Reports, Regional and Country Reports, Audits, external UN

Women's organizational assessments (MOPAN, MAR, DER, UNEG Peer Review), UN Women staff survey 2014, and corporate and decentralized evaluations of UN Women. *Level 2* will involve more in-depth analysis of six regional offices, six multi-country offices and a representative sample of 20 UN Women country offices. *Level 2* analysis will be based on document review and supplemented with additional online/skype interviews with the key stakeholders. It will also include surveys of UN Women staff and external stakeholders. *Level 3* will involve field visits in a purposively selected sample of five countries that will include at least one regional office, one multi-country office, one country office, one country with programme presence and one without any UN Women presence (to be confirmed at inception phase). The qualitative comparative case study analysis will be applied to systematically compare and analyze data from *level 2* and *level 3* case studies to identify necessary characteristics and factors to ensure effectiveness and efficiency of the regional architecture. In addition, at HQ level, a case study will be conducted to capture linkages between HQ and field offices. The case studies will provide information on how regional architecture is implemented, whether any adjustments are needed as well as identify good practices and lessons learned and feed into the synthesis report

The following data sources will be utilized and data will be triangulated to ensure validity and reliability:

- Review of key documents: Strategic Plan; Regional Architecture documents; UN Women Annual Reports; Division of Management and Administration reports; Results Management system: audits; external UN Women's organizational assessments (MOPAN, MAR, DER, UNEG Peer Review), UN Women global Staff survey 2014; corporate and decentralized evaluations; and guidance notes.
- Survey of UN Women staff; and surveys of UN Women key stakeholders at country level.
- Interviews and focus groups with a purposive sample of UN Women staff; members of Executive Board members, civil society advisory groups.
- In-depth document review of 6 regional and 6 multi-country offices and a representative sample of 20 UN Women country offices, including strategic notes, annual reports, donor reports, relevant evaluations and monitoring and reporting information on regional architecture. This review will also analyze key documents and reports of five countries where UN Women is not present. The sampling criteria for the countries will include geographic representation, range of country contexts, range of UN Women's services and capacity and investment.
- Five Country case studies and one HQ based case study: A set of criteria for selecting case study countries will be developed by the evaluation team in consultation with the Independent Evaluation Office. Besides representation of different regions as relevant, the parameters may include the size of investment; regional, multi-country and country offices, programme presence and no presence; length of establishment/ maturity of office; and feasibility of evaluation visit. A key criterion for the selection of case study countries will be their potential to generate knowledge and learning on effectiveness and efficiency of the regional architecture.

Evaluation Process

The evaluation process has five phases:

1) **Preparation:** gathering of available data on regional architecture, conceptualizing the evaluation approach, conducting internal consultations on the approach, preparing the TOR, establishing of internal reference group, and recruitment of external advisors and the evaluation team;

- 2) **Inception:** consultations between the evaluation team and evaluation office, desk review of key documents, inception meetings with the reference group, development of the result logic of regional architecture, establishment of baseline, finalization of selection criteria for country case studies for level 2 and level 3 country case studies, finalization of evaluation methodology and inception report;
- 3) **Data collection and analysis:** desk research, in-depth review of global, regional level, multi-country country and planning frameworks and programme documents, in-depth review of six regional offices, six multi-country offices and a representative sample of 20 UN Women country offices, staff and partner survey/s, participatory workshops, visits to five countries and HQ and preparation of 6 case study reports;
- 4) **Analysis and synthesis stage:** analysis of data and interpretation of findings, and drafting of an evaluation report and other communication products; and
- 5) **Dissemination and follow-up:** the development of a Management Response, publishing of the evaluation report, preparing conference room paper for the Executive Board, uploading the published report on the GATE website¹⁵, production of other knowledge products, and organizing of learning events, such as a webinar.

Evaluation Management

The UN Women Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) is responsible for the management of this corporate evaluation, including the quality of the evaluation report and its presentation to the UN Women Executive Board. IEO will hire an **external and independent evaluation firm** to conduct the evaluation. The evaluation firm will have a combination of the requisite experience in evaluation and technical expertise in organizational performance evaluations. The Independent Evaluation Office will manage the evaluation process, constitute a quality assurance system and provide administrative and substantive support, including joining the evaluation team in selected field missions and in HQ case study. IEO will also support coordination and liaison with concerned sections at headquarters and field offices. The Independent Evaluation Office will ensure that the evaluation is conducted in accordance with the UN Women Evaluation Policy, United Nations Evaluation Group Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the United Nations system and other key guidance documents.¹⁶

The establishment of **reference groups** will help to ensure that the evaluation approach is robust and relevant to staff and stakeholders, and make certain that factual errors or errors of omission or interpretation are identified in evaluation products. The core reference groups will provide input at key stages of the evaluation: terms of reference; inception report; draft and final reports. An internal UN Women reference group will be established that will be composed of senior managers/staff from regional and country offices as well as key divisions at HQ responsible for normative, operational, coordination and management and administration work. Regional Offices are encouraged to establish regional reference groups to gather inputs and comments at different stages of the process. These will be managed by regional offices.

¹⁵ UN Women's Global Accountability and Tracking of Evaluation Use (GATE) website: <http://gate.unwomen.org>

¹⁶ United Nations Evaluation Group, UNEG Ethical Guidelines, accessible at: http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=102 and UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the United Nations system, accessible at: http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=100

External Technical Experts will also be recruited to provide external quality assurance of the evaluation process. The technical experts will include one evaluation expert and one technical expert in decentralization processes in international organizations. The experts will play an important role in providing technical and strategic inputs into the evaluation process and review of the main evaluation products: TOR, inception and evaluation reports.

Evaluation Team

The core evaluation team will be composed of 4-5 independent consultants from a firm with extensive experience in organizational performance evaluation and decentralization processes, preferably of the United Nations System. The team will include an experienced Team Leader; a senior expert on organizational development and decentralization processes, a senior evaluation expert and research assistants. All team members must sign the “Evaluation consultants’ agreement form”¹⁷, based on the UNEG Code of Conduct and Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation in the United Nations system (see Annex 1). Detailed profiles of key team members are provided in Annex 2.

The combined expertise of the team should include:

- Advanced evaluation expertise and experience in a wide range of evaluation approaches including utilization-focused, gender and human rights responsive, and mixed methods.
- Proven expertise in evaluation of organizational performance and decentralization processes.
- Previous experience in conducting organizational performance evaluations as well as corporate and complex multi-stakeholder evaluations, preferably for the United Nations system.
- Knowledge of the relevant international frameworks on gender equality and women’s empowerment, gender mainstreaming, and gender analysis; experience/knowledge of women’s movements.
- Strong experience and knowledge in human rights, the human rights-based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related UN mandates.
- Strong experience of knowledge management.
- Excellent analytical, facilitation and communications skills; ability to negotiate with a wide range of stakeholders.
- Experience in organizational development and change management processes.
- Fluency in English and other official UN languages, particularly, Spanish and French.
- Balance in terms of gender and regional representation is desirable.

Evaluation Time frame and expected products

The proposed timeframe and expected products will be discussed with the evaluation team and refined in the inception report. The Independent Evaluation Office reserves the right to ensure the quality of products submitted by the external evaluation team and will request revisions until the product meets the quality

¹⁷ The form can be downloaded at: <https://unw-gate.azurewebsites.net/resources/docs/SiteDocuments/UNWomen%20-%20CodeofConductforEvaluationForm-Consultants.pdf>

standards as expressed by the Independent Evaluation Office and as set forth in UN Women Global Evaluation Reports Assessment and Analysis System (GERAAS).

Activity	Deliverables	General Timeframe
Planning phase		February-April, 2015
Reference & advisory group		April 31 2015
Draft TOR		April 31
Final TOR and RFP	Meeting on feedback to TOR May 6	May 20
RFP	Advertising 3 weeks	May 20 - June 20
Team on Board		July 15
Inception Phase of evaluation		July-September 2015
Inception	Meeting in NY August 24-25. Skype interviews with reference group September 1-2.	August –September 2015
Inception report (including two rounds of revision)	Based on inception phase activities the inception report will present a refined scope, a detailed outline of the evaluation design and methodology, evaluation questions, and criteria for the selection and approach for in-depth desk review and case studies. The report will include an evaluation matrix and detailed work plan. A first draft report will be shared with the Independent Evaluation Office and, based upon the comments received, the evaluation team will revise the draft. The revised draft will be shared with reference groups and external advisors for feedback. The evaluation team will maintain an audit trail of the comments received and provide a response on how the comments were addressed in the final inception report.	September 28
Data collection phase of evaluation		November –December 2015
Case study reports (including country and HQ cases and two rounds of revisions)	The findings from the case studies will be summarized in a report format. The format of the case study report will be defined in the inception report. The case study reports will be shared with the case	January 2015

	study reference groups established at country level. The evaluation team will maintain an audit trail of the comments received and provide a response on how the comments were addressed in the final case study reports.	
Analysis and reporting phase		February - March 2016
Presentation of preliminary findings (one round of revision)	A powerpoint presentation detailing the emerging findings of the evaluation will be shared with the Independent Evaluation Office for feedback. The revised presentation will be delivered to the reference groups for comment and validation. The evaluation team will incorporate the feedback received into the draft report.	March 2016
Draft Report (including three rounds of revision prior to the final report)	A first draft report will be shared with the Evaluation Office for initial feedback. The second draft report will incorporate IEO feedback and will be shared with the reference group and external advisors for identification of factual errors, errors of omission and/or misinterpretation of information. The third draft report will incorporate this feedback and then be shared with the reference group for final validation. The evaluation team will maintain an audit trail of the comments received and provide a response on how the comments were addressed in the revised drafts.	April 2016
Final Report	The final report will include a concise Executive Summary and annexes detailing the methodological approach and any analytical products developed during the course of the evaluation. The structure of the report will be defined in the inception report.	April - May 2016
Articles for IEO Magazine	A dissemination product/pamphlet extracting the key findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation report in a user-friendly format.	May 2016
Dissemination & Follow up	<i>Independent Evaluation Office is responsible for presenting the evaluation report to the Executive</i>	May – September 2016

<i>Board and disseminating the evaluation.</i>	
--	--

ANNEX 1: Key Evaluation Guidance Documents

(Click for hyperlink)

- [UN Women GERAAS evaluation report quality standards](#)
- [Evaluation Policy of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women \(UNW/2012/8\)](#)
- [UN Women Evaluation Handbook](#)
- [Evaluation Consultants Agreement Form](#)
- [Standards for Evaluation in the UN System](#)
- [Norms for Evaluation in the UN System](#)
- [Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation – towards UNEG Guidance](#)
- [UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports](#)
- [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#)
- [UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System](#)

ANNEX 2: Team Members Profile

As indicated in the TOR, the evaluation team should be composed of 4-5 members that include an experienced Team Leader, a senior expert on organizational performance and decentralization processes, a senior evaluation expert and research assistants. Ideally, the team leader should have expertise in UN programming processes, while the senior evaluator has strong knowledge of human rights and gender issues in evaluation. The team should be gender balanced and include regional evaluators; and preferably national researchers for the case studies of evaluation. Below is a more detailed description of the tasks and qualification requirements for each team member.

Team Leader

The team leader, with at least 15 years of evaluation experience, will be responsible for delivering the key evaluation products. He/she will coordinate the work of all other team members during all phases of the evaluation process, ensuring the quality of outputs and application of methodology as well as timely delivery of all products. In close collaboration with the IEO Task Manager, he/she will lead the conceptualization and design of the evaluation, the coordination and conduct of the country visits and the shaping of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the final report. The team leader will be required to lead/participate in the HQ case study and at least 2 regional and/or country case studies including in the first country case study. More specifically the tasks of the team leader include:

- Conducting an inception mission and developing an inception report outlining the design, methodology and the criteria for the selection of the case studies, required resources and indicative work plan of the evaluation team. Assigning and coordinating team tasks within the framework of the TOR.
- Directing and supervising the research assistant/s in carrying out research and analysis of secondary evidence, project documents, databases and all relevant documentation.
- Coordinating the conduct of case studies and preparing case study reports.
- Overseeing and assuring quality in the preparation of the case studies and taking a lead in the analysis of evaluation evidence.
- Drafting the evaluation report and leading the preparation of specific inputs from designated team members, based on case study reports prepared by the team members, desk research, focus groups, surveys, etc.
- Preparing for meetings with the IEO Task Manager and other stakeholders to review findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- Leading the stakeholder feedback sessions, briefing the IEO Task Manager on the evaluation through informal sessions and finalizing the report based on feedback from the IEO Task Manager.
- Preparing evaluation briefs, PPT presentation and working with the report editor, responding to final edits on the evaluation report.

Qualifications:

- At least 15 years practical experience in conducting evaluations of international policies and programmes applying a wide range of approaches and methods including utilization focused, gender and human rights responsive, and mixed methods with a background in social research;

- Extensive experience acting as team leader for complex evaluations and proven ability to manage a diverse evaluation team;
- Previous experience in conducting organizational performance evaluations as well as corporate and complex multi-stakeholder evaluations, preferably for the United Nations system.
- Excellent knowledge of the UN system, UN reform processes and UN Women programming at the country level, in development and conflict/post-conflict country contexts;
- Experience and knowledge on gender equality and women's empowerment, gender mainstreaming, gender analysis and the related mandates within the UN system; experience/knowledge of women's movements;
- Experience and knowledge on human rights issues, the human rights-based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system;
- Excellent analytical, facilitation and communications skills and ability to negotiate amongst a wide range of stakeholders;
- Fluent in English and knowledge of other official UN languages.

Senior Organizational Development/Decentralization expert

The senior organizational development/ decentralization expert will provide substantive advice on the organizational performance and decentralization issues in evaluation. Under the overall supervision of the evaluation team leader, the senior expert will participate in the inception and the conduct phases of the evaluation. He/she will provide inputs to the inception report, participate in the case studies and draft the case study reports, based on a standardized approach and format. In addition, he/she will contribute to the preparation of the final report and evaluation briefs as necessary, and will support the team leader in the supervision of the research assistant/s work.

Qualifications:

- At least 10 years of professional experience in organizational development, change management and decentralization;
- Knowledge of organizational development theory and practice, including feminist and gender analysis of organizations;
- Knowledge of the UN system, UN reform processes and UN programming at the country level;
- Knowledge of human rights issues, the human rights-based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system;
- Strong analytical, facilitation and communications skills and ability to negotiate amongst a wide range of stakeholders;
- Fluent in English and knowledge of other official UN languages.

Senior Evaluator

The senior evaluation expert will provide substantive advice on the design and implementation of evaluation methodology. Under the overall supervision of the evaluation team leader, the senior evaluation expert will participate in the inception and the conduct phases of the evaluation. He/she will provide inputs to the inception report, participate in the case studies and draft the case study reports, based on a standardized

approach and format. In addition, he/she will contribute to the preparation of the final report and evaluation briefs as necessary, and will support the team leader in the supervision of the research assistant/s work.

Qualifications:

- At least 7 – 10 years practical experience in conducting evaluation of international policies and programmes including organization performance assessments, utilizing a wide range of approaches and methods including utilization focused, gender and human rights-responsive, and mixed methods and background in social research;
- Strong knowledge of human rights issues, the human rights-based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system;
- Knowledge of the UN system, UN reform processes and UN programming at the country level, in development, conflict/post-conflict country contexts;
- Experience and knowledge in gender equality and women’s empowerment, gender mainstreaming, gender analysis and the related mandates within the UN system;
- Experience/knowledge of women’s movements would be considered an asset;
- Excellent analytical, facilitation and communications skills and ability to negotiate amongst a wide range of stakeholders;
- Fluent in English and knowledge of other official UN languages.

Qualifications of Research Assistant

- Strong analytical skills and ability to quickly grasp and synthesize information;
- Ability to work interactively with a team, often responding to varying requests under pressure;
- Good mastery of information technology required for organized presentation of information, including quantitative information and graphical presentations, and for organizing information and materials on the internal website;
- Excellent drafting skills in English;
- Deep knowledge and/or experience in the UN would be considered an asset;
- Working knowledge of other UN languages would be considered an asset.

ANNEX B: EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluation Objectives and Selected Questions	Indicators	Analysis	Data Sources
Evaluation Objective 1: Assess the relevance of regional architecture, particularly whether it meets the needs of key UN Women stakeholders at global, regional and country levels.			
<p>1. How well does the regional architecture respond to the needs of governments, civil society and UN agencies at global, regional and country levels? Are any improvements and adjustments needed (and what are they) to meet the needs of key stakeholders, including women and girls, and the most marginalized women?</p> <p>a. Has the RA increased UN Women’s ability to participate in global, regional and country-level fora to promote GEWE?</p> <p>b. In what ways has the regional architecture enabled UN Women to respond to stakeholder needs for information, technical guidance, advocacy, and leadership at each level – global, regional, and national?</p>	<p>Documented increase in UN Women presence in different fora at global, regional, and country level</p> <p>Changes of participation patterns at each level in the system</p> <p>Perceptions of government and civil society respondents on perceived increased participation by government and civil society</p> <p>Increased participation and role with UN partners (Coordination Evaluation)</p> <p>Documented increased catalytic partnerships of UN Women at all levels (Normative Evaluation)</p>	<p>Document evidence of responsiveness to stakeholders based on COAT 4 key indicators</p> <p>RMS Data- Annual Report Narratives analysis</p> <p>Verify staff and stakeholder perceptions of UN Women’s level of presence, participation, and responsiveness to stakeholder needs through in-depth interviews</p> <p>Document perceptions of change in responsiveness because of RA</p>	<p>UN Women annual workplans</p> <p>COAT</p> <p>Quarterly reports</p> <p>Programme reports</p> <p>Annual Reports</p> <p>Evaluations: MOPAN, MAR, Coordination, Normative</p> <p>Board documents</p> <p>In-depth portfolio review</p> <p>Staff and stakeholder interviews</p> <p>Global survey</p> <p>Country visits</p>
<p>2. How to ensure the regional architecture is fit to ensure the universality of SDGs and UN Women mandate?</p>	<p>Elements in the RA design that enable or constrain integration of SDGs and UN Women Mandates</p> <p>Evidence of enablers and constraining factors in RA’s ability to ensure the universality of SDGs and UN Women Mandate (case studies, interviews, perceptions of staff)</p> <p>Percentage of staff who report that UN Women is fit to ensure the universality of SDGs and the UN Women’s mandates.</p>	<p>Through document review and country portfolio analysis, identify elements in the RA design (including recent developments such as the 12 flagship initiatives) that enables or constrains integration of SDGs and UN Women mandates</p>	<p>Flagship initiative Documents</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Case Studies</p> <p>Charles Lusthaus Framework</p> <p>In-depth portfolio Review</p>

Evaluation Objectives and Selected Questions	Indicators	Analysis	Data Sources
		<p>Through interviews and case studies, verify and explore enablers and constraints in RA's ability to ensure the universality of SDGs and UN Women mandate</p> <p>Using the checklist of organizational analysis in the Lusthaus et al. model, identify enabling and constraining factors in the design and implementation of the RA</p> <p>Identify plans in progress to address issues that may arise due to new SDG's</p>	
<p>Evaluation Objective 2: Assess the organizational effectiveness of regional architecture to deliver UN Women's mandate across all roles – advocacy, normative, policy, UN coordination and programmatic at global, regional, and country levels.</p>			
<p>3. To what extent and in what ways have the objectives set in the Executive Board paper (UNW/2012/10) to establish an effective regional architecture been met?</p>	<p>Number of regional and multi-country offices that have been established and are fully operational</p> <p>Number and percentage of regional, multi-country and country offices with the core minimum staffing</p> <p>Number and percentage of staff in regional, multi-country, and country offices who have received training and are certified in their areas of responsibility</p> <p>Number and percentage of regional and multi-country offices that have established and are using business and financial management system in place, including procedures for administrative audit and risk mitigation</p> <p>Number and percentage of regional,</p>	<p>Compare core minimums staffing requirements in board documents (Regional Architecture Item 3, 2012) to current staff list (Staff List 2015) to analyse percentage of posts not filled</p> <p>DOA Roll out dates vs. initial proposed roll out dates in Board Documents</p> <p>% of offices with audit and risk mitigation procedures</p>	<p>Board Documents (DOA Framework, 2012 RA Board documents)</p> <p>COAT</p> <p>Staff Lists</p> <p>RMS</p> <p>Staff interviews</p> <p>Country visits</p>

Evaluation Objectives and Selected Questions	Indicators	Analysis	Data Sources
	multi-country, and country offices that allocated sufficient budgetary resources to carry out their core functions and mandate	Compare countries by region in terms of AWP funding gap, % unfunded	
<p>4. To what extent and why does the regional architecture contribute to UN Women’s achievements in the operational, normative and coordination mandate at global, regional and country levels in an effective manner? Are any improvements or adjustments to the institutional setup needed to enhance effectiveness?</p> <p>a. In what ways does the regional architecture design contribute to its achievements of the operational, normative and coordinate mandate at each level?</p> <p>b. In what ways does the regional architecture implementation contribute to its achievements of the operational, normative and coordinate mandate at each level?</p> <p>c. What do UN Women staff appreciate and value most about the regional architecture that enables them to be more relevant, efficient and effective in their work?</p>	<p>Extent to which the regional offices have engaged with intergovernmental processes to promote dialogue, sharing of information and innovations and application of international norms and policies to accelerate mainstreaming of gender equality and human rights programming</p> <p>Extent to which UN Women’s partners at all levels perceive the regional staff as an important resource for formulation of policies, setting standards and norms and harmonizing national, regional and global efforts to achieve gender equality and human-rights based programming</p> <p>Number and percentage of survey respondents who perceive the regional architecture as contributing to greater coordination and collaboration among multiple partners in programming for gender equality</p> <p>Ways in which stakeholders perceive the regional architecture as having a comparative advantage or value added in achieving UN Women’s mandate (e.g., through mobilization of resources, building of partnerships, harmonization of policies and practices, strategic capacity building of governments and civil society, improved knowledge management and information sharing, etc.)</p>	<p>Interviews and survey on staff perceptions, analysis based on qualitative findings of interviews and quantitative and qualitative findings of survey</p>	<p>Desk review including Normative evaluation is the main source of information on the normative mandate Coordination evaluation is the main source of information on the coordination mandate OEEF reports</p> <p>Staff and stakeholder Interviews In-depth portfolio review</p> <p>Global survey</p> <p>Country visits</p>
<p>5. What systems and processes (both formal and informal) are in place to monitor and assess the</p>	<p>Documentation of policies, practices and systems currently used by</p>	<p>Compare RMS data</p>	<p>Desk review including</p>

Evaluation Objectives and Selected Questions	Indicators	Analysis	Data Sources
<p>effectiveness of regional architecture? Are the systems working adequately and do they feed the organization with useful lessons?</p>	<p>UN Women to track, monitor and evaluate the regional architecture at all levels</p> <p>Extent to which the monitoring and evaluation system described in Board documents is in place, and uniformly applied across the UN Women system and integrated into programme planning and strategic decision making. Note ongoing processes such as the RMS and COAT</p> <p>Number of reports generated by the monitoring and evaluation system on the effectiveness of the regional architecture, and how the results were used for quality improvement and forward planning</p> <p>Staff perceptions in interview and survey on the use of information in existing systems for learning, improvement, etc., including specific examples of such use</p>	<p>across countries of see % of countries with missing OEEF, DRF, Monitoring, Donor Reports and Programme Reports, disaggregated by type of report</p> <p>Number of OEEF reports completed and tracked across regions, countries and typologies</p> <p>% staff who use information available for learning and improvement</p>	<p>Executive Board papers</p> <p>Annual workplans/strategic notes</p> <p>AWP Feedback reports,</p> <p>COAT and RMS;</p> <p>UN Women All Staff Survey 2014</p> <p>In depth portfolio review</p> <p>Staff interviews</p> <p>Global survey</p> <p>Country visits</p>
<p>6. How has the Regional architecture enhanced integration between normative, operation and coordination work, what adjustments are needed to improve integration at all levels and why?</p>	<p>Number and usage of specific strategies, planning guidelines, and practices applied in the regional architecture to enhance synergy and linkages between the normative, operational and coordination work of UN Women</p> <p>Number of programmes, activities, and initiatives that have built in linkages between the normative, operational and coordination work of UN Women</p> <p>Extent to which UN Women staff and partners perceive close linkages between the normative, operational and coordination work of UN Women</p>	<p>Number of reports and guidelines</p> <p>Staff perception of usefulness of planning guidelines and practices</p> <p>Quarterly reports, RMS narrative reports of integration.</p> <p>Interviews with staff in country to see integration perception</p>	<p>Desk review including memos, emails etc. from retreats including Global Retreat 2015 and staff meetings on integration topic; document of 12 Flagship Initiatives; Regional Architecture Update reports; also evaluation reports</p> <p>In-depth portfolio review</p> <p>Staff and stakeholder interviews</p>

Evaluation Objectives and Selected Questions	Indicators	Analysis	Data Sources
			Global survey Country visits
7. To what extent and why does the Regional Architecture increase UN Women's focus and capacity to apply rigorous gender analysis and human rights approach in programme design, monitoring, and implementation at regional and country levels?	<p>Specific policies, procedures and practices instituted in the regional architecture to ensure the integration of gender analysis and rights-based approaches into its programming at the national, regional and global levels</p> <p>Percentage of UN Women staff who have received training and are knowledgeable about gender-sensitive and human rights-based programming (Survey)</p> <p>Extent to which the regional architecture facilitated the implementation of established standards and norms for gender-responsive and human-rights based programming (Interviews and Survey)</p>	<p>Number of programme docs focusing on gender analysis and rights-based approaches to work.</p> <p>Number of HQ reports mentioning importance of rights-based approach.</p> <p>Analyse knowledge of gender-sensitive programming and human rights based programming in results of Survey and country interviews</p>	Desk review including Board papers 2014 Staff Survey Staff interviews Global survey Country visit
Evaluation Objective 3: Assess the efficiency of regional architecture's administrative systems, structure and processes, including mechanisms to ensure efficient communication linkages between HQ and the field.			
8. To what extent the regional architecture has been designed and implemented in a way that is responsive to needs, changes and actions emerging at the different levels of organization (HQ, Regional Offices, Multi-country and Country Offices)?	<p>Proportion of country requests that receive responses that address the needs expressed in a timely way.</p> <p>Percent of time and resources at regional level devoted to responding to country needs versus other responsibilities.</p> <p>Percentage of country and programme staff who report that they are satisfied with the response they receive to their needs.</p>	<p>Survey results of staff perceptions of RA flexibility of country context</p> <p>Results of Staff survey 2014 in perceptions of RA</p>	Board papers regarding the design of the RA Formal or informal monitoring records on requests and responses Staff Survey Desk review Staff interviews Global survey Country visits
9. How efficient and responsive is the regional architecture in terms of delegation of authority, decision-making process and methods for	<p>Documentary information on what areas of responsibility and authority have been delegated to</p>	<p>Rollout of delegation of authority chart and timing of DOA rollout in different</p>	Desk review including Board papers

Evaluation Objectives and Selected Questions	Indicators	Analysis	Data Sources
<p>setting direction? To what extent and why are the roles and responsibilities, coordination of labour and coordination of systems clear and efficient?</p>	<p>the field and what resources accompany the change to enable the field to execute that authority</p> <p>Extent to which UN Women staff at all levels feel there is sufficient clarity, transparency and consistency in roles and responsibilities, decision-making processes and operational policies – particularly in the areas of human resources management, resource allocation and programme management</p> <p>Extent to which key operations processes throughout the system – country, regional, HQ— exploring clarity of roles, common understanding of process, especially in handoffs, systems for tracking requests and responses, systems for evaluating customer service in response to requests</p> <p>Increased efficiency in decision-making processes, strategic planning as evidenced in timely completion and approvals of plans and feedback documents based on survey feedback, in-depth portfolio review and country case studies</p> <p>Improved alignment of resources to needs to implement workplans—look for chain of command in allocations; and who and at what level provides needed support</p> <p>Percentage of UN Women staff who report that the system has the flexibility to respond to changing needs or context?</p> <p>Percentage of UN Women staff who feel these RA systems and processes are gender equitable and consistent with human-rights based policies and principles of the UN system globally</p>	<p>countries</p> <p>Case study and in-depth portfolio review reported instances of faster or slower approvals</p> <p>Staff understanding and Identification of methods of setting direction—e.g. 12 Flagship Initiatives and Peer Review of Strategic Notes process</p> <p>Explore clarity of roles and challenges such as duplication of effort and role confusion</p> <p>Explore clarity of expectations, definitions, and functions at all levels of UN Women</p>	<p>(DOA and Internal Control Framework)</p> <p>Updates on Regional Architecture</p> <p>Memos from management;</p> <p>Flagship Initiatives report</p> <p>Staff interviews</p> <p>Indepth portfolio review</p> <p>Global survey</p> <p>Country visits</p>
<p>10. How efficient is the use of financial</p>	<p>Extent to which allocation of</p>	<p>Delivery and delivery</p>	<p>Desk review</p>

Evaluation Objectives and Selected Questions	Indicators	Analysis	Data Sources
<p>and human resources and IT systems in the framework of the regional architecture?</p>	<p>resources is to be well-planned (versus ad hoc), predictable and aligned with identified needs and organizational priorities at all levels of the UN Women system</p> <p>Extent to which UN Women staff feel that there are adequate and reliable financial, human, and technical resources to fully implement the regional architecture and meet its objectives</p> <p>Management and staff ratio</p> <p>Consistent use of audit and risk mitigation procedures to ensure efficient and appropriate use of financial and human resources within the regional architecture</p>	<p>rate: aggregate and regionally by type of presence; outlier countries both high and low (explore factors that influence results through interviews)</p> <p>Core and non-core: % of core vs non-core staff and changes overtime; patterns in core vs non-core activities and changes overtime</p> <p>Management and staff ratio analysis</p> <p>% Staff vacancies by type of staff (technical, administrative, etc.) and changes overtime</p> <p>Country rating for the 8 countries with data: changes overtime</p> <p>Performance in implementation of audit recommendations</p>	<p>including</p> <p>COAT</p> <p>Internal Audits</p> <p>RMS</p> <p>In-depth portfolio review</p> <p>Staff interviews</p> <p>Global survey</p> <p>Country visits</p> <p>HR Staff Data</p>
<p>11. To what extent do the existing funding sources offer sustained support for the current staff structure and planned results of the regional architecture?</p>	<p>Number and percentage of regional, multi-country, and country offices that have sufficient funding resources to support current and anticipated staffing needs through 2017</p> <p>Extent to which UN Women staff feel that the existing funding sources are sufficiently responsive to changing needs in staffing structure or capacities – both expected or unexpected</p>	<p>Resourcing efficiency: Outstanding partner advances and changes overtime</p> <p>Resource mobilization required and changes overtime</p> <p>Core and non-</p>	<p>Desk review including</p> <p>COAT-Resource mobilization required</p> <p>Staff interviews</p> <p>Global survey</p>

Evaluation Objectives and Selected Questions	Indicators	Analysis	Data Sources
		core: % of core vs non-core staff and changes overtime; patterns in core vs non-core activities and changes overtime	Country visit
<p>12. To what extent does the RA support or reinforce that management and administrative systems promote gender sensitive approaches in day-to-day operations of regional architecture?</p>	<p>Percentage of UN Women staff at all levels who received training in and are knowledgeable about gender equality and human rights principles and standards of practice</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Documented explicit policies, practices and guidelines applied within the regional architecture to operationalize gender-sensitive approaches in its day-to-day operations and practices (e.g., human resource management, programme planning, budgeting and resource allocation, etc.)</p>	<p>Compare percentage of women trained in different typologies (Country, RO, etc)</p> <p>Staff knowledge of HR guidelines to gender-sensitize approaches</p> <p>Staff perception of gender-sensitive approaches from staff survey 2014</p>	<p>Desk review including 2014 Staff Survey;</p> <p>Board papers;</p> <p>Human Resources Guidelines</p> <p>Staff interviews</p> <p>Global survey</p> <p>Country visits</p>

ANNEX C: EVALUATION WORKPLAN

Activities	September 2015		October 2015		November 2015		December 2015		January 2016		February 2016		March 2016		April 2016		May 2016		Comments/Dates of note
	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-29	1-15	16-31	
Start-up Activities																			
Contract awarded																			
Initial consultations with UNW Independent Evaluation Office																			
Orientation and planning with evaluation team																			
Review of basic evaluation documents																			
Preparations for Design Focusing Session																			
Facilitation of Design Focusing Session & meetings (NY HQ)				12-14															Three days –October 12-14
First draft Inception Report				26															26-Oct-15 for draft report
Second draft Inception Report					6														6-Nov-15 for second draft
Submit final Inception Report (Deliverable)						20													20-Nov-15 for final
Preparations for Data Collection																			
Orientation and training of evaluation team																			
Preparation of data collection tools																			
Consultations with Independent Evaluation Office																			

Activities	September 2015		October 2015		November 2015		December 2015		January 2016		February 2016		March 2016		April 2016		May 2016		Comments/Dates of note
	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-29	1-15	16-31	
Desk Review																			
Preparation of documents for review, in consultation with UNW																			Partly during inception, and partly in December for specific countries
Develop data extraction and coding procedures and forms																			
Obtain and log all documents for review																			
Conduct systematic desk review of documents agreed upon																			
Analyze and summarize results of desk review																			
In-depth Semi-Structured Interviews																			
Develop and pilot interviews for key stakeholders groups (UNW staff, partners, donors, other development agencies, etc.)																			
Identify stakeholders for interview, in consultation with UNW																			
Schedule and conduct interviews																			
Code, analyze and synthesize interview data																			
Summarize interview findings																			

Activities	Septem ber 2015		Octob er 2015		Novem ber 2015		Decem ber 2015		Janu ary 2016		Febru ary 2016		Marc h 2016		April 2016		May 2016		Comments/Dates of note
	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-29	1-15	16-31	
Global Survey																			
Identify stakeholder groups to be surveyed, in consultation with Independent Evaluation Office																			
Develop and pilot survey questions for stakeholder groups identified																			
Prepare for launch of survey, including introductory letters from UNW to survey recipients																			
Launch survey																			
Monitor and track responses to survey, send reminders																			
Analyze, summarize data from survey																			
Summarize survey data																			
Case Studies/Country Visits																			
Identification and selection of countries for site visit based on agreed upon criteria and in consultation with Independent Evaluation Office																			
Prepare country profiles, background material and relevant documents for selected countries																			
Prepare travel,																			

	September 2015		October 2015		November 2015		December 2015		January 2016		February 2016		March 2016		April 2016		May 2016		Comments/Dates of note
Activities	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-29	1-15	16-31	
logistics and coordination with country representatives																			
Conduct Pilot - Colombia						17-20													Colombia
Country 2 case study							7-11												Morocco
Country 3 case study																			Tajikistan (dates TBD)
HQ case study										18-22									New York
Country 4 case study										25-29									Liberia
Country 5 case study											1-5								Thailand
Draft case study reports of HQ and country visits																			Submit first draft to UN women on 2/19/16
Submit final case study reports (Deliverable)																			
Final Data Analysis and Synthesis																			
Consolidation of data from all sources																			
Data cleaning, reliability checks, quality control																			
Comparative analysis, synthesis and initial interpretive summaries																			
Draft evaluation report to UN Women																			Submit first draft 4/4/16

	September 2015		October 2015		November 2015		December 2015		January 2016		February 2016		March 2016		April 2016		May 2016		Comments/Dates of note
Activities	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-31	1-15	16-30	1-15	16-29	1-15	16-31	
Present findings to Independent Evaluation Office and reference group for validation, participatory feedback and discussion on their use in the evaluation report (Deliverable)																			Late April
Second draft to reference group																			Submit second draft 4/20/16
Submit final draft evaluation report (Deliverable)																			5/20/16

ANNEX D: DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

CASE STUDY AND PORTFOLIO REVIEW- ALL STAFF

UN Women Regional Architecture Evaluation

Site Visit Interview Guide

Questions for UN Women Field Staff

Date:

Country/Office:

Interviewee (name, title):

Interviewer:

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for making the time to talk with me.

We greatly appreciate this opportunity to talk with you about your experience with the UN Women regional architecture. UN Women's Independent Evaluation Group has asked EnCompass to conduct an evaluation of UN Women's Regional Architecture. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, organizational effectiveness and administrative efficiency of the RA since its implementation. The evaluation will assess the strengths and weaknesses of the RA and provide forward-looking recommendations to strengthen implementation. The findings of the evaluation will be presented to the Executive Board in 2016 and will be used for strategic decisions, organizational learning and accountability.

The evaluation consists of five country case studies that focus on different types of country offices (Regional, MCO, etc.), an in-depth portfolio analysis of 32 countries and a global survey to all UN Women staff. The purpose of this visit is to gain in-depth understanding of how the regional architecture actually functions at the country (or Regional) level and how it contributes to the achievement of the UN Women mandate.

You were suggested as a key person to inform this activity and we greatly appreciate your perspective and views on the Regional Architecture.

Before we begin, I want to let you know that no information or examples we gather during this interview will be attributed to a specific person or institution, unless you tell us that you would be willing to have your responses to be either quoted in the report or otherwise attributed to you. You are also free to not respond to any of our questions or stop the interview at any time.

Our interview will take about 1 hour.

Before we begin, do you have any questions about this interview?

CORE QUESTIONS

1. **Engagement with UNW:** Tell me about your engagement with UNW and entry into your current position.
 - a. **Background:** How long have you been with UNW and in what capacities? Were you involved with any of the predecessor organizations prior to your engagement with UNW? How long have you been involved with gender equality work and in what ways?
 - b. **Role and Responsibilities:** What is your current position and role? What are your responsibilities (PROBE FOR MOST IMPORTANT RESPONSIBILITIES)? In what ways do support the coordination, normative, operations mandates?
 - c. **Reporting:** to whom do you report? Who reports to you?

*NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: For Regional Offices and MCOs, ask: **In what ways do you support satellite countries?** Probe how countries contact them, tracking of requests, delivery of services or other support, quality assurance and reporting. **Probe into use of PCA's vs. Procurements in Country Offices and Programme Presence Offices. Is this happening? If so, Why?***

2. **Exceptional experience related to UNW work:** Think about your work with UN Women, since it became UN Women, and tell me a story about an exceptional experience, or high point, a time when you were the most proud to work here.
What happened? Who was involved? What was your role in this experience? What made it possible? (Try to get a great quote!)

NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: Is this experience related to normative, coordination, operations?

For Regional Offices and MCOs: Probe for how in this exceptional experience satellite countries were served.

3. **Values:** What do you value the most about the work you do?

4. **Most significant changes:** From your perspective, what are the three most significant changes in the way your office does business since the implementation of the regional architecture? How are these changes significant?
 - a. **For Regional Offices and MCOs:** How are these changes significant for satellite countries?

NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: Probe for changes related to roles/responsibilities, decision-making processes, resources, country level benefits, partner relationships, etc.

5. **Enabling actions:** What actions and adaptations on your part (and the part of your office/unit) have enabled you to take advantage of the RA to do your work better?
- a. **For Regional Offices and MCOs:** ...especially to serve satellite offices?

NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: Probe for examples of efficiency (do things faster with fewer steps, raise funds to get things done), effectiveness (advocate better, reach more stakeholders, adapt campaigns to local needs, feel confident and knowledgeable in promoting GEWE).

6. **Probe on a key process or key task:** Let's take your example of ... (pick one of the core areas of responsibility of this person, or key changes/enabling action areas) and help me understand it better.

NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: Probe for understanding the process: who initiates, who has input, who approves, who benefits, who has oversight, who is accountable and how, who communicates, who evaluates?

For Regional Offices and MCOs, pick a process that serves satellite offices.

Note variation (sometimes, it works this way, sometimes that) and what it depends on.

Conclude: I see this has been important for you. What is one thing you would do to strengthen it?

Checklist of areas that may come up for strengthening, PROBE FOR: REPORTING/RMS, KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT, HUMAN RESOURCES, FINANCIAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT, ADVOCACY/PARTNERSHIPS, FUNDRAISING:

Enabling environment	Organizational capacity	Organizational motivation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative • Political • Social/Cultural • Economic • Stakeholder 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership • Structure • Human Resources • Financial Management • Infrastructure • Programme Management, including support in financial management, IT, HR, etc. • Process Management • Inter-organizational linkages • Knowledge Management, e.g. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History • Mission • Culture • Incentives/Rewards including recognition, promotions, inclusion in important meetings

	<i>support by Policy Advisors</i>	
--	-----------------------------------	--

7. **Customer window questions:** In what ways has the regional architecture enabled you and your colleagues support your key stakeholders, including the most marginalized women? What challenges do you face in supporting your key stakeholders under the regional architecture?

NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: Explore Linkages with relevant stakeholders. For Regional Offices and MCOs, probe especially for support and linkages to satellite countries. Also probe into added value:

- *How would you describe the added value of this MCO/RO to the Triple Mandate of UN Women?*
- *If you could make 3 modifications to increase the ability of the MCO/RO to deliver, what would they be?*

We will use this to compare perceptions when talking to any of these stakeholders.

Stakeholder	Changes appreciated	Changes not appreciated	How to better support
Government			
Civil Society			
Other UN agencies			
Regional Office			
Multi-country Office			
Country Office(s)			
Programme Office			
Headquarters			

8. **Wishes:** If you had three wishes or requests (related to any level) that would make your exceptional experience an everyday occurrence (that would enable your work even more), and help UN Women be the best organization it could be, what would these three wishes be?

NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: Probe on each of these wishes if they are too vague: what would it take to get them accomplished?

For Regional Offices and Country Offices, probe for wishes to help UNW serve satellite countries.

We will categorize each wish by the elements in the Lusthaus and Carden model: authority, communication, incentives (recognition, consequences), leadership, structure, human resources, financial management, etc.

OPTIONAL QUESTIONS

9. **FOR REGIONAL DIRECTORS, MCO Directors, COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVES and PROGRAMME MANAGERS: Integration of work in three mandates:** How has the regional architecture enhanced integration between normative, operation and coordination work, what adjustments are needed to improve integration at all levels?

- a. To what extent and in what ways has the regional architecture enhanced your ability to integrate your work in the normative, operational and coordination spheres (e.g., planning across pillars, using normative agenda to inform operational planning and coordination activities, etc.)? Please give examples, describe a specific situation or tell us a story to illustrate your point.
- b. What adjustments or changes in the system are needed to improve integration between the three mandates at all levels?

10. **FOR SENIOR MANAGERS, 2030 agenda:** How does UN Women’s overall organizational design (the regional architecture) best position UN Women to be fit-for-purpose in supporting the 12 Flagship Initiative and addressing the 2030 agenda?

- a. **For Regional Directors/MCOs:** How does UNW’s RA best support countries to be fit-for-purpose in addressing the 2030 agenda?

11. **FROM DOCUMENTS:** To what extent do the existing funding sources offer sustained support for the current staff structure and planned results of the regional architecture?

Core funds:	Non-core funds: (note sources)
-------------	---------------------------------------

- a. **FOR SENIOR MANAGERS:** What strategies has your office used to garner resources to support its staffing needs through non-core funds and other non-traditional funding sources? How has that worked and what are the challenges (e.g., lack of continuity and stability)?

- b. **SENIOR MANAGERS:** In what areas do you need capacity strengthening to make your office more effective in delivering on the three UN Women mandates? Please explain.

NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: Probe for needed changes in management skills and leadership, programmatic and technical expertise and operational support. Also probe for gender analysis and human rights approaches competencies.

CASE STUDY- NON UNW STAKEHOLDERS

UN Women Regional Architecture Evaluation

Case Study Interview Guide

Questions for Non-UNW Stakeholders

Date:

Country:

Interviewee (name, title, affiliation):

Interviewer:

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for making the time to talk with me.

We greatly appreciate this opportunity to talk with you about your experience with the UN Women regional architecture. UN Women's Independent Evaluation Group has asked EnCompass to conduct an evaluation of UN Women's Regional Architecture. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, organizational effectiveness and administrative efficiency of the RA since its implementation. The evaluation will assess the strengths and weaknesses of the RA and provide forward-looking recommendations to strengthen implementation. The findings of the evaluation will be presented to the Executive Board in 2016 and will be used for strategic decisions, organizational learning and accountability.

The evaluation consists of five country case studies that focus on different types of country offices (Regional, MCO, etc.), an in-depth portfolio analysis of 32 countries and a global survey to all UN Women staff. The purpose of this visit is to gain in-depth understanding of how the regional architecture actually functions at the country (or Regional) level and how it contributes to the achievement of the UN Women mandate.

You were suggested as a key person to inform this activity and we greatly appreciate your perspective and views on the Regional Architecture.

Before we begin, I want to let you know that no information or examples we gather during this interview will be attributed to a specific person or institution, unless you tell us that you would be willing to have your responses to be either quoted in the report or otherwise attributed to you. You are also free to not respond to any of our questions or stop the interview at any time.

Our interview will take about 1 hour.

Before we begin, do you have any questions about this interview?

QUESTIONS

1. **Engagement with UNW:** Tell me about your involvement with UNW. In what ways are you engaged with UNW and with who do you mostly interact? What are you currently doing with UNW and how long have you been working with them?

2. **Most significant changes:** What changes have you seen in UNW in the last 3 years? What are the three most significant changes in the way you or your organization does business with UNW since the implementation of the regional architecture?

NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: Probe for changes related to roles/responsibilities, decision-making processes-speed, presence, level of engagement, resources, country level benefits, partner relationships, etc.

3. **Values:** What do you value most about your collaboration with UNW? What do you think UN Women does particularly well?

4. **Wishes:** If you had three wishes for UNW that would enable it to support your work and your joint goals for GEWE in the best way, what would these three wishes be?

NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: Probe on each of these wishes if they are too vague: what would it take to get them accomplished?

We will categorize each wish by the elements in the Lusthaus and Carden model: authority, communication, incentives (recognition, consequences), leadership, structure, human resources, financial management, etc.

ANNEX E: PROPOSED COUNTRIES SAMPLE

The following Criteria were used for selection of case studies and portfolio analysis, following consultation with UN Women IEO. Proposed list of countries are currently under review. They are listed by country criteria in Table B.

Table A:

Key criteria for country case studies (five field visits)	
1. Type of Office	
Database Ref	UN Women Global Presence
Rationale	Regional typology (regional, multi-country, country, programme presence, gender advisor, no presence)
Explanation	Type of office will allow capturing specificities on how each type of office established interacts within the regional architecture setup
Data sources	UN Women Global Presence
2. Geographic distribution	
Database Ref	UN WOMEN Regions
Rationale	Geographic diversity
Explanation	Need to include a balanced representation of the UN WOMEN work across its six regions
Data sources	UN Women Global Presence
3. Country Context	
Database Ref	UN Classification of Countries
Rationale	Contextual diversity
Explanation	UN Women operations differ in middle-income and low-income countries, and in terms of the humanitarian context. This criterion was included to capture differences and similarities in operations between different sets of countries and how different contextual variables affect results. Countries will be chosen based on country context-income and humanitarian context status.
Data sources	UN Women Global Presence, UN Classification of countries

4. Evaluation Fatigue- Site Visits ONLY	
Database Ref	Past evaluation case studies and planned decentralized evaluations
Rationale	Feasibility
Explanation	Evaluation fatigue was assessed based on the presence of evaluations at the country level since 2011, including country, regional, and corporate evaluations. The reason to include this criterion was to avoid overburdening country offices with too many evaluation demands, as well as ensuring a higher learning potential by evaluating countries that have not been already over-analysed.
Data sources	Information available on the Gate UN Women.org
Additional criteria for in-depth portfolio analysis (32 countries)	
4. Status of Workforce	
Database Ref	
Rationale	Portfolio diversity
Explanation	This criterion was selected to ensure that the sample includes countries with the varied size of workforce. Includes staff and non-staff personnel, such as service contracts, SSA/IC, secondments, UNV, other and interns. Policy advisors and economic advisors are the primary criterion.
Data sources	Total Workforce numbers per region, country, and grade, provided by Human Resources (Workforce Data spreadsheet). Data was extracted from HR Staff list provided by HR Section as of 1 September 2015.
5. Level of Maturity	
Database Ref	Status of the Rollout of DoA by region and by year
Rationale	Maturity based on Regional Architecture establishment
Explanation	The level of maturity of each office as seen by Delegation of Authority (DoA) rollout timelines, and by existence as an office or not prior to the Regional Architecture rollout.
Data sources	List of DOA, based on DoA dates consolidated from intranet and provided by PSU
6. Level of Expenditure (Secondary Criterion to Status of Workforce)	
Database Ref	2014 Level of Expenditure
Rationale	Portfolio diversity
Explanation	This indicator will be used as a secondary criterion to Status of Workforce. It includes level of investment in each office in terms of financial resources.

Data
sources

Programme Expenditure based on report sent by Finance from August 2015

Table B:

Country/Region	Type of Office	Geography	Country Context Income	Humanitarian	Gender Advisor	Eval. Fatigue	Status of Workforce – Total	Level of Maturity	Level of Expenditure (2014)	Status of Workforce – Policy & Economic
Country Case Studies (Confirmed)										
Morocco	Multi-country	Arab States	L/M			3	21	2/1/2013	\$ 1,970.80	
Liberia	Country Office	Western and Central Africa	L			2	24	4/2/2013	\$ 1,827.90	
Thailand	Regional and Country Office	Asia and the Pacific	U/M			1	43		\$ 7,094.48	2- Policy Advisors, 1 - Policy Specialist
Colombia	Country Office	Americas and the Caribbean	U/M	H		3	45	5/14/2013	\$1,650.00	
Tajikistan	Programme Presence	Europe and Central Asia	L				15		\$ 489.72	
Malaysia	Non-Programme Presence									
Portfolio Analysis Countries (Tentative)										
Regional and Multi-country Offices										
Egypt	Regional and Country Office	Arab States	L/M				53	6/14/2014	\$ 4,751.24	1- Policy Advisor
Kenya	Regional & Country	Eastern and	L			1	68	2/26/2013	\$ 5,636.82	1- Economic

Country/ Region	Type of Office	Geography	Country Context Income	Humanitarian	Gender Advisor	Eval. Fatigue	Status of Workforce – Total	Level of Maturity	Level of Expenditure (2014)	Status of Workforce – Policy & Economic
	Office	Southern Africa								Advisor, 3- Policy Advisor
Panama (Panama City)	Regional	Americas and the Caribbean	U/M				30		\$ 3,397.01	1- Economic Advisor, 2- Policy Advisor
Senegal	Regional and Country Office	Western and Central Africa	L/M			2	44		\$ 3,447.08	1- Policy Advisor
Thailand	Regional and Country Office	Asia and the Pacific	U/M			1	43		\$ 7,094.48	2- Policy Advisors, 1 - Policy Specialist
Turkey (Istanbul)	Regional	Europe and Central Asia	U/M				19		\$ 1,418.74	1- Policy Advisor
Barbados	Multi-country	Americas and the Caribbean	H			2	13	4/3/2013	\$ 1,887.13	
Fiji	Multi-country	Asia and the Pacific	U/M			4	35	3/20/2013	\$ 3,884.72	
India	Multi-country	Asia and the Pacific	L/M			5	63	4/9/2013	\$ 3,636.87	
Kazakhstan	Multi-country	Europe and Central Asia	U/M			3	15	10/15/2014	\$ 2,057.80	

Country/Region	Type of Office	Geography	Country Context Income	Humanitarian	Gender Advisor	Eval. Fatigue	Status of Workforce – Total	Level of Maturity	Level of Expenditure (2014)	Status of Workforce – Policy & Economic
Morocco	Multi-country	Arab States	L/M			3	21	2/1/2013	\$ 1,970.80	
South Africa	Multi-country	Eastern and Southern Africa	U/M			2	12		\$ 1,550.37	
Additional 20 Country and Programme Presence Countries (including 2 satellite countries)										
Cote d'Ivoire	Country Office	Western and Central Africa	L/M	H		2	15	4/24/2015	\$ 663.74	
Niger	Programme Presence	Western and Central Africa	L	H			1		\$ 87.99	
Kyrgyzstan	Country Office	Europe and Central Asia	L/M				32	5/20/2013	\$ 1,293.89	
FYR Macedonia	Programme Presence	Europe and Central Asia	U/M				14		\$ 243.59	
Somalia	Programme Presence	Eastern and Southern Africa	L	H		1	10		\$ 937.73	
South Sudan	Country Office	Eastern and Southern Africa	L/M	H		1	17	3/4/2013	\$ 4,933.24	
Tanzania	Country	Eastern	L			2	25	4/26/2013	\$	

Country/Region	Type of Office	Geography	Country Context Income	Humanitarian	Gender Advisor	Eval. Fatigue	Status of Workforce – Total	Level of Maturity	Level of Expenditure (2014)	Status of Workforce – Policy & Economic
	Office	and Southern Africa							2,214.14	
Afghanistan	Country Office	Asia and the Pacific	L	H		5	65	3/1/2013	\$ 8,289.74	1- Economics-related specialist
China	Programme Presence	Asia and the Pacific	U/M			1	7		\$ 586.15	
Vietnam	Country Office	Asia and the Pacific	L/M			1	23	8/13/2013	\$ 1,251.28	
Jordan (covering Syria)	Country Office	Arab States	U/M-Jordan L/M-SAR	H-Syria		2	23	4/25/2013	\$ 2,943.22	
Yemen	Programme Presence	Arab States	L/M	H	Gender Advisor (Senior)		1		\$ 0.71	
Uruguay	Programme Presence	Americas and the Caribbean	H			1	3		\$ 317.66	
Haiti	Country Office	Americas and the Caribbean	L	H		1	20	7/3/2014	\$ 1,058.13	
Brazil	Country Office	Americas and the Caribbean	U/M			2	20	5/2/2012	\$ 969.58	
Guatemala	Country Office	Americas and the Caribbean	L/M			1	19	3/11/2013	\$ 931.01	1- Economics-related

Country/Region	Type of Office	Geography	Country Context Income	Humanitarian	Gender Advisor	Eval. Fatigue	Status of Workforce – Total	Level of Maturity	Level of Expenditure (2014)	Status of Workforce – Policy & Economic
										coordinator
Palestine	Country Office	Arab States	L/M	H		2	??		\$ 2,774.78	
Serbia	Programme Presence	Europe and Central Asia	U/M			1	9			
Nigeria	Country Office	Western and Central Africa	L/M			1	13	5/23/2014	\$ 1,722.21	3- Economics-related support/specialist
Sri Lanka	Programme Presence (MCO Supported)	Asia and the Pacific	L/M	H			5		\$19.90	

ANNEX F: CASE STUDY DRAFT OUTLINE

OFFICE/COUNTRY:

DATES VISITED:

EVALUATION TEAM:

BACKGROUND

Clusters with what other offices/countries

Whom did we see—number and type of stakeholders

Where did we go

Relevant regional initiatives

Relevant regional contextual factors

Special questions going into this study related to the type of office

OFFICE STRUCTURE

Number of staff and roles

Funding – level, core vs. non-core

Delegation of authority dates

Programme size/staffing

FINDINGS

1. RESPONDING TO NEEDS

Aspects where the RA responds to needs well, and why

Aspects where the RA does not respond to needs well or where data is inconclusive, and why

Recommendations to enable RA to respond to needs better

This might be presented in a table by stakeholder from the customer window

2. EXECUTIVE BOARD PAPER FULFILLMENT

What is the configuration of the office visited?

What part is on core and what on non-core money? What is the expiration of the soft money?

Has it received its delegation of authority?

Most of this we should be able to find before the site visit

3. FULFILLING THE UN WOMEN MANDATE

Review responses from the question on the mandate, especially if different staff implemented different mandates

Identify ways in which RA enabled fulfilling each mandate

Identify constraints and challenges

Affinity responses on recommendations for how to strengthen structure and processes for each mandate

4. MONITORING AND OVERSIGHT

Synthesize the questions regarding monitoring and oversight, and communication and learning

Oversight and monitoring: key systems, roles and responsibilities, evidence of use of information and for what purpose

Informal channels for communication and learning: where do they go for information at each level and in the organization?

5. INTEGRATING THE MANDATES

Implications/responses on integrating mandates and respecting each one

Any conflicts? For example, between the push for normative and country ownership. What is the “country?”
What happens if government and civil society are at odds?

How does the field experience the structure of the mandates at higher levels in terms of the support/guidance it receives?

6. INFORMATION FLOW (AND USE)

Describe the information flow, and evidence of use of information at different levels

What works well and what is a challenge in terms of: systems, processes that result in use, actions triggered

Communication and learning: opportunities, sources, process of accessing

7. EFFICIENCY OF RA

Present process analysis here of one or more key processes

Findings on clarity of roles and responsibilities, reduction in delays, hand-offs in the process

Leadership and direction: is the vision clear

Incentives to behave in ways that maximize mandate fulfilment

8. SUPPORT SYSTEMS AND PROCESSES

Financial

Human Resources—positions filled, people with requisite preparedness to perform the work, who is involved in recruiting and onboarding

IT—results management system and other systems

What issues were identified in the interviews? Outsourcing?

9. SUSTAINED SUPPORT

Core vs. non-core funding

Resource mobilization: roles in the RA, and how are people fulfilling them?

What are the incentives around resource mobilization?

Evidence of the impact of soft money – positive and negative

How does the system count cases where UN Women mobilized resources not going through its own system

10. RIGOROUS GENDER ANALYSIS

What enables rigorous gender analysis in an organization? How does the RA influence those enablers?

Is gender analysis built into programming, normative work, coordination? Is the RA enabling a focus on gender analysis? How do staff experience emphasis (or not) on gender analysis and feminist approaches?

How does the RA enable or constrain the implementation of human rights approaches?

11. ENCOURAGING GENDER-SENSITIVE APPROACHES IN DAILY OPERATIONS

Does the RA include rules in its incentive structure to encourage gender-sensitive approaches in the way UN Women operates? Are such approaches promoted by leadership, enabled by capacity, measured?

CONCLUSIONS

ANNEX G: STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION LIST- INCEPTION PHASE

Position	Office
Reference Group	
Human Resources Specialist	Office of Human Resources
Eastern and Southern Africa RO	MCO South Africa
Deputy Regional Director	Europe and Central Asia Regional Office
Country Representative	Ecuador - representing LAC Regional Office
Deputy Regional Director	Asia Pacific
Coordination Advisor	Coordination Division
Political Participation Advisor	Policy Division
Secretariat Executive Board	Headquarters
Chief	ICT/ DMA IOC
Deputy Regional Director	West and Central Africa
Country Representative	oPt, Palestine
Group Interview	
Programme Advisors	LAC Programme Division
Programme Advisor	Africa, Programme Division
Programme Advisor	Arab States, Programme Team
Programme Advisor	Asia Pacific, Programme Team
Programme Advisor	Europe and Central Asia, Programme Team

Position	Office
Individual Interviews	
Assistant Secretary General	Policy and Programme Bureau
Director of Programmes	Programme Division
Deputy Director, Programmes	Programme Division
Chief of Staff	Office of the Executive Director
Director	Human Resources
Representative	Caribbean Region MCO
Regional Director and Representative	Asia and Pacific (Representative Thailand)
Policy Advisor	Gender Quality and HIV/AIDs, Policy Division
Regional Director	Americas and the Caribbean
Regional Director	Officer in Charge, West and Central Africa
Division of Management and Administration	Officer in Charge
Regional Director	Arab State
Regional Director	East and Southern Africa
Regional Director	Europe and Central Asia
Head of Programme Support Unit	Programme Division
Regional Representative	Colombia Country Office
Assistant Secretary General	Strategic Partnerships, Coordination and Intergovt Support Bureau

Position	Office
Director of Strategic Partnerships	Strategic Partnerships and Resource Mobilization Division
Special Advisor,	Strategic Partnerships and Resource Mobilization Division
Leadership and Political Participation Advisor	Policy Division
Policy Director	Policy Division
Head Programme Support Unit	Programme Division
External Stakeholders	
Project Assistant	Universalia
Senior Project Manager/Team Leader Coordination Evaluation	Unvkersalia
Independent Consultant	Conducted MCO Evaluation

ANNEX H: DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Type of Document	Name of Document	Limitations
Planning Documents	2012-2015 Annual Work Plans (AWP) by Country and Region. Includes ¹⁸ : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Note • Financial Human Resources Table • Monitoring Evaluation and Research Plan • Development Results Framework • Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Framework 	Document availability varies throughout the years and by country depending on date of DOA, typology of country office and availability of data.
	Strategic Plan 2011-2013 includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRF Framework • Management Results Framework 	
	Strategic Plan 2014-2017 includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRF Strategic Plan • OEEF Strategic Plan • Strategic Plan narrative • UN Women Strategic Plan Presentation to EB- 09/2013 	
	SN/AWP Process 2013 Lessons Learned	All lessons learned may not be as applicable with roll out of the RMS
	UN Women Results Based Management Standards- 08/04/2014	
	Concept Note: Ten Steps to Strengthened RBM in UN Women - 26/02/14	

¹⁸ Not all countries have all documents in this list of AWP. Documents and completeness of documents vary in the Sharepoint or RMS

Type of Document	Name of Document	Limitations
	Functional Analysis of Policy and Programme Bureau-27/07/2012	
	Guidelines for budget formulation and entry in ATLAS associated with AWP and new Programmes- 16/01/2014	This will need be updated when ATLAS rolls out to link to RMS
Regional Architecture Background	Executive Board Documents (and related notes)	
	Regional Architecture – 24/04/2012	
	Regional architecture: administrative, budgetary and financial implications and implementation plan- 18/09/2012	
	Regional architecture, progress towards a harmonized cost-recovery policy and proposed approach for calculating the operational reserve for the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women- 17/10/2012	
	UN Women Management Response to the Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) on the regional architecture, progress report toward a harmonized cost recovery with United Nations Funds and Programmes; and proposed approach for calculating the operational reserve for UN Women- 2/11/2012	
	2012/6 Regional Architecture: administrative, budgetary and financial implications and implementation plan- 30/11/2012	
	Policies and Procedures for Delegation of Authority- 24/09/2013	
	Talking Points for Regional Architecture Oral	

Type of Document	Name of Document	Limitations	
Regional Architecture Background	Presentation to the Executive Board- 06/2013		
	Human Resources Guidelines for the Implementation of the Regional Architecture Process -12/2012		
	Regional Architecture Responses to ACABQ Document UNW/2012/CRP.4		
	Regional Architecture Frequently Asked Documents		
	Progress update on Regional Architecture Implementation 04/2014		
	Progress Update on Regional Architecture Implementation - 12/09/2014		
	Memo on Accountability for interdivisional collaboration and synergy-01/08/2015		
	Note on Regional Architecture Policy Functions		
	RA Related Response_ Details on different functions and reporting lines within each model of country presence between HQ and the Field-		
	Memo on Accountability for interdivisional collaboration and synergy-01/08/2015		
	Background Documents		
	Copy of Country Data for Evaluation Selection		
	Workforce data as of 1-Sep-2015		

Type of Document	Name of Document	Limitations	
Regional Architecture Background	Staff Lists as of 1-Sep-2015		
	Regional Architecture Analysis, Final Report, Dalberg Global Development Advisors, 03/2012		
	Field Capacity Assessment - Minimum Requirements for UN Women's Presence at the Country Level- 14/02/2011		
	UN Women Organogram- 04/2015		
	Organizational Assessment (Charles Lusthaus et. al)		
	POM- Programme and Project Introduction		
	POM- Part 1 Programme Formulation ANNEXES		
	POM-Part 1- Programme Formulation		
	POM- Part 2 Programme Appraisal and Approval		
	POM- Part 3- Programme Implementation and Management		
	POM- Part 4- Programme Monitoring Reporting Oversight		
	POM- Part 5- Evaluation		
	Decentralization Models		
	Decentralization- A Sampling Definition- Working paper for UNDP- 10/99		
	UNFPA Strategic Plan 2014-2017		

Type of Document	Name of Document	Limitations
	FAO Decentralized Offices	
	Decentralization of Organizations with the UN System: World Health Organization - 1993	
Monitoring Data and Evaluation Reports	Quarterly Monitoring Reports, 2013-2015	Quarterly Reports are by region rather than by country. Last quarterly Reports provided end in Q2 of 2014. This may be due to change a change to RSM but individual countries will need to be contacted for more specific monitoring data
	Progress Made on the UN Women Strategic Plan 2011-2013- Data Companion- 2012	
	Progress Made on the UN Women Strategic Plan 2011-2013- Data Companion- 2013	
	UN Women Presence Then and Now Revised- 10/2014	This is not updated to 2015 DOA status
	Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) Synthesis Report- 12/2014	
	UN Women Multilateral Aid Review Updated 2013 Rating (MAR)	
	Multi-country Portfolio Evaluation of Kazakhstan Multi-country Office for Central Asia Strategic Note Evaluation- 15/09/2015	
	UN Women Global Workforce Survey 2014- 08/09/2014	

Type of Document	Name of Document	Limitations
Monitoring Data and Evaluation Reports	Evaluation of UN Entity for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (UN-Women Normative Evaluation)- 25/03/2015	
	Country Operational Assessment Tool (COAT)	Gives limited data on performance indicators and not linked to ATLAS or RMS
	Joint Development Effectiveness Review of UNFPA, UNHCR, and UN Women	
	UN Women Country Portfolio Evaluation, Mozambique 2012-2015	
	Global Evaluation Reports Assessment and Analysis System, Meta Evaluation Report- 30/03/2015	
	What can we learn from un women evaluations? A meta-analysis of evaluations managed by un women in 2013" 07/2014	
	Results Management System	This system was very recently rolled out and therefore has limited information at this point
Financial Information	Annual Reports 2011-2014 Including: - Finance Section - Data Companions	
	UN Women Internal Control Framework Approved – 26/11/2012	
	Consolidated Post Costs	
	OEEP Line Item Budget	
	Key Indicators, Delivery, Outstanding Advances and Audit Recommendations	These indicators rely mostly on financial indicators rather than performance indicators to assess performance against financial data.
	Programme Expenditure by Department- 13/08/2015	

ANNEX I: DISCUSSION OF EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Relevance

- 1. How does the regional architecture respond to the needs of governments, civil society and UN agencies at global, regional and country levels? What improvements and adjustments are needed to meet the needs of key stakeholders, including the most marginalized women?**

The first question relates to relevance, while the second places emphasis on the needs of two categories of stakeholders: (a) key stakeholders such as, broadly speaking, governments, civil society and UN agencies, and (b) most marginalized women. This wording loses focus on the most central stakeholder in the UN Mandate: women and girls. We propose to reword this question to read:

New Question #1: How well does the regional architecture respond to the needs of governments, civil society and UN agencies at global, regional and country levels? Are any improvements and adjustments needed (and what are they) to meet the needs of key stakeholders, including women and girls, and the most marginalized women?

- 2. How to ensure the regional architecture is fit to ensure the universality of SDGs and UN Women mandate?**

This question was added in an updated TOR sent to the evaluation team on October 27, 2015. The evaluation team agrees with this addition and will keep this question.

Organizational Effectiveness

- 3. To what extent is the regional architecture supporting national capacities through south-south cooperation?**

This question is too detailed to be a standalone question and we propose to move it under Question #3 (see below).

- 4. To what extent have the objectives set in the Executive Board paper (UNW/2012/10) to establish an effective regional architecture been met?**

This question checks on actions and progress aligned with the intentions of the regional architecture. During inception, many respondents asked not only for descriptive information, but the underlying reasons and implications. We, therefore, propose to reword this question as follows:

New Question #3: To what extent and in what ways have the objectives set in the Executive Board paper (UNW/2012/10) to establish an effective regional architecture been met? In particular, to what extent is the regional architecture supporting national capacities through south-south cooperation?

- 5. To what extent does the regional architecture contribute to UN Women's achievements in the operational, normative and coordination mandate at global, regional and country levels in an effective manner? Are any improvements or adjustments to the institutional setup needed to enhance effectiveness?**

A clarification: by “institutional setup,” this question means “regional architecture.” Also, feedback from inception participants was to include exploring *why* the regional architecture contributes or does not contribute to the three mandates.

***New Question #4:** To what extent and why does the regional architecture contribute to UN Women’s achievements in the operational, normative and coordination mandate at global, regional and country levels in an effective manner? Are any improvements or adjustments to the institutional setup needed to enhance effectiveness?*

6. What systems are in place to monitor and assess the effectiveness of regional architecture? Are they working adequately and feed the organization with useful lessons?

This question emphasizes systems, and the question is more complete when it inquires both into systems and the processes used for monitoring and assessment. Furthermore, monitoring and assessment are not ends in themselves, but are pursued to increase accountability, communicate guidance, knowledge and experiences, and learn from each other and collective experience.

We therefore propose to reword this question as follows:

***New Question #5:** What systems and processes (both formal and informal) are in place to monitor and assess the effectiveness of regional architecture? Are the systems working adequately and do they feed the organization with useful lessons?*

7. To what extent does the regional architecture enhance the linkages between normative, operational and coordination work? What adjustments are needed to improve these linkages?

Integration seemed to be more representative of the goals of UN Women rather than linkages between groups within the organization. Feedback during inception on this question included adding “integration” as an area of inquiry and requiring a more in-depth understanding of what “integration” of the mandates really looks like, as well as where and how it takes place. It also became clear that it is important to talk with and review the material of the evaluations of each part of the mandate. Therefore, wording was slightly changed to represent the importance of integration across normative, operational and coordination work.

***New Question #6:** How has the Regional architecture enhanced integration between normative, operation and coordination work, and what adjustments are needed to improve integration at all levels and why?*

Administrative Efficiency

8. To what extent the regional architecture has been designed and implemented in a way that is responsive to needs, changes and actions emerging at the different levels of organization (HQ, Regional Offices, Multi-country and Country Offices)?

This question was added in an updated TOR sent to the evaluation team on October 27, 2015. The evaluation team agrees with this addition and will keep this question.

9. How responsive is the regional architecture and its organizational setup in terms of information flow between HQ and the field, and vice versa?

First a clarification: We understand “institutional setup” to be synonymous with “regional architecture” and include both the structure and processes approved by the Executive Board. This question asks how regional architecture has enabled or constrained the bidirectional flow of knowledge, expertise and information between HQ and the field that is needed for decision-making and strategic planning. Because this question is overlapping with the question regarding information flow and delegation of authority in the new TOR question, we propose to remove this question.

10. How efficient is the regional architecture in terms of delegation of authority, decision-making process and methods for setting direction? To what extent are the roles and responsibilities, coordination of labour and coordination of systems clear and efficient?

This question has been raised as a central question during inception interviews. We propose an expansion of this question as follows:

New Question #8: How efficient and responsive is the regional architecture in terms of delegation of authority, decision-making process and methods for setting direction? To what extent and why are the roles and responsibilities, coordination of labour and coordination of systems clear and efficient?

11. How efficient is the use of financial and human resources and IT systems in the framework of the regional architecture?

This question raised some concerns during the inception site visit, especially around the boundaries of human resources and administrative processes. For example, it is clear that this evaluation should not become an evaluation of the human resources process—hiring, onboarding, benefits, supervising, employee relations, and separations. This evaluation will concern itself with (and establish boundaries concerning) issues related to staff and system capacities to perform UN Women’s business (fit for purpose), and any findings related to initiation, approval and participation in key decisions related to the devolution of authorities under the regional architecture.

Similarly, for information technology and procurement systems, this evaluation will incorporate findings related to the levels of authority (where decisions now take place), roles, participation in decisions and information flow. It will not delve into issues of IT systems selection and functioning, rules and procedures, etc.

12. To what extent do the existing funding sources offer sustained support for the current staff structure and planned results of the regional architecture?

This question was clear to the evaluation team. As this is a formative evaluation, it needs to consider the RA related to current efforts for resource mobilization including the 12 flagship initiatives, and any existing intentions and efforts toward sustained support of the current RA.

13. To what extent does UN Women apply rigorous gender analysis and human rights approach in programme design, monitoring and implementation at regional and country levels?

The question implied that this was an evaluation of UN Women and its performance in these two areas, which it is not. It was, thus, revised to be more targeted at evaluating the RA’s role in increasing the capacity of UN Women rather than evaluating the organization’s approach to gender analysis and human rights approaches,

for example through guidance available for staff to implement such approaches, inclusion in job descriptions, etc. The IEO proposed to move this question under organizational effectiveness.

New Question #11: To what extent and why does the Regional Architecture increase UN Women's focus and capacity to apply rigorous gender analysis and human rights approach in programme design, monitoring and implementation at regional and country levels?

14. Are the intervention resources used in an efficient manner to address human rights and gender equality (e.g., participation of targeted stakeholders, including the most marginalized groups, collection of disaggregated data)?

This question seemed to address an “intervention” – a term unclear to the team. It also seemed to ask for an evaluation of the performance of UN Women. We did not understand the connection to the implementation or current structure of the Regional Architecture. We propose to remove this question.

15. To what extent do UN Women management and administrative systems promote gender-sensitive approaches in day-to-day operations of regional architecture?

This question does not seem to be about the RA, but UN Women as a whole. We propose to place the RA at the centre of the question as follows:

New Question #13: To what extent does the RA support or reinforce that management and administrative systems promote gender-sensitive approaches in day-to-day operations of regional architecture?

16. To what extent is the regional architecture successful in achieving the gender parity of staff?

The RA, in itself, does not mandate gender parity. We propose to remove this question.

ANNEX J: DRAFT CODEBOOK

CODING PROCESS:

NAMING CONVENTION:

Name of Evaluation_Last Name of Interviewee_First name of Interviewee_Analysis Type & Place _Interviewer
e.g. UNWom_RegArch_Interview_Lakshmi_Puri_HQ Inception.TC

IMPORTANT: This is high level coding that should be done to capture emerging themes. After initial coding, additional analysis. **Code ALL responses to the relevant code.** It is better to over code during the first pass than to have to dig around in multiple codes during analysis.

DESCRIPTORS:

Type of Office: MCO, CO, RO, HQ, Programme Presence, Non-Programme Presence

Analysis Type: Case Study, Portfolio Review, Background, Inception

Country of Analysis: Tajikistan, Colombia, Morocco, Thailand, Liberia, etc.

Gender of Interviewee: Male/Female

Time worked at UN Women: 0-1 years, 1-2 years, 2-3, 3+ years

CODES: REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE

Relevance

Stakeholder Needs: This includes how and in what ways has the RA responded to needs of stakeholders (civil society, government, UN agencies) at global, regional and country level? As well as any improvement and adjustments needed (and what are they?) to deliver results to women and girls.

Fit for Purpose: How is the UN Women ensuring the regional architecture is fit to ensure the universality of SDGs and UN Women mandate?

Effectiveness

Objectives from Executive Board Paper: To what extent and in what ways have the objectives set in the Executive Board paper (UNW/2012/10) to establish an effective regional architecture been met? This code would include any information regarding Offices established, staffing filled, training, financial management systems, and budgetary resources to support RA.

Operational mandate: How is the RA contributing (or not) to delivering on operational mandate including member states implement international standards and forge effective partnership with civil society

Normative mandate: How is the RA contributing (or not) to delivering on normative mandate including; Support inter-governmental bodies in formulation of policies, global standards and norms

Coordination mandate: How is the RA contributing (or not) to delivering on coordination mandate including; Work to promote accountability of UN System on gender equality and empowerment of women, including regular monitoring of system-wide progress, mobilizing and convening key stakeholders to ensure greater coherence and gender mainstreaming across UN

Systems and Processes: What systems and informal processes are in place to monitor and assess the effectiveness of regional architecture? Are they working adequately and feed the organization with useful lessons?

Integration: How has the RA enhanced integration between normative, operation and coordination work, what adjustments are needed to improve integration at all levels?

Human Rights Approach: To what extent does the RA increase UN Women's capacity to apply rigorous gender analysis and human rights approach in programme design, monitoring and implementation at regional and country levels?

Efficiency

RA Flexibility and Responsiveness: To what extent the regional architecture has been designed and implemented in a way that is responsive to needs, changes and actions emerging at the different levels of organization (HQ, Regional Offices, Multi-country and Country Offices)?

DOA & Decision Making: How efficient is RA in terms of delegation of authority, decision making, setting direction, coordination of labor and coordination systems including coordinating resources to respond to country needs

Financial, HR, IT: How efficient is the use of financial and human resources and IT systems in the framework of the regional architecture?

Funding sources: To what extent do the existing funding sources offer sustained support for the current staff structure and planned results of the regional architecture? Document funding for current staff structure and planned results of RA

Gender Sensitive Management: To what extent does the RA mandate management and administrative systems promote gender sensitive approaches in day-to-day operations of regional architecture?

GOOD QUOTES: Any good quotes coming from the data collection that could be used in the final report.