



MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE
CHINA GENDER FUND
FOR RESEARCH AND ADVOCACY

13 MARCH 2016

BY
DINYAR LALKAKA
dinyar@lalkaka.com

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
1 Background	7
2 Purpose and Methodology of this Evaluation	7
2.1 Purpose	7
2.2 Methodology	8
2.3 Limitations	8
3 Findings	8
3.1 Relevance	9
3.2 Effectiveness	10
3.3 Efficiency	12
3.4 Impact	15
3.5 Sustainability	16
4 Recommendations	17
4.1 Towards shared governance	17
4.2 From revolving fund to inclusive platform	19
5 Conclusions	20
Annex 1: Terms of Reference	22
Annex 2: Evaluation Itinerary	31
Annex 3: CGF Grantees Interviewed	32
Annex 4: Documents Reviewed	33

List of Abbreviations

CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CGF	China Gender Fund for Research and Advocacy
FACE	Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures
ILO	International Labor Organization
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
RMB	Renminbi
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNTGG	United Nations Theme Group on Gender

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The China Gender Fund (CGF) was established by the United Nations Theme Group on Gender (UNTGG) in September 2004 with the objective of advancing gender equality and women's empowerment in China. The goal of the CGF is to contribute to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the reduction of gender inequalities in China in accordance with relevant international conventions and agreements.

The CGF awards grants of up to USD 50,000 to government institutions, civil society organizations and academic institutions in China. Grants support research on gender issues, advocacy and policy dialogue. To date the CGF has announced seven Calls for Proposals and has supported 64 projects.

CGF is administered by UN Women. UN Women provides technical and administrative support to the CGF with functions including coordination, technical assistance, capacity-development, reporting and monitoring. The CGF is supported by United Nations agencies, bilateral donors, the Ford Foundation, and the private sector company Proya Cosmetics.

Purpose of this Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess CGF's overall achievements against the standard UN evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. The evaluation is intended to focus both on the CGF as a whole, and also on particular batches, namely the 6th and 7th batch, which were not yet completed or started when the previous evaluation took place.

Methodology

This evaluation relied primarily on information collected from interviews with CGF staff, TAC members and grantees as the basis for its analysis and recommendations. Fieldwork was conducted from 27 July to 17 August 2015. In-depth interviews were conducted with: all three members of the CGF programme staff and the UN Women China Country Representative, all six then current members of the TAC, CGF's private sector sponsor, Proya Cosmetics, eleven CGF grantees during a CGF capacity building workshop on 3 and 4 August that was attended by 6th and 7th batches of grantees, and two CGF grantees during site visits to the cities in which they were based. A debriefing meeting was held in the offices of UN Women, Beijing, on 4 November 2015.

The evaluation sought to promote a participatory approach, engaging stakeholders in the evaluation process and involving them in interpreting findings and generating recommendations. Interviews followed a semi-structured approach. The evaluator kept in mind the objectives of and questions raised by the TOR, but did not follow a strict questionnaire, preferring to keep an open mind and conduct free-form interviews focused on eliciting respondents' candid feedback on the CGF.

In addition to interviews, the evaluator also examined a number of documentary sources, including the CGF programme document, grant proposals, project progress reports and project completion reports.

The evaluation was undertaken by a single international consultant. Persons to be interviewed and the evaluation itinerary were decided by UN Women Beijing. Given CGF's budget limitations, sampling a broad range of grantee opinions was not an option. The evaluator met with ten of the twelve grantees during the course of a CGF capacity building workshop, where the time available for interaction with grantees was limited. Interaction with grantees focused primarily on their views of CGF and not on evaluating grantee projects.

Findings

Relevance

CGF is closely aligned with and contributes significantly to promoting international conventions, declarations and other relevant international agreements on human rights and gender equality. Human rights and gender approaches are integrated thoroughly into all aspects of the CGF programme. CGF is increasingly relevant to China's national context because international development assistance to China, including in the area of gender, is diminishing and CGF is one of the only remaining programmes of its kind. TAC members and grantees come from diverse backgrounds, and the cross-fertilization of their views helps to strengthen CGF.

Effectiveness

TAC members were of the uniform opinion that CGF has done an outstanding job in using limited resources to advance gender equality and women's empowerment in China. Grantees feel that CGF brought a new understanding of gender equality and women's empowerment to them, their communities and China. The centrality that CGF gave these issues spurred grantees to look at their own work in a new and different light.

Although CGF has successfully leveraged limited funds to promote strategic change on human rights and gender issues in China, stakeholders were of the view that more thought should be given to building on the results of grantees, sharing experience and building synergy between grantees, and more effectively communicating grantee project and CGF program outcomes to policy makers, media and the public.

Efficiency

Grantees were critical of CGF's financial reporting requirements and grant disbursement procedures. The primary complaint was that FACE (Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures) Forms are too complex and time consuming. An email survey of ten grantees found that it required an average of one person-month of effort for each grantee to complete financial reporting requirements. According to CGF staff, two-thirds of their time is spent on financial reporting procedures. There is an urgent need to streamline financial reporting procedures.

Impact

Grantees felt that the CGF platform provided them with legitimacy and credibility. Grantees' local government, their community and their peers begin to listen to what they have to say. Grantees also felt that CGF's capacity building exercises provided them with important new ideas and new skills. In order to increase impact at the national level, CGF may wish to consider giving more emphasis to capacity building.

Sustainability

CGF's sustainability has two aspects: the cumulative sustainability of grantee results and CGF's ability to secure future funding. CGF faces challenges in both areas. These are addressed in the next section on recommendations.

Recommendations

In order to build on the many successes of past practice while enhancing the sustainability of fundraising efforts and program outcomes, this report suggests a new approach to CGF, innovating in two respects.

First, CGF should mobilize resources from the Chinese private sector and bring Chinese corporate partners into the TAC. It should also consider bringing former grantees into the TAC.

Second, CGF should shift from a primary emphasis on fund raising and grant making to give equal priority to grants, training, networking between grantees and communicating grantee results. Longer-term CGF should consider transitioning to an inclusive platform for incubating gender-related organizations where responsibility for training, communicating outcomes and even governance gradually devolves to the community itself.

Conclusions

CGF has demonstrated commendable relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Stakeholders believe that CGF is more relevant than ever. TAC members felt that CGF has successfully used limited resources to effect long-term strategic change in the area of gender equality. Grantees saw great value in the legitimacy that their CGF grants conferred, and praised the training they received.

Two long-term challenges were identified: the sustainability of financing and the sustainability of results. In response, this evaluation proposes two possible solutions. First, that it is feasible to mobilize resources from the Chinese private sector but this task would be facilitated by providing Chinese donors with the same rights and privileges as international donors. Second, in order to more effectively build on initial grantee results and promote learning between grantees, CGF should reposition itself as a virtual incubator for organizations dedicated to gender equality.

Decisions on the future of CGF must be made by UN Women and the CGF TAC. This evaluation report seeks only to ask questions and propose possible solutions for UN Women and the TAC to consider.

1 BACKGROUND

The China Gender Fund (CGF) was established by the United Nations Theme Group on Gender (UNTGG) in September 2004 with the objective of advancing gender equality and women's empowerment in China. The goal of the CGF is to contribute to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the reduction of gender inequalities in China in accordance with relevant international conventions and agreements.

The CGF awards grants of up to USD 50,000 through an open and competitive process. Grant recipients include government institutions, civil society organizations (CSO), and academic institutions in China. Grants support research on gender issues, advocacy and dialogue leading to the integration of gender into national development plans, policies and programmes. To date the CGF has announced seven Calls for Proposals and has supported 64 projects.

CGF is administered by UN Women, known formally as United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women. CGF operates under the guidance of the UNTGG and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC is the decision-making body of the CGF and provides advisory input into the selection of CGF projects, evaluates the capacity of grantee institutions, and makes the final selection of CGF grantees. Under the overall coordination and guidance of the UNTGG and the TAC, UN Women provides technical and administrative support to the CGF with functions including coordination, technical assistance, capacity-development, reporting and monitoring. The CGF is supported by United Nations agencies (UNICEF, UNFPA, ILO and UN Women); bilateral donors (the Governments of the Netherlands and France); the Ford Foundation, and the private sector company Proya Cosmetics Co., Ltd.

2 PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF THIS EVALUATION

2.1 Purpose

CGF is required by the TAC to undertake evaluations every four years. Previous evaluations were conducted in 2011 and 2007.

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess CGF's overall achievements against the standard UN evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. The evaluation is intended to focus both on the CGF as a whole, and also on the 6th and 7th batches of grantees, which were not yet completed or started when the previous evaluation took place.

The results of this evaluation are to be used in three ways:

1. To provide input to the TAC for making decisions on the future direction and design of the CGF
2. To contribute material for CGF communications and approaches to donors
3. To offer guidance for the next Call for Proposals, planned in 2016

2.2 Methodology

This evaluation relied primarily on information collected from interviews with CGF staff, TAC members and grantees as the basis for its analysis and recommendations. Fieldwork was conducted from 27 July to 17 August 2015 (see Annex 2: Itinerary).

In-depth interviews were conducted with:

- (1) All three members of the CGF programme staff and the UN Women China Country Representative,
- (2) All six then current members of the TAC,
- (3) CGF's private sector sponsor, Proya Cosmetics
- (4) Eleven CGF grantees during a CGF capacity building workshop on 3 and 4 August that was attended by 6th and 7th batches of grantees
- (5) Two CGF grantees during site visits to the cities in which they were based.

A debriefing meeting was held in the offices of UN Women, Beijing, on 4 November 2015, during which the evaluator presented preliminary findings of the evaluation to TAC members and CGF staff and received much useful feedback.

The evaluation sought to promote a participatory approach, engaging stakeholders in the evaluation process and involving them in interpreting findings and generating recommendations. Interviews followed a semi-structured approach. The evaluator kept in mind the objectives of and questions raised by the TOR, but did not follow a strict questionnaire, preferring to keep an open mind and conduct free-form interviews focused on eliciting respondents' candid feedback on the CGF.

In addition to interviews, the evaluator also examined a number of documentary sources, including the CGF programme document, grant proposals, project progress reports and project completion reports (see Annex 4).

2.3 Limitations

The evaluation was undertaken by a single international consultant, with field work conducted over the course of three weeks. Persons to be interviewed and the evaluation itinerary were decided by UN Women Beijing. Given CGF's budget limitations, sampling a broad range of grantee opinions was not an option. The evaluator met with ten of the twelve grantees during the course of a CGF capacity building workshop, where the time available for interaction with grantees was limited. Interaction with grantees focused primarily on their views of CGF and not on evaluating grantee projects.

3 FINDINGS

This midterm evaluation focuses on analyzing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the CGF programme in terms of results achieved against objectives.

3.1 Relevance

3.1.1 Extent to which the intervention is aligned with and contributes to international conventions (e.g. CEDAW, CRPD, CRC) and related documents (e.g. Concluding Observations), declarations (UDHR), and other relevant international agreements on human rights and gender equality

CGF is closely aligned with and contributes significantly to promoting international conventions, declarations and other relevant international agreements on human rights and gender equality. These documents, especially CEDAW, are tightly integrated into all aspects of the CGF programme, from grant applications to application review to grantee training and grantee project results. It was reported by CGF staff that CGF training on international conventions, declarations and agreements was warmly welcomed by grantees.

3.1.2 Extent to which the intervention is informed by substantive and tailored human rights and gender analysis that identifies underlying causes and barriers to human rights and gender equality

Despite the significant progress China has made towards the achievement of the MDGs, challenges remain, particularly on gender equality. CGF seeks to contribute to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the reduction of gender inequalities in China. CGF's Calls for Proposals and grant application screening procedures are based on the TAC's human rights and gender analysis of underlying causes and barriers to human rights and gender equality in China.

Project proposals and activities of 6th and 7th round grantees addressed current issues from a human rights and gender perspective. CGF contributed to this result through its effective training on research and advocacy methods so that project teams could conduct quality research and advocacy on the gender issues that the CGF addresses, and its ongoing technical assistance provided through email and telephone as well as site visits to grantee facilities.

3.1.3 Extent to which the objectives of CGF are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country-needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies; in other words, are the CGF goals still relevant in China

UN Women plays a special role in China. The current chapter in Chinese women's quest for gender equality is widely seen within China as having begun with the UN's Fourth World Conference on Women held in Beijing in September 1995. The conference produced the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, a blueprint for advancing women's rights worldwide, but with a special resonance within China. Arguably in the thirty-six year history of UN development assistance to China, a chapter now drawing rapidly to a close, the UN system's greatest and most sustainable impact on Chinese society has been in the field of women's empowerment, as a result of the torch it lit and passed on twenty years ago. Although UN Women only acquired its own identity in China in 2012 and even now does not have the status of a country program, the legacy of the Beijing Declaration gives it a unique and ongoing relevance in China.

CGF's relevance is already strong, but it is becoming increasingly so for two reasons. First, because of the perception that China is already a prosperous country, international development assistance to China is diminishing rapidly. This is true not only for economic development programs, but also increasingly for social development and human rights

programs. For example, in recent years, Australia, the UK, Canada and others have significantly reduced the funding that they provide to Chinese NGOs.

Secondly, the domestic space for innovative social initiatives is narrower today than at any time since China's reform policies began in 1979. One sign of this is the recently proposed legislation curtailing the activities of foreign NGOs in China. It is important to note that these proposed regulations restricting the operations of foreign NGOs do not affect CGF's ability to make grants and should not have much impact on CGF directly, as UN Women and CGF are not foreign NGOs. As such, CGF is now virtually the only actor left standing in this space and more relevant than ever.

3.1.4 Extent to which the intervention is informed by needs and interests of diverse groups of stakeholders through in-depth consultation

There is no one size fits all solution to the challenges of gender equality in China. CGF has been successful in addressing the specific needs of diverse interest groups through three mechanisms. First, each round of grants focuses on a different theme, allowing CGF to address diverse groups and needs. Grantees come from diverse backgrounds in government, academia and the NGO community, and their grant activities serve a broad range of beneficiaries. Second, the TAC is itself a diverse group, bringing together UN agencies, bilateral donors, foreign NGOs and now a Chinese private enterprise. Cross-fertilization of ideas within the TAC contributes to CGF's relevance and resilience. Finally, CGF has successfully promoted collaboration and learning between grantees, especially between NGOs and government organizations.

3.2 Effectiveness

3.2.1 Extent to which CGF's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance

CGF's objective is to advance gender equality and women's empowerment in China. TAC members were of the uniform opinion that CGF has done an outstanding job in using limited resources to attain this objective. CGF continues to bring innovative, forward-looking ideas to promoting gender equality and human rights in China. In large part because of the UN aegis, CGF has a unique ability to engage with a broad range of partners and build coalitions between governmental and non-governmental organizations. Governmental organizations — such as the Hunan Police Academy — can leverage the CGF platform to undertake pioneering initiatives that they otherwise may not have been able to. Government authorities tend to look benignly on CGF grants, but often subject grants received from foreign bilateral and NGO donors to close scrutiny. By engaging with both government and civil society, CGF has promoted dialogue between both and has succeeded in using lessons learned from CGF projects to promote policy initiatives by government.

Grantees feel that CGF brought a new understanding of gender equality and women's empowerment to them, their communities and China. The centrality that CGF gave these issues spurred grantees to look at their own work in a new and different light.

Grantees believe that CGF expanded their horizons by bringing them new ideas and new skills. This was largely — but not solely — due to the training they received in CGF capacity building workshops. Training in results-based management (RBM) met with an enthusiastic reception. Skills training in other areas such as government advocacy and media relations was also well received.

3.2.2 Extent to clarity of Theory of Change and results framework and the intervention integrate human rights and gender equality

Human rights and gender equality are fully integrated into all aspects of the CGF programme. Both the 6th and 7th Calls for Proposals were focused on topics relating to human rights and gender equality, and every project in these two rounds addressed these issues.

A clear logical framework integrating human rights and gender equality was developed for the CGF programme and last revised in October 2011. If a theory of change exists for the programme, it was not reviewed by this evaluator. As a flexible, revolving grant fund addressing a diverse range of issues, a fixed theory of change is unlikely to serve CGF well. However, it may be appropriate for CGF to encourage applicants to include more explicit theories of change in their grant proposals. Few of the proposals reviewed for this evaluation included a clear theory of change.

3.2.3 Extent to which a human rights based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy were incorporated in the design and implementation of the intervention

The CGF programme document and logical framework fully embrace human rights-based and gender mainstreaming approaches. The 6th and 7th rounds of grants reflect human rights-based approaches and gender mainstreaming strategies. Each grantee sought to integrate gender equality and human rights protection into their project.

3.2.4 Presence of key results on human rights and gender equality

A detailed analysis of the results of each grantee project is beyond the scope of this evaluation. However, every project in the 6th and 7th Calls for Proposals focused on some aspect of human rights and gender equality, CGF staff and TAC members expressed generally positive views regarding grantee results, and a review of grantee project completion reports showed strong concern with human rights and gender equality in all grantee projects.

3.2.5 Have the recommendations of CGF External Evaluation conducted in 2011 been followed? If not, why?

Key recommendations of the CGF external evaluation conducted in 2011 include:

- CGF projects have successfully built strong partnerships with institutions and law enforcement agencies, extensive knowledge based on research, and practical capacities through training,
- The limited human resources supporting the implementation work hampered active monitoring efforts,
- A clearer understanding of decision making processes and respective roles between two UN Women offices in China and Bangkok was needed,
- Regarding technical assistance, more supportive monitoring, guiding and coaching on-site would have improved grantee projects, and
- Although financial management was not a problem, it could improve if required procedures were simplified.

UN Women reports that all these recommendation have been adopted in the past four years of CGF implementation. UN Women has increased human resources, simplified the payment

transfer process, and more technical assistance has been provided through missions, training workshops and daily communications.

This evaluator is not in a position to compare the state of the CGF in 2011 and 2015 based on first hand experience. As noted in section 5.3 of this report, grantees reported a desire to further streamline financial reporting. Grantees had generally positive things to say about the support they received from CGF staff, but in the opinion of this evaluator, this is an area that deserves continuing effort. Ideally, mentoring and coaching of grantees should not rely exclusively on CGF staff, as it is unlikely that a few individuals can provide all the answers to grantee's diverse needs.

3.2.6 Has UN Women administered the CGF in an effective and transparent manner?

TAC members and grantees reported general satisfaction with the manner in which UN Women administered the CGF programme. The opinion was expressed that UN Women could do more to share information with TAC members. CGF staff, TAC members and grantees were of the uniform view that CGF should think about how to more effectively build on grantee results. The recent inclusion of Proya Cosmetics among the ranks of CGF donors raises new issues of TAC governance. Presently Proya is the only donor that does not have a seat on the TAC. CGF and the TAC may want to ask if this is an effective, transparent and sustainable policy.

3.3 Efficiency

3.3.1 Provision of adequate resources for integrating human rights and gender equality in the intervention. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes? Have resources been used efficiently?

CGF has successfully used limited resources to promote long-term strategic change in the areas of human rights and gender equality. Grantees reported that CGF expanded their horizons by bringing them new ideas and new skills. This was largely — but not solely — due to the training they received in CGF capacity building workshops.

While CGF has already succeeded in building on small successes from many little projects to make a lasting impact, CGF staff, TAC members — and this evaluator — were of the view that more thought should be given to building on the results of grantees, sharing experience and building synergy between grantees, and more effectively communicating grantee project and CGF program outcomes to policy makers, media and the public.

While grantees appreciate the technical support that CGF provides, in the view of this evaluation, greater emphasis should be placed on providing support to grantees. Coaching and mentoring of grantees is best provided by a network of experts rather than by CGF staff alone.

3.3.2 Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?

Grantees were united in their criticism of CGF's financial reporting requirements and grant disbursement procedures. The primary complaint was that FACE (Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures) Forms are too complex and time consuming.

FACE forms have been used in the UN system for about a decade. They were designed for and are used primarily by "Implementing Partners" — typically government agencies that are delegated by UN agencies to implement multi-year, multi-million dollar projects — to report

on the utilization of cash received, or to request reimbursement for expenditure already incurred. Funds that make small grants, like CGF, are not uncommon in the UN system, but evidently few such funds use the FACE form. For example, UNDP China has a small grant program focused on the environment that does not use the FACE form.

In order to get a better sense of just how cumbersome grantees found the FACE form, the evaluator emailed grantees asking how long it took them to complete one FACE form. Ten responses were received. The results are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Hours Required to Complete One Face Form

Grantee	Hours
Grantee 1	72
Grantee 2	48
Grantee 3	40
Grantee 4	40
Grantee 5	36
Grantee 6	32
Grantee 7	24
Grantee 8	24
Grantee 9	6
Grantee 10	6

The average of these ten responses is *33 hours, or about four working days!* Given that in a typical grant cycle, a grantee is required to submit six FACE forms, that comes out to more than one person-month of effort. It is difficult to generalize with confidence from this small sample and a few conversations, but in the evaluator's impression, NGOs experienced more difficulty with FACE forms than government organizations did. Part of the problem is that the forms are not available in Chinese and do not permit accounting in RMB; many grantees — especially NGOs — do not have any English-speaking staff.

We also asked grantees approximately what percent of total project effort was spent on financial reporting. The ten responses varied widely and should be taken with a grain of salt, but the average was about 25%. Discarding the highest and lowest responses gives us an average of about 20%. This does not include the portion of grant funds set aside for auditing and project management expenses.

Grantees have a long list of additional gripes regarding financial procedures, including

- Having to advance expenses, often from personal funds;
- The slow process of getting expenses approved and reimbursed;
- Frequent changes in procedures;
- Conflicts between Chinese and CGF financial reporting procedures. For example, CGF formerly required the submission of hard copies of invoices, which Chinese government procedures also require. CGF now accepts digital copies;
- Grant funds cannot be used to compensate staff, even when project activities are in addition to their normal duties.

3.3.3 *Assess the managerial and work efficiency. Were management capacities adequate?*

According to CGF staff, two-thirds of their time is spent just on *financial reporting* procedures – prodding grantees to submit financial reports and helping them with the process,

responding to emails from Bangkok and completing their own paperwork. Other administrative procedures also consume staff resources, leaving little time and energy for substantive technical assistance by CGF staff to grantees.

Previous evaluations of the CGF have noted that shortage of staff is one of CGF's constraints. Reducing the emphasis on process-based management would free CGF staff to do more meaningful work that made a greater contribution to CGF results. However, in the view of this evaluation, CGF programme results would benefit from the provision of more intensive technical support to grantee projects. CGF should therefore work towards developing a network of external partners and experts, including outstanding former grantees.

3.3.4 Did project governance facilitate good results and efficient delivery?

Grantees and TAC members had many positive things to say about CGF's management of grantee projects. TAC members felt that CGF had effectively leveraged limited resources to effect meaningful change on strategic issues of human rights and gender equality in China, but expressed concerns about CGF's ability to build on the results of grantees, share experience and build synergy between grantees, and more effectively communicate grantee project and CGF programme outcomes to policy makers, media and the public.

Grantees felt that CGF brought a new understanding of gender equality and women's empowerment to them, their communities and China. The centrality that CGF gave these issues spurred grantees to look at their own work in a new and different light. Grantees reported that cumbersome financial reporting procedures were an obstacle to efficient delivery of project results.

The UN system began delivering development assistance to China in 1979. Today, thirty-seven years later, this chapter is coming to an end. In order for CGF to remain relevant and sustainable, it needs to think about how it can more effectively balance localization with globalization in its governance.

3.3.5 How effectively did the project management monitor project performance and results?

There appeared to be a good rapport between CGF staff and grantees and close monitoring of project performance and results. Training in results based management and monitoring was appreciated by grantees. However, as reported above, two-thirds of the time of CGF staff is spent on financial reporting procedures. CGF could be more effective if it gave prioritized grantee results over grantee compliance with needlessly complex reporting procedures.

3.3.6 How did UN agencies in this programme communicate and coordinate among themselves and with partners?

UN agencies communicated and coordinated among themselves and their partners through the TAC. The UN agencies contributing to the CGF have been part of the CGF programme since its inception and have made valuable ongoing contributions to the programme.

Over time, the number of UN agencies in the TAC has gradually diminished, and it is likely that this trend will continue as budgets shrink.

3.4 Impact

3.4.1 *What are the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by CGF as a whole and of individual 6rd and 7th batch projects in particular, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.*

Grantees felt that the CGF platform provided them with legitimacy and credibility. Grantees' local government, their community and their peers begin to listen to what they have to say. This in itself is immensely empowering, especially for NGOs, which typically labor in the dark, but also for individuals in governmental organizations who have innovative ideas that might not otherwise find a receptive audience. The CGF platform validates grantees' work and gives them an important sense of national and international community.

CGF is justifiably proud of the training it provides to grantees. Grantees also felt that CGF's capacity building exercises provided them with important new ideas and new skills.

The 6th round of proposals focused on women and the environment, and mitigating gender discrimination in the context of corporate social responsibility. The 7th round continued with the theme of gender and corporate social responsibility while adding a new focus on LGBT rights. Useful results were achieved under each topic.

3.4.2 *Whether rights holders have been able to enjoy their rights and duty bearers have the ability to comply with their obligations, whether there is no change in both groups, or whether both are less able to do so*

Individual projects in the 6th and 7th batches have enhanced duty bearers sensitivity to the situation of rights holders and strengthened the ability of duty bearers to comply with their obligations. As an example, the Hunan Police Academy provided sensitivity training to front line police and police officials on LGBT rights, and this training was reported to have had a direct impact on how individual LGBT cases were handled at the grassroots level.

3.4.3 *Real change in gender relations, e.g. access to and use of resources, decision-making power, division of labor, etc.*

Grantees were of the view that the CGF platform and CGF training provided them with a deeper understanding of the meaning of gender equality. The effect of this improved understanding, aggregated across the 16 projects in the 6th and 7th batches, is likely to be significant.

Again, concern was expressed as to how to build on initial project results and share these results with a wider community of stakeholders and interested parties. At present there is no institutional mechanism to build on successful projects. Each round of grant proposals has a new theme, decided on by the TAC. This in itself makes it difficult to fund a second phase of a project. Moreover, the CGF charter currently doesn't allow funding of a second phase. There have been a few cases where CGF grantee projects have led to dedicated projects by UN Women or other UN agencies, but this is the exception, not the rule.

3.4.4 Has the CGF improved the cohesion & collaboration between government, academia and civil society? Has the CGF promoted civil society organizations' ability to address gender equality in China?

Grantees in the 6th and 7th batches include both governmental, academic and non-governmental organizations, and by all accounts, the interaction between the three appears to have helped each better understand the others and work more effectively together.

NGO grantees indicated that by providing them with credibility and enhancing their skills, the CGF platform promoted their ability to address gender equality in China. NGO grantees saw the NGO sector as under siege and hoped that CGF could give more support to NGOs relative to governmental and academic organizations.

3.4.5 How CGF's achievement can be up-scaled to bring even bigger impact at the national level?

CGF may wish to consider giving more emphasis to training. The responsibility for training could progressively shift from CGF staff to a broader network of CGF staff, former grantees and partnering organizations. It is unrealistic to expect one or two CGF staff members to assume responsibility for all training. Outstanding grantees are capable of providing training in their respective fields. To some extent, CGF is already using grantees as trainers. At the 3-4 August training workshop, a researcher at China Communications University, a 6th round grantee, coached other grantees on the art of being interviewed on camera. These experiments should be expanded. A buddy system could encourage strong grantees to mentor weak ones, or pair governmental organizations with non-governmental ones.

CGF should also enlist external partners to provide training. These could include professional service providers committed to fulfilling their corporate social responsibility, universities such as the network of China Women's Universities, etc.

3.5 Sustainability

3.5.1 To what extent has the CGF supported: (a) Developing an enabling or adaptable environment for real change on human rights and gender equality; (b) Institutional and/or policy change conducive to systematically addressing human rights and gender equality concerns; (c) Establishment of accountability and oversight systems between rights holders and duty-bearers, (d) Capacity development of targeted rights holders (to demand) and duty bearers (to fulfill) rights

CGF projects have played a catalytic role in introducing new ideas and good practices on human rights and gender equality. Many gender issues in China, LGBT rights as an example, have been treated with benign neglect, neither actively suppressed nor explicitly recognized. CGF projects have given legitimacy to these issues and helped tip the scale towards recognition by duty bearers.

CGF projects have served as small-scale pilots that can be scaled up to promote institutional and policy change. This has not yet happened with 6th batch projects, which have just concluded, or with 7th batch projects that are still under way, but it has happened in the past, for example with CGF projects on violence against women that contributed towards the broader UN Trust Fund in Support of Actions to Eliminate Violence against Women.

CGF has promoted accountability by duty-bearers towards rights holders by implementing accountability and oversight in CGF's project management practices. Grantees learn by doing. Training on results-based management was welcomed by grantees in part because these management practices emphasize accountability in ways that are novel in the Chinese context. In addition, many 6th and 7th batch projects have focused on topics such as corporate social responsibility, which are inherently about accountability.

Capacity development is an important part of the CGF grant programme, and includes training in CEDAW, results-based management and gender mainstreaming, all of which should promote the ability of rights holders to demand and duty bearers to fulfill rights.

3.5.2 How best to secure sustainable future funding for the CGF?

For the eleven years of its existence, CGF has relied on funding from UN agencies, bilateral Western donors and Western NGOs. However, the era of international development assistance to China, even for social programs, is coming to a close. We see this clearly in the steadily dwindling roster of CGF donors.

Other UN agencies in China face similar challenges. Agencies such as UNICEF and UNDP have responded by mobilizing resources from the Chinese private sector. UN Women has taken a big first step in this direction by partnering with Proya Cosmetics, which has contributed ¥6 million to UN Women, including ¥3.4 million to CGF. Proya, grantees and some TAC members believe that there is potential for CGF to partner with additional Chinese private sector enterprises. Chinese philanthropic foundations may also be considered as potential partners.

Proya had several practical suggestions as to how UN Women should go about acquiring additional Chinese corporate partners, including: focus on sectors where women are big customers; work with the best-in-class enterprise in each such sector; and cooperate closely with Chinese media personalities.

The partnership with Proya is unique in another respect: Proya is the first CGF donor that is not a TAC member. Since Proya is the first Chinese sponsor of the CGF, it is understandable that procedures will take some time to catch up with new realities. However, the long-term exclusion of Chinese sponsors from TAC governance would be both undemocratic and inimical to ensuring CGF's financial sustainability.

4 RECOMMENDATIONS

How can CGF build on the many successes of past practice while enhancing the sustainability of fundraising efforts and program outcomes? This section suggests a modified approach to CGF, inheriting past strengths but innovating in two respects: first, by mobilizing resources from the Chinese private sector and bringing private sector sponsors into the TAC, and secondly, by increasing emphasis on providing services to grantees and building a community.

4.1 Towards shared governance

Since its inception in 2004, CGF has relied on funds from UN Women, other UN agencies, bilateral donors and international NGOs. The TAC has been comprised of representatives of these organizations. In the view of this evaluation, this model has served CGF well but has

run its course. It is likely that the donors that have funded CGF in years past will no longer be able to fully fund CGF in the years to come. There is a need to think creatively about resource mobilization. The most promising new source of funding appears to be the Chinese private sector, and possibly Chinese philanthropies.

CGF has already partnered with Proya, and both Proya and UN Women report satisfaction with the partnership so far. To date Proya has contributed ¥6 million (approximately US\$1 million) to UN Women, of which ¥3.4 million was to CGF. However, for a variety of reasons, Proya does not yet have a full seat on the TAC. There is concern among the part of some TAC members about how a Chinese organization would fit in with the rights-based mandates of other CGF donors.

These concerns are understandable. It is also clear, however, that moving to a funding model in which Chinese partners play a greater role will inevitably require bringing them into the TAC as equal partners. The transition from international governance to shared international plus Chinese governance may be disruptive, but managed well, the synthesis of international and Chinese perspectives could serve to enhance CGF's relevance, impact and sustainability, and need not detract from its mission of promoting gender equity and human rights in China.

The experience of Proya suggests that CGF's future Chinese corporate partners will be eager to learn and contribute constructively to governance. Giving them an opportunity to grow is no less desirable an outcome than giving grantees this opportunity. Of course we should also recognize that there are potential conflicts of interest between CGF and prospective corporate partners. Clear principles and guidelines will be needed to ensure that CGF stays true to its goal of promoting gender equity.

In order to ensure adequate international representation, it may be advisable to break the link between contributing funds to the CGF and TAC membership. In fact, this link has already been broken in the case of Proya. Perhaps we can envisage a TAC where a larger body participates in deliberations and plays an advisory role, while a smaller group, call it an executive committee if you will, makes grant decisions. Expanding the TAC will require a transparent, fair nomination process which builds solidarity among TAC members, rather than simply providing privileges to some.

An expanded TAC could open the door to participation by grantee representatives. Participatory grant-making models have proliferated in recent years, and there is an emerging body of good practice that CGF can refer to¹. Not only is it safe to assume that former grantees best understand the challenges faced by their peers, grantee participation in the TAC could serve to make CGF an even more inclusive and powerful platform. Self-government is the ultimate capacity building exercise.

Comments on earlier drafts of this report raised an additional question: what if a potential donor wanted to support only grant projects focused on a specific theme of the donor's choice? This is a question that should be deliberated and decided by the TAC, not by this evaluator. In this evaluator's view, transparent governance suggests that all CGF donors have the same rights and responsibilities. Allowing individual donors to fund only the themes or projects they like contravenes the current model of collective decision-making by the TAC.

¹ For example, see Matthew Hart, The Lafayette Practice, *Who Decides: How Participatory Grantmaking Benefits Donors, Communities and Movements*, April 2014. There is even a Chinese translation. Both the English and Chinese versions can be found at <http://www.thelafayettepractice.com/reports/>

4.2 From revolving fund to inclusive platform

How can CGF more effectively leverage its strengths — the UN brand, training, and the sense of community, while mitigating its weaknesses — difficulty in building on grantees' initial results, creating long-term synergy between grantees, communicating program outcomes to policy makers, media and the public, and onerous financial reporting procedures?

In the view of this evaluator, the best way to do this is for CGF to transition from a linear process of making grants and providing training to an inclusive platform for incubating gender-related organizations. Based on this evaluator's interactions with grantees, grantees feel CGF's value lies as much in the UN brand, capacity building and the community of grantees as it does in the grant money itself.

Grantees could be encouraged to participate in the platform even after their funded projects end. The focus would be on building a community and ecosystem, where responsibility for training, communicating outcomes and even governance gradually devolves to the community itself.

Grants and services could receive equal priority. Grants could range from say \$50,000 to zero. One could make the case for bringing potential grantees into the community, giving them some training and getting to know them better before considering them for a grant. Second phases of projects could receive smaller grants or no grants, only support services. One grantee interviewed by this evaluator said explicitly that as long as it could continue to enjoy CGF grantee status, his organization would be happy to continue working on the follow-up to their project on a self-funded basis.

Deemphasizing grant money could also facilitate the overhaul of the present dysfunctional financial reporting system. Financial reporting procedures in small grant programs run by TAC members such as the Embassies of France and the Netherlands may be worth emulating. These programs ask grantees to keep receipts in case they are audited but otherwise require minimal financial reporting.

Reducing average grant size and devoting more of the CGF budget to services managed by CGF staff would also boost CGF's "delivery rates" — its ability to disburse funds on a timely basis. Back and forth between UN Women Beijing and Bangkok over low delivery rates currently eats up time and causes frustration in both locations.

The responsibility for training could progressively shift from CGF staff to a broader network of CGF staff, former grantees and partnering organizations. This evaluator is of the opinion that several grantees are well qualified to provide training in their respective fields. To some extent, CGF is doing this already. These experiments should be expanded. A buddy system could encourage strong grantees to mentor weak ones, or pair governmental organizations with non-governmental ones.

CGF could also enlist external partners to provide training. These could include professional service providers committed to fulfilling their corporate social responsibility, universities such as the network of China Women's Universities, etc. Business incubators, angel and venture capital investors are well versed in building networks of external service providers to support the growth of the startups they invest in; CGF can think of itself as a social venture capitalist.

CGF staff could function somewhat like a secretariat for the community, organizing grantee networking and training events, encouraging participation by the CGF community in UN Women-sponsored conferences, and coordinating communications and media outreach. These activities would give CGF staff better opportunities to display their professional skills than the present focus on following up on financial reports and delivery rates.

This evaluation proposes that the idea that CGF should reposition itself as a virtual incubator for Chinese organizations committed to promoting gender equality is one that deserves further discussion and testing. In addition to discussing this proposed new model within the TAC, it would also make sense to survey grantees to better understand how they think CGF adds value. Regardless of which course is finally chosen, a good understanding of grantee needs and a critical reappraisal of CGF's existing model is likely to make CGF a stronger and more effective organization.

5 CONCLUSIONS

Over the last eleven years, and certainly over the three year period covered by this evaluation, CGF has demonstrated commendable relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. TAC members and grantees both believed that CGF was more relevant than ever. TAC members were of the opinion that CGF has done an outstanding job in using limited resources to effect long-term strategic change in the area of gender equality. Grantees saw great value in the legitimacy that their CGF grants conferred, and praised the training they received.

Juxtaposed against these conspicuous achievements, two challenges were identified. First, the financial sustainability of CGF is in question. CGF has relied on UN Women, other UN agencies and bilateral donor programs for funding, but these resources are dwindling rapidly as the curtain falls on the era of international development assistance to China. Second, CGF staff, TAC members and grantees, each from their different vantage points, felt that more should be done to build on grantees' results, share experience between grantees, and more effectively communicate grantee project and CGF programme outcomes to policy makers, media and the public.

In response to these two challenges, this evaluation proposes two possible solutions. First, that it is feasible and appropriate to mobilize resources from the Chinese private sector (and possibly also from Chinese philanthropies). The partnership with Proya Cosmetics has been fruitful and is indicative of the potential for additional fund raising from Chinese private enterprises. However, in order for these partnerships to expand and be sustainable, Chinese donors should enjoy the same rights and responsibilities as international donors. Second, in order to more effectively build on initial grantee results and promote learning between grantees, CGF should reposition itself as a virtual incubator for organizations dedicated to gender equality. This new model would place greater emphasis on providing advisory services to grantees, not just through CGF staff but through a network of external partners. Former grantees would be able to continue to benefit from and contribute to the CGF platform.

Decisions on the future of CGF must be made by UN Women and the CGF TAC. This evaluation report seeks only to ask questions and propose possible solutions for UN Women and the TAC to consider.

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent External Mid-term Evaluation of the China Gender Fund for Research and Advocacy (CGF)

Duty Station:	Beijing, China
Application Deadline:	7 April 2015 COB
Type of Contract:	Contract for Consultant (CGF)
Languages Required:	English, with Chinese preferred
Starting Date : (date when the selected candidate is expected to start)	20 June 2015
Expected Duration of Assignment:	From 20 June 2015 to 15 November 2015

I. Background

The United Nations Theme Group on Gender (UNTGG) established the China Gender Facility (CGF) (now known as the China Gender Fund for Research and Advocacy) in September 2004 (project 40647) with the objective of advancing gender equality and women's empowerment in China. The United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) is the administering agency for the project under the overall coordination and guidance of the UNTGG and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The goal of the CGF is to contribute to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the reduction of gender inequalities in China in line with relevant international conventions and agreements. With generous support from multiple donors, this 14th progress report covers the period from 1 December 2013 to 30 November 2014.

Despite the significant progress China made towards the achievement of the MDGs over the past several years, challenges in attaining some of the goals by 2015 remain, particularly on gender equality. China faces many of the challenges of universal gender issues such as promoting women's political participation, stopping violence against women (VAW), and enhancing women's economic empowerment. China also faces the challenge of reducing the imbalanced sex ratio at birth between boys and girls (118 boys born for every 100 girls in China), promoting rural women's development and upholding the rights of migrant women and other vulnerable women's groups.

The CGF awards grants through an open and competitive process. The Fund provides grants of up to USD 50,000 to government institutions, civil society organizations (CSO), and academic institutions in mainland China to fund innovative and catalytic proposals that support research on contemporary gender issues, and/or advocacy and dialogue leading to the integration of gender into national development plans, policies and programmes.

Since its inception in 2004, the CGF has provided support for strategic actions and generated best practice models on gender equality and women's empowerment in China. The CGF has contributed to broadening awareness and understanding of gender equality issues and concerns, advocating for gender-responsive policies and laws, promoting women's access to services, and developing sustainable capacities for continued progress on gender equality. Grantees, comprised of government and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), have engaged diverse actors, such as policymakers, academia, women's rights organizations, indigenous communities and the media. So far, the project has announced seven Calls for Proposals, and 59 projects have been supported.

The CGF is supported by several United Nations agencies (UNICEF, UNFPA, ILO and UN Women); bilateral donors (the Government of Australia through the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the Government of Sweden through the Swedish International Development Agency; and the Governments of the Netherlands and France); the Ford Foundation, and the private sector company Proya Cosmetics Co., Ltd.

The TAC is the decision-making body of the CGF and provides advisory input into the selection of CGF projects, evaluates the capacity of grantee institutions, and makes the final selection of CGF grantees. Under the overall coordination and guidance of the UNTGG and the TAC, UN Women provides technical and administrative support to the CGF with functions including coordination, technical assistance, capacity-development, reporting and monitoring.

CGF is like a rolling programme, meaning it will keep going as long as the fund is available. According to TAC's decision, CGF is required to undertake an evaluation every four years.

In 2007 and 2011, an external evaluation was conducted under CGF respectively. The findings include: CGF projects have successfully built strong partnerships with institutions and law enforcement agencies, extensive knowledge based on research, and practical capacities through training. The limited human resources supporting the implementation work, however, hampered active monitoring efforts. Moreover, a clearer understanding of decision making processes and respective roles between two UN Women offices in China and Bangkok would be needed. In regards with technical assistance, more supportive monitoring, guiding and coaching on-site would have improved the programs. Although financial management rarely had a problem, it could still improve if required procedures were simplified. The shortage of personnel is a serious impediment, and thus should be resolved. In conclusion, the CGF programme demonstrates an impressive ratio of investment to return, an achievement with a visible impact on the Chinese society. (The full reports of the above the evaluations will be shared with the selected consultants.)

All these recommendation have been adopted by UN Women in the past three years of CGF implementation. For example, UN Women has increased human resources, simplified the payment transfer process, and more technical assistance has been provided through missions, training workshops and daily communications.

2015 is the MDG Year. It's time to do another external evaluation according to CGF's management. Also, with changing development and donor realities in China, the CGF requiring an examination of its future sustainability and design. In addition, we need external evaluators to look from their perspective on how the recommendations from the previous two evaluations have been taken by UN Women. Therefore, this external evaluation is designed. This evaluation will cover the period from Oct 2011 to Oct 2015.

II. Purpose of the evaluation

This evaluation will serve the following purpose:

- The evaluation findings and recommendations shared in the consultants' final report will be used by the TAC for making decisions on the future direction and design of the CGF;
- The evaluation findings and recommendations will be included in the CGF communications materials such as pamphlet to approach donors; and
- The evaluation findings and recommendations will also be used as guidance for next Call for Proposals (if funds available), which is planned in 2016.

III. Objectives of the assignment

The main objectives of this evaluation are to assess:

- Relevance: extent to which the objectives of CGF are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country-needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies;
- Effectiveness: extent to which CGF's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance;
- Efficiency: measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.
- Sustainability: The probability of continued long-term benefits from the CGF; the resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time; and
- Impact: positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by CGF as a whole and of the individual 6th and 7th batch projects in particular, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

IV. Scope of Work/Duties and Responsibilities

1. The scope of the Evaluation:

Evaluation scope: The evaluation will focus both on the CGF as a whole, to make recommendations about its future, and also on particular batches, namely the 6th and 7th batch, which were not completed/started when the previous evaluation took place.)

Geographical coverage: The evaluation will focus on 8 projects from the 6th batch and 7 projects from the 7th batch, which are located in Beijing, Sichuan, Suzhou, Hunan, Shandong, Shaanxi and Guangdong. However, the majority of the 7th batch project grantees will attend a CGF Advocacy Training Workshop in Beijing in May/June 2015. The evaluators will have the opportunity to interview all 7th batch and some of the 6th batch grantees at this event. Due to budget limitations and the huge land size of China, the plan is for the evaluators to make field visits to only 2 or 3 project sites.

Stakeholder coverage: The evaluation will reach out to all principle stakeholders, i.e. project beneficiaries, project grantees, relevant UN agencies (UNICEF, UNFPA, ILO and UN Women); bilateral donors (the Government of Australia through the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the Government of Sweden through the Swedish International Development Agency; and the Governments of the Netherlands and France); the Ford Foundation, and the private sector Proya Cosmetics Co., Ltd.

Substantive scope: The evaluation will analyze the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the programme objectives in terms of results achieved against objectives, change on human rights and gender equality, ownership of stakeholders, sustainability of the action, both financial and organizational. It should consider the nature of the joint programme, exploring the extent to which it has allowed the UN to work in more coordinated manner with partners, and how CGF's achievement can be up-scaled to bring even bigger impact at the national level.

2. The guideline of the Evaluation

A. Evaluation Questions: The consultants should be guided but not limited to the scope of the evaluation questions listed below. The consultants should raise and address any other relevant issues that may emerge during the evaluation:

Relevance Questions:

- Extent to which the intervention is aligned with and contributes to international conventions (e.g. CEDAW, CRPD, CRC) and related documents (e.g. Concluding Observations), declarations (UDHR), and other relevant international agreements on human rights and gender equality
- Extent to which the intervention is informed by substantive and tailored human rights and gender analysis that identifies underlying causes and barriers to human rights and gender equality
- Extent to which the objectives of CGF are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country-needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies; in other words, are the CGF goals still relevant in China
- Extent to which the intervention is informed by needs and interests of diverse groups of stakeholders through in-depth consultation
- Relevance of stakeholder participation in the intervention

Effectiveness Questions:

- Extent to which CGF's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance; Effectiveness assesses the outcome level, intended as an uptake or result of an output
- Extent to clarity of Theory of Change and results framework and the intervention integrate human rights and gender equality
- Extent to which a human rights based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy were incorporated in the design and implementation of the intervention
- Presence of key results on human rights and gender equality
- Have the recommendations of CGF External Evaluation conducted in 2011 been followed? If not, why?
- Has UN Women administered the CGF in an effective and transparent manner?

Efficiency Questions:

- Provision of adequate resources for integrating human rights and gender equality in the intervention Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes? Have resources been used efficiently?
- Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- Assess the managerial and work efficiency (specially the joint management matter). Were management capacities adequate?
- Did project governance facilitate good results and efficient delivery?
- How effectively did the project management monitor project performance and results?
- How did UN agencies in this programme communicate and coordinate among themselves and with partners?

Impact Questions:

- What are the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by CGF as a whole and of individual 6rd and 7th batch projects in particular, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.
- Whether rights holders have been able to enjoy their rights and duty bearers have the ability to comply with their obligations, whether there is no change in both groups, or whether both are less able to do so

- Real change in gender relations, e.g. access to and use of resources, decision-making power, division of labor, etc.
- Has the CGF improved the cohesion & collaboration between government, academia and civil society? Has the CGF promoted civil society organizations' ability to address gender equality in China?
- How CGF's achievement can be up-scaled to bring even bigger impact at the national level?

Sustainability Questions:

- To what extent has the CGF supported:
 - Developing an enabling or adaptable environment for real change on human rights and gender equality
 - Institutional and/or policy change conducive to systematically addressing human rights and gender equality concerns
 - Establishment of accountability and oversight systems between rights holders and duty-bearers
 - Capacity development of targeted rights holders (to demand) and duty bearers (to fulfill) rights
- How best to secure sustainable future funding for the CGF?

B. Methodology and Process:

An initial meeting of the evaluation team with UN Women staff, when the consultants begin the evaluation, shall be organized to determine the methods and develop a feasible joint work plan. The work plan should describe in great detail how the evaluation will be carried out, suggest further clarification on the applied methodology, roles and responsibilities of the participants, specify field visits if any, and outline the timeframe for the consultancy.

The suggested methods for the evaluation include analyses of various sources of information, including in-depth desk review and documentation analysis (CGF progress and completion reports, workshop and mission reports, knowledge and advocacy products, and other appropriate documentation produced by the CGF); conducting surveys of individual projects, meeting with the project partners (an advocacy workshop have been planned for the 7th batch projects and some of the previous projects in May/June 2015, during which the evaluators can meet many of the grantees to discuss their projects); field visits to two/three project sites; in-depth interviews with key stakeholders, focus group discussions and other means to allow cross-validation of data.

Based on consultations with UN Women, the consultants will visit selected project sites to validate the findings of the desk review and documentation analysis, and identify best practices and lessons learned. To make this evaluation more participatory, there will be a stakeholder meeting at which the initial findings are presented. UN Women will work with the evaluation team to make sure the meeting includes a wide variety of stakeholders, including some grantees and donors. The evaluation team will also hold separate meetings with and interview partners from government institutions, civil society organizations, as well as the UN Country Team and donor community, with a priority given to the members of the TAC.

V. Duration of the assignment

The total duration of the contract assignment will be 29 working days for the national consultant and 33 working days for the international consultant who serves as the team leader spread over four months beginning 20 June 2015 (tentative).

VI. Expected Deliverables

1. Expected key outputs will include:

- An agreed evaluation inception report) by 30 June 2015 (note that all dates are tentative). The inception report should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures. The inception report should also include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product.
- Evaluation tools to be developed by 5 July 2015 and shared with UN Women.
- An initial "midterm" report, summarizing key findings and recommendations is to be shared with UN Women China Office by 31 August 2015.
- A PowerPoint presentation on the initial evaluation findings and recommendations to be presented to the TAC and the UNTGG at a stakeholders meeting by 31 August 2015.
- A draft comprehensive report to be submitted to UN Women and the TAC for review by 20 Sept 2015.
- An analytical and comprehensive final evaluation report not exceeding 50 pages including annexes in hard and soft copy to be submitted to UN Women by 15 Nov 2015.
- Mission reports to project sites to be submitted to UN Women within two weeks after each mission.

2. The CGF Evaluation will be conducted according to the following tentative timeline:

Stage 1: Preparation & Initial Desk Review

Task	Responsible Party	Number of days	Remarks
Programme documents initial desk review	Evaluation team	2	home-based
Inception meeting	Evaluation team	1	in Beijing
Development of evaluation methodology and preparation of inception report	Evaluation team in cooperation with UN Women China	3	Home-based
Consultations with the UNTGG, TAC and UN Women China to identify CGF projects for in-depth analysis and reach an agreement on the proposed methods	Evaluation team in cooperation with UN Women China, TAC and UNTGG	3	in Beijing

Stage 2: Data Collection and Analysis

Task	Responsible Party	Number of days	Remarks
Analyze the data/info collected during the CGF advocacy workshop.	Evaluation team	5	in Beijing
Conduct field trips to project sites, including in-depth interviews and focus group meetings	Evaluation team in cooperation with UN Women China	5	Various sites
Conduct in-depth interviews and focus group meetings in Beijing according to the agreed list	Evaluation team	2	in Beijing

Data classification, systematization, and analysis	Evaluation team	4	in Beijing
<i>Draft the initial report, which summarizes key findings and recommendations</i>	<i>International expert</i>	3	<i>in Beijing</i>

Stage 3: Analysis and Dissemination of Evaluation Results

Activity	Responsible Party	Number of days	Remarks
Present initial findings and recommendations at a stakeholder meeting including the TAC, UN Women, grantees located in Beijing, and other agreed-upon stakeholders for initial feedback.	Evaluation team in cooperation with UN WOMEN China	2	The list of stakeholders need to be agreed with the UN Women; in Beijing
<i>Incorporate comments and feedback from the stakeholders meeting and revise and finalize the full evaluation report.</i>	<i>International expert</i>	3	<i>Home-based</i>
<i>Review the Chinese translation of the evaluation report</i>	<i>National expert</i>	2	<i>Home-based</i>

No. of days required for national expert is 29 days and No. of days required for international is 33 days.

All the documents, including the interview tools, training materials and reports should be submitted in written in English language.

Upon receipt of the deliverables and prior to the payment of the installment, the deliverables, related reports and documents will be reviewed and approved by UN Women within one week of submission.

VII. Management of the evaluation

The evaluation team will work in close collaboration and consultation with project staff and management structure as per the table below.

Who: Actors and Accountability	What: Roles and Responsibilities
Chair of UNTGG (UN Theme Group Gender)	Safeguard the independence of the evaluation exercise and ensure quality of evaluations
TAC members	Provide inputs on the CGF management from TAC's perspective Present the donor's concern to the evaluation team Observe the process of the evaluation
UN Women China Country Programme Manager	Ensure the decisions to be made on time for the evaluation team Prepare a management response to all evaluations and ensure the implementation of committed actions in the management response
CGF Programme Officer	Ensure the close communication with the evaluation team during the whole evaluation process. Clarify questions raised during the evaluation Help identify the projects to be visited
CGF Programme Associate	Help notify the partners to be evaluated.

	Provide all the document information sources the evaluation team re
CGF Programme Assistant	Help arrange meetings with TAC members Help arrange the travel to the project site and other logistic issues.

VIII. Inputs

- Existing information sources of CGF include: CGF Prodoc, CGF donor reports, Calls for Proposals, Meeting Minutes of the selection of the proposals received for each batch, training reports, mission reports, previous external evaluation reports, etc.
- For the 6th batch projects: project documents for each individual project under CGF, individual project progress reports, completion reports, and financial reports, contract amendments if the project is delayed;
- For the 7th batch project: project documents for each project, which includes project objectives, expected outcomes and outputs, timeframe, workplan; initial mid-term reports, etc.

IX. Performance evaluation:

Contractor's performance will be evaluated based on: timeliness, responsibility, initiative, communication, accuracy, and quality of the products delivered.

IIIX. Required experience and qualifications

The evaluation will be conducted by 2 experts, one international and one national of the PRC. Experts will be selected and recruited based on the requirements outlined below.

The international consultant is expected to lead the process and work closely with the national consultant. S/he will function as the Team Leader, managing the evaluation process in timely manner, and is primarily responsible for writing and producing the final report.

The national consultant will contribute to the process substantively, sharing responsibilities for conducting desk review and interviews, provide substantive input to the report, and review its translation into Chinese by professional translators.

While the Evaluation team will work in independent manner, UN Women, as the agency responsible for administering the CGF, will provide logistical and other support to facilitate the evaluation team mission, particularly for field visits, including the provision of professional interpreters to accompany the international consultant during field visits, if required. The UNTGG and TAC members can join the evaluation team field missions as observers if agreed to be necessary.

For international consultant

Education

- Advanced degree in relevant discipline (e.g., evaluation, management, gender, development and social studies, sociology, political science, etc);

Experience and skills

- At least 10 years of experience in programme evaluation and proven accomplishment in undertaking evaluations, including leading evaluations of multi-stakeholder programmes for multilateral organizations (at least 8 evaluation of which at least two as team leader)
- Extensive knowledge of qualitative and quantitative research methods
- Knowledge in Results-Based Management (RBM) particularly in the field of women's political and economic empowerment, gender justice and human rights;

- Strategic thinking and proven expertise in gender analysis;
- Excellent drafting and writing skills to produce and present concise and analytical reports and communicate clearly with evaluation stakeholders in English;
- Excellent inter-personal, team work and communication skills
- Knowledge of the UN system is a strong asset.
- Knowledge of the development context of China and preferably previous experience in development initiatives in China;

For national consultant

Education

- Advanced degree in relevant disciplines (e.g., gender, development and social studies, sociology, political science, etc);

Experience and skills

- At least 5 years of experience in evaluation and assessment assignments with the multilateral and bilateral organizations;
- Work experience with international organizations and intergovernmental bodies in the above mentioned fields.
- Proven working experience in the area of gender equality, women's empowerment and women's rights;
- Native ability in Chinese (Mandarin) and fluency in written and spoken English;
- Knowledge of evaluation methods.
- Knowledge of China and the UN system.
- Ability to facilitate multi-stakeholder discussions;
- Excellent interpersonal and teamwork skills.

Important: The evaluation team leader and specialist have to explicitly declare their independence from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the CGF. Selection process will ensure that the evaluation team leader and specialist do not have any relationship with the CGF, past, present or foreseen in the near future.

Evaluation Ethics: Evaluations in the UN will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in both UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System and by the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. These documents will be attached to the contract. Evaluators are required to read the Norms and Standards and the guidelines and ensure a strict adherence to it, including establishing protocols to safeguard confidentiality of information obtained during the evaluation.

IX. Submission of application

Interested candidates are requested to submit electronic application to unwomen.china@unwomen.org and to hr.bangkok@unwomen.org not later than 7 April 2015 COB.

Submission package

- Application Letter
- Curriculum Vitae
- Personal History Form (P11) (see attached UN Women form)
- Proposed Daily Rate
- Sample Evaluation Report

ANNEX 2: EVALUATION ITINERARY

Date	Location	Activity
24 Jul 15	Beijing	Desk research in Beijing
27 Jul 15	Beijing	Meet with CGF staff
28 Jul 15 - 30 Jul 15	Beijing	Desk research in Beijing, talk to CGF staff
31 Jul 15	Beijing	Meet Mr Ron Pouwells, UNICEF
31 Jul 15	Beijing	Meet Mr Philippe Devaud, Embassy of France
03 Aug 15 - 05 Aug 15	Beijing	CGF Advocacy Workshop
06 Aug 15 - 07 Aug 15	Suzhou	Visit Suzhou University of Science and Technology, CGF grantee
10 Aug 15	Hangzhou	Travel to Hangzhou
11 Aug 15	Hangzhou	Meet with Proya Cosmetics, CGF donor
12 Aug 15	Guiyang	Visit Guiyang Zhongyi Volunteer Center, CGF grantee
13 Aug 15	Beijing	Meet Ms Huang Qun, ILO
13 Aug 15	Beijing	Meet Ms Wen Hua, UNFPA
14 Aug 15	Beijing	Meet Ms Susie Jolly, Ford Foundation
14 Aug 15	Beijing	Meet Ms Nona de Jonge, Embassy of the Netherlands
17 Aug 15	Beijing	Wrapup with CGF staff
04 Nov 15	Beijing	Debriefing meeting with TAC members

ANNEX 3: CGF GRANTEES INTERVIEWED

China Ethnic Film and Television Arts Development and Promotion Association	中国民族影视艺术发展促进会	7th batch
Gender and HIV/AIDS Prevention Research Institute of Liangshan Prefecture	凉山州社会性别与艾滋病防制研究会	7th batch
Hunan Police Academy	湖南警察学院	7th batch
Shaanxi Research Association for Women and Family	陕西省妇女理论婚姻家庭研究会	7th batch
Shandong Women's University	山东女子学院	7th batch
Zhitong Guangzhou LGBT Center	智同公益服务中心	7th batch
Ziyang Women's Federation	资阳市妇女联合会	7th batch
Communication University Of China	中国传媒大学	6th batch
Huazhong Normal University	华中师范大学	6th batch
Hunan Women's Federation	湖南省妇联	6th batch
Suzhou University of Science and Technology	苏州科技学院	6th batch
Zhong Yi Volunteer Service Development Center of Guiyang	贵阳众益志愿者服务发展中心	6th batch
Aids Apartment	艾滋公寓	CGF partner

ANNEX 4: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

2007 CGF External Evaluation report final - meeting request from Mr. Malik to ACWF.doc
2007 CGF External Evaluation report.doc
2012 CGF Evaluation Report-Final Draft-incorporating feedback.doc
LOA-CHN-2014-003 Ethnic Film and TV Arts - LOA-CHN-2014-003 countersigned-Final.pdf
LOA-CHN-2014-004-Hunan - Final LOA-CHN-2014-004 countersigned.pdf
LOA-CHN-2014-005 Shandong - LOA-CHN-2014-005 countersigned.pdf
Meeting Minutes_CGF Selection of 7th Calll_09 July 2014-Final.docx
PCA-CHN-2014-001-Sichuan Ziyang - PCA-CHN-2014-001 countersigned final.pdf
PCA-CHN-2014-002-Shaanxi - PCA-CHN-2014-002.pdf
PCA-CHN-2014-003-Guangzhou Zhitong - PCA-CHN-2-14-003-Countersigned.pdf
CGF 6th and 7th batch project list.xls
CGF Logical Framework-2011 revised-final.docx
CGF prodoc signed 2004.pdf
List of CGF TAC members July.docx
LOA 001 Project Completion Report-20150319-发妇女署.docx
LOA 001-妇女在农村环境保护中的角色研究 (中文版本) .doc
LOA 002-苏州项目申请-中文版.doc
LOA 003 -员工劳动权益保障的社会性别分析及倡导 (汪改) [[1].doc
LOA 003-Completion Report-Trade Union-Final.doc
LOA 003-中国民族影视艺术发展促进会 - 210-少数民族地区的性少数人群的权益的电视倡导.doc
LOA 003-中国民族影视艺术发展促进会 - 210-项目预算表-少数民族影视.xls
LOA 004--四川项目申请.doc
LOA 004-Sichuan Completion Report-final.doc
LOA 004-湖南警察学院 - 201-湖南警察学院反家暴项目工作计划和预算.xls
LOA 004-湖南警察学院 - 201-湖南警察学院项目申请书.doc
LOA 005-中国传媒大学_社会性别与媒介教育设计与推广_新媒体运用与男性参与.pdf
LOA 005-山东女子学院 - 121 山东女子学院 (项目申请) .doc
LOA 005-山东女子学院 - 121 山东女子学院预算表.xls
LOA 006 中国老龄科学研究中心申请书.doc

LOA 006-Completion Report-Chinese.doc
LOA 006-四川省资阳市妇女联合会 王兰 - 307 四川资阳申请书.doc
LOA 006-四川省资阳市妇女联合会 王兰 - 307 四川资阳预算和计划表.xls
LOA-CHN-2013-001-Ministry of Environmental Protection - LOA 001-Amendment 1 Environment-Countersigned.pdf
LOA-CHN-2013-001-Ministry of Environmental Protection - LOA 001-Amendment No. 2-countersigned.pdf
LOA-CHN-2013-001-Ministry of Environmental Protection - LOA_CHN_2013_001-attachments.pdf
LOA-CHN-2013-001-Ministry of Environmental Protection - LOA-CHN-2013-001--- Ministry of Environmental Protection-countersigned.pdf
LOA-CHN-2013-001-Ministry of Environmental Protection - MOEP Progress Report-Final.doc
LOA-CHN-2013-001-Ministry of Environmental Protection - Project Completion Report-CAEE-Final.docx
LOA-CHN-2013-002-Suzhou University of Sci and Tech - LOA 002-Amendment 1 Countersigned.pdf
LOA-CHN-2013-002-Suzhou University of Sci and Tech - LOA 002-Amendment No. 2-Suzhou Countersigned.pdf
LOA-CHN-2013-002-Suzhou University of Sci and Tech - LOA_CHN_2013_002-attachments.pdf
LOA-CHN-2013-002-Suzhou University of Sci and Tech - LOA-CHN-2013-002--- Suzhou University of Sci and Tech-countersigned.pdf
LOA-CHN-2013-002-Suzhou University of Sci and Tech - Suzhou Progress Report-En-Final.doc
LOA-CHN-2013-003-Trade Union Research Center - Completion Report-Trade Union-Final.doc
LOA-CHN-2013-003-Trade Union Research Center - LOA_CHN_2013_003-attachments.pdf
LOA-CHN-2013-003-Trade Union Research Center - LOA-CHN-2013-003 Amendment No.1-Trade Union-Countersigned.pdf
LOA-CHN-2013-003-Trade Union Research Center - LOA-CHN-2013-003---Trade Union Research Center-countersigned.pdf

LOA-CHN-2013-004-Sichuan Party School - LOA 004-Amendment 1
Countersigned.pdf

LOA-CHN-2013-004-Sichuan Party School - LOA_CHN_2013_004-attachments.pdf

LOA-CHN-2013-004-Sichuan Party School - LOA-CHN-2013-004---Sichuan Party
School-countersigned.pdf

LOA-CHN-2013-004-Sichuan Party School - Sichaun Completion Report-final.doc

LOA-CHN-2013-004-Sichuan Party School - Sichuan Progress Report-English-
Final.doc

LOA-CHN-2013-005- Communication University of China - CUC Progress Report-
Final.doc

LOA-CHN-2013-005- Communication University of China - LOA 005-Amendment 1
Countersigned.pdf

LOA-CHN-2013-005- Communication University of China - LOA_CHN_2013_005-
attachments.pdf

LOA-CHN-2013-005- Communication University of China - LOA-CHN-2013-005--
Communication University of China-countersigned.pdf

LOA-CHN-2013-006-China Research Center on Aging - Amendment 1-LOA 006
countersigned.pdf

LOA-CHN-2013-006-China Research Center on Aging - China Aging Assocaition
Progress Report-Final.docx

LOA-CHN-2013-006-China Research Center on Aging - Completion Report-China
Aging Associ-Final.docx

LOA-CHN-2013-006-China Research Center on Aging - LoA-CHN-2013-006-China
Research Center on Aging countersigned.pdf

Meeting Minutes_CGF Selection of 6th Call for proposal_10 September 2012-
Final.docx

PCA 001 凉山州社会性别与艾滋病防制研究会 - 111 凉山-项目申请表.doc

PCA 001 凉山州社会性别与艾滋病防制研究会 - 111 凉山-项目预算表.xls

PCA 002 Project Completion Report-CAEE-Final.docx

PCA 002 中国少数民族经济研究会 20120713[1].doc

PCA 002-陕西省妇女理论婚姻家庭研究会 - 411 Annex 1-application form.doc

PCA 002-陕西省妇女理论婚姻家庭研究会 - 411 Annex 2-budget & work plan.xls

PCA 003- Project Completion Report-20150116 (revised).docx

PCA 003-中国纺织工业联合会中文申请表-No.18.pdf
PCA 003-智同广州 - 207 (智同广州) LGBT 平等权益保护 中文版.docx
PCA 003-智同广州 - 207 (智同广州) LGBT 平等权益保护预算 中文版.xlsx
PCA-001 拾荒妇女短期城乡循环流动研究项目申请表——贵阳众益.doc
PCA-CHN-2013-001-Guiyang Zhongyi Volunteer Center - Amendment-PCA-2013-001-countersigned.pdf
PCA-CHN-2013-001-Guiyang Zhongyi Volunteer Center - PCA-CHN-2013-001---Guiyang Zhongyi Volunteer Center-countersigned.pdf
PCA-CHN-2013-001-Guiyang Zhongyi Volunteer Center - PCA-CHN-2013-001-attachment.pdf
PCA-CHN-2013-002-Association of Ethnic Economy - PCA-CHN-2013-002---Association of Ethnic Economy--Counttersigned.pdf
PCA-CHN-2013-002-Association of Ethnic Economy - PCA-CHN-2013-002---Association of Ethnic Economy-Attachments.pdf
PCA-CHN-2013-002-Association of Ethnic Economy - Progress Report- China Minority Economy Study Society-Final- 2 Dec .docx
PCA-CHN-2013-002-Association of Ethnic Economy - Project Completion Report-CAEE-Final.docx
PCA-CHN-2013-003-China National Textile and Apparel Council - Amendment 1-PCA 003-countersigned.pdf
PCA-CHN-2013-003-China National Textile and Apparel Council - China Textile Completion Report-English Final.docx
PCA-CHN-2013-003-China National Textile and Apparel Council - PCA-CHN-2013-003---China National Textile and Apparel Council-countersigned.pdf
PCA-CHN-2013-003-China National Textile and Apparel Council - Progress Report-CNTAC-Final.doc