Final Evaluation of Two UN Women Projects:

“Strengthening a Participatory, Evidenced Based Formulation of a Comprehensive Action Plan to End Violence Against Girls in Cambodia”, and

“Implementation of the 2nd Cambodian National Action Plan to Prevent Violence Against Women (2nd NAPVAW)”

UN Women Cambodia

June 2016

Peter Hosking (Independent Evaluator)
Acknowledgements

This evaluation has been informed by the views of approximately 75 people from UN agencies (primarily UN Women), Cambodian government officials (both national and sub-national), Cambodian civil society and individuals. The evaluator is very grateful for their cooperation in the information gathering and for the time they gave generously to the evaluation process.

Deep appreciation is also due to all those in UN Women Cambodia for the comprehensive and efficient support and information they provided and their insightful comments and opinions. The evaluation was conducted under considerable time pressure and without their back-up, the necessary data could not have been gathered, nor this report written.
Executive Summary

Background

Violence against women and girls is a grave violation of human rights and a major focus of UN Women, which considers VAW/G to be a manifestation of gender discrimination and inequality. It is also seen as an instrument through which this discrimination is perpetuated, including in Cambodia, where the Royal Government of Cambodia, working with CSOs, NGOs, development partners and UN agencies, has begun initiatives to establish an enabling environment to address VAW/G - including its prevention.

Evaluation Object

UN Women in Cambodia developed a partnership framework with Australia’s Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, which resulted in two projects in Cambodia. The first agreement, *Strengthening a participatory, evidenced-based formulation of a comprehensive action plan to end violence against women and girls in Cambodia*, was signed in May 2012 for a period of 13 months, later extended to 31 December 2015. The second agreement, *Implementation of the 2nd Cambodian National Action Plan to Prevent Violence Against Women*, was signed in May 2014 for a period of 20 months. These two projects are the focus of this evaluation. The budget for the Formulation Project was AUD 1,715,758 and, for the Implementation Project, USD 597,000.

The two projects took a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary approach, necessarily so given the complexity of responding to EVAW. Five strategic areas identified in the development of the 2nd NAPVAW became the building blocks for the Implementation Project – primary prevention; legal protection and multi-sectoral services; laws and policies; capacity building; and monitoring and evaluation. Consistent with a rights-based approach, the projects emphasised both duty-bearers and rights-holders, focusing on partners in civil society as well as national and sub-national government.

Evaluation Purpose and Scope

Against the standard OECD DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, the purpose of the evaluation, as outlined in the ToR, has been to:

- Assess progress achieved or being made towards the achievement of the expected outputs and overall performance of this programme;
• Determine whether the programme contributed to achieving the stated programme outcomes, and explain why/why not;

• Provide forward-looking recommendations on how to build on the achievements of the programme and to ensure that they are sustained by the relevant stakeholders;

• Highlight any particular processes and partnerships that have contributed to the achievement of the programme outputs; and

• Document lessons learned, success stories and good practices in order to capitalize on the experiences gained.

In view of the complexity and deep-seated nature of EVAW, it was considered premature to endeavour to measure programme impact. The ToR also invited suggestions for future interventions under new programmes. The evaluation was expected to take into consideration the programme duration, existing resources and political and contextual constraints. Another limiting factor was the time available for data collection, especially at the subnational level.

The primary intended audience for the evaluation are the Royal Government of Cambodia, particularly the Secretariat and members of the Technical Working Group on Gender/Gender-Based Violence, as well as UN Women and the Australian Government as the donor. The evaluation covers activities between when the first project began (June 2012) and when both ended in December 2015. Included within the scope of the evaluation are both national-level activities and those in the provinces (15 out of 25) where the projects were implemented.

**Evaluation Methodology**

A mixed methodology was adopted that included a desk review, semi-structured interviews and two focus groups, along with observations in the field. Consistent with a human rights-based approach, it was designed to ensure the participation of as many different stakeholder groups as was feasible in the time available, and to deliver a robust set of findings, adequately triangulated.

Semi-structured interviews were undertaken with key informants from all relevant sectors, including Government and NGOs at both national and sub-national levels and development partners in Phnom Penh and three provinces (Kampong Cham, Siem Reap, Preah Vihear), selected, in view of time restraints, from those provinces bordering Phnom Penh and Siem Reap city. The results were analysed and triangulated with reports on programme activities and the results of two focus group discussions held in Phnom Penh and Siem Reap, where the NGOs most active in EVAW operate.

**Key Findings and Conclusions**

The signal achievement of the programme has been the formulation of the 2nd NAPVAW – not just the document itself, but the process for its development, which saw broad-based, country-wide participation, including by the representatives of the survivors of violence themselves. The formulation process was devised to overcome governance deficits that hinder the development of robust national policy in Cambodia. The 2nd NAPVAW formulation process has resulted in an extremely relevant resource that merges relevant international standards with local VAW priorities. The
formulation process has received international recognition and been replicated in at least one other country in the region (Lao PDR).

Capacity development was a strong focus of the programme, particularly in relation to the Ministry of Women’s Affairs. While key informants, including those from the ministry itself, considered it relatively effective, capacity development is a process more than an activity and it will need continued emphasis in on-going EVAW programmes. Some benefits from capacity development were apparent at the sub-national level, particularly in Provincial Departments of Women’s Affairs. Capacity development will continue to be a necessary component of interventions at the sub-national level.

Generally, UN Women’s partnerships worked effectively, particularly with MoWA and on TWGG-GBV, which UN Women co-chairs with GIZ, resulting in durable outcomes.

A major impediment to future progress on EVAW identified is access by all the “Responsible Institutions” identified in the 2nd NAPVAW to sufficient allocations from the state budget – many have encountered an attitude in the Ministry of Economy and Finance that these should be funded by development partners or NGOs.

**Main Recommendations**

As 2nd NAPVAW implementation progresses, UN Women’s focus should move to include the sub-national level to a significantly greater extent. Training of Trainers should be provided to both PDoWA staff and local NGOs to empower them to train key district and commune-level personnel in both EVAW policy and knowledge and attitudes towards gender equality.

Equivalent training should also be offered to anti-trafficking police in each province, which have experience in dealing not just with women survivors but also making multi-sectoral referrals to a greater extent than their national counterparts. However, efforts should be made to engage national police to a greater extent given an apparent lack of urgency in taking up police responsibilities to ensure women’s safety. Similar initiatives should be taken with the judicial system.

The ten year-old Law on the Prevention of Domestic Violence and the Protection of Victims is now proving counter-productive to effectively dealing with the issue according to a number of key informants. Its review is under contemplation. This process could be a further entry point for engagement with national police.

Also, the UNCT, and UN Women in particular, should advocate for contributions from the state budget to implement the 2nd NAPVAW effectively in line with gender equality policy commitments in the NSDP and Neary Rattanak IV. The 2016 – 2018 UNDAF also provides a vehicle for promoting action on EVAW, in line with all three UNDAF Outcomes.
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1. Background and Context

UN Women addresses violence against women and girls (VAW/G) as a grave violation of human rights whose impact ranges from immediate to long-term multiple physical, sexual and mental consequences for women and girls, including death. This violence has negative consequences not only for women but also their families, communities and countries, including in Cambodia.

Decades of mobilising by civil society, women’s movements, UN agencies and other stakeholders have resulted in ending gender-based violence becoming a high priority at both national and international levels. An unprecedented number of countries, Cambodia included, now have laws against domestic violence, sexual assault and other forms of violence. However, multiple challenges remain in implementing these laws, thus limiting women and girls’ access to safety and justice. Not enough is done to prevent violence, and when it does occur, it often goes unpunished. UN Women recognises VAW/G as both a manifestation of gender discrimination and inequality, and an instrument through which this discrimination is perpetuated.

Initiatives by the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC), working with CSOs, NGOs, development partners and UN agencies, have begun to establish an enabling environment to address VAW/G - including its prevention. There is a growing recognition that significant progress will require a more comprehensive and coordinated framework in which all stakeholders, including victims and survivors themselves (as a human rights-based approach requires), identify and prioritise issues and strategies, mobilise needed resources, and develop relevant laws, policies and procedures in line with international best practice. One prerequisite for progress is more reliable administrative data – to provide an accurate picture for the authorities of the VAW/G situation in Cambodia.

In order to pursue its support for addressing VAW/G, UN Women in Cambodia entered into a global partnership framework (2009-2015) with Australia’s Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). The first agreement, Strengthening a participatory, evidenced-based formulation of a comprehensive action plan to end violence against women and girls in Cambodia (Project 83187; DFAT reference 62966), was signed in May 2012 for a period of 13 months, later extended. The second agreement, Implementation of the 2nd Cambodian National Action Plan to Prevent Violence Against Women (2nd NAPVAW) (90454; DFAT reference 69991), was signed in May 2014 for a period of 20 months.

These two projects (“the programme”) are closely aligned to international and national strategic priorities. Cambodia, as a member state of the United Nations, is bound by Security Council resolutions, notably in this context those bearing on women peace and security. Cambodia has also, in 1992, ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination and its Optional Protocol. Nationally, VAW is also a priority, as noted in Rectangular Strategies Phase I, II and III, National Strategic Development Plans, legal and judicial reforms, sectoral policies and programmes and the Village Commune Safety Policy that provides “no prostitution, no trafficking of women and children and no domestic violence”.

The programme also recognises, through its scale and complexity:

- the different forms of violence against women – physical, psychological, sexual and economic;
that this violence is driven by a combination of factors at the individual, relationship, community and societal level; and

that some women face additional risks by virtue of their membership of particular disadvantaged groups, including women with disabilities, women living with HIV, LBT women, sex workers, entertainment workers, garment factory workers and other female employees, women who use drugs or whose partners use drugs, female prisoners, indigenous women and women from religious or ethnic minorities.

Key stakeholders involved in the implementation of the projects to be evaluated, include not just relevant state ministries and institutions but also civil society – at national and sub-national levels – as well as development partners.

The expected results of the two projects were as follows:

1. **Formulation Project: To strengthen a participatory, evidenced-based formulation of a comprehensive action plan to end violence against women and girls in Cambodia**

This first project had two over-arching outcomes, related to both 2nd NAPVAW adoption and to violence prevention and services, to be achieved via a total of five outputs, as below.

**Outcome 1: The Royal Government of Cambodia’s new national action plan to end violence against women (2nd NAPVAW) is adopted**

- **Output 1.1:** Increased capacity of stakeholders from government and civil society to formulate the new 2nd NAPVAW in line with international standards;
- **Output 1.2:** Improved coordination of main stakeholders for the development of the 2nd NAPVAW;
- **Output 1.3:** Increased participation of civil society organisations (CSOs) and other relevant stakeholders and rights holders in the development of the new 2nd NAPVAW.

**Outcome 2: Knowledge is generated to strengthen VAW/G prevention and services in Cambodia:**

- **Output 2.1:** A VAW prevalence study is initiated in Cambodia;
- **Output 2.2:** A media monitoring study on VAW/G is conducted in Cambodia.

2. **Implementation Project: To Implement the National Action Plan to Prevent Violence against Women (2nd NAPVAW)**

**Outcome: The implementation of the Royal Government of Cambodia’s 2nd NAPVAW is launched:**

- **Output 1.1 (Prevention):** An action plan for a national level community of practice for secondary prevention is drafted and agreed by VAW service providers;
- **Output 1.2 (Prevention):** A Multi-Sectoral Coordinated Primary Prevention Strategy including mapping of options is drafted;
• **Output 2.1 (Services):** Minimum Service Standards are reviewed and developed by the Technical Working Group on Gender and Gender Based Violence (TWGG-GBV) services sub-committee and selected service providers (including the justice sector) and agreements fed back into the TWGG-GBV;

• **Output 2.2 (Services):** Costing of services in the 2nd NAPVAW is initiated;

• **Output 3.1 (A2J and CEDAW):** Interventions that respond to CEDAW Concluding Observations 21 (a, b & c) are integrated into the 2nd NAPVAW Implementation Plan;

• **Output 4.1 (M&E):** Implementation Plan for a participatory process to implement, monitor and evaluate the 2nd NAPVAW is drafted;

• **Output 4.2 (M&E):** Knowledge exchange and information sharing at sub-national, national and regional level.

Acknowledging the complexity of responding to EVAW, the programme took a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary approach. The five strategic areas identified in the development of the 2nd NAPVAW became the building blocks for the Implementation Project – primary prevention; legal protection and multi-sectoral services; laws and policies; capacity building; and monitoring and evaluation. As rights-based initiatives, the Projects emphasised both duty-bearers and rights-holders, focusing on partners in civil society as well as government (national and sub-national).

The ultimate budget for the Formulation Project was AUD 1,715,758 (following two amendments during the term of the project) and for the Implementation Project USD 597,000. Both projects had their terms extended through to December 2015 with revised activity plans, so the duration of the Formulation Project was 3 years 8 months and, for the Implementation Project, 1 year 8 months. UN Women Cambodia was the executing agency for both projects. Listed as collaborating agencies for both projects were: RGC; MoWA; UN Agencies; and Women’s Media Centre. Some activities were implemented by government agencies and NGOs via Letters of Agreement or Project Cooperation Agreements.
2. Evaluation Overview

Here is set out the purpose and scope of the evaluation and the approach adopted.

Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this final evaluation of the two projects has been, as the ToR (Appendix I) articulate, is to:

- Assess progress achieved or being made towards the achievement of the expected outputs and overall performance of this programme;
- Determine whether the programme contributed to achieving the stated programme outcomes, and explain why/why not;
- Provide forward-looking recommendations on how to build on the achievements of the programme and to ensure that they are sustained by the relevant stakeholders;
- Highlight any particular processes and partnerships that have contributed to the achievement of the programme outputs; and
- Document lessons learned, success stories and good practices in order to capitalize on the experiences gained.

More specifically, the evaluation has focused on assessing:

- Relevance, including planning, design, implementation and coherence of the programme vis-à-vis the specific country contexts, and their development needs in the area of EVAW;
- Effectiveness, i.e. examining factors contributing to the achievement of the results in time. The evaluation should also look at the level of ownership among the stakeholders in the programme, and identify lessons learned;
- Efficiency in the strategic use and allocation of resources and in the managing, monitoring and documentation of the program;
- Sustainability in the continuation of the results of the programme post-implementation.

In view of the complexity and deep-seated nature of EVAW, it was considered premature to endeavour to measure programme impact, the fifth OECD DAC criterion. The ToR also invited suggestions for future interventions under new programmes. The evaluation was expected to take into consideration the programme duration, existing resources and political and contextual constraints.

The primary users/beneficiaries of the evaluation are intended to be the RGC, particularly the Secretariat and members of the TWGG-GBV, as well as UN Women and the Australian Government as donor. Other relevant development partners, women’s organisations and Cambodian civil society
more generally as well as feminist movements, research institutions and academia are expected to be secondary users.

The evaluation covers activities between when the first project began (June 2012) and when both ended in December 2015. Included within the scope of the evaluation are both national level activities and those in the provinces (15 out of 25) where the projects were implemented.

**Evaluation Approach**

The evaluation established collaboration with its primary users to ensure that the process reflected usage priorities. Key evaluation stakeholders were consulted in the development of the inception report – from government, development partners and other informants knowledgeable in the field. UN Women was regularly updated on the evaluation progress and provided with an opportunity to review the Inception Report (as a result of which some changes were made). UN Women also received, via Skype, an early presentation of preliminary findings and recommendations.

A human rights-based and gender-sensitive approach, consistent with the *UNEG Handbook for Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality Perspectives in Evaluations in the UN System* as well as the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation, Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct and guided by UN Women Quality Report Standards, was ensured through consultation with and participation by project beneficiaries, relevant stakeholders and partners involved in implementation of the programme. Interview questions acknowledged and addressed human rights and gender equality issues. Disaggregated data was collected and analysed. The data collection tools employed during the evaluation process (see Methodology below) also facilitated the inclusion of views and perspectives of stakeholders throughout the evaluation.

More specifically, human rights principles around participation, inclusion, non-discrimination and empowerment have guided the process as have gender equality principles. The CSOs, NGOs and gender equality advocates who represent and advocate for Cambodian women and girls who have been, are or may be in the future victims of violence have been included among the key informants interviewed and key CSOs/NGOs on the TWGG-GBV working group and from one province have had the opportunity to participate in the focus group discussions.

Results of interviews have been disaggregated to ensure the views of human rights and gender advocates and representatives are explicitly identified and are clearly reflected in this evaluation report, which has a sub-section devoted to human rights and gender (Figure 1).

Both national and sub-national level stakeholders were interviewed, including CSO representatives of vulnerable groups. Their rights were ensured through assurances of confidentiality and anonymity. In order to minimise demands on time, the number of questions asked of stakeholders was limited and customised to maximise the efficiency of the process and respect informants time availability.

A results-based framework was used and a matrix developed that matched the evaluation criteria and an explanation of these criteria with the evaluation questions, the source of data and the collection methods.
Evaluation Questions

The ToR posed 53 evaluation questions relating to the four evaluation criteria. Since many of these themselves were multiple questions, a total of over 80 questions were included in the tool for semi-structured interviews – see Appendix V. Indicators were developed for all questions that were not open questions – for example, the first question “To what extent does the programme respond to the international framework to prevent and respond to violence against women, such as CEDAW, Beijing Platform Action, UN Women Global Strategy on EVAW and women’s human rights principles?” had as an indicator “% of respondents who report correlation of 2nd NAPVAW and its implementation with international EVAW framework as: High / Medium / Low.”

Limitations and Constraints

As anticipated in the ToR, (which noted the need for the evaluation to take into consideration the programme duration, existing resources and political and contextual constraints) some limitations and constraints were identified in the inception report that had the potential to undermine the evaluation’s reliability and the validity of the results obtained. Others emerged as the evaluation progressed.

1. First, the data collection and analysis process relied significantly (through the review of documents and key informant interviews) on the opinions of project partners and stakeholders as well as project management. While the reason for this was the focus of the programme on policy development mostly at the national level rather than the provision of services to women survivors of violence – the ultimate beneficiaries – the risk was that these views might be subject to bias. The use of multiple data sources was designed to mitigate this risk as was the inclusion of experienced international stakeholders and external documentation not authored by project staff.

2. A further limitation resulted from the decision by UN Women that it was not practicable to undertake a survey of TWGG-GBV members. Initially, a survey was proposed of all the members of the TWGG-GBV to gain quantitative data from members of this key oversight mechanism for the 2nd NAPVAW. However, this was discounted by UN Women in light of its previous experience in securing an adequate response rate for such an exercise, at least without considerable staff input via reminders, follow-up etc. To partly compensate, two focus group discussions were undertaken to provide more qualitative data from a larger number of stakeholders, one at the national level and the other at the sub-national level.

3. In addition, there were significant time constraints on data collection at the sub-national level. The agreed work plan for the evaluation contemplated data collection over the period 22 January to 2 February with two days for development of preliminary findings. This timetable proved somewhat unrealistic, as key interviews for the inception report took longer than anticipated to secure and complete. The situation was complicated further by data collection involving face-to-face interviews not being able to extend beyond 5 February when the evaluator left Cambodia. This limited how much data could be gathered at the sub-national level and hence the number of provinces to be visited for fieldwork was been reduced from five to three.
4. During data collection at the provincial level, especially in the first province visited, Kampong Cham, some key informants deputed staff for the interviews who had not attended consultations or workshops and time constraints meant that the key informants themselves could not be interviewed. To mitigate this risk for the remaining two provinces, interviews were actively sought from informants who had actually attended consultations/workshops and this strategy was mostly effective.

5. Another similar limitation was the unavailability of some of the key informants who had attended consultation, dissemination or implementation meetings/workshops because they no longer worked at the institution. Due to the time constraints mentioned, this limitation could not be mitigated although its effect was minimised by the multiple data sources used.

6. A further limitation was the design of the projects, particularly the Formulation Project, in particular shortcomings in some of the indicators in the project documents. As with the earlier self-evaluation conducted by UN Women, new indicators were developed and two evaluation questions from the self-evaluation were included in the present evaluation. This could have the additional benefit of validating both evaluations.

7. The ToR included a large number of evaluation questions (over 80 – see Appendix IV) and many informants, had little or no information about many of them. At the sub-national level, very few informants were aware of the UN Women programme, having dealt only with representatives from the Ministry of Women’s Affairs (MoWA) or Provincial Departments of Women’s Affairs (PDoWA) with the result that there was a large number of non-responses to many questions. In such cases, in order to make them more informative, percentages reported usually relate to the number of informants able to respond with an opinion to the question, rather than the number of key informants overall.
3. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation criteria are based on the formulation project’s Conceptual Framework (also referred to as Theory of Change or Logic Model). The relevant project documents signed by UN Women and the donor identify a number of evaluation indicators. However, on review it was decided that a series of additional indicators would be required adequately to assess the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability of the 2nd NAPVAW Formulation Project. A similar approach was taken in a Mid-term Self-evaluation of the 2nd NAPVAW Formulation Project\(^1\) undertaken by UN Women Cambodia’s Monitoring and Evaluation Officer in 2014 with support from the Regional Evaluation Specialist. The objective of the mid-term evaluation was to assess the contribution of the 2nd NAPVAW Formulation Project towards the Formulation Project’s three outputs. UN Women has used the findings from the mid-term evaluation to identify its role in promoting a rights-based approach to policy development and implementation, and improve the way it engages with and encourages dialogue between the RGC, service providers, grassroots women’s groups, gender equality advocates and civil society organisations.

Both the original evaluation criteria as well as the additional indicators are shown in the Conceptual Framework.

Consistent with a results-based approach, UN Women’s partners were encouraged to participate in the evaluation to the fullest extent possible, both to ensure accountability and to demonstrate transparency. The primary focus was on the CSOs and NGOs (as representatives of the programme’s ultimate beneficiaries, the women of Cambodia) at the national and sub-national level that have partnered UN Women in project activities, together with relevant Government (national and provincial) counterparts. The evaluation design enabled disaggregation of data by gender, role (government, civil society, development partners) national/sub-national status and by type and number of workshop(s) attended, where relevant (formulation /dissemination/implementation/1, 2-4 or 5+days).

In general, the mixed methodology, that included a desk review, semi-structured interviews and two focus groups, along with observations in the field, was designed to ensure the participation of as many different stakeholder groups as was feasible in the time available and to deliver a robust set of findings, adequately triangulated. Responses to semi-structured questions, focus group responses and observations from documentation were given equal weight in a five-scale rating to provide a numerical assessment of each of the four criteria. A survey of members of TWGG-GBV, which would have strengthened the quantitative data, was ruled out by UN Women as impractical, given its experience with an earlier survey.

---

\(^1\) Cambodia country office’s Mid-term self evaluation of 2nd NAPVAW Formulation Project. Phnom Penh: United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.
Desk Review

As part of the inception exercise, a broad range of documentation was made available to the evaluator prior to the in-country phase, uploaded to Google Box. A number of project reports and other documentation were added at the evaluator’s request, making a total of 30 documents.

A list of the documents reviewed is in Appendix III.

Two relevant evaluations were a particular focus of the present evaluation: the Mid-term Self-Evaluation of the 2nd NAPVAW formulation and implementation process referred to above; and the first MOPAN (Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network) assessment of UN Women². For the latter assessment, Cambodia was one of six countries providing information collected through a perception-based survey of key stakeholders, document review, and interviews with UN-Women staff. Survey respondents included UN-Women’s direct partners, MOPAN donors based in-country and at headquarters, and peer organisations.

Two questions asked in the course of the the mid-term self-evaluation in 2014 were repeated in the semi-structured questions asked of key informants – this was to assist in the validation of both evaluations – but other semi-structured questions were expanded to ensure more in-depth data was also collected. The two questions were: “Compared to before the 2nd NAPVAW process, how has your ability changed in relation to formulating national policies in line with international standards” and “Based on your experience in developing the 2nd NAPVAW, what is your view on the range of stakeholders that should be engaged in future policy development?”

Interview sampling

Sampling aimed to ensure a cross-section of stakeholder and beneficiary representatives based on stakeholder type (government which is conclusive of national and sub-national level, CSO, UN Agencies and independent consultants). The list of key informants interviewed was developed in consultation with UN Women. Semi-structured interviews were held with a range of stakeholders selected, taking a purposive approach – the government agencies that have been most active/were the most important “responsible partners” in the 2nd NAPVAW; the three NGOs that were the most active in 2nd NAPVAW formulation and UN Women’s two most active development partners. At the sub-national level, in each of three provinces the Directors of PDOWA, the leadership of the Ministries of Health; Education, Youth and Sport; and Social Affairs along with the most active NGOs in EVAW in each province visited.

Twenty-nine semi-structured interviews were undertaken during the data collection phase. In some cases, more than one person was present during the interviews and contributed views – taking into account the interviews carried out during the inception phase and the FGDs, a total of 75 people had the opportunity to contribute to this report. For weighting purposes, however, each interview with an institution or NGO has been accorded the same weight even

² http://www.mopanonline.org/Assessments/UNWomen2014/
where, as in the case of interviews with the police in particular, as many as six or seven people were present at the interview. It was assumed that where an opinion was expressed by any of these additional attendees, they had the approval of the principal interviewee. To have done otherwise would have distorted the findings.

Results of interviews have been disaggregated to ensure the views of human rights and gender advocates and representatives are explicitly identified and are clearly reflected in this evaluation report, which has a sub-section devoted to human rights and gender (see p. 37).

Field Visits

The ToR anticipated the collection of qualitative and quantitative data not only at the national level, but also through visits to five selected provinces, all data to be gathered over a two-week period. However, the ToR also anticipated limitations of budget and time availability and, in the event, as noted above, time constraints limited data collection to the period between 22 January and 4 February, during which it was possible to visit only 3 provinces.

Programme initiatives in Cambodian provinces can be categorised as:

- those involved in formulation and dissemination consultations and two day workshops (14 provinces); and
- those involved in three-day implementation workshops (11 provinces);
- high and medium capacity, as assessed by the UN Women Programme Officer at the evaluator’s request. See Appendix VIII.

With this in mind, provinces for data collection for this evaluation were selected on the following basis:
- the province with the most developed capacity. Selected: Siem Reap
- two other provinces, one high capacity and the other medium capacity, one of which was the location of a 2-day workshop, and one the location of 3-day workshop and which also neighbour either Phnom Penh or Siem Reap (to minimise travel time and maximise data collection time) selected randomly within these constraints from such provinces neighbouring Phnom Penh and Siem Reap. Selected: Kampong Cham and Preah Vihear.

![Provinces of Cambodia](image)

**Figure 2: Provinces of Cambodia**

**Focus Group Discussions**

Two focus group discussions of a total of thirteen key respondents from civil society have added a qualitative element to the semi-structured questions asked of key informants. One FGD of five active 2<sup>nd</sup> NAPVAW NGO representatives was held in Phnom Penh and another in the province with the most active 2<sup>nd</sup> NAPVAW NGOs, Siem Reap, involving eight representatives. The questions posed to FGD participants are included among the tools in Appendix V.
4. Evaluation Findings

The findings below are based on the four criteria set out in the ToR: relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; and sustainability. In order to provide a rating of project performance, overall project performance has been summarised from all data sources based on the scoring rubric belows.

**Scoring of Programme Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Performance description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Excellent (Always)</td>
<td>Performance is clearly very strong in relation to the evaluation question/criterion. No gaps or weaknesses were identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Very good (Almost always)</td>
<td>Overall strong performance on virtually all aspects of the evaluation question/criterion. Weaknesses are not significant and have been managed effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Good (Mostly, with some exceptions)</td>
<td>Performance is reasonably strong on most aspects of the evaluation question/criterion. No significant gaps or weaknesses, or less significant gaps or weaknesses have mostly been managed effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Adequate (Sometimes, with many exceptions)</td>
<td>Performance is inconsistent in relation to the question/criterion. There are some serious weaknesses. Meets minimum expectations/requirements as far as can be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Poor (Never or occasionally with clear weaknesses)</td>
<td>Performance is unacceptably weak in relation to the evaluation question/criterion. Does not meet minimum expectations/requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3: Rating of Programme Performance**

**Overview of Programme Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Project overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Relevance

Evaluation rating = 4.8 (out of 5)

Overall, relevance of the programme has been rated highly, especially the Formulation Project, which was innovative and ground-breaking in its focus on rights-based initiatives to overcome perceived short-comings in governance that could be expected to undermine the development of a credible 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW. On this issue, there was no measureable difference between the different categories of informant. UN Women’s approach, that gender equality cannot be achieved without good governance that is human rights-based and gender-responsive, contributed significantly to 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW design. No other approach would have produced an implementable 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW. As urged by the CEDAW Committee, 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW includes references to Cambodia’s international commitments to CEDAW and, to some extent, UNSCR 1325.

Several research activities, most notably that based on WHO methodology which gathered national prevalence data on intimate partner violence, as well as the media monitoring and mediation research, have put 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW implementation on a sound footing in the Cambodian context.

**Question 1:** To what extent does the programme respond to the international framework to prevent and respond to violence against women, such as CEDAW, Beijing Platform Action, UN Women Global Strategy on EVAW, and women’s human rights principles?

**Finding 1:** The support to the development of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW resulted in it being fully aligned with international EVAW standards.

Thirty-one percent (N=9) of respondents (“NA” in the graph below) did not respond on this issue, but of the 69% (N=20) key informants who did respond, all but one rated the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW at the highest level in relation to the relevant international framework. The shortcoming mentioned by any of the interviewees was the extent to which the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW responded to UNSCR 1325. They noted that it was included in the policy statements but not included in activities. Notwithstanding, the two informants who expressed concern about UNSCR 1325 still rated the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW as highly as the majority of interviewees.
Question 2: To what extent does the programme respond to the needs and priorities for EVAW in Cambodia, including the stated policy priorities of the Royal Government of Cambodia, such as Neary Rattanak IV, National Strategic Development Plan, and Rectangular Strategy IV, the Domestic Violence Law, Criminal Codes, National Action Plan to Prevent Violence against Women, and UNDAF?

Finding 2: The 2nd NAPVAW was closely aligned with national priorities on EVAW

Thirty-four percent (N=10) respondents did not respond to this question. Of the rest, the largest group (52%, N=15) gave a “high” rating for the alignment of the 2nd NAPVAW with national policy documents, with the balance (14%, N=4) indicating a “medium” alignment. Foremost in the reasoning of the latter group were deficiencies in the Domestic Violence law, noting that the Law was outdated. The fact that the 2nd NAPVAW was more progressive than the law was in fact a positive assessment for the 2nd NAPVAW and especially the programme that supported its development.
**Question 3:** Whose needs and whose problems related to EVAW in Cambodia were identified, and how?

**Finding 3:** The 2nd NAPVAW reflects the needs of a much broader range of women than the 1st NAPVAW, including “women with increased risk” - LBT women, those living with HIV, women with disabilities, sex workers, entertainment workers, garment factory workers and other female workers, women who use drugs or whose partners use drugs, women in prisons, indigenous women and women from religious or ethnic minorities. This was achieved through the breadth of the consultation undertaken.

There was a general recognition among key informants that the process for developing the 2nd NAPVAW, drawn out though it was, had resulted in a much more inclusive document.

**Question 4:** How much has the programme contributed to building a broader knowledge base and capacity in Cambodia?

**Finding 4:** The process supporting the formulation, dissemination and implementation of the 2nd NAPVAW has had a real effect on EVAW knowledge and capacity in the country.

A majority of interviewees responding (60%, of N=9) considered that the programme had contributed “a lot” to knowledge and capacity around EVAW in the country, with only one indicating it had made “little” contribution. Some noted the difficulty of attribution – where there are number of initiatives under way in a particular sector, it is difficult to determine cause and effect; that is, the extent to which a particular agency’s activity has led to a measurable change when the change could (and indeed is likely) to have multiple causes. In these circumstances, it is usual to look at the agency’s planning and to ascertain whether the initiative was carried out in accordance with the plan, as has happened with UN Women’s support to the 2nd NAPVAW.

**Question 5:** How much was the programme able to adapt to changing contexts and situation on the ground?

**Finding 5:** The programme has demonstrated the ability to deal with contextual changes, as demonstrated by its flexibility in handling the long delay in government sign-off on the 2nd NAPVAW.

*The 2nd NAPVAW development process, even though it took a long time, showed us as NGOs how it is possible to work on a consistent basis with government – NGO Siem Reap*
All respondents except one noted the programme’s ability to adapt (a lot or somewhat) and three noted more generally UN Women’s programming flexibility (as opposed to its level of bureaucracy – see below, 4.3 Efficiency). The delay in signing the 2nd NAPVAW was often cited in this context, noting that a number of activities were begun even before the document was signed.

**Question 6:** Extent to which the intervention was informed by substantive and tailored human rights and gender analyses that identify underlying causes of human rights violations and barriers to human rights and gender equality;

**Finding 6:** The programme, and the 2nd NAPVAW it supported, evidences current human rights and gender analyses.

The question is somewhat complicated and 13 informants (NA, below) felt unable to respond to this question. The remaining respondents considered that the 2nd NAPVAW, as a result of UN Women’s support, reflects (“a lot” 56%, N=9, “somewhat” 44%, N=7) the latest human rights and gender analyses, with women respondents generally being more positive than men. As a number of respondents noted, a challenge for the next stage is ensuring that these analyses infuse the implementation process. For example, commune level “mediation” and the attitudes of police and other officials currently lack this analysis, which will tend to undermine the underlying philosophy and implementation of the programme.
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**Figure 6:** Reflection of HR and GE by sex (N=29)
Question 7: Extent to which the intervention was informed by needs and interests of diverse groups of stakeholders through in-depth consultation.

Finding 7: 2nd NAPVAW content clearly demonstrates the extent to which a diverse group of stakeholders was consulted by the programme during 2nd NAPVAW development.

The 2nd NAPVAW consultation process is the feature most often mentioned with approval by key informants – 81% (N=13). They considered that the programme reflects diverse consultation “a lot” and the rest (N=3) “somewhat”. At the sub-national level, some in the NGO community considered it could have been even more “in-depth”, citing that it is important who is invited/sent to such consultations. Even where an invitation is sent to the correct (ie knowledgeable) individual, sometimes another, less informed, person can be assigned. It is therefore important that invitations be personalised where possible. As noted below, a large majority supported the breadth of this consultation. However, fewer recognised the essentially democratic elements of the process or that it was rendered necessary by short-comings in governance systems in Cambodia. But it is clear that similar considerations based on human rights and gender equality approaches should inform implementation and future similar exercises. These views from key informants were reinforced by both FGDs, although in the Siem Reap FGD there was agreement that while wide consultation was essential and it was important to get a diversity of groups, who came from the each group was important for a quality discussion.

The 2nd NAPVAW development process involved much sharing, with the result that we got to see a lot of different approaches in relation to different groups. We shared our experience but also heard about the experience of others... – NGO in FGD, Phnom Penh

Question 8: Were the outputs of the programme clear, realistic and likely to be achieved within the established time schedule and with the allocated resources (including human resources)?

Finding 8: Overall, the two projects adequately anticipated time and resource issues.

There was only limited detail in the formulation project, including a lack of activities – understandable given the magnitude of the formulation task in an environment unsuited to such an undertaking. The outputs in the implementation project were more succinctly defined and at the time they were designed, the timeframe was realistic. However, not all were implemented at the same rate, as noted in 4.2 Effectiveness below.

Question 9: Was the programme design logical and coherent in: a) taking into account the roles, capacities and commitment of stakeholders; and, b) in realistically achieving the planned outputs?

Finding 9: Overall, programme design was logical, coherent and realistic. While some implementation delays occurred, these were not due to design issues
The programme design correctly identified the need for a coordinated multi-stakeholder and holistic approach, which was represented in the design, outputs and activities, although not all proceeded according to plan. Few informants were familiar with UN Women project documentation, but none were critical of delays in implementation, which were put down to the delay in adoption of the 2nd NAPVAW by the RGC. Activities proceeded at an uneven rate and two activities in the implementation project in particular made real progress only in the last six months of the programme term and had not been completed by the time it closed (although they have been or are being completed subsequently).

**Question 10:** Were the planned programme activities relevant and realistic to the situation and needs on the ground? Were the problems and needs adequately analysed?

**Finding 10:** Programme activities were mostly relevant and realistic and based on sound analysis.

The programme design correctly identified the need for a coordinated multi-stakeholder and holistic approach, which is represented in the design, outputs and activities, although not all proceeded according to plan. As noted in 4.2 Effectiveness, problems that emerged with some implementation project activities (Output 1: Primary and Secondary Prevention, 2.1 Minimum Service Standards and 2.2 Costing) were not due to design issues.

**Question 11:** How appropriate and useful were the indicators described in the programme document for monitoring and measuring results? If necessary, how should they be modified to be more useful? Are the means of verifications for the indicators appropriate?

**Finding 11:** The Logframe for the Formulation Project contained no indicators as although these would have been standard in UN Women project development, DFAT did not require them. The implementation project identified more indicators, including at the activity level, although these could have been more robust.

There is wide acceptance that the development of indicators for human rights projects generally can be described as a “work in progress”. It is a relatively new area and it is not uncommon for evaluations to note how project indicators, designed three to five years earlier, could have been better defined. The situation is similar with this programme. With hindsight, more robust indicators could have been developed. This situation was recognised at the time of the self-evaluation of the Formulation Project and several new indicators were drawn up for that evaluation.

For example, in relation to relevance, the formulation project had the following Output 1.1: *Increased capacities of stakeholders from government and civil society to formulate the 2nd NAPVAW in line with international standards.*

The project document adopted as an indicator: *A budgeted multi-sectoral 2nd NAPVAW has been drafted.* In recognition of the limited utility of such an indicator, the UN Women self-evaluation broadened this with, in relation to relevance, a more specific indicator, viz “% of MOWA participants attributing their improved capacity to UNW's support.”

Most of the indicators could have similarly been made more specific and measurable.
**Question 12:** To what extent were external factors and assumptions identified at the time of design?

**Finding 12:** Generally, both projects effectively identified the inherent assumptions and risks.

Included in the Formulation Project was the assumption that the 2nd NAPVAW would be approved by the Council of Ministers, a potential delay that actually eventuated. Another assumption was the difficulties in getting participants to voice their views in a public setting with government representatives, which was addressed through the number of and diversity of participants invited to consultation meetings held, and effective facilitation. The more detailed assumptions/risks in the implementation project were also reasonably robust, although progress has overall been slower than the project documents anticipated.

### 4.2 Effectiveness

**Evaluation rating = 4.4 (out of 5)**

The programme was highly effective in achieving a comprehensive 2nd NAPVAW based on contributions from both duty bearers and rights holders. It also undertook considerable capacity development of both MoWA and the TWGG-GBV, as well as limited capacity development of selected PDoWAs at the subnational level. Progress remains hampered by only limited political will, especially among the more powerful line ministries.

In relation to 2nd NAPVAW implementation, the AOP, and particularly the PMF, (comprehensive though they were) may need a modified approach given the comments of some key informants who considered them overly complicated and to require considerable capacity development. As a result, a more straightforward and user-friendly document (which would still require capacity building in MoWA and the line the ministries) will be developed a part of future planning.

**Question 13:** Assess the achievements of the programme against planned outputs and activities. What were the quantity and quality of outputs produced?

**Finding 13:** The signal achievement of the two projects has been the development of a high-quality 2nd NAPVAW that meets international standards and expressed national priorities through a robust process that has been acknowledged as regional and global best practice. The achievements of the second project have been more modest and somewhat uneven but this reflects the inherent difficulties in implementing activities of this kind in the Cambodian context.

In this section, outputs from both projects are reviewed in the order in which they appear in the project documents.
Formulation Project

Output 1.1: 2nd NAPVAW formulation

Not only did the first project result in an impressive policy document but it also introduced an inclusive, democratic, gender-responsive policy formulation process that built long-term capacity of both rights holders and duty bearers in line with international best practices.

Importantly, it facilitated effective collaboration and coordination amongst government officials (in line ministries and at the sub-national level) as well as CSOs (including the media) and development partners. The Implementation Project covers the same five strategic areas as the 2nd NAPVAW: primary prevention; legal protection and multi-sectoral services; formulating and implementing policies and laws; capacity-development; and review, monitoring and evaluation.

Capacity development was another programme achievement under this output, particularly in relation to the Ministry of Women’s Affairs and the TWGG-GBV, although more needs to be done if MoWA and the sub-national PDoWAs are to play their proper role in effective implementation of the 2nd NAPVAW.

Output 1.2: Improved stakeholder coordination

UN Women, with GIZ, co-chaired the TWGG-GBV, which coordinated 55 stakeholders to oversee the successful development of the 2nd NAPVAW. They subsequently initiated reform of the group to better enable its oversight of 2nd NAPVAW implementation.

One or two NGOs here and in Phnom Penh thought there were too many consultations but we think the number was about right. If there was a problem, it was that sometimes people were sent to the consultations who didn’t really have the interest or expertise and sometimes this slowed us down - NGO Siem Reap

Output 1.3 CSO participation

The project supported 2nd NAPVAW development through consultation with approximately 90 stakeholders at the sub-national level (10 provinces) from CSOs and provincial government – presentations were made on women’s rights and EVAW international standards, which led into discussions on 2nd NAPVAW content. A crucial aspect of this intervention was the breadth of consultation, which included women with increased risk of VAW, survivors of different forms of GBV and women with disabilities as well as their representatives were consulted.

All 16 key informants present at these formulation consultations indicated that their views were adequately reflected in the 2nd NAPVAW and that the workshops were well organised.
Output 2.1 VAW prevalence study

The VAW prevalence study, titled Women’s Health and Life Experiences in Cambodia, was launched in November 2015. It resulted from a partnership between MoWA and the National Institute of Statistics, supported by the WHO (using WHO methodology) and UN Women, and funded by DFAT via the project. It is worth noting that the donor does not consider this latter fact was adequately acknowledged despite the Australian Ambassador speaking at the launch, nor that there was adequate communication to DFAT by UN Women about the time being taken to complete the exercise.

The prevalence study, a first for Cambodia, gathered nationally representative data through interviews throughout the country between May and July 2015 with 3,087 women aged 15-64. It focused on their experiences with VAW, risk factors, coping responses and the effects on children. It provides counter data to official statistics (administrative data) that have significantly under-reported VAW/G. As the prevalence study notes: “the [Domestic Violence] Law distinguishes “serious” acts, which are criminalised, while “lesser” forms of violence are not seen as legally actionable. Consequently, despite a plethora of awareness raising activities, intimate partner violence is not widely considered as a crime, but rather as a private family matter...because police do not consider domestic violence to be a crime, they do not consider the issue to fall within their jurisdiction. Police respond only to violent incidents causing severe injuries, and do not implement protection orders to prevent future violence.”

Output 2.2 Media monitoring study

An early implementation activity under the first project was a media monitoring study on VAW/G undertaken by the Open Institute, which was designed to improve the understanding of stakeholders about how VAW/G is portrayed in local printed media, radio and television. This was not completed until 2015. Print media was monitored daily to establish a baseline to inform future approaches (implementation project) to the presentation of violence in the media and popular perceptions.

The media study proved what we all see daily – victims blamed, VAW downplayed, stereotyping and so on. But it is good to have it recorded and publicised by UN Women. It should be essential reading in journalist training
– TWGG-GBV member

Key issues raised were ethical issues in the media’s portrayal of violence, irresponsible reporting and its effect and the limited implementation of the existing journalist’s Code of Conduct. The study proved valuable for identifying appropriate activities to be included in the Annual Operational Plan (AOP) of TWGG-GBV Members, and did identify privacy rights violations of victims due to the frequent publication of their names and/or identifying information. However, production of the output was delayed as a result of UN Women concerns about the quality of the report and its methodology. A lesson learned for UN Women – when selecting for such initiatives, samples of previous reports should be obtained and
included in the assessment process and the opportunity provided for a methodology review before the exercise gets underway.

**Implementation Project**

Outputs in support of implementing the 2nd NAPVAW aligned with the five strategic areas in the 2nd NAPVAW: primary prevention; legal protection and multi-sectoral services; laws and policies; capacity building; and monitoring and evaluation.

**Output 1.1** An action plan for secondary prevention is drafted and agreed by VAW service providers’ community of practice.

An action plan for a national level community of practice for secondary prevention was planned to upscale GIZ initiatives in two pilot provinces to define the roles and responsibilities of key actors and identify referral paths to promote better coordination and collaboration. It also recognised that primary prevention and secondary prevention initiatives need coordination and collaboration to avoid a recurrence of violence.

Little progress was made however, until the arrival of the new programme manager and a rapid assessment of stakeholders’ capacity in the areas of primary and secondary prevention was initiated late in 2015. Like some other outputs where timeframes have not been met, the delays were contributed to by over-ambitious planning.

**Output 1.2** A Multi-sectoral Coordinated Primary Prevention Strategy, including mapping of options drafted.

For similar reasons, progress was also slow on this output until a one-day consultative workshop involving CSOs and line ministries was held in December 2014 to identify priority prevention interventions. Some of the main prevention interventions discussed were included in the AOPs for 2015 and 2016. Only in late 2015 was a consultant hired to assess current practice in primary and secondary prevention and to draft a prevention strategy. As this evaluation report is being finalised, a draft strategy has been produced and will shortly be reviewed.

However, it is clear that a completed action plan for primary prevention and a secondary prevention strategy is still some distance away.

**Output 2.1** Minimum service standards are reviewed and developed by the TWGG-GBV sub-committee on Service and Policy and selected service providers (including the justice sector) and agreements fed back into the TWGG-GBV.

Another activity finalised in 2015 but begun under the formulation project was a mediation study that explored governmental and non-governmental mediation practices in cases of VAW/G at the commune and district levels. Improving the skills and knowledge of key players in mediation at the commune level is crucial if secondary prevention EVAW initiatives are not to be undermined.
Recommendations from the study included developing standard guidelines for EVAW mediation, gender-sensitivity training for mediators, reviewing the Domestic Violence Law, and establishing guidelines governing the interventions of the Ministries of Justice and Interior.

An assessment of multi-sectoral service provision for survivors of VAW in a number of provinces to scope the current geographical reach of VAW services, the quality of these services and their cost was also completed only in mid-2016 as the evaluation report is finalised.

A limited proportion of funds budgeted for Output 2.1 was also applied to support the Cambodia Centre for Human Rights in designing and developing a project to support women’s human rights defenders with psychosocial support, legal aid and humanitarian assistance.

**Output 2.2  Costing of services in the 2nd NAPVAW is initiated.**

The project document noted that securing long-term budget commitments would require significant evidence-based advocacy and that funding would continue to come from a range of sources beyond government budgets. Despite these potential funding sources, it remains the fundamental responsibility of the state to fulfill its human rights obligations to women and costing EVAW policy and action is therefore a priority, beginning with costing services.

Two staff from MoWA and one CSO representative attended a UN Women regional workshop in Bali, Indonesia, in October 2014. This was followed by capacity building on the issue with TWGG-GBV and a commitment has been obtained from MoWA to cost VAW services for 2016 – 2018. That was as far as the matter reached by the end of the project. However, the main focus there was the cost to women survivors endeavouring to access services and justice. Key informants recognised this output as one where only limited progress had been made – of the 11 out of 29 key informants who responded to this question, none considered the output to have been achieved. Three informants, (30%) nominated the output as having achieved the least.

**Output 3.1  Interventions that respond to CEDAW Concluding Observation 21 are integrated into the 2nd NAPVAW**

The output aimed to avoid overlap with the CEDAW reporting process, with the recommendations to be included in the AOP. This was achieved via a one-day consultation workshop with TWGG-GBV in October 2014 to develop the links between the CEDAW Concluding Observations and the 2nd NAPVAW as a tool to guide policy implementation.

UN Women also took responsibility for putting together, for the UNCT, a confidential follow-up report to the CEDAW Committee on its Concluding Observation on the redress and support provided to victims of sexual violence during the Khmer Rouge regime and the incorporation of UNSC Resolution 1325 into the 2nd NAPVAW; and Concluding Observation 21 on ensuring the effective protection of victims and prosecution of perpetrators of GBV, fostering the filing of formal complaints by victims, and increased awareness-raising on VAW in rural areas.
Output 4.1 A guideline for a participatory system to implement, monitor and evaluate the 2nd NAPVAW is drafted

A significant achievement of the second project was the development of the results-based 2015 AOP for the 2nd NAPVAW and a 2015 Performance Monitoring Framework (PMF). These resulted from project sponsored capacity-development consultation workshops held both at national and sub-national levels. The AOP is also an innovative plan – the first Cambodian EVAW operational plan covering all relevant sectors (both line Ministries and CSOs). It is intended to strengthen coordination and collaboration among stakeholders at all levels as well as joint monitoring. The project provided technical support to MoWA and TWGG-GBV for the development of the framework and, in late 2015, to MoWA for workshops with the PDoWAs on 2nd NAPVAW implementation.

Although preparation began late in 2015 for new AOPs and PMFs for 2016, a modified approach may be required in relation to the PMF, which some commentators considered overly complicated and to require considerable capacity development, as project management recognises. A more straight forward and user-friendly document (which would still require capacity building in MoWA and the line the ministries) will be developed as part of future planning. All three PDoWAs interviewed rated this capacity development highly while noting the difficulties experienced at the sub-national level with lack of funding to implement their roles and responsibilities, including under the 2nd NAPVAW.

Output 4.2 Knowledge exchange and information sharing at sub-national, national and regional level

A range of initiatives were completed in fullfillment of this output – including presentations where study findings were shared with TWGG-GBV; the launch of the prevalence study; the presentation of the VAW mediation assessment; and the dissemination of the 2nd NAPVAW through 14 sub-national level three-day workshops in provinces other than those consulted in the 2nd NAPVAW formulation.

Sub-national key informants interviewed rated these workshops highly, unanimously endorsing the organisation of the workshops and acknowledging that they were provided with sufficient knowledge about the 2nd NAPVAW. All those responding to the interview questionnaire indicated that, compared with before the 2nd NAPVAW process, their ability had been improved in relation to formulating national policies in line with international standards, 20% (N=4) “significantly” improved and the other 80% (N=12)“slightly” so.

These results compare favourably with those obtained through the self-evaluation, where 15% of members of the 30 TWGG-GBV members interviewed did not consider their ability in this area had been improved at all – these participations were generally representatives of international NGOs. While a higher proportion of the self-evaluation informants considered their abilities had increased significantly (44%), these participants were drawn from the TWGG-GBV itself and, as a result, exposed to significant capacity development over a longer period. Both the self-evaluation and this final evaluation rate the capacity development process a success.
Finding 14: The formulation process and outcome are the programme’s greatest success, in particular the democratic approach and breadth of consultation.

Of the 12 interviewees responding on this issue, a majority (59% N=7) of key informants rated the formulation of the plan as the programme highlight, while 25% (N=3) opted for the dissemination process, with the remaining two informants split between incorporation of CEDAW Concluding Observations and the multi-sectoral minimum service standards initiative.

Figure 7: Achievements of Outputs (N=12)

The 2nd NAPVAW acknowledges VAW/G as a human rights issue in line with international definitions, and a manifestation of unequal power between men and women. Its five strategic priorities are comprehensive and the document has set a standard for the region. The formulation process, in which drafting was undertaken through a series of participatory consultations of governmental and non-governmental actors, was ground-breaking for Cambodia in adopting a participatory and inclusive approach. Not only has the process helped improve the Government’s approach to policymaking on EVAW, it also demonstrated how national policy can and should be developed in Cambodia. The process has rightly been acknowledged at regional and global levels as EVAW policy formulation best practice. The process has been extended through to the dissemination of the 2nd NAPVAW and early implementation – and is strongly supported by key informants.

Question 15: In which areas does the programme have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they be overcome?
Finding 15: Two outputs in particular (Implementation Project 1.1 and 1.2) were incomplete by the end of the project term, due in part to the complexity of the issues involved and in part to the delay in approval of the 2nd NAPVAW by the Government.

Only nine key informants of the 29 questioned on this issue (31%) offered any view about the programme’s least achievements. Of these, five (17%) considered the costing output the least achievement; three (10%) the AOP; and the remaining participant opted for the action plan for secondary prevention. The low response rate (9/29) renders the results unreliable. A change in project management in the last six months of the projects has resulted in more attention to those outputs that were not being achieved, and more progress on them.

Question 16: Did the programme develop and build the capacities of partners on planning for activities?

Finding 16: Building partnerships to advance EVAW in Cambodia was a key element in programme design, and this has been achieved effectively.

In order to engage multiple stakeholders to deal with the complexity of the issues, and to improve prospects for sustainability, UN Women elected to build partnerships with government actors such as the MoWA, development partners, United Nations agencies and CSOs. The main ministry focus for the programme was MoWA and there were advantages and disadvantages in this approach. MoWA is clearly the appropriate counterpart for UN Women, but as the ministry itself acknowledges, it is not a high status/ high resource ministry, and pursuing policy reform via MoWA is not as effective as it could be by engaging, for example, the Ministry of the Interior or working directly with the National Police. As recommended below, in the future, UN Women could build on its contacts through TWGG-GBV and the UNCT to involve some relevant and higher ranking ministries.

UN Women co-chairs the TWGG-GBV with GIZ. This is an important partnership although several development partners noted a period during the project when it languished somewhat. The arrival of new management at the programme has seen the relationship restored. There are obvious mutual benefits from this cooperation and as recommended below, the partnership should be built on for the implementation phases.

Question 17: What alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving expected results?

Finding 17: As noted above, selecting MoWA as a partner meant that UN Women’s interface with the Government was channelled through a less-influential ministry. This was the only real option at the time the programme was developed, but for the implementation phase a broader engagement that includes other ministries, and especially sub-national government agencies, is recommended.
Generally, the strategies chosen were appropriate, logical and achievable. However, while it was important during the formulation phase to focus on policy development to establish the framework for EVAW action in the years to come, in the implementation phase there should be additional emphasis on reaching perpetrators – both through ensuring appropriate action by police and justice (including informal mechanisms) and ensuring effective services are available to men who wish to change their behaviour.

**Question 18:** How did the outputs and outcomes contribute to the UN Women’s strategic objectives, mainstreamed strategies and EVAW agenda?

**Finding 18:** The programme contributed directly to UN Women’s strategies and EVAW agenda and through the formulation process set global best practice for countries with governance challenges

One of UN Women’s strategic priorities at the time the programme was developed was (*c*) *Women and girls live a life free from violence. (UN Women Global Impact 3).* This strategy is continued in the current strategic plan (2014 – 2017). Further, UN Women Global Outcome 3.1 provides: *Laws, policies and strategies adopted and implemented in line with international standards and informed by voices of women survivors of violence to prevent and respond to violence against women and girls.*

Another UN Women global strategic priority is coordination, which is mainstreamed into the global results framework. In Cambodia, this priority is reflected in UN Women and GIZ serving as the co-facilitators of the TWGG-GBV, as well as its partnerships with both government and civil society actors.

The formulation of the 2nd NAPVAW fell squarely within these strategic priorities. Its success, and the effectiveness of the process that developed it, has contributed not just to UN Women’s priorities in Cambodia, but as acknowledged, best practice at regional and global levels.

**Question 19:** How have stakeholders been involved in programme implementation? How effective has the programme been in establishing local ownership?

**Finding 19:** The programme identified collaboration and coordination as a key strategy from the outset and has achieved local ownership with its direct partners.

The TWGG-GBV, representing at times up to 60 key stakeholders from government, civil society and development partners, was co-chaired effectively by UN Women with GIZ to formulate and then to implement the 2nd NAPVAW, including the development of the 2015 AOP and PMF. These achievements reflect the active participation of other key partners, such as UNFPA, WHO, UNICEF as well as international and Cambodian CSOs. Both MoWA and, at the provincial level, PDowWas express strong ownership, although the commitment of other ministries is mixed. There is also robust support for the 2nd NAPVAW and the process that developed it, which will be an important factor for implementation at the sub-national level in particular.
**Question 20:** How well has the programme contributed to the collaboration and coordination among UN agencies on EVAW?

**Finding 20:** The programme had some impact on collaboration and coordination on EVAW within the UNCT, where UN Women is acknowledged as the lead agency on this issue.

UN Women has put significant energy into building collaboration and coordination among UNCT through joint public campaigns such as International Women’s Day, the 16-Days Campaign and He4She, as reports of those activities verify. However, most key informants, particularly those at the sub-national level, had no experience of relationships within the country team. Key informants in Phnom Penh noted that identifying which particular initiatives out of several contributed to improved coordination and collaboration in the UNCT is difficult to identify, but some key informants observed a measureable if slight improvement as a result of VAW programme activities. Out of the 10 informants responding on this issue, all but one indicated “some” contribution, with one expressing that the programme had made a “significant” contribution.

**Question 21:** Assess the effectiveness of the activities implemented by partner institutions, their contribution to the outcomes of the programme and potential replication. Assess the lessons learned from these partnerships.

**Finding 21:** UN Women’s relationship with partner institutions worked well, which is particularly important given limited staffing available to the programme at particular times.

All UN Women’s partners interviewed reported effective relationships with UN Women, half of them mentioning especially the dedication and expertise of the staff and the experts they engaged.

The programme’s major partnership with MoWA produced a range of effective initiatives, not the least the highly successful 2nd NAPVAW formulation process. There are other examples as well, such as the 16 Days Campaign. According to its monitoring report, this activity, with its localised message (“Shift the Blame”) gained significant coverage in the print media, social media and especially Facebook. The activities were organised by MoWA with the support of the UN Women programme and DFAT. Not every partnership resulted in a perfect output – notably the Media Monitoring exercise undertaken by Open Institute, which was delayed due to concerns about the quality of the report (See Finding 13 above). But the majority of activities carried out by UN Women partners were of high quality, such as the Prevalence Study produced under cooperation with WHO.

**Question 22:** How effectively does the programme management monitor programme performance and results?
Finding 22: Programme management effectively monitored programme performance and results, although some outputs were affected by delays in recruiting a fixed-term programme manager and delays in approving the 2nd NAPVAW itself.

Despite the lack of resources available to them, programme management received qualified support from the limited number of those involved enough in the activities of the project to have a view. 56% (N=5) of respondents thought programme management was very effective and 44% (N=4) thought it was effective. No-one considered programme management “not effective”. While there were delays in getting some project activities under way, this has been addressed in the last few months and all outputs are likely eventually to be achieved, if not before the projects under evaluation came to a close at the end of 2015.

Question 23: How did factors outside of the control of the programme affect programme implementation and programme objectives, and how did the programme deal with these external factors? How realistic were the critical assumptions identified by the programme?

Finding 23: Programme implementation was affected by some delays, though these were not related to any shortcomings in project design.

Programme implementation was affected by the long delay caused by the post-election government hiatus, and the fact that the 2nd NAPVAW was not signed until 5 December 2014. Essentially, the late start resulted in a late finish and when both projects closed, two outputs (1.1 and 1.2) of the second project had only just begun. These delays were not, however, the result of project design (except to the extent that it was ambitious) nor management. By project end, all outputs were back on track.

4.3 Efficiency

Evaluation rating = 4.2 (out of 5)

Efficiency is rated the lowest of the four criteria used for this evaluation. This is due largely to delays in commencing or completing some significant activities. Not all delays were the responsibility of UN Women, although the programme was somewhat ambitious. Some delays were caused by slow responsiveness of UN Women’s partners, especially in government, which might have been better anticipated.

UN Women has a reputation, including in Cambodia, for a level of bureaucracy which, while often necessary to ensure integrity and avoid inappropriate use of resources, can slow the achievement of outputs. One benefit of this approach, however, is to ensure that funding is generally spent efficiently.
**Question 24:** How did factors outside of the control of the programme affect programme implementation and programme objectives and how did the programme deal with these external factors? How realistic were the critical assumptions identified by the programme?

**Finding 24:** Programme implementation was affected by some delays, though these were related more to factors outside the programme’s control, rather than any shortcomings in project design.

Programme implementation was somewhat uneven through the extended duration of the two projects. For example, the duration of the implementation project was originally 1 May 2014 to 31 December 2014 (8 months) but the 2nd NAPVAW was only signed by the Council of Ministers in the last month of 2014 as a result of the political hiatus resulting from the 2013 election. However, this potential assumption/risk had been anticipated by the project log frame: “The Council of Ministers will approve the 2nd NAPVAW once it is presented to them in the first quarter of 2014.

This is not to say that nothing was done during this period. For example, the 2nd NAPVAW logical framework was reviewed in preparation for the development of an AOP and further work was undertaken on the Khmer version of the document.

Other critical assumptions correctly identified the impediments that emerged. In relation to costing, for example (Output 2.2), which had not been completed by the end of the programme, the log frame noted that: *Costing the entire 2nd NAPVAW will be a lengthy process and will require several steps.*

Finally, it is noted that there were delays in the recruitment of the fixed term programme manager, which contributed to some delays in implementation.

**Question 25:** Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) for integrating human rights and gender equality been allocated strategically to achieve results? Have resources been used efficiently and effectively?

**Finding 25:** Programme resources were generally used efficiently and largely achieved anticipated results.

Ideally, the efficiency with which resources have been used in a programme can be measured by comparison with similar NAPVAW projects in the region, or if necessary globally. However, it has not proved possible to locate any other NAPVAW project with a similar formulation process (widespread consultation to circumvent democratic deficiencies). For the same reason, and because implementation projects are very diverse in their approach and focus, cost effectiveness of the implementation process has not been able to be measured against other similar projects internationally.
In these circumstances, key informants were asked to rate the efficiency of the two projects – a more subjective measure, but at least an independent one. While most key informants considered resources had been used efficiently, two commented that both the formulation and dissemination processes had involved the considerable expense of holding a large meeting in hotels. Even those informants also commented however that this was probably unavoidable to ensure the participation of as many participants (particularly those with key expertise) as possible. Several key informants also noted UN Women’s reputation for extracting good value through its procurement processes, bureaucratic though these can at times be.

**Question 26:** Have programme funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?

**Finding 26:** Timeliness was an issue in relation to some outputs, although this has been addressed in the last few months of the projects and they are on track to be completed within a reasonable time of the projects ending.

As noted above Questions 22-24, those outputs that have not been completed are on track to be completed within a reasonable time of the projects coming to an end.

**Question 27:** Assess managerial and work efficiency. Were management capacities adequate?

**Finding 27:** Project management was effective in achieving programme results.

Only eight key informants of the 29 interviewed were sufficiently familiar with the programme managers to express a view about their effectiveness and efficiency, but their approach and industry received endorsement from all but one of these key informants.

**Question 28:** How effectively did the programme management team monitor programme performance and results?

**Finding 28:** Project management was effective in monitoring programme performance and results.

As with Question 27, only a few (eight) among the key informants interviewed felt sufficiently knowledgeable about monitoring project management to express an opinion – and all but one backed the performance of the two project managers. The improved relationship with GIZ in recent months was credited to the effectiveness of the current programme manager. This relationship, with the other co-chair of the TWGG-GBV, had languished to the point where GIZ was considering withdrawing from that role. However, in the past six months the relationship has improved considerably and this is no longer a possibility.

**Question 29:** Provision of adequate resources for integrating human rights and gender equality into the intervention as an investment in short-, medium- and long-term benefits; what were the costs or consequence of not providing sufficient resources for integrating a
human rights and gender equality approach, to the extent that the approach was not fully integrated, (e.g. enhanced benefits that could have been achieved for a modest investment).

**Finding 29:** Adequate resources were made available for integrating human rights and gender equality into the programme, with positive results.

A human rights-based and gender equality approach was at the heart of the programme from the outset. As noted (Finding 6), the programme, and the 2nd NAPVAW it supported, evidences current human rights and gender analyses. This finding was supported by 31% (N=9) of informants, who considered that the 2nd NAPVAW, as a result of UN Women’s support, reflects the latest human rights and gender analyses. One respondent (3%) considered the 2nd NAPVAW did not reflect these analyses and the remainder (66% N=19) had no response.

Ensuring this approach resulted in a more drawn out (and hence more expensive) drafting process, and the extent of consultation also had financial implications. However, the outcome was a highly relevant 2nd NAPVAW. This approach continued through the dissemination and implementation phases.

**Figure 8: HR and GE Integration (N=29)**

### 4.4 Sustainability

**Evaluation rating = 4.5 (out of 5)**

Durability of the 2nd NAPVAW has been ensured by the process selected for its formulation, based as it was on a democratic and especially human rights and gender responsive approach. The 2nd NAPVAW is owned in varying degrees by all those involved in its formulation, and the decision to continue this approach in implementation is building that ownership. While political will is lacking in the larger and more powerful line ministries, a national framework, endorsed at the highest level by the Council of Ministers, provides a solid foundation to improve commitment at these levels. The work commenced at the sub-national level late in the term of the programme will assist overall in sustainability, although there are severe difficulties facing any development agency working at this level, not the least the country’s governance challenges and the difficulties encountered at the sub-national level in securing sufficient resources to implement their priorities, including priorities determined at the national level.
**Question 30:** Assess to what extent a phase-out strategy has been defined and what steps have been taken to ensure programme sustainability?

**Finding 30:** Neither project had a phase-out strategy, but the establishment of a national framework, national standards and the capacity development of duty bearers and rights holders have all been effectively carried out.

The process adopted for the formulation of the 2nd NAPVAW was highly innovative and began a novel process, for Cambodia, of participatory and inclusive cooperation in national policy development between MoWA and grassroots women (through their representative CSOs) that has continued into the dissemination and implementation phases. Capacity of both duty bearers and rights holders was built in the process, and both express confidence that the processes and standards will continue to have an effect. To this extent, the programme has secured a level of sustainability even though neither project articulated a phase-out strategy. This is because ending violence against women is no short-term undertaking and, realistically, assistance with implementing the 2nd NAPVAW, through continuous improvement of service standards and capacity development of both duty bearers and rights holders will need to continue through several project cycles.

Despite the progress made, however, focus has been limited mainly to the development of national strategies for EVAW, the frameworks for cooperation and standard setting. The actions taken to date are pre-conditions for effectively addressing EVAW, but this is yet to have any measurable effect on the actual incidence of VAW/G in Cambodia. This will need to be addressed at the sub-national level – provincial, district and ultimately in the villages and communes where women live.

**Question 31:** Are the programme results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable? Are results anchored in national institutions, and can they be maintained at the end of the programme?

**Finding 31:** Programme results, achievements and benefits are durable and owned by the national institutions targeted, particularly MoWA. As such, they will continue after the end of the programme.

Thirty-eight per cent (N=11) of key informants considered that what had been achieved by the programme was durable, was anchored in national institutions and would continue after the end of the programme. Some commented that UN Women’s support will be required for some time (many years) in the future and that without that assistance from UN Women (or some other agency) the benefits may be difficult to maintain. Seven per cent (N=2) did not consider programme results to be durable and the remaining 55% (N=16) felt unable to express a view on the issue.

As MoWA itself acknowledges, it is not a ministry that is afforded high status nor the necessary resources in Cambodia’s governance system, but the support of MoWA by UN agencies, including UN Women, has improved the level of influence the ministry has been able attain.
Question 32: Can the programme approach or results be replicated or scaled up by national partners? What would support their replication and scaling up?

Finding 32: Because most programme results involve strategy/standard setting at the national level, they do not lend themselves to scaling up, as such, although they could be replicated in other national policy development processes. Certainly, the programme approach used has served to build a foundation on which to move the emphasis of future programmes to the sub-national level.

All respondents considered that the programme approach and results could be replicated or scaled up and it was noted that UNICEF has now replicated the formulation process in the development of the National Action Plan to Prevent Violence Against Children (NAPVAC). Several key informants emphasised the need, at the current point in the implementation process, to move the emphasis from the national to the subnational level.

Question 33: Assess what aspects/factors of the programme that were likely to ensure sustainability of the programme objectives.

Finding 33: The main aspect/factor that has ensured sustainability is the human rights and gender equality approach underlying the whole programme.

The most common response of key informants on questions around sustainability was that the civil society actors that have been engaged in the process of formulating the 2nd NAPVAW have been empowered to demand their rights. To a lesser, but none-the-less significant, effect of the programme has been to condition MoWA and PDoWAs to give effect to their duty-bearer roles. There has also been some effect, though not as great, on other duty bearers engaged, such as MoH, and MoEYS. There has been little effect on the Police and Justice...
sectors – this will depend on more determined engagement at the national, and, more importantly, at the sub-national level.

**Question 34:** Has an enabling or adaptable environment been developed for real change on human rights and gender equality issues?

**Finding 34:** Although attribution is a problem in such a broad-ranging issue on which many development partners are also engaged, the UN Women programme has had an influence on the creation of an environment for real human rights and gender equality change.

Thirty-one per cent (N=9) of respondents credited the programme with achieving a measure of change on human rights and gender equality, although several pointed out that the activities of a number of international agencies and NGOs are also intended to improve the human rights/gender equality situation. Seven per cent (N=2) did not consider that an environment had been built for real change on these issues and the remaining 62% (18) indicated they had no view on the issue.

Where such problems of attribution – “cause and effect” – arise in evaluation, it is usual to examine the strategy behind the programme to determine whether it could have had the desired effect and then to determine whether the programme was implemented in line with the strategy. Here, as already noted, the programme strategy was sound and it was effectively carried out. It is reasonable to conclude therefore that the programme has indeed contributed to some improvements in the human rights and gender equality environment.

*Yes, as a result of the consultations around the 2nd NAPVAW more women know about their rights, but only 10% of participants at the consultations we attended were men and until men understand human rights and gender issues we’ll get nowhere – NGO Siem Reap*

Both FGDs – in Phnom Penh and Siem Reap – agreed with the NGO quoted above. They also noted that there are a number of programmes being implemented for other donors that relate to gender-equality and that some of these will have contributed to women knowing more about their rights. However, they considered that process for developing the 2nd NAPVAW ensured that MoWA and UN Women’s contribution had high visibility. These NGOs also agreed that major changes are needed in the attitudes of men, and many women, before VAW/G is likely to be reduced and that this cultural change is a long-term process.
Question 35: How were the institutional changes implemented as part of the project conducive to systematically addressing human rights and gender equality concerns?

Finding 35: The programme strategy, successfully implemented, was to use a democratic process for the development and implementation of the 2nd NAPVAW. The national institutions engaged in the process have begun to acknowledge their human rights responsibilities. Through empowering civil society, in all its diversity, the programme has contributed to an environment where duty-bearers recognise their responsibilities to rights-holders.

The development of the 2nd NAPVAW set a countrywide strategy in place and established standards in various areas of service delivery – in both primary and secondary prevention. The existence and visibility of these standards provide the springboard for future actions in support of human rights and gender equality. Through standard setting, some institutional changes have been achieved that can be expected to have a lasting effect, particularly if these are reinforced by an empowered civil society. Many more institutional changes are required, at both national and sub-national levels and these should be the focus of future initiatives.

Question 36: Has an accountability and oversight systems for human rights and gender equality been established and implemented?

Finding 36: Both the 2nd NAPVAW and the formulation process had a focus on accountability – the framework is in place. However, it is too early to refer to this system as “being implemented”.

Eighty percent (N=8) of key informants acknowledged that the systems are in place, for example, a domestic violence law (imperfect though it may be), police and judicial capacity
(however ineffectively exercised), but several also expressed, in a variety of ways, the concern that little is yet being implemented. This will require further engagement with the authorities, particularly the police and justice sectors, at the highest levels to which UN Women, in its own right and through the UNCT, have better access than MoWA and civil society. Informants noted that little was happening in this area at the sub-national level.

**Question 37:** How sustainable was the capacity development of targeted rights holders and duty bearers to respectively demand and fulfill rights?

**Finding 37:** The capacity development of targeted rights holders and duty bearers was sustainable, but it will need further attention in future programming if the progress made is not to be lost over time.

Almost all key informants (93%, N=11) considered that the capacity development of rights holders and duty bearers was sustainable, although further capacity development was needed to ensure that the gains endure. Some duty bearers, notably the police, indicate little commitment to their role of human rights/gender responsive duty bearer and will need more intensive engagement to achieve this.

**Question 38:** Can the programme results or strategies be replicated or elaborated into a new Regional Programme, which would build on the same methodologies? If so, what specific recommendations can be provided for such a programme?

**Finding 38:** The formulation process has already been replicated in Lao PDR, but while there are governance challenges in making progress on EVAW throughout the region, they differ from country to country. In this context, a new Regional Programme may not be the best approach for other countries in the region to benefit from the achievements of the Cambodian programme. Although 90% of key informants responding on this issue considered a new regional programme could be built on the same methodologies, it was also a common response that countries in the region are very diverse, and that the same applies even in the Mekong delta sub-region. The undoubted benefits of the formulation process, adequately publicised, are more likely to be taken up on a case-by-case basis elsewhere in the region.

**Gender and Human Rights**

As per the ToR, this evaluation has been based on gender and human rights principles and has followed UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations. Human rights principles around participation, inclusion non-discrimination and empowerment have guided the process, as have gender equality principles. The CSOs, NGOs and gender equality advocates who represent and advocate for Cambodian women and girls who have been, are or may be in the future victims of violence have been included among the key informants interviewed and key CSOs/NGOs on the TWGG-GBV working group and from one province participated in the two focus group discussions.
Overall, of the 29 key informants interviewed, 16 were women and 13 were men. The largest group (Government) was equally divided between women and men.

![Key Informant by Category and Sex](chart1.jpg)

**Figure 11: Key Informants by category and sex (N=29)**

Similarly, the FGDs had a reasonable balance of men and women, with a slight majority of women in both Phnom Penh and Siem Reap.

Overall, however, there were no identifiable differences in responses by men or women during either key informant interviews nor in the two FGDs.

![FGD Participants by Sex](chart2.jpg)

**Figure 12: FGD participants by sex (N=13)**
5. Good Practices and Lessons Learned

5.1 2nd NAPVAW Formulation Process

As noted above, the programme adopted an innovative process for dealing with the challenges of developing national policy in an environment where good governance was lacking. The process took some time and this had cost implications, but the result is a document that met international and national priorities in relation to EVAW, has broad-based support within government at national and sub-national levels, among CSOs and among development partners, and has gained sufficient national ownership to ensure successful local support for implementation. Learning this lesson, implementation of the 2nd NAPVAW is also following a similar human rights-based and gender-sensitive approach.

5.2 Membership of TWGG-GBV

As noted in Finding 23, while membership of the TWGG-GBV was broad-based across all sectors, in hindsight an omission was representation from the Ministry of Economy and Finance. Some key ministries with implementation responsibilities under the AOP are reporting that after including the cost of implementation in their annual budgets, these are not being approved by the Ministry of Economy and Finance (MoEF) with the advice that these costs should be met by NGOs and the development community. As a national document meeting national priorities articulated in Neary Rattanak IV and approved by the Council of Ministers, its costs (at least those being incurred by national and regional government) should clearly be met out of the state budget. Involving the MoEF among the fifteen ministries represented on the TWGG-GBV might have eased the difficulties now being encountered by the line ministries. Line ministries could have raised their budgeting issues in relation to implementation and the AOP.

5.3 Consultations at the sub-national level

While there was broad-based approval for the consultation process around the formulation of the 2nd NAPVAW, three sub-national NGOs noted that it is important to consider not just which organisations should be invited to attend, but which specific people within the organisation attend. Sometimes substitutions can be made which deprive the consultation of the knowledge and experience of a senior staff member. Invitations could be personalised, with follow-up to ensure that the desired person actually attends on the day.

5.4 Methodology reviews

In the light of UN Women’s experience with the Media Monitoring Project (Output 2.2) where production of the output was delayed as a result of UN Women concerns about the quality of the report and its methodology, when selecting partners for such initiatives, samples of previous reports should be obtained and included in the assessment process and the opportunity provided for a methodology review by UN Women before the exercise gets underway.
6. Conclusions

6.1 The highlight of the programme has, according to all data sources, been the formulation of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW – not just the document itself, but the process for its development, which was devised to overcome governance deficits that hinder the development of robust national policy. From the range of government/NGOdevelopment partners, national/subnational, men and women interviewed for this evaluation, the views expressed in FGDs as well as documentation examined, it is clear that the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW formulation resulted in an extremely relevant resource that merges germane international standards with local VAW priorities. The formulation process has received international recognition and one key informant active in international development indicated that she had been requested to provide information about the process in both Lao PDR and Vietnam.

6.2 The 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW formulation process, which saw broad-based, country-wide participation, particularly by the representatives of the survivors of violence themselves, has improved MoWA’s credibility and, at least in Phnom Penh, that of UN Women itself (UN Women was not associated with the formulation process at the sub-national level). This is important for future development of gender-related national policies, given MoWA’s relatively minor status in the government hierarchy.

6.3 Capacity development was a focus of the programme, particularly in relation to MoWA. While key informants, including those from MoWA itself, considered it relatively effective, capacity development is a process more than an activity and it will need continued emphasis in on-going EVAW programmes. Some benefits from capacity development were apparent at the sub-national level, particularly in PDoWAs, arising from the range of consultations, workshops etc., and given the recommendations for an increased focus at the subnational level that follow, capacity development will continue to be a necessary component of interventions at the sub-national level.

6.4 Generally, UN Women’s partnerships worked effectively, particularly with MoWA and the TWGG-GBV, which UN Women co-chairs with GIZ. The latter relationship has improved over the past year with the arrival of the contracted programme manager at UN Women. There was no negative feedback from its partners about how UN Women managed its relationships with them, and several useful outputs resulted.

6.5 A major impediment to future progress on EVAW is access by all the “Responsible Institutions” identified in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW to sufficient allocations from the state budget – many have encountered an attitude in the MoEF that these should be funded by development partners or NGOs. There is room for advocacy by the UNCT and UN Women in particular to have increased national budget allocations for gender equality, women’s empowerment and EVAW in line with gender equality policy commitments in the NSDP and Neary Rattanak IV. One entry point to be considered is early work on GRB and the workshop on GRB attended by MoWA staff in Bali in October 2014.

6.6 As the focus turns to implementation of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW, efforts are needed to involve the national police and justice systems as key institutions without whose strong
commitment, change will come only slowly. Advice from police HQ that they have only one programme to address the VAW issue, which will be rolled out over three years at the rate of 8 provinces a year indicates a lack of urgency in taking up CNP responsibilities to ensure women’s safety. As noted, no fewer than six 2nd NAPVAW activities identify CNP as one of the primary institutions, and one initiative from CNP HQ spread over three years is likely to result in police attitudes and policies to remain a barrier to effective implementation of the 2nd NAPVAW. One area of engagement with the CNP could be through its Police Academy to ensure that training of recruits and in-service training is delivered in accordance with CNP responsibilities under the 2nd NAPVAW.

6.7. The ten year-old Law on the Prevention of Domestic Violence and the Protection of Victims is now proving counter-productive to effectively dealing with the issue according to a number of key informants. Its review is under contemplation, but this process could be a further entry point for engagement with national police.

6.8 Similar impediments exist in the judicial system, and efforts to improve the responsiveness of the police to EVAW will founder if the Courts do not have a consistent approach. Care is needed to ensure that capacity development for judges is carried out by their judicial peers.

6.9. As part of an increased focus at the sub-national level, capacity development is also required for those who facilitate informal mediation. The recommendations of the mediation review are all relevant here:

- establishing mediation best practices as part of EVAW minimum services by developing standard guidelines for mediation in cases involving VAW;
- conducting gender-sensitivity training for mediators;
- reviewing the legal framework, including the Law on the Prevention of Domestic Violence and Protection of Victims and its Explanatory Notes, to strengthen access to protection; and
- establishing guidelines governing the interventions of the Ministries of Justice and Interior.

6.10. As foreshadowed above, as 2nd NAPVAW implementation progresses, UN Women’s focus should move to include the sub-national level to a greater extent. An effective national framework has been developed, but it is in their homes and communities that women and girls most often experience violence. Training of Trainers should be provided to PDoWA staff and local NGOs to empower them to train key district and commune level personnel in both EVAW policy and knowledge and attitudes towards gender equality.
7. Recommendations

7.1. As 2nd NAPVAW implementation progresses, UN Women’s focus should move to include the sub-national level to a significantly greater extent.

7.2. Training of Trainers should be provided to PDoWA staff and local NGOs to empower them to train key district and commune-level personnel in both EVAW policy and knowledge and attitudes towards gender equality.

7.3. Equivalent training should also be offered to anti-trafficking police in each province. As noted, these units have experience in dealing not just with women survivors but also making multi-sectoral referrals to a greater extent than their national counterparts.

7.4. Efforts should be made to engage national police to a greater extent. Advice from police HQ that they have but one programme to address the VAW issue that will be rolled out over three years at the rate of eight provinces a year indicates a lack of urgency in taking up CNP responsibilities to ensure women’s safety. One area of engagement with the CNP could be through its Police Academy to ensure that training of recruits and in-service training is delivered in accordance with CNP responsibilities under the 2nd NAPVAW.

7.5. Similar initiatives should be taken with the judicial system, since efforts to improve the responsiveness of the Police to EVAW will founder if the Courts do not have a consistent approach. Care needs to be taken to ensure that capacity development for judges is carried out by their judicial peers.

7.6. The ten year-old Law on the Prevention of Domestic Violence and the Protection of Victims is now proving counter-productive to effectively dealing with the issue according to a number of key informants. Its review is under contemplation, but this process could be a further entry point for engagement with national police.

7.7. The UNCT, and UN Women in particular, should advocate for contributions from the state budget to implement the 2nd NAPVAW effectively in line with gender equality policy commitments in the NSDP and Neary Rattanak IV. The 2016 – 2018 UNDAF also provides a vehicle for promoting action on EVAW, in line with all three UNDAP Outcomes.

7.8. In order to begin addressing the budgetary issues being encountered by line ministries, the Ministry of Economy and Finance should, with the agreement of MoWA and GIZ, be invited to join TWGG-GBV and its new high-level steering committee. One entry point to be considered is early work on GRB and the workshop on GRB attended by MoWA staff in Bali in October 2014.

7.9. Those facilitating informal mediation also need training. The recommendations of the mediation review are all relevant:

- establishing mediation best practices as part of EVAW minimum services by developing standard guidelines for mediation in cases involving VAW;
- conducting gender-sensitivity training for mediators;
• reviewing the legal framework, including the Law on the Prevention of Domestic Violence and Protection of Victims and its Explanatory Notes, to strengthen access to protection; and
• establishing guidelines governing the interventions of the Ministries of Justice and Interior.

7.10. Another environment where women and girls experience gender-based harassment is at work. A focus on workplace anti-harassment programmes would be a vehicle not just for empowering women, but also for addressing the behaviour of men and boys. The 2nd NAPVAW has a section in Primary Prevention on Community and Workplace.

7.11. Since the workplace can also be a place where survivors of violence at home can be supported UN Women should also engage the labour ministry (MoLVT) to encourage the development of workplace domestic violence policies for roll out in, first, the state sector and then in the private sector.
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Consultant for Final Evaluation of the Programme

Location: Phnom Penh, CAMBODIA
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Type of Contract: Individual Contract
Post Level: International Consultant
Languages Required: English
Starting Date: (Expected to start): 19-Oct-2015
Duration of Initial Contract: 35 Working Days
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BACKGROUND

In spite of concerted global, regional and national efforts, violence against women (VAW) continues to undermine the human rights of women, hampering gender equality and overall development. An expression of unequal gender power relations and men’s domination and control over women, VAW is both a manifestation of gender discrimination and inequality and a tool with which such discrimination is perpetuated.

VAW/G in Cambodia is happening in various forms, such as sexual harassment, rape and sexual assault, intimate partner violence, acid violence and trafficking, cutting across all divisions of income, culture and class. VAW/G is a grave violation of human rights and is a barrier to women’s full and meaningful participation in public life and the decisions that affect them.

Despite significant efforts by the Royal Government of Cambodia, together with CSOs, NGOs, development partners and UN Agencies, in establishing an enabling environment for the prevention of, and response to, VAW/G, the prevalence of VAW/G will not be reduced easily, but requires a more comprehensive and coordinated framework in which all stakeholders, including victims and survivors themselves, identify and prioritize issues and strategies, mobilize needed resources, and develop relevant laws, policies and procedures in line with international best practices. Moreover, reliable data, widely acknowledged as a shortage, providing an accurate picture of the VAW/G situation in Cambodia must be collected and used to design interventions and formulate policy formulation is
In addition to its sound partnerships with the Ministry of Women’s Affairs and civil society groups, UN Women entered into a global partnership framework (2009-2015) with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). The partnership, for which two reinforcing agreements between DFAT and UN Women Cambodia Country Office (CCO) were signed, prioritizes collaboration on ending violence against women and girls (EVAW/G). The first agreement, strengthening a participatory, evidenced-based formulation of a comprehensive action plan to end violence against women and girls in Cambodia was signed in May 2012 for a period of 13 months. The second agreement, Implementation of the 2nd Cambodian National Action Plan to Prevent Violence Against Women (2nd NAPVAW) was signed in May 2014 for a period of 20 months.

The expected results of the two agreements are as follows:

1st agreement: to strengthen a participatory, evidenced-based formulation of a comprehensive action plan to end violence against women and girls in Cambodia

Outcome 1: The Royal Government of Cambodia’s new national action plan to end violence against women (2nd NAPVAW) is adopted

- Output 1.1: Increased capacity of stakeholders from government and civil society to formulate the new 2nd NAPVAW in line with international standards;
- Output 1.2: Improved coordination of main stakeholders for the development of the 2nd NAPVAW;
- Output 1.3: Increased participation of civil society organizations (CSOs) and other relevant stakeholders and rights holders in the development of the new 2nd NAPVAW.

Outcome 2: Knowledge is generated to strengthen VAW/G prevention and services in Cambodia:

- Output 2.1: A VAW prevalence study is initiated in Cambodia;
- Output 2.2: A Media monitoring study on VAW/G in conducted in Cambodia.

2nd Agreement: to implement the National Action Plan to Prevent Violence against Women (2nd NAPVAW)

Outcome: The implementation of the Royal Government of Cambodia’s 2nd NAPVAW is launched:

- Prevention-Output 1.1: An action plan for a national level community of practice for secondary prevention is drafted and agreed by VAW service providers;
- Prevention-Output 1.2: A Multi-Sectoral Coordinated Primary Prevention Strategy including mapping of options is drafted;
- Services-Output 2.1: Minimum Service Standards are reviewed and developed by the TWGG-GBV services sub-committee and selected service providers (including the justice sector) and agreements fed back into the TWGG-GBV;
- Services-Output 2.2: Costing of services in the 2nd NAPVAW is initiated;
• Access to Justice and CEDAW-Output 3.1: Interventions that respond to CEDAW Concluding Observations 21 (a, b & c) are integrated into the 2nd NAPVAW Implementation Plan;

• M&E-Output 4.1: Implementation Plan for a participatory process to implement, monitor and evaluate the 2nd NAPVAW is drafted;

• M&E-Output 4.2: Knowledge exchange and information sharing at sub-national, national and regional level.

PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

The UN Women Cambodia Country Office is seeking a qualified consultant to conduct a final evaluation of its programme ending violence against women in Cambodia. This final evaluation will focus on evaluating the programme in its entirety. While an investigation into the impact of the program remains premature, the evaluation will predominantly focus on assessing the achievement of the programme outputs and their contribution to the programme outcomes.

Therefore, the purpose of this evaluation is to:

• Assess progress achieved or being made towards the achievement of the expected outputs and overall performance of this programme;

• Determine whether the programme contributed to achieving the stated programme outcomes, and explain why/why not;

• Provide forward-looking recommendations on how to build on the achievements of the programme and to ensure that they are sustained by the relevant stakeholders;

• Highlight any particular processes and partnerships that have contributed to the achievement of the programme outputs; and

• Document lessons learned, success stories and good practices in order to capitalize on the experiences gained. The evaluation should take into consideration the programme duration, existing resources and political and contextual constraints.

OBJECTIVES

More specifically, the evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programme. The objectives of the evaluation will be to assess:

• Relevance, including planning, design, implementation and coherence of the programme vis-à-vis the specific country contexts, and their development needs in the area of EVAW;

• Effectiveness, i.e. examining factors contributing to the achievement of the results in time. The evaluation should also look at the level of ownership among the stakeholders in the programme, and identify lessons learned;

• Efficiency in the strategic use and allocation of resources and in the managing, monitoring and documentation of the program;

• Sustainability in the continuation of the results of the programme post-implementation. Suggestions for future interventions under new programmes are welcome.
The primary users/beneficiaries of the evaluation will be the Royal Government of Cambodia, particularly the Secretariat and members of the Technical Working Group on Gender/Gender-Based Violence (TWGG-GBV), as well as UN Women and the Australian Government as the donor. Secondary users will be other relevant development partners, women’s organizations and feminist movements, as well as research institutions/academia.

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

Since the programme is implemented in a majority of the provinces of Cambodia (15 out of 25 provinces/municipalities), this evaluation will involve desk review in Phnom Penh, and field data collection as relevant in both Phnom Penh and provinces/municipalities. In order to render the evaluation as cost-effective and geographically representative of the whole country as possible, it is therefore suggested that the filed visits and the data collection take place in Phnom Penh with some travels to five provinces to be selected based on the proposed methodology, budget and time availability.

**EVALUATION KEY QUESTIONS**

While the specific questions to be answered will be finalized and agreed with the selected consultant, it is anticipated that the evaluation seeks to answer the following questions.

Relevance and strategic fit:

- To what extent does the programme respond to the international framework to prevent and respond to violence against women, such as CEDAW, Beijing Platform Action, UN Women Global Strategy on EVAW, and women’s human rights principles?
- To what extent does the programme respond to the needs and priorities for EVAW in Cambodia, including the stated policy priorities of the Royal Government of Cambodia, such as Neary Rattanak IV, National Sustainable Development Plan, and Rectangular Strategy IV, the Domestic Violence Law, Criminal Codes, National Action Plan to Prevent Violence against Women, and UNDAF?
- Whose needs and whose problems related to EVAW in Cambodia were identified, and how?
- How much has the programme contributed to building a broader knowledge base and capacity in Cambodia?
- How much the programme been able to adapt to changing contexts and situation on the ground?
- Extent to which the intervention was informed by substantive and tailored human rights and gender analyses that identify underlying causes of human rights violations and barriers to human rights and gender equality;
- Extent to which the intervention was informed by needs and interests of diverse groups of stakeholders through in-depth consultation.
Validity of programme design:

- Were the outputs of the programme clear, realistic and likely to be achieved within the established time schedule and with the allocated resources (including human resources)?
- Was the programme design logical and coherent in: a) taking into account the roles, capacities and commitment of stakeholders; and, b) in realistically achieving the planned outputs?
- Were the planned programme activities relevant and realistic to the situation and needs on the ground? Were the problems and needs adequately analysed?
- How appropriate and useful were the indicators described in the programme document for monitoring and measuring results? If necessary, how should they be modified to be more useful? Are the means of verifications for the indicators appropriate?
- To what extent were external factors and assumptions identified at the time of design?
- Was the time frame for programme implementation and the sequencing of activities logical and realistic?
- Was the programme designed in a flexible way to respond to changes / needs that could occur during the implementation?

Effectiveness:

- Assess the achievements of the programme against planned outputs and activities. What were the quantity and quality of outputs produced?
- Which components of the programme had the greatest achievements? What were the supporting factors? How can the programme build or expand on these achievements?
- In which areas does the programme have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they be overcome?
- Did the programme develop and build the capacities of partners on planning for activities?
- What alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving expected results?
- How did the outputs and outcomes contribute to the UN Women’s strategic objectives, mainstreamed strategies and EVAW agenda?
- How have stakeholders been involved in programme implementation? How effective has the programme been in establishing local ownership?
- How well has the programme contributed to the collaboration and coordination among UN agencies on EVAW?
- Assess the effectiveness of the activities implemented by partner institutions, their contribution to the outcomes of the programme and potential replication. Assess the lessons learned from these partnerships.
- How effectively does the programme management monitor programme performance and results?
- How did factors outside of the control of the programme affect programme implementation and programme objectives and how did the programme deal with these
external factors? How realistic were the critical assumptions identified by the programme?

**Efficiency:**

- Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) for integrating human rights and gender equality been allocated strategically to achieve results? Have resources been used efficiently and effectively?
- Have programme funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- Assess managerial and work efficiency. Were management capacities adequate?
- How effectively did the programme management team monitor programme performance and results?
- Provision of adequate resources for integrating human rights and gender equality into the intervention as an investment in short-, medium- and long-term benefits;
- What were the costs or consequence of not providing sufficient resources for integrating a human rights and gender equality approach, to the extent that the approach was not fully integrated, (e.g. enhanced benefits that could have been achieved for a modest investment)?

**Sustainability:**

- Assess to what extent a phase-out strategy has been defined and what steps have been taken to ensure programme sustainability?
- Are the programme results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable? Are results anchored in national institutions and can they be maintained at the end of the programme?
- Can the programme approach or results be replicated or scaled up by national partners? What would support their replication and scaling up?
- Assess what aspects/factors of the programme that were likely to ensure sustainability of the programme objectives.
- Has an enabling or adaptable environment been developed for real change on human rights and gender equality issues?
- How were the institutional changes implemented as part of the project conducive to systematically addressing human rights and gender equality concerns?
- Has an accountability and oversight systems for human rights and gender equality been established and implemented?
- How sustainable was the capacity development of targeted rights holders and duty bearers to respectively demand and fulfil rights?
- Can the programme results or strategies be replicated or elaborated into a new Regional Programme which would build on the same methodologies? If so, what specific recommendations can be provided for such a programme?
METHODS, PROCESSES AND TIMEFRAME

Methodology

The evaluation will be a transparent and participatory process involving relevant UN Women stakeholders and partners at the regional and country levels. The evaluation will be based on gender and human rights principles, as defined in the UNEG Guidance. The evaluation methodology will employ mixed methods for data collection. The evaluation will have two levels of analysis and validation of information:

Level 1: A desk review of information sources, such as, but not limited to: programme documentation, work plans, roles and responsibilities, partnership agreements, progress reports, meeting minutes, mission reports, monitoring reports, technical products developed, data collected, and any important correspondence between key parties.

Level 2: In-depth analysis of the programme both by qualitative and quantitative data collection. This will involve visits to 5 selected provinces of Cambodia, and will employ a number of evaluation methods ranging from document reviews, interviews, focus group discussions, surveys, observations.

Evaluation process and timeframe:

The evaluation will look at the progress made towards the results and communicate lessons learned and any forward-looking recommendations for similar programmes to management, so that the evaluation can serve to inform future programmes of UN Women and those of the partners. The evaluation will also help the donor to gauge in which areas to invest in the future. The entire process will take place over a period of three months (estimated period: October – December 2015). The collection of field data should be completed over a period of two weeks. The evaluation should include the following steps:

Step 1: Inception meeting, desk review of key programme documents (e.g. programme documentation, contracts, agreements, progress reports, monitoring reports, etc.), and key stakeholder interviews to understand the scope of the evaluation. The Consultant will attend an inception meeting where orientation on programme objectives will be offered, as well as on progress made. At this stage of the evaluation, the consultant will have the chance to speak with UN Women staff, as well as with selected stakeholder representatives. The Consultant will be given key programme documentation for review.

Step 2: Submission of an Inception Report and finalization of methodology and evaluation design based on UN Women’s feedback. The Inception Report should include final evaluation questions, stakeholders identified for interviews and discussions, and present the methodology of the evaluation. This will be finalized in agreement with UN Women.

Step 3: Data collection (mixed-methods)

Interviews and focus group discussions should focus on how stakeholders view the programme. Data from programme staff, documentation and stakeholder interviews and group discussions should be used to determine the plausibility of the programme model, i.e.
to the extent it is properly implemented, sufficiently developed, and entails appropriate activities.

Step 4: Data analysis

Collected data should be analysed, and the Analysis Framework should be clearly explained in the report.

Step 5: Sharing of preliminary findings and presentation of draft report (in Power point presentation format) with UN Women. The Consultant will share preliminary findings and recommendations with UN Women at the end of the field visits and interviews with stakeholders. The Consultant will draft the report and present the initial draft report to a group with representatives from UN Women and key stakeholders.

Step 6: Draw conclusions and make recommendations (analysis and report writing). The Consultant makes conclusions and recommendations. Conclusions and recommendations are to be drawn from the data. The consultant is encouraged to guard against validity threats, such as personal bias.

Step 7: Draft Report

The Consultant will finalize the draft report. The report structure should follow UNEG’s evaluation report guidance (annex 2). UN Women will review the report as part of quality assurance and will share it with the reference group for their feedback.

Step 8: Finalization of the Report

The Consultant will present the draft report to stakeholders in a validation meeting. Based on the recommendations and comments validated, the consultant team will finalize the report, including recommendations for management response.

Step 9: Sharing of the evaluation report, and plan for steps on utilizing the findings

UN Women will develop a plan on how to share and utilize the report findings, as appropriate, following the finalization of the Evaluation Report.

Evaluation Schedule:

- Sep 2015: TOR drafted and finalized;
- Oct 2015: Selection of consultant and hiring process;
- Oct 2015: Inception meeting, desk review and preparation of inception report (03 working days);
- Oct 2015: Development of evaluation methodology and preparation of inception report (04 working days);
- Oct 2015: Inception review by UN Women and reference group;
- Nov 2015: Data Collection (10 working days);
- Nov 2015: Preliminary findings to UN Women (02 working day);
- Nov 2015: 1st Drafting of the report (05 working days);
• Nov 2015: Review 1st draft report by UN Women;
• Dec 2015: 2nd drafting of the report (04 working days);
• Dec 2015: Review the 2nd draft report by UN Women;
• Dec 2015: Semi-finalize the report (04 working days);
• Dec 2015: Review the semi-finalized report by UN Women and the Reference Group;
• Dec 2015: Facilitate a validation workshop with about 60 members of TWGG-GBV (including agreeing recommendations) - (0.5 working day);
• Dec 2015: Finalization and submission of final report (2.5 working day);
• Dec 2015: Report dissemination and follow up action to address the recommendations.

The Consultant is expected to commit 35 working days between 19th October and 10 December 2015.

Deliverables:

• Inception report: The inception report should detail the consultant’s 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. It should also identify the site visits and elaborate on the selection criteria for those sites selected. (Please follow UN Women Guidance on inception reports). UN Women guidance on inception report is available upon request. (7 working days);

• Preliminary findings: The consultant shall share initial findings and recommendations with the UN Women programme team prior to the stakeholders’ consultation. The expected duration for this delivery is 12 days including 10 days for data collection. (12 working days);

• First Draft Report: The consultant will prepare and submit the first draft report to UN Women for review and comments after incorporating earlier comments provided by UN Women on the preliminary finding. The draft report structure should follow UNEG evaluation report guidance. (5 working days);

• Second Draft Report: After obtaining feedbacks from UN Women on the first draft report, the consultant will improve the report and submit to UN Women again. (3 working days);

• Semi-finalize the report: Incorporating comments provided by UN Women into the semi- finalized report and submit to UN Women again. (3 working days);

• Validation Workshop: The consultant will organize a-half day workshop with the participation of about 60 stakeholders. (0.5 working days);

• Final evaluation report: The final report will not exceed 30 pages (excluding annexes) in hard and soft copies to be submitted to UN Women (please follow UN Women’s evaluation report guidance). (4.5 working days).
Management arrangement

The consultant will be based in the UN Women Cambodia Country Office, and will need to work with his/her own personal computer. S/he will work in close collaboration and consultation with UN Women staff and management structure as per the table below:

Commissioner of the Evaluation (Country Representative of UN Women Cambodia):

- Safeguards of the independence of the evaluation exercise and ensure quality of evaluations;
- Prepares a management response to the evaluation and ensure the implementation of committed actions in the management response.
- Evaluation Task Manager (EVAW Programme Manager):
  - Provides inputs from the programme perspective;
  - Participates in the review of the evaluation methodology and provide comments to the evaluation team;
- Observes the process of the evaluation;
- Facilitates evaluation by providing relevant documents and contacts;
- Facilitates and ensure the preparation and implementation of relevant management responses;
- Facilitates and ensure knowledge sharing and use of the evaluation information;
- Coordinates with the programme team to arrange travels for field visits of the consultant.

Regional Evaluation Specialist:

- Supports the UN Women Cambodia Programme team at all stages of the evaluation management in terms of technical issues of the evaluation.
- Reference Group (Members of the TWGG-GBV):
  - Participates in various steps of the evaluation management process such as inception meeting and commenting on draft reports to ensure evaluation quality.

Consultant:

- Leads the whole evaluation process;
- Manages the evaluation process in timely manner;
- Communicates with UN Women Cambodia Country Office whenever it is needed;
- Conducts field visits to the selected provinces and collect data;
- Reports to UN Women Cambodia when required;
- Produces the inception report;
- Holds validating workshop with members of TWGG-GBV;
• Produces the final report by addressing and incorporating comments and feedbacks provided by UN Women Cambodia, UN Women Regional Evaluation Specialist, and the reference group;
• Participates in dissemination workshops organized by UN Women Cambodia and present findings of the report.

COMPETENCIES

Technical Competencies:
• Proven expertise in evaluating programmes focusing on human rights and gender equality, preferably in Cambodia and/or in the region;
• Extensive knowledge of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods;
• Good knowledge of development evaluations;
• Strong knowledge in results-based management (RBM) principles, gender equality and human rights-based approaches;
• Good knowledge of the Cambodian policy and legislative framework and institutional mechanisms concerning ending violence against women;
• Knowledge of the UN system would be an asset.

Functional Competencies:
• Good understanding of gender equality and human right approaches;
• Local knowledge of the social, cultural, and political context of Cambodia and its relation to gender and VAW;
• Demonstrated knowledge transfer throughout programme evaluation process;
• Demonstrated sensitivity, discretion, tact, and courtesy in relation to gender equality and women’s rights, development principles, implementing partners, and national and international personnel of various nationalities and backgrounds.

Corporate Competencies:
• Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
• Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UN Women;
• Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age and sensitivity and adaptability;
• Treats all people fairly without favouritism;
• Fulfils all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.
REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

Education:

• Advanced university degree in relevant fields such as gender, development and social studies, sociology, political science and evaluation;
• Advanced degree in evaluation is an asset.

Experience:

• At least 7 years of experience in programme evaluation in a development context and proven accomplishment in undertaking evaluations, including leading evaluations of multi-stakeholders programme for multilateral organizations. Expertise in evaluating programmes focusing on human rights and/or gender equality;
• Experience in evaluating gender equality and human rights – related programmes/projects;
• Sound knowledge of international standards on human rights, women’s rights and related instruments such as CEDAW, SCR 1325 etc.;
• Professional experience working in women’s human rights and/or development, in particular on ending violence against women in Cambodia would be a strong asset.

Language:

• Excellent written and spoken English and presentational capacities;
• Ability to converse in Khmer language would be another asset (but not necessary).

Important:

The Consultant has to explicitly declare his/her independence from any organization that has been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the UN Women Cambodia Country Office’s EVAW programme. The selection process will ensure that the Consultant does not have any relationship with this particular UN Women Cambodia Country Office’s programme in the past, present or as 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 Evaluations’ (annex 1). The consultant is 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.
APPLICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA

The consultant will be evaluated based on technical capacities (70%) and financial proposal (30%). Technical evaluation will be based on the criteria indicated below.

A two-stage procedure will be utilized in evaluating the submissions, with evaluation of the technical components being completed prior to assessing any financial proposal. The financial proposal will be opened only for submissions that passed the minimum technical score of 70% of the obtainable score of 70 points in the evaluation of the technical component. The technical component will be evaluated on the basis of its responsiveness to the Term of Reference (TOR).

Technical qualification assessment criteria:

The total number of points allocated for the technical qualification component is 100. The technical qualification of the candidate/swill be assessed based on the following criteria:

- Education 15%;
- Experience 40%;
- Technical competency 25%;
- Functional competency 20%.

Only the potential candidates who have obtained a minimum of 70% of the total points will be considered as technically qualified candidates.

Financial proposal comparison:

- Only the financial proposal of submissions that have passed at least 70% of the obtainable points of the technical qualification will be considered and assessed;
- Maximum 100 points will be given to the lowest offer and the other financial proposal will receive the points inversely proportional to their financial offers. i.e. \( FS = \frac{100 \times F_m}{F} \), in which \( FS \) is the financial score, \( F_m \) is the lowest price and \( F \) is the price of the submission under consideration.

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis, the award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable; and
- Having receive the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.
SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS

Technical component:

- A letter of interest explaining why the candidate is the most suitable for this evaluation assignment
- Technical Proposal;
- Updated and signed Curriculum Vitae with at least three contactable clients preferably for whom you have rendered similar services;
- Personal History Form (P11);
- Two writing samples/reports in English.

Financial proposal (with your signature):

- The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount in USD including consultancy fees and all associated costs i.e. airfares, travel costs, meals, accommodation, insurance, etc.;
- Please also note that the cost of preparing the proposal and of negotiating a contract, including any related travel, is not reimbursable as a direct cost of the assignment.

Applications without a financial proposal will be treated as incomplete and will not be considered

UN Women-Cambodia requires that all international personnel, regardless of contract modality or position status, comply with UN Cambodia security standards (MORSS) for accommodations and housing in Cambodia. A residential inspection is required and will be conducted by UN DSS, whereupon corrections may be identified to achieve compliance with UN Cambodia MORSS standards. As such, newly arriving personnel are advised not to enter into long-term housing arrangements until inspection and compliance are verified. For personnel who are already in-country, steps must be taken to achieve UN Cambodia MORSS compliance.

UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applications will be treated with the strictest confidence.
## Appendix II: Stakeholders Interviewed for Inception Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Clay</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australian Government</td>
<td>EVAW Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vutha Phon</td>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>National Programme Officer EVAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inala Fathimath</td>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>Governance Programme Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Dr. Khiev Serey Vuthea H.E. Ms Nhean Socheatra</td>
<td>Ministry of Women’s Affairs</td>
<td>Secretary of State Director General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigo Montero Cano</td>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)</td>
<td>Gender and Communications Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Lori Jeanine Mann</td>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>Project Manager EVAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Sokleang Kim</td>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>National Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Officer – EVAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Sarah Knibbs</td>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>Deputy Country Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Wenny Kusuma</td>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>Country Representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Stakeholders Interviewed for Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Sokroeun Aing</td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Gender Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Robin Mauney</td>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td>Academic consultant Cambodia Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Kazumi Nakagawa</td>
<td>CARE Cambodia</td>
<td>Academic consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kakkda Sea</td>
<td>CARE Cambodia</td>
<td>Academic consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Uy Saret</td>
<td>Open Institute</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Ellen Minotti</td>
<td>Social Services of Cambodia</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mostafa Sen</td>
<td>ForumSyd</td>
<td>Programme Officer Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pok Panhavichetr</td>
<td>Cambodian Women’s Crisis Centre</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardy Keth</td>
<td>MoWA</td>
<td>Director, Legal Protection Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Ms Soeur Socheata</td>
<td>Ministry of Education Youth and Sport</td>
<td>Under Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Ms Chan Sotheavy</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>Judge, Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Theay Kheam</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning</td>
<td>Director of Demographic Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Yit Viriya</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning</td>
<td>Bureau Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Role</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Pol. Lt General Youk Sokha, Lt Gen. Pol Phie They, You Polivuth, Pol Pithey, Yuk Sokha</td>
<td>Mol (General Commissariat of Cambodia National Police)</td>
<td>Deputy General Commissioner, Director of Anti-Human Trafficking and Juvenile Protection Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Srun Sok, Prof Kim Savuon, Dr Som Seiharath, Dr Kol Hero, Dr Lak Muy Seang</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Director of Hospital Services, Deputy Director, Prevention, Vice Chief of REO, Deputy Director Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Group Discussion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phnom Penh NGOs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Channeang</td>
<td>Cambodian NGO Committee on CEDAW (NGO-CEDAW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Physal Eart</td>
<td>CARE Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So Rathavy</td>
<td>Cambodia Community Justice Assistance Partnership (CCJAP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Khem Sreymom</td>
<td>SILAKA</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Sok Phay</td>
<td>Child Help Line Cambodia</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Kampong Cham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>PDoWA</td>
<td>Director of PDoWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six members of Police</td>
<td>Police for anti-human trafficking &amp; juvenile protection</td>
<td>Police members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Chad Chanthida</td>
<td>PDoH</td>
<td>Deputy Director Provincial Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph. Pang Dang</td>
<td>PDOH</td>
<td>Deputy Director Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ly Mengsau, Ms [illegible], Mr Chim Sokdara, Ms Ly Voucch Leang, Mr [illegible]</td>
<td>PDoEYS</td>
<td>Director of Education, Deputy Director, Staff Officer, Youth Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Tek Emeng, Mr Srey Malay, Mr Chhim Poulot</td>
<td>Phnom Srey Organisation for Development</td>
<td>Programme Manager Coordinator, Community Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Siem Reap</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms La Oun, Mr Ngin Sarin, Ms Trang Sithavry, Ms Noeuy Soneam</td>
<td>PDoWA</td>
<td>Director, Chief, Law Protection, Chief. Women, Health and Education, Officer, Law Protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col. Soksam</td>
<td>Provincial Police, Anti-human Trafficking and Juvenile Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt Col. Duong Taavry</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner i/c Human Trafficking and Juvenile Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Cheng Vama</td>
<td>PDoSVY Director of Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ly Bunna, Mr Chhun Bunna</td>
<td>PDoEYS Deputy Director Chief Office of Planning and AIDs Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Poe Oumoete</td>
<td>Legal Aid of Cambodia Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Ponnarann Peng, Ms Heng Boravuth</td>
<td>Cambodian Women’s Crisis Centre (CWCC) Regional Manager Community Organising Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Heng Boravuth, Ms Ponnarann Peng</td>
<td>CWCC Community Organising Officer Regional Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Pen Chantra</td>
<td>CCASVA Provincial Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Pharom Ly, Mr Ren Samphors</td>
<td>Banteay Srei Violence Prevention Officer Team Leader Peace Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Kion So Da</td>
<td>Transcultural Psychosocial Organisation (TPO) Counsellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Poe Oumoete</td>
<td>Legal Aid of Cambodia Advocacy Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Chea Riny</td>
<td>Women’s Resource Centre (WRC) Women’s Rights and Gender Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Preah Vihear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Mong Samol, Ms Sou Narika</td>
<td>PDoWA Director Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Nei Samnang, Lt Col. Brang Thida, Mr Nou Sithan, Ms Kong Nara, Mr Chea Vutha, Mr Chhun Dina, Mr Touch Visal</td>
<td>Police for anti-human trafficking &amp; juvenile protection Deputy Commissioner Office Chief Deputy Office Chief Officer Officer Officer Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ros Sipha</td>
<td>PDoSVY Director, Department of Social Affairs Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Chheng Limhoan</td>
<td>PDoEYS Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Lor Chann, Ms Houmabony</td>
<td>Cambodian Human Rights and Development Association (ADHOC) Provincial Coordinator Staff Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III: List of reports and documents reviewed

1. UNIFEM Guidance Note Quality Criteria for Evaluation Reports
2. UNEG Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations
3. National Survey on Women's Health and Life Experiences in Cambodia
4. UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation
6. The 2nd NAPVAW Formulation and Dissemination Workshop Capacity Analysis
7. GERAAS Executive Feedback Note - AC Regional Office
9. List of TWGG-GBV Membership
10. UN Women: Guidance Note for Inception Reports
11. Final UNCT CEDAW Report updated October 8
12. TWGG-GBV TOR and Member List: 2015/06/30
13. Final Report (June 12-Nov 15) to Australia DFAT Projects 83187 90454
14. 2010 SEAD Service Directory for vulnerable people
15. Study on Implementation of Policies on VAW in Cambodia (P4P) Jan 2013
16. 2nd NAPVAW (2014-2018)
17. Project Document 69991 (90454)
18. Project Document AusAID Cambodia 2nd NAPVAW (83187)
19. National Guidelines for Managing VAW/Children in the Health System
20. Annual Achievements 2014 (PSOD)
21. UN Women: Media report 16 Days
22. 16 Days of Activism in the Asia Pacific
23. Communication and advocacy results for UN Women Cambodia’s 16 Days campaign to end gender-based violence
25. Formative Evaluation of the Pacific Regional Ending Violence Against Women (EVAW) Facility Fund
27. Joint UN Op-ed on the Law on Associations and Non-Governmental Organizations
28. UN Women Cambodia: DRF ANNUAL WORK PLAN (AWP) 2016
29. UN Women_ Bridging the gap: driving 2nd NAPVAW implementation from the national to the sub-national level - Proposal for January 2016 – June 2017
30. UN Women Evaluation Unit
Appendix IV: Conceptual Framework (Logic Model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT DOCUMENT 1 (E3187) FORMULATION OF 2nd NAPVAW</th>
<th>Indicators as per project document E3187</th>
<th>Additional Indicators Included in this Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome:</strong> The Royal Government of Cambodia’s new 2nd NAPVAW is adopted.</td>
<td>Existence of an Implementation Plan with M &amp; E system for the second 2nd NAPVAW</td>
<td><strong>RELEVANCE:</strong> Evaluation Question: To what extent does the 2nd NAPVAW correlate with international EVAW framework and national priorities <strong>EFFECTIVENESS:</strong> Evaluation Question: To what extent have the outputs been achieved? <strong>EFFICIENCY</strong> Evaluation Questions: Have resources been used efficiently? Have programme funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? <strong>SUSTAINABILITY</strong> Evaluation Question: Are the changes initiated by the Project likely to continue afterwards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.1. Increased capacities of stakeholders from government and civil society to formulate the 2nd NAPVAW in line with international standards.</strong></td>
<td>A budgeted multi-sectoral 2nd NAPVAW has been drafted</td>
<td>% of participants reporting improved capacity to formulate national plans in line with international standards % of government and civil society participants reporting improved capacity to formulate or influence national policies in line with international standards % of respondents reporting that resources have been used efficiently and that activities have been delivered in a timely manner % of respondents reporting improved capacity likely to be durable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.2. Improved coordination of main stakeholders for the development of the 2nd NAPVAW.</strong></td>
<td>Number of joint submissions, that present inputs for inclusion in the 2nd NAPVAW</td>
<td>% of participants reporting improved coordination in 2nd NAPVAW implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.3. Increased participation of civil society organisations (CSOs) and other relevant stakeholders and rights-holders in the development of the 2nd NAPVAW.</strong></td>
<td>Number of implementing organisations included in the new 2nd NAPVAW in relation to the organisations included in the 2009-12 2nd NAPVAW</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting increased participation in development of 2nd NAPVAW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT DOCUMENT 2 (90454) LAUNCH OF 2nd NAPVAW</th>
<th>Indicators as per Project Document 90454</th>
<th>Additional Indicators Included in this Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome:</strong> The implementation of RGC 2nd NAPVAW is launched.</td>
<td>Existence of an Implementation Plan</td>
<td><strong>RELEVANCE:</strong> Evaluation Question: To what extent does the implementation process reflect national and sub-national priorities and processes? <strong>EFFECTIVENESS</strong> Evaluation Question: To what extent have the outputs been achieved? <strong>EFFICIENCY</strong> Evaluation Questions: Have resources been used efficiently? Have programme funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? <strong>SUSTAINABILITY</strong> Evaluation Question: Are the changes initiated by the Project likely to continue afterwards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.1 Action Plan for a national level community of practice for secondary prevention is drafted and agreed by VAW service providers</strong></td>
<td>Existence of a comprehensive Multi-Sectoral Action Plan aimed at improving secondary prevention interventions by service providers</td>
<td>% of respondents who report that the Multi-Sectoral Action Plan reflects national and sub-national priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.2 A Multi-Sectoral Coordinated Primary Prevention</strong></td>
<td>Existence of Multi-Sectoral Coordinated</td>
<td>% of respondents who report that the Multi-Sectoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy including mapping of options is drafted</td>
<td>Primary Prevention Strategy</td>
<td>Coordinated Primary Prevention Strategy reflects national and sub-national priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.1 Minimum Service Standards are reviewed and developed by the TWGG-Services sub-committee and selected service providers (including the justice sector) and agreements fed back into the TWGG-GBV</td>
<td>Existence of a Cambodia specific Minimum Service Standards that are developed and agreed by stakeholders from different sectors</td>
<td>% of respondents who report that the Minimum Service Standards reflect national and sub-national priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.2 Costing of services in the 2nd NAPVAW is initiated</td>
<td>Extent to which services in the 2nd NAPVAW are costed</td>
<td>% of respondents who report that costing of services in the 2nd NAPVAW has been completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.1 Interventions that respond to CEDAW Concluding Observations 21 (a, b &amp; c) are integrated into the 2nd NAPVAW implementation Plan</td>
<td>Number of interventions that respond to CEDAW Concluding observations 21 (a, b &amp; c) integrated into the 2nd NAPVAW Implementation Plan</td>
<td>% of respondents who report that CEDAW Concluding Observations 21 (a, b &amp; c) have been integrated into the 2nd NAPVAW implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 4.1 An implementation Plan for a participatory process to implement, monitor and evaluate the 2nd NAPVAW is drafted</td>
<td>Extent to which TWGG – GRB members believe the system is participatory and effective</td>
<td>% of respondents who report that the Implementation Plan reflects national and sub-national priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 4.2 Knowledge exchange and information sharing a sub-national, national and regional level</td>
<td>Increase in understanding of 2nd NAPVAW and level of information exchange</td>
<td>% of respondents who report that the Multi-Sectoral Action Plan reflects national and sub-national priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V: I - Questions for Focus Group Discussions

Qu 1: To what extent did the programme (both projects) to support the 2nd NAPVAW (formulation, dissemination, implementation) reflect the needs and interests of diverse groups of stakeholders through in-depth consultation.

Qu 2: Were the programme activities to build (1) a broader knowledge base and (2) capacity related to EVAW in Cambodia effective? If yes, how? If not, why not?

Qu 3: Has an enabling or adaptable environment been developed for real change on human rights and gender equality issues?

Qu 4: Although the programme (both projects) finished at the end of 2015, it is expected that further funding will be available for a new project. What should a new project focus on?
Appendix V: II - Key Informant Interview Questionnaire

Introduction and welcome

Explain that the interview relates to an evaluation of the UN Women programme supporting the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW. This includes the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW formulation and the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW launch, dissemination and implementation.

Personal information

(If name card not supplied)

- Can you tell me your name?
- Organisation
- Position
- Sex
- What has been your involvement with the formulation or implementation of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW (Member of TWGG-GBV, Government - MOWA, MoH, MoEYS, CNP etc - INGO, Cambodian civil society or individual key informant)
- Clarify whether key informant has attended MOWA consultations. If so, how many? One / Two to Four / Five or More
- Did these workshops relate the formulation of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW, the dissemination of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW or the implementation of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW.

Depending on the involvement of the key informant in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} NAPVAW, select questions from the Matrix below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Explanation of Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>The extent to which planning, design, implementation and coherence of the programme aligns with beneficiaries’ (or their representatives CSOs and NGOs) development needs, country contexts and priorities and international standards in the area of EVAW.</td>
<td>To what extent does the programme respond to the international framework to prevent and respond to violence against women, such as CEDAW, Beijing Platform Action, UN Women Global Strategy on EVAW and women’s human rights principles?</td>
<td>To what extent does the 2nd NAPVAW and its implementation respond to the international framework to prevent and respond to violence against women?</td>
<td>% of respondents who report correlation of 2nd NAPVAW and its implementation with international EVAW framework as: High / Medium / Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does the programme respond to the needs and priorities for EVAW in Cambodia, including the stated policy priorities of the Royal Government of Cambodia, such as Neary Rattanak IV, National Sustainable Development Plan, and Rectangular Strategy IV, the Domestic Violence Law, Criminal Codes, National Action Plan to Prevent Violence against Women, and UNDAF?</td>
<td>To what extent does the NSPVAW and its implementation respond to national priorities to prevent and respond to violence against women?</td>
<td>% of all respondents who report correlation of programme with national priorities as: High / Medium / Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whose needs and whose problems related to EVAW in Cambodia were identified, and how?</td>
<td>Whose needs and whose problems related to EVAW in Cambodia were identified by the programme? How was this done?</td>
<td>Open Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How much has the programme contributed to building a broader knowledge base and capacity related to EVAW in Cambodia?</td>
<td>In your opinion, how much has the programme contributed to building a broader knowledge base and capacity related to EVAW in Cambodia?</td>
<td>% of respondents who report programme contribution to building a broader knowledge base and capacity as: A lot / Somewhat / Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How much has the programme been able to adapt to changing contexts and the situation on the ground?</td>
<td>In your opinion, how much has the programme been able to adapt to changing contexts and the situation on the ground?</td>
<td>% of respondents who report programme’s ability to adapt to changing contexts and the situation on the ground as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the programme been informed by substantive and tailored human rights and gender analyses that identify underlying causes of human rights violations and barriers to human rights and gender equality;</td>
<td>How much do you think the programme reflects human rights and gender analyses relating to the causes of human rights violations and barriers to human rights and gender equality?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting the correlation between the programme and human rights and gender analyses relating to the causes of human rights violations and barriers to human rights and gender equality as: A lot / Somewhat / Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the programme been informed by the needs and interests of diverse groups of stakeholders through in-depth consultation.</td>
<td>How much do you think the programme reflects the needs and interests of diverse groups of stakeholders through in-depth consultation?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting the correlation between the programme and the needs and interests of diverse groups of stakeholders through in-depth consultation as: A lot / Somewhat / A little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the outputs of the programme clear, realistic and likely to be achieved within the established time schedule and with the allocated resources (including human resources)?</td>
<td>Were the outputs of the programme clear? Were the outputs of the programme realistic? Were the outputs of the programme likely to be achieved in the timeframe? Were the outputs of the programme likely to be achieved given the resources allocated (including human resources?)</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting whether outputs: Clear / Not Realistic / Not Likely to be achieved in the timeframe / Not Likely to be achieved given the resources allocated / Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the time frame for programme implementation and the sequencing of activities logical and realistic?</td>
<td>Was the timeframe for programme implementation logical?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting whether timeframe: Logical / Not Realistic / Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response Options</td>
<td>% of Respondents Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the timeframe for programme implementation realistic?</td>
<td>Logical / Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the sequencing of activities logical?</td>
<td>Logical / Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the sequencing of activities realistic?</td>
<td>Logical / Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents reporting whether sequencing of activities:</td>
<td>Logical / Not, Realistic / Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the programme design logical and coherent in: a) taking into account the roles, capacities and commitment of stakeholders; and, b) in realistically achieving the planned outputs?</td>
<td>Did the programme design take into account the roles, capacities and commitment of stakeholders?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting whether the design took into account the programme design took into account the roles, capacities and commitment of stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the programme design realistic in relation to the achievement of the planned outputs?</td>
<td>Was the programme design realistic in relation to the achievement of the planned outputs?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting whether the programme design was realistic in relation to the achievement of the planned outputs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the planned programme activities relevant and realistic to the situation and needs on the ground? Were the problems and needs adequately analysed?</td>
<td>Were the planned programme activities relevant and realistic to the situation and needs on the ground?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting whether the planned programme activities were relevant and realistic to the situation and needs on the ground.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents reporting whether the problems and needs were adequately analysed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of respondents reporting whether the problems and needs were adequately analysed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How appropriate and useful were the indicators described in the programme document for monitoring and measuring results?</td>
<td>In relation to each indicator described in the programme document for monitoring and measuring results, was the indicator appropriate and useful?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting: Appropriate and useful/Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>The extent to which the programme’s desired results have been achieved, are being achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess the achievements of the programme against planned outputs and activities. What were the quantity and quality of outputs produced?</td>
<td>Formulation of 2nd NAPVAW After attending the workshop on formulating the 2nd NAPVAW, do you consider that the 2nd NAPVAW adequately reflects your views? What is your view of the organisation of the workshop(s) you attended? Compared to before the 2nd NAPVAW process, how has your ability changed in relation to formulating national policies in line with international standards? Based on your experience in developing the 2nd NAPVAW, what is your view on the range of stakeholder involvement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents reporting that the 2nd NAPVAW representation of their views as: Adequate / Not Adequate</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting the organisation of the workshop(s) as: Well Organised / Poorly Organised</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting improved ability as: Significantly Improved / Slightly Improved / About the Same / Slightly Worsened</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting that the range of stakeholder should be:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders that should be engaged in future policy development?</td>
<td>Wider range / Similar range / Narrower range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissemination of 2nd NAPVAW</strong> Based on your attendance at the workshop to disseminate the 2nd NAPVAW, do you consider you acquired sufficient knowledge about the 2nd NAPVAW?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting knowledge or 2nd gained as: Sufficient / Not Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, what additional information do you need?</td>
<td>Open question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your view of the organisation of the workshop(s) you attended?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting the organisation of the workshop(s) as: Well Organised / Poorly Organised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| In your opinion, has the output been achieved and how do you assess its quality? | % of respondents reporting whether each output has been achieved and level of quality: Well Achieved / Achieved / Not Achieved |

<p>| In relation to the each of the planned outputs of the two projects: - Formulation - Dissemination 1.1 Action Plan for COP 1.2 Primary Prevention Strategy 2.1 MSS 2.2 Costing 3.1 A2J /CEDAW 4.1 AOP 4.2 Knowledge exchange) | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>% of respondents selecting particular output</th>
<th>% of respondents reporting whether the programme can build on these achievements in the future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which components of the programme had the greatest achievements? What were the supporting factors? How can the programme build or expand on these achievements?</td>
<td>Which of these outputs achieved the most? Why and how did this occur? Can the programme build on these achievements in the future? If so, how?</td>
<td>Open question</td>
<td>Open question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In which areas does the programme have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they be overcome?</td>
<td>Which of these achievements achieved the least? Why do you say this? What were the constraints leading to this? How can these restraints be overcome?</td>
<td>Open question</td>
<td>Open question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the programme develop and build the capacities of partners on planning for activities?</td>
<td>Did the programme develop and build the capacities of partners to plan activities?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting whether the programme developed and built the capacities of partners to plan activities</td>
<td>Open question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving expected results?</td>
<td>What alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving expected results?</td>
<td>Open question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did the outputs and outcomes contribute to the UN Women’s strategic objectives, mainstreamed strategies and EVAW agenda?</td>
<td>Did the programme outputs and outcomes contribute to UN Women’s strategic objectives mainstreamed strategies and EVAW agenda? If so, how?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting whether the programme outputs and outcomes contributed to UN Women’s strategic objectives mainstreamed strategies and EVAW agenda?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have stakeholders been involved in programme implementation? How effective has the programme been in establishing local ownership?</td>
<td>How well has the programme contributed to the collaboration and coordination among UN agencies on EVAW?</td>
<td>Assess the effectiveness of the activities implemented by partner institutions, their contribution to the outcomes of the programme and potential replication. Assess the lessons learned from these partnerships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have stakeholders been involved in programme implementation? How effective has the programme been in establishing local ownership?</td>
<td>How well has the programme contributed to the collaboration and coordination among UN agencies on EVAW?</td>
<td>How effective has [each partner institution] been in implementing their activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective has the programme been in establishing local ownership?</td>
<td>How effective has the programme been in establishing local ownership?</td>
<td>How effective has the contribution of [each partner institution’s activity] been to outcomes of the programme?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How can the activity with the partner institution be replicated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What lessons do you consider have been learned from the partnerships?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents reporting how effective the programme has been in establishing local ownership very effective / effective / not effective</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting how well the programme has contributed to the collaboration and coordination among UN agencies on EVAW?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting effectiveness of partner institution in implementing their activities: Very Effective / Effective / Not Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of respondents reporting effectiveness of contribution of [each partner institution’s activity] in implementing their activities: Very Effective / Effective / Not Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open question</td>
<td>Open question</td>
<td>Open question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>How economically are resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) converted to results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) for integrating human rights and gender equality been allocated strategically to achieve results? Have resources been used efficiently and effectively?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have programme funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assess managerial and work efficiency. Were management capacities adequate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of respondents reporting that human resources have been used efficiently – that the same results could not have been achieved with fewer resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of respondents reporting that activities have been delivered in a timely manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of respondents reporting, in relation to managerial and work efficiency, that management capacities were adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainabilit y</td>
<td>The probability of long-term benefits from programme activities once they are over, including whether it is feasible to continue them in the future.</td>
<td>Assess to what extent a phase-out strategy has been defined and what steps have been taken to ensure programme sustainability?</td>
<td>To what extent has a phase-out strategy been defined? What steps have been taken to ensure programme stability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the programme results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable? Are results anchored in national institutions and can they be maintained at the end of the programme?</td>
<td>Are the programme results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable? Are results anchored in national institutions? Can they be maintained at the end of the programme?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting that results, achievements and benefits are likely to be durable. % of respondents reporting that results are anchored in national institutions. % of respondents reporting that results are anchored in national institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can the programme approach or results be replicated or scaled up by national partners?</td>
<td>Can the programme approach or results be replicated or scaled up by national partners?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting that the programme approach or results can be replicated or scaled up by national partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Open Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partners? What would support their replication and scaling up?</td>
<td>What aspects/factors of the programme were likely to ensure sustainability of the programme objectives?</td>
<td>Open question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess what aspects/factors of the programme that were likely to ensure sustainability of the programme objectives.</td>
<td>What aspects/factors of the programme were likely to ensure sustainability of the programme objectives?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting that an enabling or adaptable environment has been developed for real change on human rights and gender equality issues?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has an enabling or adaptable environment been developed for real change on human rights and gender equality issues?</td>
<td>Has an enabling or adaptable environment been developed for real change on human rights and gender equality issues?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting that an enabling or adaptable environment has been developed for real change on human rights and gender equality issues?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How were the institutional changes implemented as part of the project conducive to systematically addressing human rights and gender equality concerns?</td>
<td>How were the institutional changes implemented as part of the project conducive to systematically addressing human rights and gender equality concerns?</td>
<td>Open question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has an accountability and oversight systems for human rights and gender equality been established and implemented?</td>
<td>Have accountability and oversight systems for human rights and gender equality been established and implemented?</td>
<td>Open question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How sustainable was the capacity development of targeted rights holders and duty bearers to respectively demand and fulfil rights?</td>
<td>How sustainable was the capacity development of targeted rights holders and duty bearers to respectively demand and fulfil rights</td>
<td>% or respondents reporting the capacity development of targeted rights holders and duty bearers to respectively demand and fulfil rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the programme results or strategies be replicated or elaborated into a new Regional Programme which would build on the same methodologies? If so, what specific recommendations can be provided for such a programme?</td>
<td>Can the programme results or strategies be replicated or elaborated into a new Regional Programme which would build on the same methodologies? If so, what specific recommendations can be provided for such a programme?</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting that the programme results or strategies can be replicated or elaborated into a new Regional Programme which would build on the same methodologies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix VI: Schedule of Stakeholder Meetings

### Inception Meeting with Key Stakeholders in Phnom Penh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Proposed Time</th>
<th>Confirmed</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Clay</td>
<td>DFAT</td>
<td>Tue, 19 Jan</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UNW Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vutha Phon</td>
<td>UNW</td>
<td>Tue, 19 Jan</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UNW Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inala Fathima</td>
<td>UNW</td>
<td>Wed, 20 Jan</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UNW Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Dr. Khiev Serey Vuthea</td>
<td>MoWA</td>
<td>Wed, 20 Jan</td>
<td>2-3pm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>MoWA’s office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Nhean Sochetra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigo Montero Cano</td>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Wed, 20 Jan</td>
<td>3:30-4:30pm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>MoWA’s office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leang, Vutha, Lori</td>
<td>UNW</td>
<td>Thur, 21 Jan</td>
<td>10-12pm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UNW Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Knibbs</td>
<td>UNW</td>
<td>Thur, 21 Jan</td>
<td>3-4pm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UNW Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenny Kusuma</td>
<td>UNW</td>
<td>Fri, 22 Jan</td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wenny’s office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field data collection with freelancers and NGOs at national level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokreoun</td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Fri, 22 Jan</td>
<td>3-4pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNFPA Office</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbin</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>Mon, 25 Jan</td>
<td>1-2pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNW?</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazumi</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>Mon, 25 Jan</td>
<td>2:30-3:30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>PU?</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manavy</td>
<td>OI</td>
<td>Mon, 25 Jan</td>
<td>4-5pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>OI Office</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elen Menoti</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Tue, 26 Jan</td>
<td>8:30-9:30am</td>
<td></td>
<td>SSC Office</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pok Panha Vichetr</td>
<td>CWCC</td>
<td>Tue, 26 Jan</td>
<td>10:30-11:30am</td>
<td></td>
<td>CWCC Office</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channeang</td>
<td>NGO-CEDAW</td>
<td>Tue, 26 Jan</td>
<td>2-4pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNW</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pysal</td>
<td>CARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samneang Moul/Erin</td>
<td>TAF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostafa Sen</td>
<td>ForumSyd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotheary Yim</td>
<td>KDei Karona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Field data collection with key ministries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Key Informant Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mardy Keth</td>
<td>MoWA</td>
<td>Fri, 22 Jan</td>
<td>9-10am</td>
<td>MoWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Socheata</td>
<td>MoEYS</td>
<td>Wed, 27 Jan</td>
<td>9-10am</td>
<td>MoEYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Chan Sotheavy</td>
<td>MoJ</td>
<td>Wed, 27 Jan</td>
<td>10:30-11:30am</td>
<td>MoJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Hang Lina</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Wed, 27 Jan</td>
<td>2-3pm</td>
<td>MoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Yuk Sokha (Police)</td>
<td>MoI</td>
<td>Wed, 27 Jan</td>
<td>3:30-4:30pm</td>
<td>MoI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sok Srun</td>
<td>MoH</td>
<td>Thu, 28 Jan</td>
<td>9-10am</td>
<td>MoH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field Data Collection Schedule at provincial level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Proposed Time</th>
<th>Whom to meet</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thu, 28 Jan 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu, 28 Jan 2016 (PM)</td>
<td>Kampong Cham</td>
<td>2-3pm</td>
<td>Director of PDoWA</td>
<td>PDoWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:30-4:30pm</td>
<td>Police for anti-human trafficking &amp; juvenile protection</td>
<td>Provincial Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri, 29 Jan 2016 (AM+PM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-9am</td>
<td>Director of Health</td>
<td>PDoH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:30-10:30am</td>
<td>Director of Education</td>
<td>PDoEYS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12pm</td>
<td>Provincial Coordinator</td>
<td>ADHOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>Travel by LTA Car: Kampong Cham – Phnom Penh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun, 31 Jan 2016</td>
<td>Siem Reap</td>
<td>8-9am</td>
<td>Director of PDoWA</td>
<td>PDoWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, 1 Feb 2016 (AM+PM)</td>
<td>Siem Reap</td>
<td>10-11am</td>
<td>Police for anti-human trafficking &amp; juvenile protection</td>
<td>Provincial Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3pm</td>
<td>Director of Social Affairs</td>
<td>PDoSVY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-5pm</td>
<td>Director of Education</td>
<td>PDoEYS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date, Time, and Location</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tue, 2 Feb 2006 (AM+PM) | 8:30-9:30am: Provincial Coordinator Legal Aid of Cambodia  
10:30-11:30am: Provincial Coordinator CWCC  
1:30-3:30pm: FGD with CSOs: ADHOC, CWCC, BS, TPO, LAC, CCASVA, WRC BS Office? |
| Tue, 2 Feb 2016 (PM) | 3:30-6pm: Travel by LTA Car: Siem Reap – Preah Vihear |
| Wed, 3 Feb 2016 (AM+PM) | Preah Vihear  
8-9am: Director of PDOWA PDOWA  
10-11am: Police for anti-human trafficking & juvenile protection Provincial Police  
2-3pm: Director of Social Affairs PDOSVY  
4-5pm: Director of Education PDOEYS |
| Thu, 4 Feb 2016 (AM) | 8:30-9:30am: Provincial Coordinator Banteay Srey BS Office |
| Thu, 4 Feb 2016: Around 10am | Travel by LTA Car: Preah Vihear - Phnom Penh |
### Appendix VII: Evaluation Logframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Explanation of Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Collection Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>The extent to which planning, design, implementation and coherence of the programme aligns with beneficiaries’ (or their representatives CSOs and NGOs) development needs, country contexts and priorities and international standards in the area of EVAW.</td>
<td>To what extent does the programme respond to the international framework to prevent and respond to violence against women, such as CEDAW, Beijing Platform Action, UN Women Global Strategy on EVAW and women’s human rights principles?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review, Semi-structured Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To what extent does the programme respond to the needs and priorities for EVAW in Cambodia, including the stated policy priorities of the Royal Government of Cambodia, such as Neary Rattanak IV, National Sustainable Development Plan, and Rectangular Strategy IV, the Domestic Violence Law, Criminal Codes, National Action Plan to Prevent Violence against Women, and UNDAF?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review, Semi-structured Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whose needs and whose problems related to EVAW in Cambodia were identified, and how?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review, Semi-structured Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How much has the programme contributed to building a broader knowledge base and capacity related to EVAW in Cambodia?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review, Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How much has the programme been able to adapt to changing contexts and the situation on the ground?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review, Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent has the programme been informed by substantive and tailored human rights and gender analyses that identify underlying causes of human rights violations and barriers to human rights and gender equality;</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review, Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent has the programme been informed by the needs and interests of diverse groups of stakeholders through in-depth consultation.</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review, Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were the outputs of the programme clear, realistic and likely to be achieved within the established time schedule and</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs</td>
<td>Desk Review, Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective-ness</td>
<td>The extent to which the programme’s desired results have been achieved, are being achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.</td>
<td>Assess the achievements of the programme against planned outputs and activities. What were the quantity and quality of outputs produced?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Which components of the programme had the greatest achievements? What were the supporting factors? How can the programme build or expand on these achievements?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In which areas does the programme have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they be overcome?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Respondent Groups</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the programme develop and build the capacities of partners on planning for activities?</td>
<td>UN Women, Government, Stakeholders, NGOs, Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving expected results?</td>
<td>UN Women, Government, Stakeholders, NGOs, Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did the outputs and outcomes contribute to the UN Women’s strategic objectives, mainstreamed strategies and EVAW agenda?</td>
<td>UN Women, Government, Stakeholders, NGOs, Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have stakeholders been involved in programme implementation? How effective has the programme been in establishing local ownership?</td>
<td>UN Women, Government, Stakeholders, NGOs, Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well has the programme contributed to the collaboration and coordination among UN agencies on EVAW?</td>
<td>UN Women, Other UN agencies, Government, Stakeholders, NGOs, Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess the effectiveness of the activities implemented by partner institutions, their contribution to the outcomes of the programme and potential replication. Assess the lessons learned from these partnerships.</td>
<td>UN Women, Government, Stakeholders, NGOs, Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews FDGs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effectively does the programme management monitor programme performance and results?</td>
<td>UN Women, Government, Stakeholders, NGOs, Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did factors outside of the control of the programme affect programme implementation and programme objectives and how did the programme deal with these external factors? How realistic were the critical assumptions identified by the programme?</td>
<td>UN Women, Government, Stakeholders, NGOs, Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency: How economically are resources/inputs (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) for integrating human rights and gender equality been allocated strategically to achieve results?</td>
<td>UN Women, Government, Stakeholders, NGOs</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise, time, etc.) converted to results</td>
<td>Have resources been used efficiently and effectively?</td>
<td>Development Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have programme funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess managerial and work efficiency. Were management capacities adequate?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effectively did the programme management team monitor programme performance and results?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of adequate resources for integrating human rights and gender equality into the intervention as an investment in short-, medium- and long-term benefits;</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the costs or consequence of not providing sufficient resources for integrating a human rights and gender equality approach, to the extent that the approach was not fully integrated, (e.g. enhanced benefits that could have been achieved for a modest investment).</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability**

<p>| The probability of long-term benefits from programme activities once they are over, including whether it is feasible to continue them in the future. | Assess to what extent a phase-out strategy has been defined and what steps have been taken to ensure programme sustainability? | UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners | Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews |
| Are the programme results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable? Are results anchored in national institutions and can they be maintained at the end of the programme? | UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners | Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews |
| Can the programme approach or results be replicated or scaled up by national partners? What would support their replication and scaling up? | UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners | Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assess what aspects/factors of the programme that were likely to ensure sustainability of the programme objectives.</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has an enabling or adaptable environment been developed for real change on human rights and gender equality issues?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews FDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How were the institutional changes implemented as part of the project conducive to systematically addressing human rights and gender equality concerns?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has an accountability and oversight systems for human rights and gender equality been established and implemented</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How sustainable was the capacity development of targeted rights holders and duty bearers to respectively demand and fulfil rights?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the programme results or strategies be replicated or elaborated into a new Regional Programme which would build on the same methodologies? If so, what specific recommendations can be provided for such a programme?</td>
<td>UN Women Government Stakeholders NGOs Development Partners</td>
<td>Desk Review Semi-structured Interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix VIII: Capacity Assessment of PDoWA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of Province</th>
<th>NAPVAW Formulation</th>
<th>NAPVAW Dissemination</th>
<th>3-days workshop on NAPVAW implementation</th>
<th>2-days workshop on NAPVAW implementation</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kampong Chhnang</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siem Reap</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kampong Cham</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pursat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Battambang</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Koh Kong</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sihanouk</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Udor Meanchey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kampot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Preyveng</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ratanakiri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mondulkiri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Steung Treng</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kampong Thom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kandal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Svay Rieng</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kep</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kampong Speu</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Takeo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Banteay Meanchey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tbong Khmom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pailin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Preahvihear</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kratie</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IX: Evaluator’s Biodata

Peter Hosking, a human rights lawyer also holding a Diploma in Corporate Management, has undertaken a number of reviews, needs assessments and evaluations of human rights institutions and programmes, including for UNDP, OHCHR and UN Women. He has founded and led human rights NGOs, including two with a focus on violence against women.