

**Mid Term
Evaluation of
UNFPA Strategic
Plan
Organizational
Goal 3 – Gender
Equality**

Phase II
Final Evaluation
Report



June 14, 2011

Executive Summary

1. Evaluation Background and Purpose

The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)'s core mission of furthering sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights for all also implies accountability for progress on gender equality (GE). Accordingly, addressing and promoting gender equality is one of three priority areas of UNFPA programming. This is also reflected in UNFPA's current Strategic Plan 2008-2011 (extended to 2013) that includes three corporate goals, one of which focuses on gender equality (Goal 3: "Gender equality advanced and women and adolescent girls empowered to exercise their human rights, particularly their reproductive rights, and live free of discrimination and violence").

In July 2010, following an open tendering process, UNFPA's Gender, Human Rights and Culture Branch (GHRCB) contracted Universalia Management Group to conduct the first of two phases of the external, independent mid-term evaluation of UNFPA's performance on its Organizational Goal 3 on gender equality and on mainstreaming gender across its programmes. In February 2011, Universalia was contracted to conduct phase II of the same review. Key dimensions that UNFPA wished the evaluation to address were:

- The extent to which Strategic Plan objectives for GE are being achieved or are likely to be achieved by the end of the plan;
- The logic (coherence) and usefulness of the Goal 3 results chain;
- The extent to which UNFPA's integration of three approaches (gender mainstreaming, human rights-based approach, and culturally-sensitive approaches) is contributing to achieving the organization's goals and objectives for gender equality and human rights across all areas of its mandate; and
- Factors related to the organizational arrangements and relationships between UNFPA Headquarters (HQ), regional offices (RO), sub regional offices (SRO) and country offices (CO) that support or hinder progress in achieving Goal 3, as well as good practices.

While the evaluation considered UNFPA work at global, (sub-) regional, and country levels, it focused on data collection and analysis at the *country* level. During Phase I (2010), the evaluation team reviewed countries in the Arab States and Africa regions. During Phase II, the evaluation focused on the Asia Pacific (AP), Latin America and Caribbean (LAC), and Eastern Europe and Central Asia (EECA) regions.

The client for the evaluation is UNFPA GHRCB. Other intended addressees and users of the evaluation include UNFPA regional and country offices, other units in UNFPA Headquarters (programming and technical divisions), as well as the UNFPA Executive Board. The evaluation findings are intended to guide UNFPA decision-making and facilitate mid-term adjustments to improve achievement and reporting on gender equality and human rights results.

2. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The evaluation was managed by the UNFPA GHRCB. Data gathering and analysis were carried out by the independent evaluation team from Universalia, in close consultation with UNFPA GHRCB. The evaluation team's overall approach to the assignment was consultative, participatory, and utilization-focused, and was designed in alignment with the ethical code of conduct of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

With input from UNFPA, Universalia developed a detailed methodology for the evaluation as outlined in the evaluation Inception Report approved by UNFPA. The evaluation team included five evaluation specialists. A total of 259 individuals were consulted for the evaluation. Data were collected through

semi-structured face-to-face and telephone interviews, group interviews, observations, document review, and email correspondence. The evaluation team carried out field visits to UNFPA Country Offices in Armenia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Georgia, Guatemala, and Jamaica, as well as to the Regional Offices in Panama and Thailand. The team used descriptive, content, and quantitative analyses to review the data for this study. Validity was ensured through data triangulation and compliance with standard evaluation practices.

One key challenge for the evaluation was the significant lack of data on actual *results* due to the fact that available UNFPA reports tend to be activity-focused and not systematically report against the outcome indicators identified in the Strategic Plan.

3. Environment

External Environment: In UNFPA's external environment a number of global events and development since 2008 have emphasized the continued relevance of and need for work on gender equality and women's reproductive rights. For example, the 2008 Accra High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness reinforced development partners' commitment to the principles of Aid Effectiveness as outlined in the 2005 Paris Declaration. The Beijing +15 review (2010) acknowledges progress made towards achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women, yet also stresses that severe challenges and obstacles remain in the implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action.

UN Environment: A recent change in the UN environment that is highly relevant in the context of this evaluation has been the creation and launch of UN Women as the UN's Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women. UNFPA and other UN agencies have welcomed the creation of the new entity and expressed their commitment to close collaboration. It remains to be seen whether and in what ways the existence of UN Women will affect the work and scope of activities of other UN agencies including of UNFPA.

UNFPA Internal Environment/ Corporate Level: Key developments since 2008 that are relevant to UNFPA's work on gender equality and women's human right include:

- *Change in Leadership:* In November 2010 Dr. Babatunde Osotimehin replaced Thoraya Ahmend Obaid as UNFPA's Executive Director. This change is not expected to result in major shifts in UNFPA's commitment to or work on gender equality and women's human rights.
- *Strategic Plan 2008-2011 (2013) and DRF.* While the 2004-2007 MYFF outlined only one broad outcome on gender equality, the SP identifies four outcomes with different thematic foci. Under the current SP, Regional and Country Offices define their own outputs that are expected to relate to and feed into the corporate outcomes.
- *Restructuring:* In 2007, UNFPA underwent an organizational review resulting in a number of significant restructuring efforts. This included the creation of a programming division at HQ and the relocation of geographical divisions to the field as Regional Offices (RO).
- *Roles, responsibilities and capacity for gender equality:* UNFPA's commitment to gender mainstreaming implies that gender equality is the responsibility of all units within its organizational structure. Recent external and internal assessments of UNFPA have flagged some important strengths and weaknesses of the agency's capacity for addressing gender equality.

Regional and Country Levels

The *Asia and Pacific* (AP) region encompasses 23 Country Offices responsible for 36 different jurisdictions. The region is home to 3.7 billion people, accounting for 60 percent of the global population. Although vast inequalities and stark socio-economic contrasts abound, significant progress has been made across the region in the reduction of extreme deprivation and hunger, widening access to basic services, and the promotion of food security and economic growth. Common challenges for women across the

region include elevated maternal mortality, limited access to reproductive health services, gender inequality and discrimination, and various forms of gender-based violence.

- *Bangladesh* has made some socio-economic and health gains over the last decade, but more than 40 percent of the population still live below the poverty line. Gender disparities are staggering, as legal measures to protect women's rights are not effectively implemented. Women constitute the majority of the poor, maternal malnutrition is high, and gender based violence (GBV) is prevalent including dowry-related abuse, physical assaults and human trafficking.
- *Cambodia* faces persistent poverty challenges, despite the progress made since the Paris Peace Accord of 1991. One-quarter of the population still lives below the poverty line. Maternal mortality rates remain high, and access to reproductive health services, though increasing, is limited. Gender inequality is present in many spheres of life, notably in the education system and labour market, and is deep-rooted throughout society.

The *Eastern Europe and Central Asia* (EECA) region includes 20 UNFPA Country Offices. Among the countries in the sub-regions, there are considerable differences in economic strength and a wide range of ethnic and faith-based groups. Over the past two decades, women and vulnerable groups across the region have faced deteriorating health and education services, and have become more vulnerable due to gender disparities and GBV. While at the national level, GBV is gaining attention and becoming the focus of social policies, the problem persists.

- *Armenia* has made major gains in political stability and economic growth after declaring independence from the former Soviet Union in 1991. However, in 2007 more than 25 percent of the population were still living in poverty. GBV remains culturally ingrained, and the legal system does not entirely support prevention of GBV. Human trafficking disproportionately affects women and girls in Armenia, exacerbated by poverty and unequal work opportunities.
- *Georgia* has faced depopulation on a massive scale due to poverty and unemployment since the early 1990s. The violent conflict in 2008 disrupted development efforts, yet also led to a considerable flow of international aid into the country. While education levels of both men and women are high, empowerment among women in Georgia is still low, and women are more vulnerable to poverty than men. GBV, especially domestic and sexual violence as well as trafficking, is a persistent challenge, with permissive attitudes being widespread, including among law enforcement and judicial bodies.

The *Latin America and Caribbean* (LAC) region is made up of 47 countries with a population of 570 million. Socio-economic inequalities are deeply ingrained. In comparison to men, a disproportionate numbers of women are unemployed, along with youth and indigenous populations. Another common challenge especially in the Caribbean is the early onset of sexual initiation, rape, incest and carnal abuse. Gender inequality also presents itself in the workplace; although education rates among women are greater than those amongst men, salaries and labour market conditions remain favourable for males.

- *Guatemala's* population is primarily young, rural and poor. Extreme inequality persists and the situation is especially dire for indigenous women and rural indigenous communities. The recent situation in Guatemala has been characterized by high levels of violence (not only, but especially against women), and an overall climate of insecurity. A particular concern is the increase in the number of femicide cases, combined with a lack of protection mechanisms and access to justice.
- *Jamaica* developed a 25-year National Development Plan (NDP) with the goal of attaining developed country status by 2030. However, the development agenda has been side-tracked by serious challenges that include high levels of violence, crime and security concerns, the debt burden, and inequality. In this context, issues such as reproductive health are not considered priorities and do not receive adequate funding.

4. Results Achievement under SP Goal 3

Finding 1: All consulted stakeholders described UNFPA as a highly respected and effective advocate for gender equality and women's empowerment at the country level that often takes a leadership role among UN agencies and development partners.

Phase II of the evaluation confirmed the very positive overall assessment of UNFPA's role and reputation for its work on gender equality. Almost all consulted national partners, both government agencies and NGOs, and most consulted international partners described UNFPA as a dedicated and effective advocate for gender equality and women's rights issues and as a partner that is respected and trusted. Furthermore, partners repeatedly described UNFPA staff members at the country level responsible for gender-equality work as dedicated, knowledgeable, flexible, and easy to work with.

Finding 2: There is considerable evidence that UNFPA activities at the country level are relevant to Goal 3 and contribute to its four stated outcomes. However, due to the lack of a comprehensive logic framework, it is not possible to assess UNFPA's overall progress in terms of the stated outcomes and indicators of SP Goal 3, or how country-level results contribute to the organization's intended overall results.

There is considerable evidence that all reviewed UNFPA Country Offices in the reviewed regions have supported a wide variety of activities that are relevant to Goal 3 and that have contributed or are very likely to contribute to output-level results related to all four outcomes of Goal 3. While it was not possible to capture these results in terms of the indicators outlined in the SP, they constitute the basis for the evaluation's overall positive assessment of UNFPA's work on gender equality at the country level.

Key *types* of documented efforts and achievements under each of the four outcomes are presented below:

Outcome 1: Gender equality and the human rights of women and adolescent girls, particularly their reproductive rights, integrated in national policies, development frameworks and laws.

1. National policies, development frameworks and laws better reflect the rights of women and adolescents, particularly their reproductive rights (e.g. through initiatives in Armenia, Georgia, the Maldives, Jamaica, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Cambodia, and the Pacific).
2. Implementation or enforcement of national commitments to gender equality and women's human rights (e.g. in Cambodia, Belarus, Armenia, Costa Rica, Jamaica, Peru, Guatemala, Bosnia and Herzegovina).
3. Effective Monitoring of gender equality commitments (e.g. in Georgia and Guatemala).

To date the translation of policies into action has remained a major challenge in most countries. Although UNFPA is making visible efforts to support the implementation of GE-related policies and laws, there is little and varied information on the extent to which these efforts have been systematic and/or effective.

Outcome 2: Gender equality, reproductive rights and the empowerment of women and adolescent girls promoted through an enabling socio-cultural environment that is conducive to male participation and the elimination of harmful practices.

Key *types* of UNFPA's efforts and achievements under this Outcome are:

1. Awareness raising and advocacy for gender equality among the general population, in particular men and boys, and youth (e.g. through initiatives in Armenia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Jamaica, Peru, Guatemala, Myanmar, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ecuador, and Costa Rica).
2. Enhance knowledge and awareness of gender equality issues among culturally relevant opinion leaders and secure their support (e.g. in Georgia, Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, and Bangladesh).

3. Initiate and/or support community level work on the abandonment of harmful traditional practices (e.g. through work in Colombia on stopping female genital mutilation).

As already noted in Phase I of the evaluation, the current formulation of the outcome statement makes it difficult to detect what specific development change it is describing.

Outcome 3: Human rights protection systems (including national human rights councils, ombudspersons, and conflict-resolution mechanisms) and participatory mechanisms are strengthened to protect reproductive rights of women and adolescent girls, including the right to be free from violence.

As during Phase I of the evaluation, the evaluation team found the least evidence of country level activities or results under Outcome 3. Types of reported achievements were:

1. Knowledge generation and awareness raising on Women's Human Rights (e.g. in Guatemala).
2. Strengthen the capacity of duty bearers to promote and protect women's human rights (e.g. in Ecuador, Guatemala, Colombia, Costa Rica, Maldives, Bangladesh).
3. Strengthen the capacity of rights holders to assert and monitor the realization of women's human rights (e.g. in Ecuador, Guatemala, Colombia, and Peru).

This Outcome is the only one for which the data indicate considerable regional differences - with LAC countries appearing to focus (or at least report) more on this area than countries from other regions. One reason for the difference may be that in the EECA and AP regions the concept of human rights appears to be a considerably more sensitive issue than in Latin America and the Caribbean. The paucity of information on progress may also, at least in part, be due to the fact that activities and results that are relevant to Outcome 3 are also relevant to other outcomes and more likely to be reported there. Further, as already noted in Phase I of the evaluation, the relative small amount of information available on Outcome 3 may be related to a lack of clarity about the specific development changes the outcome seeks to capture.

Outcome 4: Responses to gender-based violence, particularly domestic and sexual violence, expanded through improved policies, protection systems, legal enforcement and sexual and reproductive health and HIV-prevention services, including in emergency and post-emergency situations.

Phase II evaluation data on country-level activities and results confirm the positive observations noted in Phase I: All reviewed COs work on GBV, especially domestic and sexual violence, and in most cases GBV is the area that UNFPA is best known for among its national and international partners in relation to gender equality. In several countries, UNFPA is considered the technical leader and expert with regard to GBV among UN agencies and national and international development partners (especially in countries where UN Women does not yet have a presence). Key types of achievements include:

1. Generation of data/evidence on GBV at national and (sub) regional levels (e.g. in Georgia, Armenia, Cambodia, BiH, Bangladesh, Jamaica, and the Pacific).
2. Raising knowledge and awareness of GBV (e.g. in Belarus, Georgia, Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, Cambodia, Guatemala, Bangladesh, and Jamaica).
3. Development or review and revision of GBV policies, laws and regulations, and support for their implementation (e.g. in Myanmar, BiH, Georgia, Armenia, Maldives, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Colombia).
4. Strengthen the capacity of national stakeholders and institutions for addressing GBV and monitoring related processes and progress (e.g. in Georgia, Armenia, Myanmar, Ecuador, Bangladesh, and Guatemala).
5. Enhanced service delivery for victims of GBV (e.g. in BiH, Georgia, Solomon Islands, Armenia).

6. Systematic Approaches. Several UNFPA COs (e.g. Kyrgyzstan, Solomon Islands, Belarus, Bangladesh, and Panama) are part of and/or support systematic and coordinated approaches to addressing GBV at the national and/or sub-regional level.

UNFPA's reported efforts under Outcome 4 on GBV are impressive, and their relevance is underlined by the positive perceptions of consulted national partners and stakeholders. However, most available data are on UNFPA's *activities* rather than development results. Further, it is unclear to what extent the SP commits UNFPA to working not only on *responses* to GBV, but also on its *prevention*, given that the Outcome 4 statement only refers to the former.

Overarching Observations on all four Outcomes:

Overlap between outcomes: As noted in Phase I of the evaluation, UNFPA COs sometimes reported the same efforts or results under two or more outcomes; in other cases, achievements were reported under one outcome but, in our understanding, could just as well or even better have been placed under another outcome. This may reflect the fact that UNFPA and its partners work on complex issues that often encompass many dimensions. However, the overlap raises the question of whether the current outcomes are the most suitable way to categorize UNFPA's work on gender equality and human rights issues.

Project versus program approach: A considerable part of UNFPA's work on gender equality is funded through, and dependent on, external funds from donors. In many cases, these funds are tied to a specific time bound project. While allowing UNFPA to conduct more in depth work on specific gender equality issues, the project approach makes it difficult to ensure a continuous and comprehensive approach to addressing issues. Consulted staff and stakeholders noted that it would be highly beneficial if UNFPA was able to commit to longer term, ongoing programming on key issues.

Capacity Development: A considerable part of UNFPA's work under all four outcomes relates to strengthening the capacity of national partners and their organizations in GE and WHR. While UNFPA has outlined its understanding of 'capacity' and 'capacity development' based on the respective UNDG definitions, there is room for further reflection on how to operationalize this understanding on the ground.

Finding 3: Consulted UNFPA staff and stakeholders noted that in light of the changing global context, especially the creation of UN Women, UNFPA may need to define an even clearer focus for its work related to gender equality.

Consulted UNFPA staff and partners agreed that gender equality is key to UNFPA's mandate and that the agency must and will continue to address gender equality in its work. Consulted stakeholders had slightly differing views with regard to the creation of UN Women and the impact it may have on UNFPA's role in relation to gender. While some stakeholders do not expect this to affect the scope or nature of UNFPA's efforts, many others commented that UNFPA would need to better define and focus its work on GE.

5. Effectiveness of UNFPA's Integration of Gender, Human Rights and Culture in Programming

Finding 4: While consulted staff members in the field had varying degrees of awareness of the corporate guidance note on integrating gender equality, human rights and culture, there was wide agreement that all three dimensions are at the core of 'good' development work.

Consulted UNFPA staff members in the field had varying degrees of awareness of the corporate guidance note on integrating GE, HR and culture. Several, especially senior staff, had read the guidance note, while others, especially new and/or junior staff, had not. However, all consulted staff members were generally familiar with UNFPA's corporate dedication to culturally sensitive programming, and its commitment as a UN agency to integrating gender equality and taking a human rights-based approach. Several staff members emphasized the indivisible link between gender equality, cultural sensitivity and human rights,

and their understanding that (women's) human rights cannot be fully realized as long as gender inequalities exist. Thus, working to enhance gender equality is one way of strengthening (women's) opportunities to realize their human rights. This however cannot be achieved in a vacuum, but always needs to take cultural considerations into account to understand and address the respective issues.

Finding 5: Country Offices in all regions reviewed use programming strategies that reflect UNFPA's commitment to culturally sensitive programming.

The evaluation found evidence of a variety of ways in which Country Offices are 'translating' the notion of cultural sensitivity to inform their programming approaches. These include:

1. Developing skills for dealing with individuals, communities and interest groups living in a specific cultural context (e.g. men and boys, indigenous women, faith based communities).
2. Using culturally acceptable and persuasive language, e.g. by taking into account negative connotations of certain terms in a region or country, or ensuring that information materials and/or events are culturally appropriate
3. Establishing bridges between local cultural values and universally recognized human rights and gender equity and equality, e.g. by identifying common ground among gender advocates and faith based organizations around specific issues, or by working with national/cultural icons to enhance the likelihood of reaching broader parts of the population
4. Creating a more conducive environment for programme ownership, e.g. by establishing a mutual system of 'checks and balances' between the agency and its partners that allows national partners to comment on and provide input to UNFPA's work (such as in Jamaica).

Evaluation data also indicate a number of stakeholder concerns in relation to the use of culturally sensitive strategies, in particular in view of working with FBOs, given that these organizations are often perceived as being responsible for perpetuating practices, beliefs or taboos that create gender inequalities.

Finding 6: UNFPA has started to collect and share examples of experiences and lessons learned from using culturally-sensitive approaches, but there is further room for improvement in the way the agency systematically captures and uses country level data.

Given the close links between gender equality and culture, the notion of culturally-sensitive approaches is convincing and promising in the context of advancing GE. Being able to provide evidence on how such approaches enhance the effectiveness and/or sustainability of programming would be beneficial not only to UNFPA but also to other development partners. The same applies to capturing information on what has *not* worked and why.

Finding 7: While there are several examples of UNFPA having successfully integrated gender equality in the areas of Population and Development and Reproductive Health, Phase II evaluation data confirm UNFPA's ongoing challenge in mainstreaming gender systematically.

There is considerable evidence that UNFPA COs have successfully integrated some gender equality dimensions in the areas of Population and Development and Reproductive Health. At the same time, most consulted UNFPA staff members indicated that there is considerable room for improvement in systematically mainstreaming gender equality into the agency's work. Key challenges noted in this regard were related to:

- *Leadership and accountability:* The interest in and commitment to GE of the UNFPA Country Representative (or Deputy) is highly relevant in view of the extent to which sufficient numbers of qualified GE officers are hired, budget allocations for GE are made, and for ensuring that all CO team members know how to and are accountable for integrating gender into their work.

- *Clearly defined responsibilities:* To date, collaboration among gender, P&D and RH teams appears to largely depend on the good will and personal interest of the individuals involved.
- *Knowledge and skills:* Consulted staff members stated that they and/or their colleagues lacked the required knowledge, skills and tools to successfully mainstream GE into the work of other pillars.
- *Resources:* Staff members noted the absence of dedicated resources (financial or human) for gender mainstreaming activities.
- *Reporting tools:* UNFPA's current reporting system does not provide space for reporting on GM-related efforts or expenses across pillars as data must be entered under one pillar only.

6. Results Logic of SP Goal 3

Finding 8: There is considerable room for improvement in the accuracy and coherence of the Goal 3 results chain.

Phase II of the evaluation confirmed the observations made during Phase I with regard to the internal coherence of the UNFPA Goal 3 results chain. Key issues in this regard included:

- The SP does not provide an overarching theory of change that describes how the four outcomes contribute to Goal 3, or how they are intended to complement each other.
- Most of the Goal 3 current outcome statements do not describe a specific, measurable development-oriented change. Some outcomes overlap.
- The four outcomes mix results with strategies to obtain results. Outcome 4 addresses changes related to a specific thematic issue (GBV). Outcomes 1 to 3, however, describe strategies to influence change that can be applied across different thematic areas.
- The outcome indicators are not suitable for measuring change at the country-level, and are not comprehensive in measuring the stated outcomes.
- All outcome indicators are quantitative. As such they do not allow UNFPA to systematically capture the quality, type, and relevance of changes to which it contributes.

Finding 9: The links between country-level outputs and corporate SP outcomes are not always evident, explicit, or logical. This contributes to UNFPA's difficulty in capturing progress on outcomes at regional and global levels.

The concept of a results chain (as used in the RBM approach) is based on the assumption that lower level results contribute to higher level and more complex results. The vertical logic of a results chain describes these links from outputs to outcomes to goals. In the SP Goal 3 results chain, identifying this vertical logic is not always easy. While the link between Goal 3 and its four outcomes is plausible, the relationship between these corporate outcomes and country level outputs is not always evident. Key observations in this regard are: i) Most of the reviewed country programme documents identify not only their own outputs, but also their own GE-related *outcomes*. ii) The reviewed country programme results frameworks include from one to three outputs on GE. In some cases, country-level outputs are at the same level of complexity as the SP outcomes or even the SP Goal to which they are expected to contribute to.

Finding 10: The SP facilitates the translation of UNFPA's broad organizational priorities into programming, but it is not evident how the SP can be used in the reverse direction, to roll up country-level results into progress towards corporate outcomes and goals. This makes it difficult for UNFPA to capture its contributions to development results.

While it is relatively clear that the SP is intended to and does facilitate the translation of UNFPA's broad organizational priorities into specific programming on the ground, its envisaged use in the *reverse*

direction is less evident, i.e., in rolling up country-level results into progress towards corporate outcomes and goals. In an RBM approach, accountability is usually placed at the level of *outputs*. As noted earlier, UNFPA's development results framework does not include corporate outputs, and the existing country programme outputs differ considerably in type and level of complexity. Further, UNFPA is not currently capturing data on these country-level outputs. It is thus not clear whether or to what extent the SP is intended to play a role in defining and tracking the development results that UNFPA will hold itself *accountable* for by the end of the programming period.

7. Organizational Structures and Relationships

Finding 11: There is room for strengthening UNFPA's organizational structures and intra-organizational relationships to enhance communication on and accountability for GE.

Phase II of the evaluation confirmed the areas of improvement noted during Phase I with regard to UNFPA's intra-organizational communication and accountability for achieving and tracking results on GE. In theory, gender equality is the responsibility of all UNFPA units at central, regional, sub-regional and country levels. However, there is no mechanism in place to ensure that individual responsibilities for results achievement and tracking outcomes in relation to Goal 3 and gender mainstreaming actually come together to a coherent whole. Selected issues at CO, RO and HQ levels that are likely to contribute to the observed gaps are described below.

Country Offices: are obliged to work on all three of UNFPA's priority areas, including gender, and to use a human-rights based approach, but beyond this general expectation there are no corporate guidelines or standards regulating how this is put into practice. Thus, COs are free to decide on the percentage of country program budgets allocated for gender equality, the number or percentage of total staff hired as gender focal points or advisors, the extent to which the TOR of staff members include explicit obligations with regard to gender mainstreaming, and the extent of professional development opportunities on GE are available to staff members.

Regional Offices: In the five regions reviewed during the two evaluation phases, there is limited evidence that ROs are analyzing or synthesizing country programme data on activities and progress under Goal 3 from a regional perspective.

Headquarters: The GHRCB is mandated with developing and sharing policy and programmatic guidance on gender equality, human rights and culture-related issues – but is not formally tasked with ensuring and monitoring implementation. Other units in HQ as well as ROs and COs are under no obligation to follow and apply strategies and guidance provided by GHRCB. Also, the GHRCB is accountable only for the global program's achievements under Goal 3 but has no formal role with regard to monitoring, analyzing and assessing overall results achievement at the corporate level.

Finding 12: While Regional Offices can and are contributing to GE programming at the country level, they are also facing some challenges in terms of their roles in technical assistance and ensuring the coherence of UNFPA programming on GE.

All consulted stakeholders viewed the relocation of ROs to the field as a positive step with the potential to enhance communications (between COs, and between the field and HQ), and ensure timely and quality technical assistance on GE and human rights to CO teams and national programming partners. Many respondents noted that the ROs are relatively new and probably need more time to become fully functional. One issue repeatedly mentioned in all regions was the fact that the ROs have not yet effectively replaced the country technical support teams. While all ROs are making efforts to establish regional inter-agency rosters of experts, progress has been varied and mostly limited.

8. Recommendations

Based on these findings, the evaluation team makes the following recommendations to UNFPA. The full report also provides practical suggestions accompanying each recommendation.

Recommendation 1: In light of the evolving UN environment, UNFPA should review the scope and foci of its work on gender equality (GE) and the links between GE and the Fund's work on reproductive health (RH) and population and development (P&D).

The evolving UN environment, in particular the creation of UN Women, creates the need for all UN agencies, including UNFPA, to review the scope and focus of their work related to gender equality, and to consider the division of labour for GE among agencies. While all UN agencies address gender equality as a cross-cutting issue, UNFPA and UN Women are in a special position and relationship given that gender equality and women's human rights are key concepts in the mandates of both organizations.

Consultations with UNFPA staff and partners also indicate that in some cases UNFPA is running the risk of 'spreading itself too thin' by taking on a broad range of responsibilities around gender equality, not all of which are closely linked to its core mandate or its other areas of focus. Critically reviewing the Fund's areas of engagement in GE in light of their links to UNFPA's work on SRHR and P&D could help ensure a more focused approach, which in turn might help COs use their available resources for gender equality in fewer areas, but in a more comprehensive (programmatic) and sustained way.

Recommendation 2: UNFPA should improve its systems and internal capacity at all levels for results-based analysis and reporting under SP Goal 3.

As noted throughout the Phase I and II evaluation reports, one key challenge for conducting a meaningful assessment of UNFPA's progress towards SP Goal 3 was the absence of information on actual results rather than on activities. Effective reporting on results is essential to UNFPA's accountability and its ability to mobilize resources for gender equality in the future. Especially in light of the evolving UN environment, it will be increasingly important for UNFPA to provide evidence of its contributions to development results, and clearly communicate its particular niche in relation to gender equality and women's human rights issues.

Recommendation 3: UNFPA should refine the SP Goal 3 results chain to improve the logic and coherence between intended results – from country programme outputs, to corporate SP outcomes, to goals.

The evaluation noted several challenges with regard to the logic and clarity of Goal 3 outcomes and indicators. It also noted the need to clarify the Strategic Plan's role in defining corporate accountability for development results, and pointed out the missing logical link between the many and diverse country programme outputs and the SP outcomes.

Specifically, UNFPA should: i) Revise the Goal 3 outcome statements to ensure that they describe specific, realistic, and achievable development results that UNFPA's work on the ground can contribute to; ii) Review and clarify the intended relationship between the four Goal 3 outcomes; iii) Clarify how country programme results (outputs and outcomes) are intended to contribute to the SP outcomes and goal, and iv) Develop outcome indicators that are useful, measurable, and sufficient for measuring each outcome.

Recommendation 4: UNFPA should broaden its efforts to collect, analyze, and share data that demonstrates the added value of integrating gender, human rights, and culture in achieving and sustaining development results.

UNFPA documents and guidance notes convincingly outline the relevance of integrating human rights-based, culturally-sensitive, and gender mainstreaming approaches. UNFPA is beginning to systematically

collect data on how these approaches are put into practice and on the benefits and challenges related to their application. In order for this to be a practical programming tool, and not just a theoretical framework, UNFPA needs to further explore and demonstrate how the integration of these approaches can enhance programming effectiveness and/or the sustainability of development results.

Recommendation 5: UNFPA should clarify or define its expectations for gender equality and gender mainstreaming at all levels of the organization.

The evaluation noted the need for stronger UNFPA mechanisms for: i) monitoring, analyzing, and synthesizing GE- related achievements and experiences at country, regional, and corporate levels, and ii) holding units accountable for their obligations around Goal 3 results achievement and gender mainstreaming.

Acknowledgement

The evaluation team would like to thank all UNFPA colleagues in Armenia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Georgia, Guatemala, Jamaica, Panama, and Thailand for their kind assistance in preparing the evaluation site visits in a relatively short timeframe and for providing assistance to the consultants during their stay. We would further like to thank the UNFPA HQ, RO, SRO, and CO teams in New York, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Fiji, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Peru, and the Solomon Islands for taking the time to participate in phone interviews and email consultations.

Thanks also to all colleagues who provided helpful comments and suggestions on the presentation of preliminary findings, and the draft evaluation report.

Acronyms

APRO	Asia and Pacific Regional Office
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
CO	Country Office
COAR	Country Office Annual Report
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CPD	Country Programme Document
DAW	Division for the Advancement of Women
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
DRF	Development Results Framework
EBERB	Executive Board/External Relations Board
ECOSOC	(UN) Economic and Social Council
EECARO	Eastern Europe & Central Asia Regional Office
ESPB	Environmental Scanning and Planning Branch
FGM/C	Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting
GBV	Gender-based Violence
GCC	Gulf Cooperation Council
GE	Gender Equality
GHRCB	Gender, Human Rights and Culture Branch
GRB	Gender Responsive Budgeting
HIB	HIV/AIDS Branch
HR	Human Rights
HRB	Humanitarian Response Branch
ICPD	International Conference on Population and Development
INSTRAW	International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women
KAP	Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices
LACRO	Latin America and Caribbean Regional Office
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MCB	Media and Communications Branch
MRF	Management Results Framework
MYFF	Multi Year Funding Framework

Acronyms

OSAGI	Office of the Special Advisor on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women
PDB	Population and Development Branch
PSRDB	Programme Support and Regional Desks Branch
PSRO	Pacific Sub-Regional Office
RBM	Results Based Management
RHCSB	Reproductive Health Commodity Security Branch
RMB	Resource Mobilization Branch
RO	Regional Office
RR	Reproductive Rights
SGBV	Sexual and Gender Based Violence
SP	Strategic Plan
SRHB	Sexual and Reproductive Health Branch
SRHR	Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights
SRO	Sub Regional Office
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women (now part of UN Women)
UNSCR	United Nations Security Council Resolution
VAW	Violence Against Women
WE	Women's' Empowerment
WHO	World Health Organization

Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Evaluation Background and Purpose	1
1.2 Evaluation Methodology	2
1.3 Terminology	4
1.4 Organization of the Report	5
2. Programming Environment	6
2.1 Overview	6
2.2 External Environment	6
2.3 UNFPA Internal Environment	7
2.3.1 Corporate Level	7
2.3.2 Regional and Country Levels	9
3. Results Achievement under Goal 3	15
3.1 Overview	15
3.2 Overall Progress towards Goal 3	15
3.3 UNFPA Achievements under Goal 3 Outcomes	17
3.3.1 Introduction	17
3.3.2 Outcome 1	17
3.3.3 Outcome 2	20
3.3.4 Outcome 3	23
3.3.5 Outcome 4	26
3.4 Overarching Observations	30
4. UNFPA's Integration of Gender, Human Rights, and Culture in Programming	32
4.1 Overview	32
4.2 Integrating Gender Equality, Human Rights and Culture in UNFPA Programming	32
4.3 Gender Mainstreaming	36
5. Results Logic of SP Goal 3	39
6. Organizational Structures and Relationships	43
7. Conclusions and Recommendations	47
7.1 Overview	47
7.2 Conclusions	47
7.3 Recommendations	48

Exhibits

Exhibit 1.1	Site Visits	3
Exhibit 3.1	Outcome 1 Activities and Achievements	18
Exhibit 3.2	Outcome 2 Efforts and Achievements	21
Exhibit 3.3	Outcome 3 Efforts and Achievements	24
Exhibit 3.4	Outcome 4 Efforts and Achievements	27
Exhibit 4.1	Use of Culturally Sensitive Approaches to Programming	34

Appendices

Appendix I	Evaluation Terms of Reference	55
Appendix II	Evaluation Framework	61
Appendix III	Data Sources: People	65
Appendix IV	Data Source: Documents and Websites	77
Appendix V	Interview and Email Consultation Protocols	89
Appendix VI	UNFPA Organizational Units and their (explicit and implicit) GE responsibilities	99
Appendix VII	Annotated Goal 3 Results Chain	101
Appendix VIII	Country Programme Results Frameworks	105
Appendix IX	List of Findings	111

1. Introduction

1.1 Evaluation Background and Purpose

The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)'s core mission of furthering sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights for all also implies accountability for progress on gender equality (GE).

Accordingly, addressing and promoting gender equality is one of three priority areas of UNFPA programming¹ and is one of the three corporate goals in UNFPA's current Strategic Plan 2008-2011² (see sidebar).

GOAL 3: Gender equality advanced and women and adolescent girls empowered to exercise their human rights, particularly their reproductive rights, and live free of discrimination and violence.
(UNFPA SP 2008-2011, Development Results Framework. 2008)

In July 2010, following an open tendering process, UNFPA's Gender, Human Rights and Culture Branch (GHRCB) contracted Universal Management Group to conduct the first of two phases of the external, independent mid-term evaluation of UNFPA's performance on its Organizational Goal 3 on gender equality and on mainstreaming gender across its programmes. In February 2011, Universal Management Group was contracted to conduct phase II of the same review. Key dimensions that UNFPA wished the evaluation to address were:

- The extent to which Strategic Plan objectives for GE are being achieved or are likely to be achieved by the end of the plan;
- The logic (coherence) and usefulness of the Goal 3 results chain;
- The extent to which UNFPA's integration of three approaches (gender mainstreaming, human rights-based approach, and culturally-sensitive approaches) is contributing to achieving the organization's goals and objectives for gender equality and human rights across all areas of its mandate; and
- Factors related to the organizational arrangements and relationships between UNFPA Headquarters (HQ), regional offices (RO), sub-regional offices (SRO), and country offices (CO) that support or hinder progress in achieving Goal 3, as well as good practices.

While the evaluation considered UNFPA work at global, regional, and country levels, it focused on data collection and analysis at the *country* level. During Phase I, the evaluation team reviewed countries in the Arab States and Africa regions. During Phase II, the evaluation focused on the Asia Pacific (AP), Latin America and Caribbean (LAC), and Eastern Europe and Central Asia (EECA) regions.

The client for the evaluation is UNFPA GHRCB. Other intended addressees and users of the evaluation include UNFPA regional and country offices, other units in UNFPA Headquarters (programming and technical divisions), as well as the UNFPA Executive Board.

The evaluation findings are intended to provide UNFPA with evidence about the effectiveness of programming for gender equality to guide decision making and facilitate mid-term adjustments to further improve achievement and reporting on gender equality and human rights results. The full evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR) are included as **Appendix I**.

This document fulfills a **dual purpose**: a) it presents findings specific to **Phase II** of the evaluation and its focus on the AP, LAC, and EECA regions; b) it summarizes the **overall evaluation findings** that emerged

¹ The others are related to Population and Development, and Reproductive Health.

² In 2010, the UNFPA Executive Board extended the Strategic Plan to cover the period up to 2013.

during the first and second phases of the evaluation, e.g., by noting similarities or differences among the five reviewed regions. Based on these findings, the report makes a number of **recommendations** and practical **suggestions** for their implementation. This report summarizes key information from the Phase I evaluation report and refers the reader to that report for full details.

1.2 Evaluation Methodology

Evaluation Framework

With input from UNFPA, Universalia developed a detailed methodology for the evaluation as outlined in the Inception Report approved by UNFPA in March 2011. The evaluation framework summarizing the major evaluation questions and sub-questions is included in **Appendix II**.

Evaluation Scope

Timeframe: The evaluation covers the timeframe 2008- 2010. At the same time, it is forward looking in terms of providing recommendations and suggestions for UNFPA programming under Goal 3 and in relation to gender mainstreaming for the duration of the Strategic Plan until 2013.

Geographic scope: Phase II of the evaluation focused on UNFPA's work at the country level in the Asia Pacific, Latin America and Caribbean, and Eastern Europe and Central Asia regions. For the evaluation missions, UNFPA selected a sample of two countries in each region: Guatemala and Jamaica (LAC), Bangladesh and Cambodia (AP), and Georgia and Armenia (EECA). These countries had been suggested by the respective Regional Offices based on the willingness and ability of the respective country offices (COs) to engage with the evaluation exercise. Consultations were also held with UNFPA RO staff and, where feasible, programme partners in all three regions.³

In addition to the site visits, the evaluation team conducted telephone interviews and email consultations with UNFPA CO staff as well as with national program partners in 11 countries (Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Peru, and the Solomon Islands) as well as with the SRO Pacific in Fiji, and reviewed documents made available by the UNFPA colleagues in these countries.

Further, during the site visits to Jamaica and the APRO in Thailand respectively, the visiting evaluation team members also conducted telephone or Skype interviews with UNFPA staff members from additional countries in the Caribbean and the Pacific Sub-Regional Office.

While going beyond the originally agreed upon geographic scope of the evaluation, these sub-regional interviews provided the evaluation team with additional data to confirm and/or challenge overall evaluation findings. Please also see sidebar.

Throughout the assignment the evaluation team had to **balance** the large amount of detailed information collected at the country, sub-regional and regional level on the one side, with the need to identify and report upon key findings relevant to UNFPA as a whole on the other side. To mitigate this challenge at least for the six countries visited, the evaluation team members met with the respective UNFPA team at the end of each site visit to share and discuss key observations on UNFPA's work in the specific country.⁴

³ LACRO and APRO were visited, while EECARO was consulted by telephone/Skype.

⁴ If UNFPA conducts a similarly broad evaluation in the future, it could consider adding brief country summary reports to the list of evaluation deliverables and allocate related resources to allow for reporting on country specific details in more depth.

Evaluation Process

The evaluation was managed by the UNFPA GHRCB. Data gathering and analysis were carried out by the evaluation team from Universalia in close consultation with GHRCB. The evaluation Advisory Group established by GHRCB provided advice on evaluation content and methodology, and provided the evaluation team with written and verbal comments on deliverables.⁵ The evaluation team's overall approach to the assignment was consultative, participatory, and utilization-focused, and was designed in alignment with the ethical code of conduct of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

Data Sources and Methods of Data Collection

Key methods of data collection were document review, semi-structured interviews (face-to-face, or via telephone or Skype), face-to-face group interviews/focus groups, observations, and email correspondence. There were three major sources of data for this evaluation: people, documents, and site visits.

People: A total of 259 individuals were consulted for this second phase of the evaluation.⁶ **Appendix III** provides a list of all stakeholders from whom data were obtained. The individuals consulted during site visits were suggested by the respective UNFPA office team and included direct partners that UNFPA had worked with in the area of gender equality, as well as representatives from other donor/UN agencies active in the same area. In addition, the evaluation team conducted telephone interviews and email consultations with UNFPA CO and SRO⁷ staff as well as with national programme partners in 11 countries (Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Peru, and the Solomon Islands).

Consultations (in person, by phone and email) followed agreed upon interview protocols that were tailored to different stakeholder groups. For consultations in LACR and EECAR, the protocols were translated into Spanish and Russian respectively. Interview protocols and email consultation tools are included as **Appendix V**.

Documents: The evaluation team reviewed and analyzed numerous UNFPA corporate, regional and country level documents and websites. A list of written documents and relevant websites reviewed during the course of the evaluation is presented as **Appendix IV**. As various team members contributed to document review, the team developed and used simple review frameworks that were based on the evaluation matrix. These frameworks are also included in Appendix IV.

Site visits: As shown in Exhibit 1.1 below, the team conducted site visits to eight locations.

Exhibit 1.1 Site Visits

Destination	Purpose	Dates
Panama	Data collection in the LAC Regional Office	March 23-25
Guatemala	Data collection in the Guatemala CO	March 28 – April 1
Jamaica	Data collection in the Jamaica CO	April 4-8
Thailand	Data collection in the AP Regional Office	March 9-11
Bangladesh	Data collection in the Bangladesh CO	March 14-18
Cambodia	Data collection in the Cambodia CO	March 21-24

⁵ The Advisory Group included seven members who are listed in Appendix III.

⁶ During Phase I, 108 stakeholders had been consulted.

⁷ Pacific and Caribbean.

Destination	Purpose	Dates
Armenia	Data collection in the Armenia CO	March 14-21
Georgia	Data collection in the Georgia CO	March 28 – April 3

Data Analysis

The team used descriptive, content, and comparative analyses to analyze the data for this study. Validity was ensured through data triangulation (using a convergence of multiple data sources) and compliance with standard evaluation practices. Based on the data analysis, the evaluation team developed findings and recommendations.

Evaluation Team

The evaluation team consisted of the following members:

- Anette Wenderoth – Team Leader
- Halcyon Louis – Regional Consultant (Asia Pacific)
- Sofia Zaragozin – Regional Consultant (LAC)
- Blanka Hancilova – Regional Consultant (EECA)
- Emma Mason – Analyst

Factors affecting data collection and analysis

Several factors supported the evaluation data collection process. UNFPA staff members at HQ, RO and CO levels provided logistical support which helped the evaluation team prepare for and conduct site visits in a relatively short timeframe, and also assisted in identifying and obtaining relevant documents in a timely manner. The evaluation team was able to build upon the experiences and lessons learned during Phase I in terms of both data collection logistics and evaluation content.

One key challenge for the evaluation was the fact that available UNFPA reports and other documents tended to be activity-oriented and provided limited information on results. Consultations with UNFPA staff and stakeholders provided some, but not always substantial, information on results. This issue was also flagged in Phase I of the evaluation. Another very minor limitation was that not all individuals suggested by UNFPA COs were available for consultations (one individual in Kyrgyzstan, two persons in Cambodia, and one person in Bangladesh). This did not, however, significantly reduce the evaluation team’s ability to triangulate data in the respective countries.

1.3 Terminology

Several sections of this report, in particular Chapter 5, make reference to results-based management (RBM) terminology. In this report, the following definitions were used:⁸

Goal – The higher order objective to which a development intervention is intended to contribute. Development goals refer to significant changes in the lives of people and are only achievable in the long term (i.e., 5 to 10 years or longer).

Outcome – The intended or achieved short and medium-term effects of an intervention or activity’s outputs, usually requiring the collective effort of partners. Outcomes represent changes in development conditions, more specifically institutional and/or behavioural changes of key actors. Outcomes are results to

⁸ Based on: RBM Terminology and definitions. UNFPA ESPB/PD. Updated version, April 2010.

which a particular development partner can contribute, but that require actions by others as well. A combination of outputs is usually needed to produce an outcome. It can be useful to distinguish between immediate, intermediate, and end outcomes.

Output – The products and services that result from the completion of activities within a development intervention. Outputs are expected to be achieved during the lifetime of a programme and the respective development partner leading them can be held accountable for them.

Indicator – A quantitative or qualitative measure of programme performance that is used to demonstrate change and that details the extent to which programme results are being or have been achieved.

1.4 Organization of the Report

The report is organized in seven chapters.

Following this introduction **chapter 2** summarizes key aspects within UNFPA’s external and internal environments that have been relevant in setting the context for the agency’s work on gender equality and human rights. **Chapter 3** presents evaluation findings with regard to results achievement and progress under Strategic Plan Goal 3 and its outcomes. **Chapter 4** analyzes the effectiveness of UNFPA’s strategy to integrate gender, human rights and culture in programming and its efforts in mainstreaming GE under the other two SP goals on Population and Development (Goal 1) and Reproductive Health (Goal 2).

Chapter 5 addresses the logic and appropriateness of the SP Goal 3 results chain, as well as its relation to and relevance for country programmes. **Chapter 6** summarizes observations regarding UNFPA’s organizational structures and relationships and their implications for the agency’s work on gender equality and human rights. Finally, **chapter 7** provides conclusions and recommendations to UNFPA that derive from the analysis and findings outlined in the report.

Key evaluation **findings** are embedded in chapters 2 to 6. A list of all evaluation findings can be found as **appendix IX**. Also, given the evaluation’s focus on generating information relevant to the whole organization, **country specific information** is incorporated into each chapter in order to illustrate and provide evidence for the respective overarching findings.

2. Programming Environment

2.1 Overview

This section notes aspects of UNFPA's external and internal environments since 2008 that are relevant to the evaluation foci.

2.2 External Environment

Global Environment

A number of global events since 2008 emphasize the continued relevance of and need for work on gender equality and women's reproductive rights.⁹

- The 2008 Accra High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness reinforced development partners' commitment to the principles of Aid Effectiveness as outlined in the 2005 Paris Declaration. The resulting *Accra Agenda for Action* acknowledged overall progress towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), yet also noted that poverty prevails and mostly affects women and girls. It emphasized the need for further strengthening country ownership of development processes, improving the effectiveness of partnerships among all development players, and focusing on development results and accountability.
- The Beijing +15 review (2010) acknowledged progress towards achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women, yet also stressed that severe challenges and obstacles remain in the implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. Key areas highlighted in the report include maternal mortality and morbidity and Female Genital Mutilation and Cutting (FGM/C).¹⁰
- At the September 2010 UN Summit on the Millennium Development Goals, Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon kicked off a major concerted worldwide effort to accelerate progress on women's and children's health. The *Global Strategy for Women's and Children's Health* combines pledges of more than \$40 billion over the next five years and includes national commitments to improving women's access to sexual and reproductive health (SRH) as well as broader commitments on furthering gender equality.¹¹
- Gender advocates have voiced concern over potential negative impacts of the ongoing global financial crisis on the lowest income countries, as well as on women globally. This crisis, especially, but not only in countries hardest hit by the AIDS pandemic, has put a disproportionate burden on women.¹² There is also widespread concern that the financial crisis may lead to a severe decrease in funds available for development assistance and thus in resources available for work on gender equality and human rights. Several UN agencies (including UNFPA) have observed or are expecting a decline in donor funds.

⁹ These were also noted in the Phase I evaluation report.

¹⁰ Commission on the Status of Women. Report on the 54th session, Economic and Social Council, Official Records 2010, Supplement No.7. E/2010/27. <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing15/index.html>

¹¹ For more information, see: http://www.un.org/sg/hf/global_strategy_commitments.pdf

¹² Beijing at Fifteen. UNFPA and Partners Charting the Way Forward. UNFPA 2010

UN Environment

UN Women: A recent change in the UN environment that is highly relevant in the context of this evaluation has been the creation and launch of *UN Women* as the UN's Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women. (Please also see sidebar). The new agency became operational on January 01, 2011 and is, at the time of writing this report, in the process of developing its first full Strategic Plan. UN Women's publication on its *Vision and 100-Day Action Plan* (February 2011) outlines five key priorities for the agency's work: 1) expanding women's voice, leadership and participation; 2) ending violence against women; 3) Strengthening the implementation of women's peace and security agenda; 4) enhancing women's economic empowerment; and 5) making gender equality priorities central to national, local, and sectoral planning, budgeting and statistics.

In July 2010, the United Nations General Assembly formally created UN Women by UN GA Resolution 62/689. The new agency merges four previously existing entities, namely the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW), the Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW), and Office of the Special Advisor on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women (OSAGI).

UN Women is likely to require some time to fully establish and/or expand its presence at the regional and country levels. UNFPA and all other UN agencies have welcomed the creation of the new entity and expressed their commitment to close collaboration. It remains to be seen whether and in what ways the existence of the new agency will affect the work and scope of activities of other UN agencies, including of UNFPA.

Other developments in the UN environment that are relevant to UNFPA's work on Gender Equality include the following:

- In June 2008, the UN Security Council adopted SCR 1820 which confronts sexual violence in conflict and post-conflict situations. Also in 2008, the Secretary General launched the *UNiTE to End Violence against Women* campaign that brings together eleven UN agencies (including UNFPA) in a joint effort to combat violence against women (VAW).¹³
- In June 2010, the United Nations Human Rights Council adopted resolution 11/8 on preventable maternal mortality and morbidity and human rights. The resolution is the first to recognize the human rights implications of preventable maternal mortality and morbidity and paves the way for renewed and greater emphasis on a human rights analysis of the Millennium Development Goal on maternal health (MDG 5).
- The 2010 High Level Segment of the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) held from 28 June – 2 July 2010 in New York focused on gender equality and women's empowerment.¹⁴

2.3 UNFPA Internal Environment

2.3.1 Corporate Level

A number of developments and changes within the UNFPA corporate environment since 2008 are relevant to the agency's work on gender equality and women's human rights, and had an impact (direct or indirect)

¹³ For more information see: <http://www.un.org/en/women/endviolence/about.shtml>

¹⁴ For more information, please visit: http://www.un-ngls.org/spip.php?page=article_s&id_article=2702

on the content and organization of UNFPA's work at global, regional, and country levels during the period under review.

Change in Leadership: In November 2010 Dr. Babatunde Osotimehin was appointed the successor of Thoraya Ahmend Obaid as UNFPA's Executive Director. Consulted UNFPA staff and partners indicated that they do not expect this change to result in major shifts in UNFPA's commitment to or work on gender equality and (women's) human rights.

Strategic Plan and Development Results Framework: Since 2008, UNFPA's work has been guided by the 2008-2011 (2013) Strategic Plan. Like its predecessor (the 2004-2007 Multi Year Funding Framework [MYFF]), the Strategic Plan (SP) highlights gender equality as one of UNFPA's corporate priorities. The Development Results Frameworks (DRFs) of both the MYFF and current SP each include one goal explicitly focusing on gender equality. However, while the 2004-2007 MYFF outlined only one broad outcome under this goal, the SP identifies four outcomes with different thematic foci (see chapter 5 for an analysis of the Goal 3 results chain).

The 2004-2007 MYFF Development Results Framework included a set of agency-wide outcomes and over 60 corporate outputs that guided the organization's work at all levels. Under the current SP, this approach was changed and Regional and Country Offices now define their own outputs. UNFPA hopes that this increased flexibility will allow regional and country outputs to be more responsive and relevant to national/regional priorities and needs. All UNFPA units, including country programmes, are obliged to report on progress against the corporate outcomes and indicators defined in the SP (see also sidebar).

Some of the country programmes reviewed were developed under the 2004-2007 MYFF and thus before the current SP (e.g., Bangladesh, Cambodia). To our knowledge, these programmes and their results frameworks were not adapted in or after 2008, but are used to report against the current SP outcomes.

Restructuring: In 2007, UNFPA underwent an organizational review resulting in a number of significant restructuring efforts. These included the creation of a Programming Division at HQ and the relocation of geographical divisions to the field as Regional Offices (RO). This change was aimed at strengthening country office (CO) performance by allowing for direct interaction and real-time response on relevant issues, and to help UNFPA forge strategic partnerships and work more closely with regional and sub-regional political and economic institutions. The previously existing Country Support Teams (responsible for providing technical advisory services to COs) were merged into the newly created ROs with the intention to consolidate programmatic and technical functions in the same structure and create a 'one-stop shop' for integrated technical and programmatic support to UN country teams and COs.¹⁵

All ROs were established in 2008. The process of becoming fully operational on the ground was fairly smooth for the Asia Pacific and LAC Regional Offices (APRO and LACRO), but the Eastern Europe & Central Asia Regional Office (EECARO) faced some challenges. Initially established in Slovakia, the RO was temporarily relocated to New York before moving to Turkey (Istanbul) in late 2010. These changes had implications for staffing (especially of national programme officers in Slovakia and Turkey) and for the RO's ability to get started with its content-related work.

Global and Regional Programmes: In addition to its work at the country level, UNFPA is also implementing its *Global and Regional Programme* (2008-2011) consisting of one global and five regional programmes. All of these focus on strategic policy and programmatic interventions at regional and global levels to create the operational support required by countries to implement the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) Programme of Action and respond to their national development

¹⁵ Review of the Organizational Structure of UNFPA, Report of the Executive Director. DP/FPA/2007/16. See also revised/new Terms of Reference for UNFPA Units, 2007.

priorities.¹⁶ Like country programmes, the global and five regional programmes are structured around the SP goals and outcomes but formulate their own outputs.

Roles, responsibilities and capacity for gender equality: While UNFPA’s commitment to gender mainstreaming implies that gender equality is the responsibility of all units within its organizational structure, units play different roles depending on their respective mandates. (Please see **Appendix VI** for more detailed information on the roles and responsibilities of organizational units and their responsibilities for gender equality and human rights.) The Gender, Human Rights and Culture Branch (GHRCB) in the Technical Division plays a central role as it is responsible for developing and sharing policy and programmatic guidance on gender equality across the organization (see sidebar).

Selected GHRCB Strategy/Guidance Documents since 2008

UNFPA Strategy and Framework for Action to Address Gender-Based Violence (2009)

Guidelines for Engaging Faith-Based Organizations as Agents of Change (2009)

Integrating Gender, Human Rights and Culture in UNFPA Programmes (2010)¹⁷

Recent external and internal assessments of UNFPA¹⁸ have flagged the strengths and weaknesses of the agency’s capacity for addressing gender equality. Key areas for improvement highlighted in these studies included the need to strengthen capacity for GE (number of staff, their knowledge and skills) across the organization, further strengthen the use of gender mainstreaming strategies at all levels, and the need to clarify that gender issues are not the responsibility of gender focal points and advisers only.¹⁹

2.3.2 Regional and Country Levels

This section highlights key characteristics of the three regions under review as well as in the six countries visited by the evaluation team.²⁰

¹⁶ DP/FPA/2007/19.

¹⁷ At the time of writing, GHRCB was finalizing revisions to the 2007 *Delivering on the Promise of Equality: UNFPA’s Strategic Framework on Gender Mainstreaming and Women’s Empowerment 2008-2011*.

¹⁸ DFID Gender Benchmarking Study (2010), CIDA GE Institutional Assessment (2009), and UNFPA Internal capacity assessment (2008)

¹⁹ Please see Phase I evaluation report for a more detailed list of both strengths and weaknesses of UNFPA’s capacity for gender equality that were pointed out in the mentioned reviews.

²⁰ Sources included: UNFPA Regional Programme for Asia and the Pacific at a Glance, UNFPA EECA Website: <http://eeca.unfpa.org>, Mid-Term Review Regional Programme 2008-2013 UNFPA Eastern Europe & Central Asia Regional Office (EECARO), Revised RPAP Draft 3 UNFPA Regional Programme for EECA 2008-2013, Draft Country Programme Document for Armenia 2010-2015, UNFPA Armenia Resource Mobilization Plan 2nd Country Programme 2010-2015, UNFPA Georgia website: www.unfpa.org.tr/georgia, Bangladesh Country Programme Document 2006-2010, UNFPA Cambodia website: <http://cambodia.unfpa.org>, Guatemala Country Programme Document 2010-2014, UNFPA Jamaica COAR 2010, UNFPA Jamaica Country Programme Document 2007-2011, AP at a Glance (2009).

Asia and the Pacific

The UNFPA Asia and Pacific region encompasses 23 Country Offices responsible for 36 different jurisdictions (please see sidebar). The region is home to 3.7 billion people, accounting for 60 percent of the global population. Although vast inequalities and stark socio-economic contrasts abound, significant progress has been made across the region in the reduction of extreme deprivation and hunger, widening access to basic services, including education and health, as well as the promotion of food security and economic growth.

However, an estimated 641 million people in the region survive on less than US \$1 per day, and struggle with poverty, disease and inequality.

While there are significant differences between countries, there are a number of development challenges that persist across the region, including: rural-urban migration within countries and cross-border migration; environmental degradation and vulnerability to natural disasters; growing youth populations lacking access to health services, education and employment; an ageing population, coupled with a large youth population, and an unmet need for family planning services and education. Women are affected by elevated maternal mortality, limited access to reproductive health services, gender inequality and discrimination, and various forms of gender-based violence.

Bangladesh

Fertility rates have been reduced significantly, from 6.5 children per woman in the early 1970s to 2.5 children per woman in 2010, and contraceptive use is reported at 56 percent.²¹ The maternal mortality rate has come down rapidly in the last ten years, from 320 per 100,000 live births in the early 2000s to 194 per 100,000 live births in 2010; a 40 per cent decline in 10 years!. Nevertheless, more than 75 per cent of all deliveries take place at home, and only 24 percent of all births are attended by skilled health personnel.

Gender disparities persist, and legal measures to protect women's rights are not effectively implemented.

Women constitute the majority of the poor, maternal malnutrition is high, and gender based violence (GBV) is prevalent including acid throwing, dowry-related abuse, honour killings, physical assaults and human trafficking.

Gains have been made in primary and secondary school enrolment for girls, reaching 86 percent, contributed to by a government project providing free schooling and stipends for girls through to the end of secondary school. Population make-up includes one quarter adolescents, and almost half of adolescent girls are married and 57 per cent become mothers before the age of 19. In the Bangladesh Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and the Bangladesh MDG report, goals are laid out to improve reproductive health, congruent with the goals of the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD), and the sector-wide approach (SWAp), which includes a safe motherhood component in the essential services package. Civil society organizations play an important role in the national context by making major contributions to promoting and protecting women's development and rights.

Countries covered by the Asia and Pacific RO

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, DPR Korea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pacific Islands (Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu), Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor Leste, and Viet Nam

UNFPA implemented its Seventh Country Programme in Bangladesh from 2006 to 2010.

²¹ Statistics differ by year and by UNFPA publication.

Cambodia

Notwithstanding the great progress that Cambodia has achieved since the Paris Peace Accord of 1991, poverty persists. One-quarter of the population lives below the poverty line (25 percent), and only 21 percent of the working age population receives wages on a regular basis from paid employment (AP at a Glance, 2009). In 2004 the government established the “Rectangular Strategy,” a mechanism to fulfill the Cambodian MDGs, which later helped to frame the National Strategic Development Plan 2006-2010 and its subsequent update – the National Strategic Development Plan Update 2009-2013, recognizing key priorities such as population, reproductive health and gender. The strategy has helped to focus national efforts on education and health, improving literacy and elementary school enrolment levels, and decreasing infant and child mortality rates.

However, maternal mortality rates remain high (472 deaths per 100,000 live births), and access to reproductive

UNFPA implemented its Third Country Programme in Cambodia from 2006 to 2010.

health services, though increasing, remains limited. Gender inequality is present in many spheres of life, notably in the education system and labour market, and is deep-rooted throughout society. Thirty-seven percent of the women in Cambodia aged 25 years and over have little or no education, in contrast to 15 percent of men in the same age range. GBV remains widespread and largely under-reported. Although there is a high unmet need for family planning services and Cambodia’s HIV/AIDS prevalence rates are the highest in Asia, the country has made great strides in these areas, seeing a dramatic increase in contraceptive use and a decline in new HIV/AIDS infection rates.

Eastern Europe and Central Asia

The UNFPA Eastern Europe and Central Asia region includes 20 Country Offices. Among the countries in the sub-regions, there are considerable differences in economic strength and a wide range of ethnic and faith-based groups. Following the

collapse of communist regimes in the region, the area has experienced extreme transformations over the last two decades, affecting political, social and economic spheres. Some countries in Eastern Europe have

Countries covered by Eastern Europe and Central Asia RO

Albania, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Macedonia, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan

gained entry into the European Union, while others are still working towards this goal. New economic and geo-political cooperation structures have been formed in the region including the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC), the Eurasian Economic Community (EAEC), and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO).

Even with these new forms of cooperation, tensions over historical and regional geopolitical conflicts persist, threatening achievements in economic and social development. Certain countries in the region have experienced the effects of the global economic crisis that started in 2008 relatively severely. This has resulted in increased labour migration, vulnerability of younger populations to HIV, and the fastest growing AIDS epidemic in the world.²²

Over the past two decades, women and vulnerable groups across the region have faced deteriorating health and education services, and have become more vulnerable due to gender disparities and GBV. While at the national level, GBV is gaining attention and becoming the focus of social policies, the problem persists and, according to some consulted stakeholders, is increasing. All countries in the region are both sources and receivers of human trafficking of women and girls for sexual exploitation. Further, since the breakup of

²² The number of infections increased from 30,000 in 1995 to 1.4 million in 2004.

the Soviet Union, several societies in the region (especially in Central Asia, but also in Eastern Europe) are experiencing the revival and re-emergence of pre-Soviet ethics and traditional practices such as polygamy and bride-kidnapping, which had been abolished. A considerable number of faith-based /religious groups play an important role in affirming or at least tolerating these practices. This trend threatens to reverse previously made gains for gender equality.

Armenia

After declaring independence from the former Soviet Union in 1991, Armenia made major gains in political stability and economic growth, halving the number of people living under the poverty line between 1999 and 2007. However more than 25 percent of the population were still living in poverty in 2007, a number that has grown since 2008, impacted by the global economic crisis which has stunted and even reversed Armenia's exemplary economic growth over the past decade. A major effect of Armenia's political, economic and social transitions has been a marked decline in population growth that is coupled with the socio-economic demands of an aging population. Although some reproductive health indicators have shown improvement, such as maternal and infant mortality rates, abortion rates remain high due to the lack of accessibility and availability of family planning education and services, and/or a lack of knowledge of existing services. The incidence of sexually transmitted diseases including HIV/AIDS remains high.

UNFPA implemented its first Country Programme in Armenia from 2005 to 2009, and is currently implementing its second programme.

GBV remains culturally ingrained, and the legal system does not entirely support prevention of GBV. Human trafficking has become a problem that disproportionately affects women and girls in Armenia, exacerbated by poverty and unequal work opportunities. Despite these challenges, Armenia has comprehensive policies regarding reproductive health (2007-2015), a newly established state demographic policy (2009-2035), maternal and child health services (2003-2015) and a policy on child and adolescent health and development (2009-2015). These provide frameworks from which a stronger health care system with reproductive health services can be supported – a priority of the national government that receives significant funding from international sources. At the same time, national policy frameworks often remain under-implemented.

Georgia

Due to poverty and unemployment, Georgia has faced depopulation on a massive scale – from 5.4 million in 1991 to 4.4 million in 2003. Birth rates have dropped and the population is ageing. Georgia's sustainable development is endangered by poor social policies, weak institutional capacity, increasing poverty, unemployment, and poor access to basic social services. The violent conflict in 2008 disrupted development efforts, yet also led to

UNFPA implemented its first Country Programme in Georgia from 2006 to 2010, and is currently implementing its second programme.

a considerable flow of international aid into the country. Although Georgians now enjoy many more rights, freedoms and opportunities than in Soviet times, the persistent socio-economic difficulties have created a gender imbalance and eroded the status of women in society.

While education levels of both men and women are high, empowerment among women in Georgia is still low, and women are more vulnerable to poverty than men. GBV, especially domestic and sexual violence as well as trafficking, is a persistent challenge, with permissive attitudes being widespread, including among law enforcement and judicial bodies.

Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC)

The UNFPA LAC region is made up of 47 countries with a population of 570 million. Socio-economic inequalities are deeply ingrained; 10 percent of the population controls 50 percent of the region's income, and the poorest 10 percent survives on a 1.6 percent share. Democracy has spread across the region, civil society has been strengthened, advances have been made in human rights, and extreme poverty has been reduced, but economic growth has been limited and poverty remains a chronic problem. While access to education has improved, the school drop-out rate for adolescents is 50 percent; on average women still receive less education than men.

Countries covered by Latin America and the Caribbean RO

Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela

Caribbean countries that speak English and Dutch: Belize, Guyana, Saint Lucia, Jamaica, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, Netherlands Antilles, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Turks and Caicos

In comparison to men, a disproportionate numbers of women are unemployed, along with youth and indigenous populations. These groups have increased levels of fertility, maternal and infant mortality, pregnancy amongst adolescent girls, lower life expectancy, education abandonment, and have less access to sexual and reproductive health education and services than the general population. In Latin America the AIDS epidemic is considered to be stable, but in the Caribbean, AIDS is among the leading causes of death of among people aged 25 to 44. Fuelling this epidemic are weak policy frameworks and lack of inter-sectoral coordination, limited prevention strategies, inadequate access to antiretroviral treatments, coupled with gender disparities, stigma and discrimination.

Especially in the Caribbean another common challenge is the early onset of sexual initiation, rape, incest and carnal abuse. At the same time, adolescent fertility rates have declined in most Caribbean countries. Gender inequality also presents itself in the workplace; although education rates among women are greater than those amongst men, salaries and labour market conditions continue to be more favourable for males.

Various countries in the LAC region have passed legislation concerning reproductive rights, adopted legal frameworks, instituted gender mechanisms pertaining to equally opportunity measures, and institutionalized laws and policies to address GBV. Across the region there has been progress in developing policies within the frameworks of the ICPD and the MDGs, but there are challenges in mobilizing government resources and in implementation.

Guatemala

With 14 million people, Guatemala's population is primarily young (69 percent under the age of 30), rural and poor. Extreme inequality persists: two percent of the population controls 64 percent of the land and 10 percent receive more than half of all national income. The situation is especially dire for indigenous women and rural indigenous communities who have the highest rates of illiteracy, malnutrition, maternal and infant mortality, and unmet needs for family planning. The use of contraceptives is the third lowest in Latin America (43 percent).

The recent situation in Guatemala has been characterized by high levels of violence (not only, but especially against women), and an overall climate of insecurity. A particular concern is the increase in the number of femicide cases, combined with a lack of protection mechanisms and access to justice. The current government has shown a considerable amount of political will to mainstream gender into the work of line ministries and government specialized units. At the same time, social justice advocates criticize the

UNFPA is currently implementing its sixth Country Programme in Guatemala (2010 to 2014).

government for not demonstrating a similar commitment to addressing intercultural issues, in particular related to the rights of indigenous populations. Some gender advocates are concerned that the upcoming presidential elections (2011) and the possible change in elected officials may negatively affect government efforts around gender equality.

Jamaica

In 2009/2010 Jamaica developed a 25-year National Development Plan (NDP) with the goal of attaining developed country status by 2030. However, the development agenda has been side-tracked by serious challenges that include high levels of violence, crime and security concerns, the debt burden, and inequality. In this context, issues such

as reproductive health are not considered priorities and do not receive adequate funding. Jamaica has one of the world's highest emigration rates: from 1965 to 2000, it lost 85 to 90 percent of its most skilled workers and almost one-third of the general workforce to developed countries.

UNFPA is currently implementing its fourth Country Programme in Jamaica (2007 to 2011)
--

3. Results Achievement under Goal 3

3.1 Overview

This chapter presents the evaluation findings on UNFPA results for Goal 3 of the Strategic Plan 2008-2013.

GOAL 3: Gender equality advanced and women and adolescent girls empowered to exercise their human rights, particularly their reproductive rights, and live free of discrimination and violence.
(UNFPA SP 2008-2011, Development Results Framework. 2008)

- Section 3.2 examines UNFPA’s overall progress toward Goal 3;
- Section 3.3 discusses the four outcomes of Goal 3 in terms of UNFPA Country Office contributions, and provides key observations and questions that emerged from the evaluation ; and
- Section 3.4 presents overarching issues pertaining to all four outcomes.

3.2 Overall Progress towards Goal 3

Finding 1: All consulted stakeholders described UNFPA as a highly respected and effective advocate for gender equality and women’s empowerment at the country level that often takes a leadership role among UN agencies and development partners.

Phase II of the evaluation confirmed the very positive overall assessment of UNFPA’s role and reputation for its work on gender equality. Almost all consulted national partners, both government agencies and NGOs, and most consulted international partners described UNFPA as a dedicated and effective advocate for gender equality and women’s rights issues and as a partner that is respected and trusted. Furthermore, partners repeatedly described UNFPA staff members at the country level responsible for gender-equality work as dedicated, knowledgeable, flexible, and easy to work with.

UNFPA is playing a leadership role in initiating and/or coordinating gender-related development efforts with UN agencies and other development

We consider UNFPA as a long term partner that is flexible and responsive, and takes a short time to respond to our needs.
Government representative, Armenia

partners – especially (but not only) in countries where UNIFEM/UN Women does not yet have a presence. UNFPA has been an active member and has often taken the lead on gender issues within UN Country Teams (UNCTs) and in inter-agency working groups on gender equality and GBV. In several reviewed countries, national partners described UNFPA as ‘the’ agency working on gender equality. For example:

- In Bangladesh, Myanmar and the Pacific Sub-Region, UNFPA is chair of UN Gender Theme Group; in Bangladesh, it is the lead for the strategic pillar on gender equality and women’s advancement²³; in Myanmar, it chairs the Women’s Protection Technical Working Group.
- In Guatemala, UNFPA heads the inter-agency table on gender. In Armenia, UNFPA is co-chair of the UN extended Gender Theme Group and is widely seen as the lead agency for gender equality not only in the UN system, but countrywide. In Georgia, UNFPA is leading the donor’s coordination group on gender.
- UNFPA is involved in and often plays a lead role in Joint UN Programmes related to gender equality issues, in particular VAW/GBV (e.g., in Bangladesh, Colombia, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, the Solomon Islands, and the Maldives).

²³ The strategic pillar on Gender Equality and Women’s Advancement is one of six national priority areas that were jointly identified by the UN country team and the government of Bangladesh.

At the sub-regional and regional levels UNFPA is playing a similar leadership role, e.g. in Asia and Pacific the RO has spearheaded policy dialogue to address the issue of gender inequality in the region by chairing the thematic group on gender, and co-chairing the Task Force on Women, Peace and Security in relation to the UNite campaign in the AP region.

Finding 2: There is considerable evidence that UNFPA activities at the country level are relevant to Goal 3 and contribute to its four stated outcomes. However, due to the lack of a comprehensive logical framework, it is not possible to assess UNFPA’s overall progress in terms of the stated outcomes and indicators of SP Goal 3, or how country-level results contribute to the organization’s intended overall results.

It was not possible to assess UNFPA’s progress against Goal 3 using the goal and outcome indicators stated in the UNFPA Strategic Plan, for several reasons:

- The logical relationships between country-level results (outputs and outcomes) and corporate SP outcomes have not been defined and are not evident;
- SP outcome indicators have not been used (and are not suitable) for tracking progress at the country level,²⁴ and country-level achievements cannot be aggregated to the organizational level;
- Most of the information elicited through the evaluation document review and stakeholder consultations related to completed activities rather than development results.

Nevertheless, there is considerable evidence that all reviewed UNFPA Country Offices in the five regions reviewed²⁵ have supported a wide variety of activities that are relevant to Goal 3 and that have contributed or are very likely to contribute to output-level results related to all four outcomes of Goal 3. While it was not possible to capture these results in terms of the indicators outlined in the SP, they constitute the basis for the evaluation’s overall positive assessment of UNFPA’s work on gender equality at the country level.

Finding 3: Consulted UNFPA staff and stakeholders noted that in light of the changing global context, especially the creation of UN Women, UNFPA may need to define an even clearer focus for its work related to gender equality.

All consulted UNFPA staff and partners agreed that gender equality is key to UNFPA’s mandate and that the agency must and will continue to address gender equality in its work. Consulted stakeholders had slightly differing views with regard to the creation of UN Women and the impact it may have on UNFPA’s role in relation to gender. While some stakeholders do not expect this to affect the scope or nature of UNFPA’s work, many others commented that UNFPA would need to better define and focus its gender-related work.

As UN Women develops its field presence, it may be necessary to re-distribute responsibilities among UN agencies, especially in countries where UNFPA has been the only lead UN agency on women’s and gender issues. Some consulted stakeholders foresee increased competition for donor funds between UNFPA and UN Women in areas that both work on such as

Prior to the launch of UN Women there was no need to identify an agency that would have oversight of the strategic pillar for gender as it would automatically fall under the jurisdiction of UNFPA. However, there is now a need for architectural change to allocate gender responsibilities. National stakeholder, APR

Overall our gender work has been broad [...]. With UN Women influencing the landscape we should now look at focusing our work on SGBV prevention and response issues in relation to reproductive health. UNFPA Staff Member, EECAR

²⁴ See chapter 5 of this report for a more detailed discussion of these issues.

²⁵ Africa and Arab States during Phase I, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Asia and the Pacific during Phase II

SGBV and VAW. Others see the creation of UN Women as an opportunity for UNFPA to focus its gender-related work more clearly around the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) agenda²⁶ and to overcome the observation that, in some cases, UNFPA has spread itself too thin. See sidebar.

3.3 UNFPA Achievements under Goal 3 Outcomes

3.3.1 Introduction

This section examines UNFPA achievements under each of the four outcomes of Goal 3. As noted above, the evaluation team found considerable anecdotal evidence of UNFPA contributions in all areas, but little hard data on results. The Strategic Plan indicators for all four outcomes focus on the proportion of all countries that UNFPA works in and are not helpful for capturing the extent or specific nature of UNFPA's work at the *country* level. In addition, there is some overlap between outcomes, and consequently stakeholders are not always clear about where to report on activities or results.

3.3.2 Outcome 1

The Outcome 1 statement and two outcome indicators as outlined in the SP are shown in the sidebar.

The 2010 Report of the UNFPA Executive Director noted that since 2007 there has been an increase in the proportion of UNFPA programming countries (from 78 to 91 per cent) that

incorporate reproductive rights in their CEDAW reports. The report did not comment on the first indicator (implementation and enforcement of policies and laws).

However, available data do not provide insights on UNFPA's specific contributions to reported changes at the country, regional, or global level. Given that the two indicators for Outcome 1 focus on the proportion of all countries that UNFPA works in, they are not suitable (and have not been used by UNFPA CO staff) for measuring progress at the country level.²⁸ Consequently, the evaluation team focused on other available information on UNFPA activities and/or results that were relevant to the development changes described in the outcome statement (i.e., the development or strengthening of national policies or laws concerning gender equality and women's human rights).

The document review and consultations with stakeholders confirmed that there is **considerable evidence** of relevant UNFPA activities related to Outcome 1 (also noted in Phase I of the evaluation). All COs reviewed in the three regions have undertaken efforts to support the integration of GE and women's human rights into national policies, frameworks and laws, and have, in doing so, contributed to a number of output-level results.

UNFPA has assisted with the **development** and/or **revision** of national GE policies (e.g., through capacity development, financial and technical assistance) and has provided support for the **dissemination**,

Outcome 1: Gender equality and the human rights of women and adolescent girls, particularly their reproductive rights, integrated in national policies, development frameworks and laws.

Outcome Indicators²⁷

Proportion of countries that implement/enforce policies and laws in line with the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security in conflict and post conflict

Proportion of countries that have incorporated reproductive rights into the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) reports

²⁶ See section 3.3, observations and questions related to Outcome 1.

²⁷ As per Strategic Plan Results Framework

²⁸ See Chapter 5 and Appendix VII of this report for a more detailed discussion of the outcome indicators.

implementation and (to a lesser extent) **monitoring** of GE-related country commitments. In doing so, CO efforts and their envisaged results actually exceed the types of changes outlined in the outcome statement. Exhibit 3.1 below summarizes the key types of efforts that UNFPA has supported, and provides some examples of specific activities/results achieved in the reviewed countries.

Exhibit 3.1 Outcome 1 Activities and Achievements

Type of Effort ²⁹	Examples of UNFPA Activities/Achievements
<p>National policies, development frameworks and laws better reflect the rights of women and adolescents, particularly their reproductive rights</p>	<p>UNFPA has supported national governments in the development or revision of national policies, development frameworks, and action plans for gender equality. Selected examples:</p> <p>Armenia –development of a National Action Plan to combat GBV. Support to the development of a gender policy strategic program and action plan.</p> <p>Georgia –drafting of the National Action Plan on Elimination of Domestic Violence for 2009-2010.</p> <p>Maldives - development of the National Gender policy.</p> <p>Jamaica –incorporation of reproductive health into National Gender Policy, developed in 2007 also with assistance from UNFPA.</p> <p>Costa Rica – development of the institutional gender policy for the Social Security office.</p> <p>Colombia - provided technical assistance to the Attorney General’s Office and to the Judicial Sector to design gender equality policies using participatory methodologies</p> <p>Guatemala - provided technical assistance to the government, in particular to SEPREM (Secretaría Presidencial de la Mujer) in the development of the National Policy on the Promotion and Development of Women 2008-2023.</p> <p>Cambodia –Supported the Ministry of Women’s Affairs and National Assembly to adopt the Law on the Prevention of Domestic Violence and the Protection of Victims (2005); and the National Action Plan to Prevent Violence Against Women- domestic violence (2009).</p> <p>Pacific - development of national policies and (multi-sectoral) national action plans to eliminate VAW in two countries (Kiribati and Solomon islands) – which have been approved by Cabinet.</p>
	<p>UNFPA efforts have included advocacy work as well as research/knowledge generation for the development or improvement of relevant policies, development frameworks, and laws, for example:</p> <p>Bosnia and Herzegovina - conducted advocacy for strengthening the legislation mechanisms and strategic framework on reproductive health.</p> <p>Armenia –assessment of the Republic of Armenia Legislation from GBV perspective.</p> <p>Myanmar – conducted a situation analysis of Population and Development, Reproductive Health and Gender.</p> <p>Colombia, Guatemala – lobbying for the formulation of a national policy for the advancement of women.</p>
	<p>UNFPA has made efforts to strengthen the capacity of government representatives responsible for the drafting of gender relevant frameworks and laws. For example:</p> <p>Ecuador – The CO worked to strengthen the capacity of the Parliamentary Group of Women’s Rights within the National Assembly to elaborate new laws and reforms necessary to incorporate gender equality and women’s rights, especially sexual and reproductive rights.</p>

²⁹ The three ‘types of effort’ are the same that were used to categorize activities/achievements for Outcome 1 in Phase I of the evaluation.

Type of Effort ²⁹	Examples of UNFPA Activities/Achievements
Implementation or enforcement of national commitments to gender equality and women's human rights	<p>UNFPA COs have undertaken a broad range of efforts to strengthen national capacity for implementing/enforcing national gender policies, development frameworks, and laws. This has included efforts to - more broadly – assist national partners (duty bearers) to effectively and systematically apply gender equality principles in their work. Selected examples:</p> <p>Cambodia - supported the Ministries of Health, Planning, and Women's Affairs to develop and implement strategies for gender equality mainstreaming under the National Strategic Plan for Gender Equality Mainstreaming; supported the establishment of Gender Mainstreaming Action Groups in 24 out of 27 ministries.</p> <p>Belarus - participated in regular policy meetings/discussions with government partners on gender mainstreaming.</p> <p>Armenia - supported Ministry of Labour and Social Issues to develop a National Strategy and Action Plan on Gender equality under the State Gender Policy Concept Paper.</p> <p>Costa Rica - assisted National Parliament and the Social Security Institution in charge of public health services with developing gender policies; strengthened INAMU's (Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres) leadership role for the promotion of the National Gender Policy.</p> <p>Jamaica – supported re-establishment of a committee to oversee the implementation of the National Gender Policy.</p> <p>Peru - supported MIMDES (Ministry of Women and Social Development) through legal technical assistance to strengthen their leadership role on gender equality, especially in inter-sectoral coordination.</p> <p>Guatemala - institutional strengthening of the presidential secretariat of women, which has permitted the signing of 13 covenants for the institutionalization of National Policy on the Promotion and Development of Women.</p> <p>Maldives – strengthened the Ministry of Finance and Treasury's capacity for Gender Responsive Budgeting.</p> <p>In several countries UNFPA has supported the establishment or functioning of dialogue mechanisms between government and civil society related to the development and implementation of national gender equality commitments (e.g., Georgia, Guatemala, Jamaica, and Bangladesh).</p> <p>UNFPA has assisted national governments to comply with international treaty reporting mechanisms such as CEDAW. For example:</p> <p>Georgia - supported the compilation of CEDAW reports and/or the dissemination of CEDAW concluding comments and observations.</p> <p>Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) - supported the national Gender Equality Agency to develop the BiH CEDAW Report for the period 2006-2010.</p>
Effective monitoring of national GE commitments	<p>Georgia – organized a meeting to present the findings and recommendations of the Report Review of the Gender Equality Strategy and Monitoring of the 2007-2009 National Action Plan on Gender Equality in the Parliament of Georgia.</p> <p>Guatemala – supported the design and establishment of an evaluation and monitoring system for the National Policy of Promotion and Development of Women. Targeted women leaders now understand the National Policy and know how to monitor its implementation.</p>

Outcome 1 – Observations and Questions

Our review of available data on UNFPA activities and achievements under Outcome 1 raises a number of observations and questions as outlined below.

From Policy to Implementation: Phase II data confirmed an issue flagged during Phase I. Consulted stakeholders in most reviewed countries noted that while there has been progress in the development or revision of national policies, development frameworks and laws for gender equality and women's human rights issues, their *implementation* remains a major challenge. Frequently cited obstacles to the effective

translation of policy into practice were gaps in national capacity and resources, as well as lack of political will and/or incentives for national governments.³⁰ Our data provide limited and varying information on the extent to which UNFPA COs

In Guatemala, the National Women's Machinery regards UNFPA as a key partner for all aspects of creating and implementing gender related public policy. The gender mainstreaming strategy for the government was developed with UNFPA assistance, allowing the agency to play a key and crucial role in the process of institutionalizing gender across government.

(can) provide systematic assistance to national partners for the implementation/application of policies and laws. In most cases, related support appears to be part of broader UNFPA assistance for gender mainstreaming across national governments (see also sidebar).

Scope of UNFPA's engagement: While Outcome 1 does not focus exclusively on women's reproductive rights (RR), the outcome statement specifically mentions these and thus implies that RRs are to be at the centre of UNFPA's efforts around policies, laws, and national development frameworks. The examples of actual activities and achievements above illustrate that a considerable part of UNFPA's work under this outcome is indeed closely linked to RRs. At the same time UNFPA is also engaged in broader, more generic efforts around gender equality, such as helping to build national governments' overall capacity for gender mainstreaming. The 'lines' of what does and does not fall within UNFPA's mandate are not clear cut, and depends in part on the national context (e.g., other agencies working on GE issues in the country). Given UNFPA's overall commitment to gender equality, one could argue that almost any effort that seeks to advance gender equality is within UNFPA's mandate. However, given UNFPA's finite and often limited resources for GE, and in light of the creation of UN Women, there are strong indications that the Fund will need to be more focused and selective in its areas of work to support and complement the work of other agencies and avoid duplication, while reinforcing its commitment to gender equality in line with guidance from the Secretary General. At the same time, being selective may be difficult especially in countries where UNFPA is the only UN agency on the ground that addresses gender issues, and/or where national capacity for all gender issues (not only for sexual and reproductive health and rights [SRHR]) is low.

3.3.3 Outcome 2

The Outcome 2 statement and two outcome indicators as outlined in the SP are shown in the sidebar.

The 2010 Report of the UNFPA Executive Director includes information on the first indicator and notes a significant decrease in the proportion of women that have undergone Female Genital

Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C) in at least six countries.³¹ The report includes no data on the second indicator. Given that the indicators focus on global developments, they are not helpful for capturing the specific type or extent of UNFPA's contributions. Thus, as it did for Outcome 1, the evaluation team focused on gathering information on UNFPA CO activities and results that were relevant to the envisaged development change described in the outcome statement.

In Phase I of the evaluation, which focused on the Arab States and Africa regions, most reported UNFPA activities and achievements under Outcome 2 were related to the first indicator (FGM/C). In LACR,

Outcome 2: Gender equality, reproductive rights and the empowerment of women and adolescent girls promoted through an enabling socio-cultural environment that is conducive to male participation and the elimination of harmful practices

Indicators

Female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM/C) prevalence rate

Percentage of women who decide alone or jointly with their husbands/partners/others about their own healthcare

³⁰ Please also see paragraph 71. of the 2010 Report of the UNFPA Executive Director that notes the same challenge (low rate of implementation of laws and policies) and likely reasons.

³¹ Burkina Faso, Egypt, Eritrea, Kenya, Nigeria, and Senegal

EECAR and APR, however, female genital mutilation is not a significant problem.³² Instead, the efforts of the reviewed COs focused on working with **faith-based organizations** (FBOs), **men and boys**, and **youth** to encourage their constructive engagement in the achievement of gender equality. Exhibit 3.2 below shows the types of efforts and some examples of UNFPA initiatives in the reviewed countries.

Exhibit 3.2 Outcome 2 Efforts and Achievements

Type of Effort ³³	Examples of UNFPA Activities /Achievement
<p>Awareness raising and advocacy for gender equality among the general population, in particular men and boys, and youth</p>	<p>UNFPA has worked on raising awareness of the general population, in particular of men and youth (male and female), of gender equality issues, particularly GBV/DV and SRH. Selected examples:</p> <p>Armenia – supporting public campaigns against GBV; involving men in fighting GBV (e.g., White Ribbon campaign³⁴); organizing awareness raising events for male and female students, teachers, and university lecturers. Similar activities (training for men) were introduced in Georgia.</p> <p>Bangladesh – efforts to engage men and boys to end violence against women.</p> <p>Cambodia – national and community-based programming with adults and youths to raise awareness of GBV and the rights of women.</p> <p>Jamaica – supported the Bureau of Women's Affairs in working with young men to discuss prevention of GBV and train them as advocates for the elimination of VAW. Created a men's desk in the women's affairs office. Provided assistance to various Caribbean conferences on masculinities³⁵.</p> <p>Peru – programme to motivate young men to critically reflect on rigid norms related to manhood and how these influence their lives (health, personal relations, sexual and reproductive health, and fatherhood).</p> <p>Guatemala – support conduct of national meeting and implementation of national plan on masculinities.</p> <p>Myanmar – fostering male involvement to improve joint decision making on RH issues.</p> <p>BIH - peer education programme to encourage boys and girls to take equal responsibility for a couple's sexual and reproductive health.</p> <p>Ecuador – promoting inclusion of young men in RH through research, sensitization, training and participation; supported women and youth organizations, including indigenous women, to empower them and improve knowledge about gender equality and reproductive rights.</p> <p>Bangladesh and Costa Rica (among others) – joint meeting of UNFPA COs from around the globe to discuss ongoing initiatives and ways to strengthen work on involving men and boys.</p> <p>Pacific – through the joint UN program 'Partners for Prevention', UNFPA has supported research, advocacy and other outreach activities in a variety of countries in the Sub-Region. The programme is aimed at primary prevention - stopping violence before it starts – especially among boys and men.</p>

³² During Phase II we found one example of work related to FGM – the Colombia CO works to protect and promote the human rights of indigenous women and raise awareness of sexual and reproductive rights, including debates on the use of female genital mutilation.

³³ The 'types of effort' differ from those used during Phase I of the evaluation given that FGM/C is not a significant issue in the reviewed COs in LACR, APR, and EECAR.

³⁴ Please also see <http://www.genderbasedviolence.am/en>.

³⁵ The discussion of masculinities encourages men to consider the success-related and responsibility-related aspects of masculinity, not only the aggressive and sexual aspects of masculinity.

Type of Effort ³³	Examples of UNFPA Activities /Achievement
Enhance knowledge and awareness of gender equality issues among culturally relevant opinion leaders and secure their support	<p>UNFPA COs have reached out to opinion leaders, particularly from faith-based organizations (FBOs), to secure their support in addressing gender inequalities. GBV/DV has been a strong thematic focus. Selected examples:</p> <p>APRO has established various regional partnerships with FBOs to eliminate GBV.</p> <p>Georgia - supported training on domestic violence for young clergy from various FBOs.</p> <p>Armenia - work with the Armenian Apostolic and Catholic Churches to address issues of domestic violence through community priests.</p> <p>Kyrgyzstan – conducted Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) studies among religious leaders to feed into capacity development initiatives concerning GBV.</p> <p>Bangladesh – conducted capacity building for religious leaders (male and female) in the areas of women’s rights, reproductive health, family planning and gender issues. Conduct research on masculinity and GBV.</p>
Initiate and/or support community level work on the abandonment of harmful traditional practices	<p>Colombia – supported a four-year process of community consultations, advocacy and capacity development that resulted in the Embera de Risarlada indigenous community suspending the practice of female genital mutilation.</p>

Outcome 2 – Observations and Questions

Male involvement/‘masculinities’: There is considerable evidence of UNFPA COs making efforts to address gender equality in a holistic way by emphasizing the role and involvement of men and boys in the move towards equality. Especially notable is UNFPA’s work around the concept of ‘masculinities’ (e.g., in the Jamaica and other Caribbean COs) which addresses men not only in terms of how they support or hinder the realization of *women’s* rights, but also focuses on male identity/identities and related challenges and opportunities. UNFPA’s mandate around SRHR puts it in a good position to work on gender equality in a way that goes beyond addressing women’s issues only. A holistic approach to the notion of ‘gender equality’ may become increasingly relevant in light of the (potential) need for UNFPA to further define its own niche around gender equality and distinguish itself from other UN agencies, in particular UN Women.

Strategy or result? During Phase I of the evaluation we noted that consulted UNFPA staff appeared to consider activities with FBOs, youth, and men and boys as *achievements* in themselves, rather than as strategies. Data collected during Phase II modify this observation, as most UNFPA CO staff members consulted during this second phase clearly described their work with men and boys, or FBOs as *strategies* aiming to influence the socio-cultural environment for gender equality and women’s human rights. Consultations with UNFPA partners (e.g., representatives of targeted FBOs) confirmed that UNFPA project activities had contributed to output-level achievements – e.g., contributed to enhancing participants’/partners’ awareness and knowledge of gender equality/women’s human rights issues as well as of their actual and potential personal roles in furthering gender equality. Please also see sidebar.

“Until this joint project [with UNFPA] I would never have thought that within our society GBV is such a big issue.”

FBO Representative, EECAR

Outcome statement: As noted in Phase I of the evaluation, the current formulation of the outcome statement makes it difficult to detect what specific development change it is describing. The assumed relationship between the concepts of a conducive socio-cultural environment, male participation, and the elimination of harmful practices is unclear. Further, the outcome indicators only focus on one of these three issues, namely FGM/C as a specific type of harmful practice. The relevance of the second outcome indicator³⁶ is not evident, and evaluation data provide no evidence of activities or results that could be or have been

³⁶ Percentage of women who decide alone or jointly with their husbands/partners/others about their own healthcare.

measured by this indicator. As during Phase I, consultations with UNFPA staff at regional and country levels indicated a considerable range of interpretations of this outcome. Some consulted CO staff members in LACR and EECAR interpreted the outcome as being ‘about FGM/C’ only (the first indicator) and hence felt that it was not relevant in their national context. Further, a considerable number of results reported under this outcome in the reviewed Country Office Annual Reports (COARs) did not visibly link to either the outcome statement or to one of the indicators, thus confirming the challenge in interpreting the outcome statement.

3.3.4 Outcome 3

The Outcome 3 statement and the outcome indicator as outlined in the SP are shown in the sidebar.

The 2010 Report of the UNFPA Executive Director provided data on the increase in the proportion of countries

that have incorporated reproductive rights in national human rights protection systems (from 61.7 percent in 2007 to 69.2 percent in 2010).

Outcome 3: Human rights protection systems (including national human rights councils, ombudspersons, and conflict-resolution mechanisms) and participatory mechanisms are strengthened to protect reproductive rights of women and adolescent girls, including the right to be free from violence.

Indicator

Proportion of countries with reproductive rights incorporated in national human rights protection system

Similar to Outcomes 1 and 2 above, the outcome indicator focuses on global trends but is not helpful for capturing the specific types of contribution made by UNFPA towards the envisaged change at the *country* level. Again, the evaluation team focused on anecdotal evidence, provided in documents and consultations, of activities and results relevant to the outcome statement.

As during Phase I of the evaluation, overall data provide the least amount of evidence of country level activities or achievements under Outcome 3. However, in Phase II there were clear regional differences: Countries in the LAC region (e.g., Guatemala and Colombia) reported a number of efforts and achievements under Outcome 3 while other COs reviewed reported no activities (e.g., Belarus, Georgia). COARs of other COs include a number of activities under this outcome, but not all of these are evidently relevant in terms of strengthening human rights protection systems and/or participatory mechanisms.

The available data indicate that COs focus on three key types of efforts in relation to strengthening Human Rights Protection Systems – i) contributing to the generation of public awareness and knowledge on (women’s) human rights, as well as on existing violations or ‘gaps’ in this regard, ii) supporting the strengthening of capacity of duty bearers (from executive, judicial and legislative) to promote and protect women’s human rights, and iii) help strengthen the capacity of rights holders and their organizations to assert and monitor the implementation of women’s human rights.

Exhibit 3.3 below provides some examples of relevant activities or results achieved in the reviewed countries.³⁷

³⁷ This includes some examples that, in the respective COARs, had been reported under other outcomes, but that, in our understanding, better ‘fit’ here.

Exhibit 3.3 Outcome 3 Efforts and Achievements

Type of Effort ³⁸	Examples of UNFPA Efforts/Achievement
<p>Knowledge generation and awareness raising on Women's Human Rights</p>	<p>Guatemala</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported local and national media campaigns to draw attention to and promote the rights of women, including reproductive rights. • Technical and financial support for a report on the situation and condition of Guatemalan women, with emphasis on indicators of human development, access to basic services, maternal health coverage, and economic and labour situation. <p>APRO supported the Asian-Pacific Resource and Resource Centre for Women to prepare an advocacy brief on SRH-GBV linkages in the context of the MDGs within the ICPD framework.</p>
<p>Strengthen the capacity of duty bearers to promote and protect women's human rights</p>	<p>Ecuador – building capacities within National Police and Armed Forces for GBV prevention and care.</p> <p>Guatemala – supported enhanced coordination between national mechanisms for the advancement of women within Executive, Judicial and Legislative to allow for better positioning of women's priorities.</p> <p>Colombia</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided technical support for the implementation of the "National human rights Programme" of the Ministry of Education. One of the main achievements was the approval of a "National Plan for human rights" issued by the Ministry of Education together with the Colombian Ombudsman (Defensoría del Pueblo) which integrated a strong gender perspective. • Supported capacity development of public service employees (General Attorney Office and Judicial Sector) related to the promotion and protection of women rights. <p>In alliance with the Attorney General's Office, UNFPA continued to support an oversight system on women and adolescent girls rights, aimed at monitoring the performance of public institutions regarding respect and promotion of reproductive rights</p> <p>Costa Rica – supported establishment of an institutional division (including a gender unit) to prevent trafficking and promote human development in the Ministry of Security, Police and Governance.</p> <p>Maldives – contributed to UN joint programme on Human Rights that provides (limited) support to the Human Rights Commission of Maldives (HRCM). Some officers in the commission are following up on reported cases of GBV.</p> <p>Bangladesh - support for the inclusion of gender considerations in the work of law enforcement agencies (e.g., the establishment of a victim support desk for female victims of violence, and awareness training for male police officers to enable them to better meet the needs of female victims of violence).</p> <p>APRO – has embarked on an initiative with the Asia Pacific Forum on National Human Rights Institutions to strengthen the capacity of NHRIs to promote and protect reproductive rights. A mapping has been conducted to explore what NHRIs are currently doing to address reproductive rights.</p>

³⁸ The 'types of efforts' used to categorize the examples have been slightly modified from Phase I.

Type of Effort ³⁸	Examples of UNFPA Efforts/Achievement
Strengthen the capacity of rights holders to assert and monitor the realization of women's human rights	<p>Ecuador – supporting organizations of youth and women, including indigenous women, to strengthen their capacities to defend and demand sexual and reproductive rights including the right to live free of violence, and to improve their participation.</p> <p>Guatemala – contributing to strengthening the institutional capacity of the protection system of indigenous women (La Defensoría de la Mujer Indígena, DEMI) to monitor compliance with and attention to the rights of indigenous women, particularly in relation to VAW; provided financial support to the elaboration and application of a manual to institutionalize gender and ethnic perspectives.</p> <p>Colombia – supporting the National Network of Women Organizations to carry out an educational and research process aimed at developing the capacity of women organizations to mobilize and defend human and reproductive rights.</p> <p>Peru - strengthen women local authority networks capacities to defend and demand their human rights.</p>

Outcome 3 – Observations and Questions

Regional differences This outcome is the only one for which the data indicate considerable regional differences - with LAC countries appearing to focus (or at least report) more on this area than countries from other regions. One reason for the difference may be that in the EECA and AP regions the concept of human rights appears to be a considerably more sensitive issue than in Latin America and the Caribbean. UNFPA staff and partners in both EECAR and APR noted that government representatives in their regions tend to view human rights as a foreign and potentially dangerous, revolutionary agenda. While HR might be disputed in certain countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, the concept does not have the same ‘taboo’ status seen in the other regions. This may have affected the number of organizations/institutions that are explicitly tasked with working to protect HR in a region (and consequently the number of organizations with whom UNFPA can partner or support in that region) and the extent to which UNFPA COs have been able to address and report on HR issues.

Programming or Reporting Issue? Many UNFPA activities and results reported under Outcomes 1, 2, and 4, while not necessarily using the term ‘Human Rights’, are relevant to women’s human rights, and in particular reproductive rights. This was confirmed by national partners consulted in several countries where the UNFPA CO had reported no activities (or very few) under Outcome 3. They noted that UNFPA is doing important work to support the realization of women’s human rights (e.g., by raising awareness about and helping to improve responses to the issue of GBV/DV). The paucity of information on progress under Outcome 3 may be due, at least in part, to the fact that activities and results that are relevant to Outcome 3 are also relevant to other outcomes and more likely to be reported there. In fact, several examples shown in Exhibit 3.3 above came from COARs in which they were reported under one of the other three outcomes).

³⁹ This links to the following point.

What is the intended development change? As noted in Phase I of the evaluation, the evaluation team wonders if the relative lack of information on activities and results under Outcome 3 is due in part to the lack of clarity about the development changes the outcome seeks to capture – in other words, is this more of a reporting issue than an indication of a lack of interest or commitment to HR?

The current outcome statement describes changes in a country’s human rights protection *system* and provides some examples of specific institutions that may be part of such a system (e.g., councils, ombudsmen, mechanisms). This suggests that the envisaged outcome-level change is the strengthened capacity of specific national institutions or organizations working on HR issues. However, the only

³⁹ It should be noted that working to ensure the realization of women’s human rights can include but is not necessarily identical to strengthening HR protection systems (i.e., not everything that UNFPA does that is related to HR would necessarily fit under Outcome 3).

indicator for Outcome 3 does not specify what ‘strengthening HR protection systems’ would look like on the ground, and asks only if reproductive rights have been integrated into such a system. There is no indicator that would help interpret or measure the strengthening of ‘participatory mechanisms’ that are also mentioned in the outcome statement.

The examples of UNFPA activities and results outlined above indicate that the most common (though implicit) interpretation of Outcome 3 is to improve stakeholder knowledge and awareness of women’s human rights issues, and assist both duty bearers and rights holders to strengthen their capacities in promoting, protecting, or asserting women’s human rights. This observation might be helpful should UNFPA consider revising the outcome statement and/or its indicators.

3.3.5 Outcome 4

The Outcome 4 statement and outcome indicators as outlined in the SP are shown in the sidebar.

The 2010 Report of the UNFPA Executive Director noted that over 90 percent of countries have mechanisms in place to monitor and reduce GBV (first indicator) and that the proportion of countries that include GBV in pre- and in-service training of health care providers increased from 64.4 percent in 2007 to 72.5 percent in 2010 (second indicator).

Outcome 4: Responses to gender-based violence, particularly domestic and sexual violence, expanded through improved policies, protection systems, legal enforcement and sexual and reproductive health and HIV-prevention services, including in emergency and post-emergency situations.

Indicators

Proportion of countries that have mechanisms in place to monitor and reduce gender-based violence

Proportion of countries that include gender-based violence in pre- and in-service training of health service providers

As with Outcomes 1 to 3, the indicators for Outcome 4 focus on the proportion of all countries that UNFPA works in and are not helpful for capturing the extent or specific nature of UNFPA’s work on and contributions to strengthening responses to GBV at the *country* level.

Phase II evaluation data on country-level activities and results confirm the positive observations noted in Phase I: All reviewed COs work on GBV, especially domestic and sexual violence, and in most cases GBV is the area that UNFPA is best known for among its national and international partners in relation to gender equality. In several countries, UNFPA is considered the technical leader and expert with regard to GBV among UN agencies and national and international development partners (especially in countries where UN Women does not yet have a presence).⁴⁰ Please also see sidebar.

At the global level, UNFPA acts as the co-chair of the United Nations Trust Fund in Support of Actions to Eliminate Violence against Women. Further, along with United Nations partners, governments and civil society organizations it has established a joint programme on eliminating VAW in 10 pilot countries. Also, as part of the United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force on Women, Peace and Security, UNFPA has worked to develop global indicators for monitoring implementation of Security Council resolution 1325, which were presented by the Secretary-General to the United Nations Security Council.

2010 Report of the UNFPA Executive Director, p.25

In the countries reviewed, UNFPA has worked to address GBV issues in a number of ways, including: raising awareness on GBV, contributing to the generation of evidence-based data to support advocacy on GBV (including, for example, national level VAW prevalence studies), supporting the development or revision of policies and laws, strengthening the

⁴⁰ The evaluation of the 2006-2010 Georgia Country Programme (2010), and the evaluation of the 2005-2011 Kyrgyzstan Country Programme (2011) confirm this impression. The latter particularly highlights UNFPA’s leadership role with regard to improving the quality of interagency data collection and analysis of VAW.

capacity of national stakeholders and institutions for addressing GBV and monitoring related processes and progress, and contributing to enhanced service delivery for GBV survivors. In several countries (e.g., Armenia, Colombia, Georgia, Guatemala, Jamaica) consulted stakeholders noted that UNFPA had been key to putting GBV on the public agenda and had helped break taboos around discussing the issue in public. Exhibit 3.4 below provides some examples of initiatives and results in the reviewed countries.

Exhibit 3.4 Outcome 4 Efforts and Achievements

Type of Effort ⁴¹	Examples of UNFPA Efforts/Achievement
Generation of data/evidence on GBV at national and (sub)regional levels	<p>UNFPA has contributed to collecting and disseminating data on GBV to inform advocacy and policy work.</p> <p>Georgia and Armenia – conducted nationwide representative research on domestic violence and disseminated results (as part of a South Caucasus regional project on GBV).</p> <p>Cambodia - conducted GBV surveys and studies.</p> <p>BiH – UNFPA and UNICEF supported pilot efforts for systematic GBV data collection in three municipalities.</p> <p>Bangladesh – support for a research project: <i>Gender-based Violence Prevention and Masculinities Collaborative Research project for Asia and the Pacific</i>.</p> <p>Jamaica - Research carried out on violence in the Caribbean.</p> <p>Pacific - conducted three studies on VAW and women’s health (Samoa, Kiribati and Solomon Islands).</p> <p>LACRO – conducted regional research on sexual violence.</p>
Raising knowledge and awareness of GBV	<p>UNFPA has played a key role in raising awareness of GBV issues (among government and non-government stakeholders, the public, donors, and other UN agencies) and has contributed to breaking existing taboos around the issue. Selected examples:</p> <p>Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Bangladesh, Kyrgyzstan, Jamaica, Ecuador, Peru, Costa Rica, Colombia – active participation in and support for the 16 days of activism against gender violence campaign, and for International Women’s Day.</p> <p>Belarus – participation in the Joint UN Information Campaign to Prevent Domestic Violence.</p> <p>Georgia - Advocacy on DV and women’s rights issues targeting duty bearers such as MPs and policy makers, as well as journalists. Support for roll out of the Unite Campaign, leading to the adoption of the declaration through the Georgian parliament.</p> <p>Georgia and Armenia – prepared and disseminated visual and printed materials and conducted awareness-raising activities for the general public on gender, gender equality and GBV (the regional project on Combating GBV in the South Caucasus).</p> <p>Kyrgyzstan – efforts to raise awareness about GBV among religious groups, break silence, ensure that victims’ voices are heard, provide help for victims, and keep GBV in the spotlight as a major health and human rights concern.</p> <p>Cambodia – conducted sensitization and training on DV/GBV, including specific initiatives in relation to the role of men.</p> <p>Guatemala – three-day campaign promoting sexual violence as a medical emergency; active involvement in the UNITE campaign.</p> <p>Bangladesh – policy advocacy with the participation of policy makers, government, NGOs and civil societies to engage men in GBV and HIV/AIDS issues.</p> <p>Jamaica – supported creation and broadcasting of television series on GBV.</p>

⁴¹ The categories used to structure the types of efforts are the same ones used in the Phase I evaluation report. Several of these correspond with UNFPA’s priorities for addressing GBV as outlined in UNFPA’s *Strategy and Framework for Action for addressing GBV* (2008-2011).

Type of Effort ⁴¹	Examples of UNFPA Efforts/Achievement
Development or review and revision of GBV policies, laws and regulations, and support for their implementation	<p>Myanmar – advocacy with key ministries which contributed to GBV issues reflected in the National RH Strategic Plan (Ministry of Health).</p> <p>BiH – supported the development of the Strategy to Combat Domestic Violence in the Republic of Srpska and the Federation of BiH.</p> <p>Georgia – supported the elaboration of the National Action Plan on DV, the assessment of existing legislation, and the drafting of bills on GBV.</p> <p>Armenia – assessed compliance of national laws with international legislation, legal norms and standards pertaining to GBV prevention, and made recommendations concerning necessary amendments and changes.</p> <p>Maldives – UNFPA was instrumental in bringing together cross-party supporters, UN and other stakeholders to lobby for the first Domestic Violence Bill and to raise public awareness on domestic violence through mass media.</p> <p>Bangladesh – participated in consultations on the upcoming domestic violence bill.</p> <p>Cambodia – supported the Ministry of Women’s Affairs in the development and implementation of the National Action Plan to Prevent VAW.</p> <p>Colombia – assisted with the development of a national law on VAW.</p>
Strengthen the capacity of national stakeholders and institutions for addressing GBV and monitoring related processes and progress	<p>South Caucasus – supports inter-country networks of agencies working on GBV to share best practices, lessons learned and experiences (regional GBV project in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia).</p> <p>Georgia – technical assistance for the newly established Interagency Coordination Council on Domestic Violence.</p> <p>Armenia – supported the establishment of a national coordination monitoring and advisory mechanism for GBV.</p> <p>Myanmar - training on GBV for humanitarian actors and relevant bodies.</p> <p>Ecuador – supported the National Technical Secretariat plan to eradicate GBV and strengthen coordination among government institutions (Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Government and Police, Ministry of Education at the national and local levels).</p> <p>Bangladesh – support for the inclusion of gender considerations in the work of law enforcement agencies, such as the establishment of a victim support desk for female victims of violence, and awareness training for male police officers to enable them to better meet the needs of female victims of violence.</p> <p>Guatemala – support the Public Ministry and Health Ministry, in coordination with CSOs, in the implementation of a protocol on sexual violence; develop training programmes on VAW for leaders of government departments and judicial officers.</p>
Enhanced service delivery for victims of GBV	<p>BiH –supported the implementation of the Strategy to Combat Domestic Violence in the Republic of Srpska; contributed to the creation of referral mechanisms for GBV survivors.</p> <p>Georgia – supported preparation of the State Referral Mechanism document for the victims of domestic violence; supports capacity development of medical staff.</p> <p>BiH, Georgia, Solomon Islands – supported the training of health service providers/ health response systems on GBV/DV.</p> <p>Bangladesh – provided financial and technical support to Women’s Support Centers where victims of domestic violence and their children are provided safe shelter, legal assistance and rehabilitation services.</p> <p>Guatemala and Georgia – supported training of national police officers on the protection of women victims of violence, including sexual violence.</p> <p>Guatemala – supported the work of a NGO alliance that has given legal, psychological, and occupational help to over 2000 mestiza and indigenous women.</p> <p>Armenia – developed manuals for psychologists, medical workers, police officers, social workers and priests to work with GBV survivors.</p>

Type of Effort ⁴¹	Examples of UNFPA Efforts/Achievement
Systematic Approaches	<p>UNFPA COs support efforts to establish comprehensive approaches to addressing GBV at the national (and to some extent the regional) level. Several examples noted above are part of these interventions (e.g., the regional project on Combating GBV in the South Caucasus). Other examples:</p> <p>Kyrgyzstan – UNFPA contributes to the UN Taskforce on VAW that assists States in developing and implementing comprehensive, multi-sectoral national approaches to GBV. Kyrgyzstan is a pilot country.</p> <p>Solomon Islands -as result of national VAW study: developed UN inter-agency Joint Programme for the elimination of VAW.</p> <p>Belarus – UNFPA is a key player in the Gender Theme Group (GTG) that is working to set up an inter-sectoral mechanism to address GBV. SIDA and the UNTF have agreed to provide funding for two proposed sub-projects - one on DV and one on inter-sectoral approach to address gender issues.</p> <p>Bangladesh – lead agency for a UN Joint Programme to end VAW that includes nine UN agencies and 11 ministries.</p> <p>Panama (LAC RO) - Regional project on the eradication of sexual violence and attention to sexual violence victims.</p> <p>APRO - Launch of a Regional Advisory Group on Women, Peace and Security (2010) for the effective implementation of UNSCR 1325 and the elimination of violence against women during and after armed conflict in the region. Also an active member of the Regional Advisory Group on GBV that has, among others, carried out i) a regional mapping to identify existing gaps and assess national action, ii) a regional analysis paper, iii) fact sheets on 8 countries in the AP region, iv) an advocacy brief, v) a documentary on the impact of conflict on women.</p>

Outcome 4 – Comments and Questions

Scope of UNFPA’s work on GBV: Outcome 4 focuses explicitly on strengthening *responses* to GBV. However, a good deal of UNFPA’s work under this outcome and other outcomes (especially Outcome 2) is relevant to *preventing* GBV. For example, efforts to enhance the socio cultural environment (Outcome 2) can contribute to eliminating some of the root causes for GBV and thus help to prevent further incidents of violence. While UNFPA’s *Strategy and Framework for Action for addressing GBV* (2008-2011) explicitly notes its roles in both GBV prevention and response, the current SP outcomes do not systematically capture UNFPA’s work in both areas.

Future of UNFPA’s work on GBV: When asked about the possible implications of the creation of UN Women on UNFPA’s gender-related work, a large number of UNFPA staff members and partners focused on the area of GBV⁴². They highlighted opportunities for collaboration, as well as the potential for competition over limited resources. Consulted stakeholders inside and outside UNFPA expressed no doubt that the agency will (and should) continue to address GBV issues given the vast needs in this area. Some individuals also noted that in their view GBV was the area least ‘under threat’ by UN Women due to UNFPA’s proven expertise, experience and leadership in this regard.⁴³ At the same time there was acknowledgement that GBV is also a declared area of focus for UN Women, and that there is a need for the two agencies to clarify their respective roles and foci.

In this context it was repeatedly mentioned that even if UN Women

In some countries (e.g., Guatemala and Jamaica), consulted stakeholders reported that UN Women and UNFPA are already effectively coordinating their GBV work and are collaborating on various initiatives.

⁴² Especially domestic and/or sexual violence.

⁴³ As noted earlier, many stakeholders described UNFPA as the technical leader for GBV among UN agencies; in many countries UNFPA has been the only organization addressing the issue.

intended to ‘take over’ some or all of UNFPA’s current work on GBV at the country level, it will not be in a position to do so for quite a long time (if at all) as it lacks both field presence and capacity, and as (in many countries) UN Women has not yet earned the same trust and respect of national partners as UNFPA.

3.4 Overarching Observations

This section summarizes overall observations about the four outcomes under Goal 3.

Overlap between Outcomes: In Phase II, document review and consultations with UNFPA staff confirmed the Phase I observation that the considerable overlap between the four Goal 3 outcomes makes it difficult (for UNFPA COs as well as for the evaluation team) to decide the best ‘fit’ of a particular achievement. Several of the reviewed COARs reported the same activity or result under two or more outcomes – and in most cases it was understandable, as the result really did fit each outcome. In some other cases achievements appeared to have been arbitrarily placed under one outcome, while – in our understanding – they were evidently more relevant to another one. This appears to be partly due to the fact that while Outcome 4 focuses on a specific *thematic issue* (GBV), the other outcomes address *strategic approaches* or areas of intervention (integrating gender concerns into national policies, strengthening the enabling socio-cultural environment for gender equality, and strengthening HR protection systems) that cut across and can be relevant to a number of thematic issues (including GBV).⁴⁴ To our knowledge, UNFPA has not developed a theory of change (narrative or visual) that would clarify the envisaged linkages and complementarities among these different types of results.

The evaluation team acknowledges that UNFPA and its partners work on complex issues that are difficult if not impossible to fully capture in a single outcome statement. To some extent, the overlap between outcomes reflects the fact that an activity or result may be relevant to a number of different dimensions of change. Nevertheless, the question needs to be asked whether the current outcomes are the most effective and appropriate way to conceptualize UNFPA’s work on gender equality – this includes the noted challenges around wording as well as the observed differences in the types of issue that they capture (thematic area versus strategy/dimension).

Project versus programme approach: A considerable part of UNFPA’s work on gender equality is funded through, and dependent on, external funds from donors. In many cases, these funds are tied to a specific time bound project. While allowing UNFPA to conduct more in depth work on specific gender equality issues, the project approach makes it difficult to ensure a continuous and comprehensive approach to addressing issues. For example, from 2008-2010 UNFPA implemented a large regional project on combating GBV in the South Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia) that was largely funded by the Norwegian government. The project is currently coming to an end, leaving a notable gap in the national (and regional) response to GBV. Consulted staff and stakeholders noted that it would be highly beneficial if UNFPA was able to commit to longer term, ongoing programming on key issues (see sidebar).⁴⁵

During Phase I consultations, UNFPA staff and partners in the countries visited raised a related issue – that COs’ work on gender was sometimes perceived as fragmented, lacking a unified vision and approach for gender

We are very sorry that the [GBV] project comes to an end, there would be much more to do and we wish UNFPA would not leave us half way through. National stakeholder, Armenia

It would be really good to have instead of projects a standing programme to tackle the issues on a permanent basis. No other organization [than UNFPA] is working in this area [GBV] in Armenia. International stakeholder, Armenia

⁴⁴ The question also arises of whether the ‘harmful practices’ mentioned in Outcome 2 are a form of GBV and could/should be captured under Outcome 4.

⁴⁵ At the time of writing UNFPA is trying to secure funds for an extension of the project (or a similar initiative). To date however these efforts have not (yet) been successful.

equality and human rights, and as being project rather than programme-based. They also noted that some of UNFPA's initial achievements would require substantial follow-up and longer term investments in order to achieve actual development results.

Concept of Capacity Development: As in Phase I, the data collected in Phase II provide very limited information on the specific approaches that UNFPA uses for capacity development (CD) other than training, and on the underlying assumptions and theories of what UNFPA considers capacity development.

UNFPA has issued at least two corporate documents⁴⁶ that address the Fund's understanding of and approach to CD. Following the UN Groups' (UNDG) definitions⁴⁷, UNFPA understands *capacity* as "the ability of people, organizations and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully", and *capacity development* as "the process whereby people, organizations and society as a whole unleash, strengthen, create, adapt and maintain capacity over time." Further, UNDG sees capacity as interdependent across three levels: individual, organizational and enabling environment. However, UNFPA's fairly recent guidelines on CD have not yet been widely shared with staff members. Further, while clarifying the 'big picture' of what the Fund understands capacity and capacity development to be, the documents provide very little if any guidance on how to effectively support related processes on the ground.

Our data indicate that at present a lot of UNFPA's actual work on capacity development in the field is based on a set of mostly implicit assumptions on what 'good' capacity development is and how it works. Given UNFPA's vast experience in this area, it is in an excellent position to reflect further on the concept of capacity development in relation to its own mandate. This would be valuable for internal learning as well as for joint efforts with development partners.⁴⁸ Key areas that would benefit from further exploration and clarification are, for example, whether, to what extent, and in what situations UNFPA capacity development efforts focus on strengthening *individuals*, or *organizations*, or the enabling *environment*; how these three dimensions relate to and influence each other, and how UNFPA envisages the 'leap' from working with individuals to strengthening organizational or sector capacity or, in the longer term, national capacity for GE and women's human rights.

⁴⁶ 1) Guidance Note on Aid Effectiveness: From Policy to Practice: UNFPA's Role in the Changing Aid and Development Environment (2010). Chapter 3. 2) Guidelines for Management of Quality Assured Technical Assistance (March 2011).

⁴⁷ See, for example, Technical Brief on UNDG Programming Principles: Capacity Development, March 2009.

⁴⁸ UNFPA HQ is currently working on developing a *reference set of outputs* that will help the agency compile an aggregate snapshot of its work. The (draft) set of outputs focus on the support that UNFPA is providing for strengthening national capacity in relation to P&E, RH, and Gender. This work on reference outputs confirms the relevance of capacity development as a key thrust of the Fund's work at the country level.

4. UNFPA's Integration of Gender, Human Rights, and Culture in Programming

4.1 Overview

One of the mandates of this evaluation was to assess the extent to which UNFPA's integration of gender mainstreaming, a human rights-based approach, and culturally-sensitive approaches is contributing to the organization's goals and objectives for gender equality and human rights across all areas of its mandate. The TORs put special emphasis on the extent to which UNFPA has been successful in gender mainstreaming. This chapter presents the evaluation observations and findings on UNFPA's integration of gender equality, human rights and culture (section 4.2) and on gender mainstreaming (section 4.3).

4.2 Integrating Gender Equality, Human Rights and Culture in UNFPA Programming

Like all UN agencies, UNFPA is committed to a rights-based approach to programming and to promoting gender equality. However, the agency is unique insofar as it also emphasizes the need to include a careful analysis of cultural sensitivities into programming, and is trying to integrate the notions of gender equality, human rights and cultural sensitivity in all of its programming.

Over the past years, UNFPA has developed several guidance and training publications on human rights, and has delivered training on how to apply a Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) to staff in multiple regions and in HQ. Further, UNFPA is an active player at the inter-agency level and works with UN Country Teams to support their analysis of human rights issues – in particular when countries are reporting to the CEDAW committee.

(...) the objective of an integrated approach is to build ownership of the human rights agenda within communities through a clear demand for a better quality of life built on social justice and equality of all members of the community.

Integrating Gender, Human Rights and Culture in UNFPA Programmes. UNFPA 2010, p.1

In 2004, the Office of the Executive Director issued a *Policy Note on Implementing a Human Rights-Based Approach to Programming in UNFPA*⁴⁹ that outlined the principles and modalities of integrating the three approaches. In April 2010, an organizational Guidance Note was issued by the Office of the Deputy Executive Director on *Integrating Gender, Human Rights and Culture in UNFPA Programmes*.⁵⁰

Key premises underlying the suggested approach include the following:⁵¹

- Human rights can be recognized, internalized and validated through a culturally sensitive approach which builds on positive cultural values, beliefs, practices and religious interpretations affirming human rights principles.
- Every culture is characterized by diversity, contestability and private and public spaces for mediation, negotiation and diverse interpretations. This includes interpretations of traditional beliefs and religious texts that can be aimed at realizing human rights through the engagement of gatekeepers, community leaders and traditional and religious communities.

⁴⁹ UNFPA/RR/04/8.

⁵⁰ *Integrating Gender, Human Rights and Culture in UNFPA Programmes.* UNFPA 2010, p.1.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* p. 2ff. Additional information on the integration of culture, gender and human rights (including a number of case studies on the use of culturally sensitive approaches in the field) can be found on the UNFPA website under <http://www.unfpa.org/culture/field.htm>.

- Cultures are dynamic and change as the external and internal context of the society changes. As they evolve, they impact on the organization of social structures and relations, especially gender power relations.
- People are both the products and the creators of their cultures. They are not simply passive receivers but active agents.
- Change that is internalized through community-based consensus building is a key to sustainability.

The evaluation team collected data on the extent to which UNFPA staff members in ROs and COs were aware of the demand to integrate gender mainstreaming, human rights, and culturally sensitive approaches, the extent to which their programming efforts indicated that they actually applied this concept, and whether there was evidence that the integration of the three approaches made a positive difference in the effectiveness and/or sustainability of programming efforts.

Finding 4: While consulted staff members in the field had varying degrees of awareness of the corporate guidance note on integrating gender equality, human rights and culture, there was wide agreement that all three dimensions are at the core of ‘good’ development work.

UNFPA staff members consulted in the field had varying degrees of awareness of the corporate guidance note on integrating GE, HR and culture. Several, especially senior staff, had read the guidance note,⁵² while others, especially new and/or junior staff, had not. However, all consulted staff members were generally familiar with UNFPA’s corporate dedication to culturally sensitive programming, and its commitment as a UN agency to integrating gender equality and taking a human rights-based approach. However, several individuals expressed the need for further training or other forms of capacity development to effectively address the integration of HR, GE, and culture in programming.

Several staff members emphasized the indivisible link between gender equality, cultural sensitivity and human rights: (women’s) human rights cannot be fully realized as long as gender inequalities exist. Thus, working to enhance gender equality is one way of strengthening (women’s) opportunities to realize their human rights. In this context some people emphasized that they considered gender and culture as intrinsic parts of UNFPA’s mandate, rather than distinct ‘programming approaches’. (Please also see sidebar).

Gender is a culturally defined concept that cannot be addressed without taking cultural considerations into account.

UNFPA staff member in the field

Many staff members also described cultural sensitivity as a core element of what they considered ‘good’ development work (i.e., effective and ethically sound). A few noted that the notion of cultural sensitivity was most important for international staff working in a country and culture different from their own, given that national programme officers already understand the context.

Finding 5: Country Offices in all regions reviewed use programming strategies that reflect UNFPA’s commitment to culturally sensitive programming.

The theory of change⁵³ underlying UNFPA’s use of a culturally sensitive approach is based on the assumption that it can help policy makers and development practitioners achieve the goals of development programming more effectively and efficiently, with stronger community acceptance and ownership. The

⁵² Staff consulted in the LACR reported ongoing efforts to adapt the document to better fit the (sub) regional context.

⁵³ As implied, for example, on the UNFPA website: <http://www.unfpa.org/culture/culture.htm>

UNFPA website outlines a number of key elements considered relevant in this regard. Exhibit 4.1 below provides examples of how the reviewed COs have been addressing these elements in their work.

Exhibit 4.1 Use of Culturally Sensitive Approaches to Programming

Element of using a culturally sensitive approach	Examples of use in reviewed countries
Developing skills for dealing with individuals, communities and interest groups living in a specific cultural context	<p>Caribbean – work around masculinities.</p> <p>Bangladesh – work with men and boys in relation to GBV, RH, and other issues; the CO provides separate information sessions on RH and GE for men and women as addressing these issues in a mixed group is considered inappropriate in the local culture.</p> <p>Georgia – a considerable part of CO work on RH focuses on men’s RH, which had been neglected during Soviet times.</p> <p>Guatemala – work with indigenous women’s groups; CO team deliberately hired indigenous staff members.</p>
Using culturally acceptable and persuasive language	<p>All reviewed COs – tailor language/terminology taking into account negative connotations of certain terms in a region or country (e.g., in some contexts the terms <i>human rights</i> and <i>gender equality</i> are seen as representing a foreign and/or potentially harmful agenda and may trigger negative responses from national partners).</p> <p>Jamaica – CO holds meetings with CSOs and government representatives to ensure that UNFPA information materials are culturally appropriate (i.e., understandable and not offensive).</p>
Establishing bridges between local cultural values and universally recognized human rights and gender equity and equality ⁵⁴	<p>Guatemala – identifying points of common interest between gender advocates and the Catholic Church (e.g., on reducing maternal and infant mortality) which helped neutralize longstanding disagreements and became the centerpiece of a new law that promotes better health for women and their families.</p> <p>South Caucasus – identifying common ground among gender advocates and FBOs around specific issues (e.g., regional project on ending GBV).</p> <p>Armenia – developing the capacity of priests around ICPD issues resulted in the development of a guidebook on Christian understanding of anti-GBV issues and detailed guidelines for priests on how to use the information in their work with congregations and parishioners.</p> <p>Several COs have made efforts to secure the support of individuals and/or media that are popular in the national context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Armenia – the CO involved a well-known wrestling champion as spokesperson for its campaign to involve men in the fight against GBV. • Georgia – the CO worked with a popular women’s magazine to promote GE and anti GBV messages, and cooperated with the First Lady to reach ethnic minorities and the most vulnerable women in the regions. <p>Cambodia – work with Buddhist monks and nuns to integrate gender perspectives into Buddhist teachings (e.g., by emphasizing the merits of non-violence and the important role that monks and nuns can play in preventing GBV).</p>

⁵⁴ Other examples of this element were described in the Phase I evaluation report, in particular UNFPA’s work in Africa and the Arab States around the elimination of FGM/C. UNFPA’s approach was to first understand and acknowledge why the practice was relevant to a community, and then design strategies to eradicate FGM/C based on this understanding – e.g., by replacing it with other significant rituals to mark the coming of age.

Element of using a culturally sensitive approach	Examples of use in reviewed countries
Creating a more conducive environment for programme ownership	<p>Jamaica – UNFPA established a mutual system of ‘checks and balances’ between the agency and its partners that allows national partners to comment on and provide input to UNFPA’s work. The notion that ‘UNFPA can teach us but we can also teach UNFPA’ was highlighted positively by many national counterparts.</p> <p>Armenia – consulted NGO representatives who had worked with UNFPA for over a decade noted that UNFPA was always very respectful of Armenian traditions, while not giving up on its own values.</p>
Delivering more sustainable programmes	Likely <i>result</i> of other efforts above, but no evidence yet in the reviewed countries.

The evaluation data also indicate a number of **concerns** and **challenges** in relation to the use of culturally sensitive strategies, in particular in connection to working with FBOs. These include:

- **Striking a balance** – NGO partners raised the concern that being culturally sensitive (i.e., respectful of existing traditions and belief systems) can also sometimes run the risk of seeming to accept and therefore perpetuate structures, practices, beliefs or taboos that are responsible for gender inequalities and/or other human rights violations. This issue was raised in relation to UNFPA’s work with FBOs (religious organizations), as institutions that are widely seen as being at least partly responsible for persisting gender inequalities.⁵⁵
- **Identifying areas of disagreement and common ground** – UNFPA staff in the ECCA region noted that while the work conducted with FBOs in the region led to some successes, it also highlighted the need for UNFPA staff to gain even better knowledge and understanding of how its partner institutions work and what their internal value system and (institutional) culture is based on, in order to identify suitable openings for identifying common ground as well as areas of disagreement. See also sidebar.
- **Culture in UNFPA workplaces** – Some consulted staff members voiced concerns about the extent to which UNFPA has and is taking steps to ensure that GE, HR and cultural sensitivity are respected in UNFPA workplaces. In the LAC region, some staff members commented on tensions (both gender and ethnically-related) within some UNFPA country teams, and noted that they were not aware of any steps or mechanisms in place to address these.

I think all UNFPA needs to build capacity to understand the language of the religious organizations. We are sometimes talking completely different languages. [In our recent work] it took us 1.5 years of discussion to understand that we were actually talking about the same thing – but we had to name the issues in ways that were acceptable to both sides.

UNFPA CO staff member, Armenia

⁵⁵ UNFPA’s corporate *Guidelines for engaging with FBOs* (http://www.unfpa.org/culture/docs/fbo_engagement.pdf) address this as well as other concerns. The guidelines emphasize that UNFPA needs to be selective about the organizations that it partners with (i.e., to ensure that partners’ core values are not in conflict with the key development goals underlying the ICPD and/or MDGs), and also that partnerships should be issue-based and specific, rather than being regarded as ‘lifelong’ relationships.

Finding 6: UNFPA has started to collect and share examples of experiences and lessons learned from using culturally-sensitive approaches, but there is further room for improvement in the way the agency systematically captures and uses country level data.

At the corporate level, UNFPA has started to collect and share information on field level experiences in using culturally-sensitive approaches. The current UNFPA website presents a number of country case studies that describe the processes and results achieved in specific contexts, and that outlines a number of lessons learned.⁵⁶ In country level data collection, however, the evaluation team found varying degrees to which COs are collecting and analyzing data on the benefits and challenges of culturally-sensitive approaches. While there was wide agreement among consulted staff members that these approaches work, they cited only a few, mostly anecdotal, examples of actual results and/or factors influencing success.

Given the close links between gender equality and culture, the notion of culturally-sensitive approaches is convincing and promising in the context of advancing GE. Being able to provide evidence on how such approaches enhance the effectiveness and/or sustainability of programming would be beneficial not only to UNFPA but also to other development partners. The same applies to capturing information on what has *not* worked and why (i.e., the challenges and/or limitations of the approach).

4.3 Gender Mainstreaming

Our understanding of gender mainstreaming (GM) is based on the definition and principles outlined by the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in 1997 and shown in the sidebar.

The key evaluation questions in view of gender mainstreaming were:

- Whether UNFPA was applying these principles systematically;
- To what extent and how gender equality concerns were addressed in UNFPA’s programming under SP Goal 1 (Population and Development) and SP Goal 2 (Reproductive Health);
- What factors UNFPA staff members found either supportive or challenging for gender mainstreaming efforts.⁵⁷

ECOSOC definition of gender mainstreaming

“...the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women’s as well as men’s concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality.”

Finding 7: While there are several examples of UNFPA having successfully integrated gender equality in the areas of Population and Development and Reproductive Health, Phase II evaluation data confirm UNFPA’s ongoing challenge in mainstreaming gender systematically.

UNFPA COs have undertaken numerous successful efforts to mainstream gender in their work on RH and PD. These include: support for the sensitization of health care providers on GBV, helping to engender national census processes, assisting Ministries of Health and other line ministries to mainstream gender,

⁵⁶ Please see <http://www.unfpa.org/culture/field.htm> .

⁵⁷ The evaluation focused on the extent to which UNFPA is mainstreaming gender in its own work (i.e., under the three programming pillars RH, P&D and GE). This is different from UNFPA’s efforts to help national partners strengthen their capacity and performance with regard to gender mainstreaming. As noted in the examples in chapter 3 above, UNFPA is doing a considerable amount of work in this regard at the country level.

and providing targeted RH information and support (e.g., distribution of condoms or ‘dignity kits’) to both boys and girls, and men and women.

- In some countries, such as **Belarus**, UNFPA’s work on supporting the development of gender policies or national action plans was carried out under the country programme’s P&D component.
- **Colombia, Georgia, Guatemala, Kyrgyzstan and Myanmar** – UNFPA has contributed to or led efforts to mainstream gender equality in UN responses to emergency/humanitarian situations (see also sidebar).
- **Georgia** – ensuring that men have better access to RH information and services.
- **Bangladesh** –engendering the national census process.

In Colombia UNFPA was part of the UN’s humanitarian response to the devastation caused by torrential rains. UNFPA played a key role in ensuring that not only SRH, but also GBV issues were integrated and taken into account in planning and delivering this response.

In Georgia and Kyrgyzstan UNFPA’s emergency response included the distribution of dignity kits to women. In Georgia, UNFPA also co chaired the protection group.

Despite these positive examples, Phase II data confirm the agency’s persistent challenges in gender mainstreaming that were noted in Phase I and also the recent EECAR Midterm Evaluation (2011). Among the gender officers and members of the RH and P&D teams consulted, very few were able to describe specific strategies or tools they use for gender mainstreaming. Several respondents acknowledged that GM activities tend to be ad hoc and also noted that gender analysis is not a regular or mandatory part of project/programme planning. Several COs reviewed noted that planning and management for the three pillars (RH, P&D and Gender) tends to be parallel rather than a team effort – this is often referred to as a vertical or ‘silo’ approach. A few individuals commented that gender mainstreaming is inherent in programming on P&D and RH as both areas address women and/or gender issues. However, while most RH and P&D initiatives focus on the rights and well-being of women, many do not have specific results or indicators for GE.

The following factors – most of which were also noted in Phase I of the evaluation – appear to affect whether and to what extent COs are able to effectively mainstream gender across pillars:

- **Leadership and accountability:** The interest in and commitment to GE of the UNFPA Country Representative (or Deputy) is a highly relevant factor – not only in terms of ensuring that sufficient and qualified GE officers are hired and that appropriate budget allocations are made, but also for ensuring that all CO team members have basic knowledge and commitment to integrating gender considerations into their work and are accountable for progress.⁵⁸ Some respondents noted that UNFPA senior leadership (HQ) needed to ‘send stronger messages’ on the need for GM across all three pillars and take visible steps to establish and enforce accountabilities for gender mainstreaming.
- **Clearly defined responsibilities:** To date, collaboration among Gender, P&D and RH teams appears to depend on the good will and personal interest of the individuals involved. The TOR of many gender officers, especially junior staff members, do not include an explicit mandate for working with other units to ensure that gender is mainstreamed into all projects and programmes. Even if an officer’s job description does include such a mandate, colleagues from other units are not always

⁵⁸ The generic TOR for Country Representatives and Deputy Representatives do not include explicit reference to gender mainstreaming. However, the Representative’s role of providing overall vision, direction and management for the work of UNFPA in the country implies a responsibility for ensuring that UNFPA’s corporate commitment to gender equality and gender mainstreaming is translated into action.

aware of this and may not seek out collaboration. Similarly, the TOR of many RH and P&D officers do not make reference to gender mainstreaming or to collaboration with GE officers.

- Knowledge and skills: Several consulted staff members (gender officers⁵⁹ and members of P&D and RH sub-teams) stated that they and/or their colleagues lack the required knowledge, skills and tools to successfully mainstream GE into the work of other pillars.
- Reporting tools: UNFPA's current reporting system (using Atlas) does not provide space for reporting on GM-related efforts or expenses across pillars as data must be entered under one pillar (RH, P&D or Gender).⁶⁰
- Resources: Staff members (both gender officers and P&D and RH team members) in several COs noted the absence of dedicated resources (financial or human) for gender mainstreaming activities.

⁵⁹ "Gender Officers" refers to all individuals - gender advisors or focal points – responsible for working on GE-related issues.

⁶⁰ However, in line with UNDG directives, UNFPA is developing a gender marker system that will track expenditures for mainstreaming. This will be piloted in 2012.

5. Results Logic of SP Goal 3

This chapter provides evaluation findings on the accuracy, logic (coherence), and usefulness of the Goal 3 results chain at the country level.

Finding 8: There is considerable room for improvement in the accuracy and coherence of the Goal 3 results chain.

Phase II of the evaluation confirmed the observations made during Phase I with regard to the internal coherence of the UNFPA Goal 3 results chain. Key issues in this regard are outlined below. Please see also **Appendix VII** for an annotated version of the Goal 3 Outcomes and Indicators.

- The SP does not provide an overarching theory of change that describes (in narrative or visually) how the four outcomes contribute to Goal 3, or if or how they are intended to complement and/or influence each other.
- Most of the Goal 3 current outcome statements do not describe a specific, measurable development-oriented *change*.
- The four outcomes mix results with strategies to obtain results. Outcome 4 addresses changes related to a specific thematic issue (GBV). Outcomes 1 to 3, however, describe strategies to influence change that can be applied across different thematic areas:
 - Engendering national policies, laws and frameworks (Outcome 1),
 - Creating a conducive socio-cultural environment for GE (Outcome 2), and
 - Strengthening national Human Rights Protection Systems (Outcome 3).
- Some outcomes overlap.
 - For example, engendering national policies (Outcome 1) and efforts to enhance the socio-cultural environment (Outcome 2) can be (and are) part of UNFPA’s work on strengthening national responses to GBV (Outcome 4).
 - Most UNFPA activities that are relevant to strengthening Human Rights Protection Systems (Outcome 3) are also relevant to other outcomes. For example, working with the national police force to strengthen their awareness and capacity to respond to GBV *could* be reported under Outcome 3, but tends to be captured under Outcome 4 (response to GBV).
- The outcome indicators are not suitable for measuring change at the country-level, and are not comprehensive in measuring the stated outcomes.
 - Some indicators are suitable for measuring broad changes that are likely to be achieved only in the long term. For example, the indicator for Outcome 2 (FGM/C prevalence rate) could be used to track changes at the *goal* level but is not useful in tracking progress at the *outcome* level (when outcomes are defined as medium-term changes to which development actors can contribute. See RBM definitions in section 1.3).
 - Some indicators refer to results that are not described (explicitly or implicitly) in the outcome statement. For example, the second indicator for Outcome 2 is the “Percentage of women who decide alone or jointly with their husbands/partners/others about their own healthcare.”⁶¹

⁶¹ This indicator would be more appropriate for an outcome such as “Men are involved in working towards GE and the elimination of harmful practices”.

- Some outcomes have insufficient indicators to measure progress toward the outcome. For example, the sole indicator for Outcome 3 is the “proportion of countries with reproductive rights incorporated in national human rights protection system.” This does not allow measuring the strengthening of ‘participatory partnerships’ that is also addressed in the Outcome.
- All of the outcome indicators are quantitative. As such they do not allow UNFPA to systematically capture the quality, type, and relevance of changes to which it contributes.

Finding 9: The links between country-level outputs and corporate SP outcomes are not always evident, explicit, or logical. This contributes to UNFPA’s difficulty in capturing progress on outcomes at regional and global levels.

Reviewed UNFPA documents at regional and global levels indicate that UNFPA has been only moderately successful in rolling up country-level achievements on gender equality and human rights into an analysis of regional and/or global progress. One factor that is likely contributing to this is a conceptual disconnect between SP Goal 3 outcomes and country-level outputs.

While the SP outcomes are expected to guide UNFPA’s global, regional and country programmes, outputs are defined by each country programme individually. This approach is flexible, responsive, context-sensitive, and relevant to the Aid Effectiveness principle of ensuring greater country ownership of development processes. At the same time, however, it poses theoretical and practical challenges.

The concept of a results chain (as used in the RBM approach) is based on the assumption that lower level results contribute to higher level and more complex results. The vertical logic of a results chain describes these links from outputs to outcomes to goals. In the SP Goal 3 results chain, identifying this vertical logic is not always easy. While the link between Goal 3 and its four outcomes is plausible, the relationship between these corporate outcomes and country level outputs is not always evident due to a number of reasons:

- Most of the 14 reviewed country programme documents⁶² identify not only their own outputs, but also their own GE-related *outcomes*.⁶³ These outcomes differ considerably from those in the SP: most describe changes that are more specific (and thus lower level) than the SP outcomes,⁶⁴ while others are broader than the SP outcomes and closer to the SP Goal.⁶⁵
- The reviewed country programme results frameworks include from one to three outputs on GE that relate to the specific country programme outcomes described above.⁶⁶ How these outputs relate to the four SP outcomes is not made explicit in any of the reviewed documents. In some cases, country-level outputs are at the same level of complexity as the SP outcomes or even the SP Goal to which they are expected to contribute to (please see sidebar for examples).

⁶² The Myanmar CPD 2007-2010 did not include a separate gender component; nor did the 2005-2009 CPD for Kyrgyzstan.

⁶³ Of the reviewed country programmes, 11 identified one gender-specific outcome, 3 had two outcomes. Please also see Appendix VIII for an overview of reviewed country programme results frameworks.

⁶⁴ E.g., “*The capacity of civil society groups, especially youth, minorities, women and the elderly, to participate in decision-making processes, is enhanced*”, Georgia CPD 2006-2010.

⁶⁵ E.g., “*Societal changes are realized to reduce discriminatory practices and to pursue equity and empowerment for women and girls*”, Bangladesh CPD 2006-2010.

⁶⁶ In most of the reviewed CPDs there is room for further strengthening the logical link between CP outputs and outcomes, i.e. in some cases outputs and outcomes describe the same type and level of change rather than creating a vertical logic with increasing complexity of results.

The evaluation team further noted that UNFPA’s current corporate reporting requirements and templates provide no room for COs to capture or report on progress on country outputs or outcomes. To our knowledge, country programme outputs and related indicators are used only for country programme evaluations, but are not used to aggregate UNFPA’s corporate achievements around the world (i.e. in COARs).⁶⁸

The Bangladesh CPD (2006-2010) identifies one output for its gender related work: “Rights of women and girls promoted and gender equity enhanced.” This more or less corresponds to the SP Goal 3 statement.⁶⁷

The Peru CPD (2006-2010) formulates one Output as “National legislation is aligned with international women’s rights covenants to safeguard gender equality, women’s autonomy and protect women from gender-based violence” – which captures SP Outcome 1 and parts of Outcome 4.

These gaps in the logic of the Goal 3 results chain, particularly the disconnect between corporate results and those defined at the country level, are likely contributing to the observed lack of systematic analysis and aggregation of results at regional and global levels. This is relevant not only in terms of accountability, but also in relation to UNFPA’s ability to systematically share, compare, and learn from experiences at the country level.

Finding 10: The SP facilitates the translation of UNFPA’s broad organizational priorities into programming, but it is not evident how the SP can be used in the *reverse* direction, to roll up country-level results into progress towards corporate outcomes and goals. This makes it difficult for UNFPA to capture its contributions to development results.

UNFPA Country Programmes are expected to respond to and address identified national priorities as outlined in national development plans and strategies. UNFPA staff at Headquarters and in the field indicated that CO staff use the SP as a starting point – to set the broad parameters within which they decide how and where to engage in the joint UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)⁶⁹ and which national priorities to support as they plan programming at the country level.

Staff in several of the countries reviewed noted that the SP Goal and Outcomes are very broad and require ‘translation’ into specific programming decisions on the ground, but also described them as useful in providing general orientation and bringing UNFPA’s diverse work at the global level under a common umbrella. Some field staff noted positively that COs are not obliged to work on *all* SP Outcomes but are encouraged by HQ to focus on those most relevant and feasible in their respective contexts. Others, however, feel that having three different guiding frameworks (SP, UNDAF, and national priorities) requires them to ‘respond to three masters’ at the same time and are uncertain how to do this effectively.

While it is relatively clear that the SP is intended to and does facilitate the translation of UNFPA’s broad organizational priorities into specific programming on the ground, its envisaged use in the *reverse* direction is less evident, i.e., in rolling up country-level results into progress towards corporate outcomes and goals.

⁶⁷ SP Goal 3: “Gender equality advanced and women and adolescent girls empowered to exercise their human rights, particularly their reproductive rights, and live free of discrimination and violence.”

⁶⁸ Only one of the recently conducted country programme evaluations that were reviewed for this evaluation (i.e. the 2011 evaluation of the Kyrgyzstan CP) explicitly mentions the UNFPA SP and the Goal 3 Outcomes. While it implies that the Kyrgyzstan CP has been relevant in view of Outcome 4, it does not explore systematically whether and in what ways the CP has contributed to progress towards the SP Outcomes and Goal 3. The other four recent CP evaluations reviewed for the evaluation do not mention the SP Goal 3 and related Outcomes at all.

⁶⁹ Or its equivalent in humanitarian/emergency situations, the Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP)

It is not clear whether or to what extent the SP is intended to play a role in defining and tracking the development results that UNFPA will hold itself *accountable* for by the end of the programming period.⁷⁰

In the RBM approach, accountability is usually placed at the level of *outputs*.⁷¹ As noted earlier, UNFPA's development results framework does not include corporate outputs (outputs are defined at the country, regional and global levels). The existing country programme outputs differ considerably in type and level of complexity, which would make it very difficult to capture UNFPA's results achievement at the output level. We say 'would make it difficult' deliberately, as UNFPA is not currently capturing data on country-level outputs. While COs try to report on progress toward SP outcomes in the COARs, this is close to impossible given that the results they are working toward and that they can report on are much more specific and at a lower level than the broad changes outlined in the SP outcomes. As a result, COARs tend to list activities that are or appear to be relevant to the respective result area.

Thus, while the SP provides a structure that COs use for their annual reports, it has no real function in terms of UNFPA's accountability for results – it is not helpful and is not being used to summarize the output-level results that could help UNFPA describe or report on its contributions to progress at the outcome level.

In our understanding, the use of RBM terminology (such as outputs and outcomes) generally indicates that an organization is willing and committed to being assessed on the logical implications of these terms. Should UNFPA decide that the linear logic that characterizes RBM-based results chains is not appropriate for its needs and purposes, it may be advisable to change the language used in its SP (e.g., avoid the term 'outcome'). Similarly, if UNFPA does not intend the SP outcome indicators to be used as measures of its contributions to development changes, it would be helpful to specify what they are intended to measure.

⁷⁰ Other than for the results outlined in the Management Results Framework (MRF).

⁷¹ In RBM terminology, outcomes are broader changes that development players contribute to but are not accountable for (see section 1.2).

6. Organizational Structures and Relationships

This chapter addresses the extent to which UNFPA's organizational structures and relationships at all levels (HQ, Regional Offices, Sub-Regional Offices and Country Offices) support or hinder performance in relation to Goal 3 and the application of the integrated approach.

Finding 11: There is room for strengthening UNFPA's organizational structures and intra-organizational relationships to enhance communication on and accountability for GE.

Phase II of the evaluation confirmed the areas of improvement noted during Phase I with regard to UNFPA's intra-organizational communication and accountability for achieving and tracking results on GE.

In theory, gender equality is the responsibility of all UNFPA units at central, regional, sub-regional and country levels (see section 2.3.1 above). However, there is no mechanism in place to ensure that individual responsibilities for results achievement and tracking outcomes in relation to Goal 3 and gender mainstreaming actually come together to a coherent whole.

As noted above, there has been no systematic collection, aggregation, or analysis of results at different organizational levels. The review of UNFPA's corporate reports (UNFPA Annual Reports, reports to the Executive Board, and COARs) found no summative analysis or aggregation of achievements under Goal 3 and no systematic analysis of how country-level achievements contribute to regional and/or global progress towards SP outcomes.⁷² Selected issues at CO, RO and HQ levels that are likely to contribute to the observed gaps, many of which were also noted in Phase I, are described below.

Country Offices

Under the current SP, Country Offices are expected to work on all three of UNFPA's pillars, including gender equality, and to use a human rights-based approach in all of their work. However, there are currently no guidelines that could help COs put these broad expectations into practice, or standards for assessing whether and to what extent GE is being addressed across COs. Currently, COs are free to decide upon a number of key issues, including:

- The percentage of the core country programme budget allocated to GE (see sidebar);
- The extent to which the TOR for staff members (gender officers and others) include explicit obligations for gender mainstreaming or collaboration with other units;
- The number or percentage of staff hired as gender focal points or advisors, as well as their contract level and professional profile⁷⁴ (see sidebar);

Of the 14 reviewed country programme budgets,⁷³ allocations for GE (core funds) were significantly lower than for RH. In 3 cases, core funds for GE were the same or higher than for P&D.

Most consulted CO gender officers indicated that budgetary constraints were not a major problem, as most COs have been able to raise additional resources for gender through the UNCT, other joint efforts, or directly through donors (e.g., in Belarus, the GE component attracted more other (external) resources than both the RH and P&D components.

⁷² By results *analysis* we mean a thorough *interpretation* and *assessment* of reported results in light of their contextual relevance that goes beyond listing individual efforts and short-term results.

⁷³ The Myanmar and Kyrgyzstan CPDs 2006-2010 did not include separate gender components or budgets.

⁷⁴ The number of individuals working as part of the GE team in the consulted COs ranged from one to three (in Guatemala).

- Professional development on GE for staff members – the amount and type, as well as whether staff members from all units can or are obliged to attend.

Existing accountability mechanisms (such as country programme evaluations and performance reviews of senior CO staff members) do not appear to address any of these areas. As noted earlier, reviewed country programme evaluations do not examine or assess whether or how country programme achievements contribute to UNFPA’s regional or global objectives on gender equality.

CO staff in several countries, as well as their national NGO and government partners, noted room for improvement in how RH, P&D, and GE officers/teams in a CO communicate (see sidebar).

In the EECA region, consulted staff members noted that most COs the region are small, usually with one person responsible for RH, P&D, and Gender. While this eliminates the problem of coordinating efforts between three sub-teams, it poses other challenges in terms of a CO’s capacity to provide in-depth support to national partners in any of the three areas.

One respondent noted that in his experience “as a result, unfortunately, amongst the three programme areas, GE is paid the least attention.”

Sometimes, we that have worked for years with UNFPA feel that we know more about what each component does than the staff in the office. NGO representative, LAC region

Regional Offices

According to Regional Office TOR (UNFPA, Dec. 2007), ROs are responsible for:

- Ensuring programmatic and technical coherence and effectiveness, based on analysis, evaluation and synthesis of programme interventions within the region; and
- Ensuring effective and efficient use of UNFPA resources and accountability in the region through coordination, oversight, support, and monitoring of COs and SROs.

In the five regions reviewed during the two evaluation phases, there is limited evidence that ROs are analyzing or synthesizing country programme data on activities and progress under Goal 3 from a regional perspective (see also finding 12 below.)

Headquarters

The GHRCB is mandated with developing and sharing policy and programmatic guidance on gender equality, human rights, and culture-related issues – but is not formally tasked with ensuring and monitoring implementation. To date, GHRCB has not systematically tracked the use of its tools and materials by different units in HQ or in the field.

Other units in HQ (especially in Technical Division), as well as ROs and COs are encouraged to follow and apply strategies and guidance provided by HQ but are under no obligation to do so. Consultations with field-based staff showed considerable variance in the extent to which strategies and guidance notes from HQ are known and being used.⁷⁵

In terms of development results, the GHRCB is accountable only for the *global programme’s* achievements under Goal 3; it has no formal role with regard to monitoring, analyzing and assessing overall results achievement at the corporate level (i.e., providing an integrated view of the joint achievements of global, regional, and country programmes).

⁷⁵ One positive example is the LAC region, which is currently developing regionally tailored adaptations of the guidance note on the integration of gender, HR and culture issued by GHRCB.

The Programme Division, in particular the Environmental Scanning and Planning Branch (ESPB), is responsible for translating UNFPA's strategic direction into results-oriented planning and management. This includes the task of reporting on UNFPA's overall progress in implementing the SP based on annual reports from all units. The content and quality of corporate reporting on progress toward Goal 3 is dependent on the information provided by technical units. However, the type and depth of this information is to some extent pre-determined by the current reporting format, in particular the COAR template. Corporate reporting is made more difficult by the fact that there is no regional roll-up of country-level results.

Finding 12: While Regional Offices can and are contributing to GE programming at the country level, they are also facing some challenges in terms of their roles in technical assistance and ensuring the coherence of UNFPA programming on GE.

All consulted stakeholders at country, HQ, and regional levels view the relocation of ROs to the field as a positive step with the potential to enhance communications (between COs, and between the field and HQ), and ensure timely and quality technical assistance on GE and human rights to CO teams and national programming partners. Many respondents noted that the ROs are relatively new and probably need more time to become fully functional (e.g., the EECARO has faced considerable challenges beyond its control that have delayed its establishment and have made its work very difficult).

The following positive observations about ROs as well as areas for improvement have emerged during the evaluation.

- **Provision of Technical Assistance:** The ROs have not yet effectively replaced the country technical support teams. Several individuals expressed concern about the intended approach of providing TA (to COs as well as to national partners) through sub-regional inter-agency rosters of experts managed by the RO. While many agreed with the rationale for this approach,⁷⁶ they noted considerable difficulties in putting it into practice in a relatively short timeframe and without a transitional model in place. While all ROs are making efforts to establish regional rosters, progress has been varied and mostly limited. Key challenges (varying by region) include difficulties in identifying individuals or organizations with relevant technical expertise, geographic experience, and linguistic capacity. Another question raised was who will pay for the TA provided by these experts in the long term.
- **Role of RO Gender Teams:** Gender officers in several COs noted the support and guidance they had received from gender specialists in their ROs who have helped to establish and maintain an active network of gender focal points in their regions (e.g., in LACR, gender focal points share experiences and discuss common issues through webinars). Phase II evaluation data indicate that, at least in some regions, ROs are becoming the first contact for COs who require guidance on gender related issues (see sidebar).⁷⁷ Some COs noted that they would like more strategic guidance from their respective RO on UNFPA's regional priorities and

When we have questions we first go to the RO, then to HQ. It is more and more becoming the regional level. Previously there was no capacity at the RO but now people are there and are responsive, we are getting more and more used to going to the RO rather than directly to HQ. UNFPA CO staff member, EECAR

⁷⁶ The notion that, in the long term, the use of national and/or regional expertise will contribute to strengthening ownership of results and more sustainable capacity in the region.

⁷⁷ This is in contrast to Phase I data, in which COs reported that they usually contact HQ first. Available data do not provide evidence of whether there are differences between the reviewed regions, or whether this has changed across all regions since Phase I of the evaluation.

strategies in relation to GE. In all three regions, RO gender advisors reported that their limited ability to travel was a constraint to effectively assisting COs.

- Status of RO Gender Teams: While RH, P&D, and Gender are officially considered three equal pillars of UNFPA's work, this is not always reflected in the field. Some noted differences influence the status of gender teams and hence their ability to influence the work of other pillars. In EECAR, for example:
 - The most senior person on the gender team is a 'specialist' (pay grade P4), while the leaders of other two pillars are 'advisors' (pay grade P5).
 - RH and P&D are considered *clusters*, and their senior officers are cluster leaders, while staff members working on gender issues are considered a *team*.
- (S)RO roles and responsibilities: Consulted (S)RO staff in both the EECAR and LACR noted the need to clarify the roles of the Sub Regional Offices (in Almaty and Jamaica respectively) to avoid duplication of efforts and to ensure the most effective and efficient use of existing resources.
- In addition to the RO's envisaged role in brokering (and, to a limited extent, providing) technical assistance, another important (potential) aspect of their role is to provide guidance and oversight to COs and ensure the coherence and relevance of UNFPA's programming on gender equality and human rights across the region. Evaluation data indicate that there is still considerable room for clarification of the exact role that the ROs can and should play in this regard and how to operationalize it, e.g., related to exercising quality control of CO reporting.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1 Overview

This chapter presents the main conclusions of the evaluation based on the evidence collected during both Phase I and II of the assignment. It also provides recommendations and some related practical suggestions intended to help UNFPA improve its reporting; results framework and roles; its approach to integrating gender, human rights and culture; and its structure for accountability and communication in relation to Goal 3 results achievement.

7.2 Conclusions

While the absence of systematic reporting on results in relation to the SP outcome indicators makes it difficult to formally assess UNFPA's progress toward SP Goal 3, there is considerable evidence from all five reviewed regions that UNFPA COs have undertaken a wide range of activities to strengthen gender equality and women's rights that are relevant to Goal 3 Outcomes. Most documented progress was found in relation to Outcome 1 (supporting the integration of GE and women's human rights into national policies, frameworks and laws) and Outcome 4 (strengthening responses to gender-based violence).

In both phases of the evaluation, consulted national and international stakeholders in all reviewed countries acknowledged UNFPA as a trusted and respected partner, and, in most cases, as a leader among UN agencies with regard to addressing GE issues at the national level. Particularly noted in this regard were UNFPA's experience, dedication to, and expertise in combating GBV (especially sexual and domestic violence).

UNFPA's commitment to integrating gender, human rights, and culture in its programming is relevant in view of the complex development issues that UNFPA works on. There is considerable evidence from all reviewed regions that COs are 'translating' this commitment into practice, in particular by using culturally-sensitive approaches to promote gender equality and, in doing so, furthering and protecting (women's) human rights. Exemplary areas in this regard are UNFPA's work on eliminating female genital mutilation and cutting (FGM/C), its work in all five regions with faith-based organizations (FBOs), men and boys, and youth to engage them in efforts for GE, as well as its work on indigenous women's rights in the LAC region. While UNFPA has started to collect and share information on specific experiences and lessons learned from using human rights based and culturally-sensitive approaches there is room for further expanding its efforts in this area.

With regard to gender mainstreaming, there is considerable evidence that UNFPA COs have integrated gender equality dimensions in activities that are part of its work on Population and Development and Reproductive Health. At the same time, most consulted UNFPA staff members agree that there is a need for approaching gender mainstreaming in a more systematic way across the three pillars, and tracking related results.

The evaluation found considerable room for improving the coherence and logic of the Goal 3 results chain – in terms of the intended logical links between SP Goal and Outcomes and Country Programme Outputs, the wording of Goal 3 Outcomes, and the choice of outcome indicators. Further, the evaluation noted that UNFPA needs to clarify the intended and feasible uses of the SP. While SP Goal 3 and its four outcomes provide broad guidance for country-level programme planning, management, and reporting, it is not clear if the SP is also intended to outline the development results that UNFPA holds itself accountable for.

There are numerous examples of successful collaboration and communication on gender equality issues within UNFPA Country Offices as well as between COs and the (S)ROs. However, the evaluation noted the need to further strengthen UNFPA's organizational structures and intra-organizational relationships to enhance communication on and accountability for GE programming and mainstreaming across all organizational levels.

7.3 Recommendations

The recommendations to UNFPA outlined below are based on data collected during Phases I and II of the evaluation and are presented in four categories: progress towards Goal 3; the Goal 3 results chain; integration of gender, human rights, and culture; and UNFPA structure and relationships.

Progress towards SP Goal 3

Recommendation 1: In light of the evolving UN environment, UNFPA should review the scope and foci of its work on gender equality (GE) and the links between GE and the Fund’s work on reproductive health (RH) and population and development (P&D).

The evolving UN environment, in particular the creation of UN Women, creates the need for all UN agencies, including UNFPA, to review the scope and focus of their work related to gender equality, and to consider the division of labour for GE among agencies. While all UN agencies address gender equality as a cross-cutting issue, UNFPA and UN Women are in a special position and relationship given that gender equality and women’s human rights are key concepts in the mandates of both organizations.

Consultations with UNFPA staff and partners at country and regional levels also indicate that in some cases UNFPA is running the risk of ‘spreading itself too thin’ by taking on a broad range of responsibilities around gender equality, not all of which are closely linked to its core mandate or its other areas of focus. Critically reviewing the Fund’s areas of engagement in GE in light of their links to UNFPA’s work on SRHR and P&D could help ensure a more focused approach, which in turn might help COs use their available resources for gender equality in fewer areas, but in a more comprehensive (programmatic) and sustained way.

Suggestions

1.1 Provide interim guidance to COs and ROs: At the corporate level, UNFPA and UN Women are likely to negotiate and agree upon general delineations of their respective roles and responsibilities, as well as on core areas and strategies for collaboration. Given that UN Women will need time to develop its field presence, there may be areas that UNFPA will continue to address in the interim. UNFPA COs and ROs will need to be kept informed and provided with guidance – for example, on how the role of UN Women may affect the types of issues that COs get involved in and commit to in their current planning.

1.2 Allow room for interpretation and contextual adjustments: Defining a set of carefully selected foci for UNFPA’s work on gender equality does not mean setting absolute and immovable boundaries for this work. Given their diverse and dynamic contexts, COs need to be able to interpret whatever is agreed upon at HQ and adapt it to the specific requirements of their own contexts. For example, while UNFPA may suggest that COs should – if possible – abstain from getting involved in ‘general’ capacity development of national partners for gender mainstreaming, there may be compelling reasons at the country level to do so. COs need to be able to make programming decisions based on the professional judgement of their staff members. However, it would be helpful for UNFPA at all levels and for UNFPA partners if COs were required to clearly articulate how any envisaged work relates UNFPA’s mandate and how it links to RH and/or P&D.

1.3 Acknowledge differences in COs’ roles in countries where UN Women is or is not present. In countries where UN Women does not yet have a field presence and those where it may not develop one in the future, UNFPA COs may be expected to take on a more prominent role in guiding and coordinating the UN’s overall work on gender equality. COs in such countries may also see the need to engage in ‘broader’ GE work (i.e., work that is less directly linked to RH or P&D) than COs in countries where more agencies are addressing GE issues. Consulted UNFPA staff members in several countries suggested the establishment of a dedicated fund/additional resources to be tapped by COs in countries where UN Women does not have a presence, and the evaluation team passes on this suggestion for UNFPA’s consideration.

1.4 Gender Mainstreaming across pillars: The recommendation that UNFPA should work towards a slightly more focused approach to addressing GE issues also relates to the observed need to strengthen its work on gender mainstreaming. Ensuring that GE programming is relevant to RH and P&D may help to enhance collaboration among the three pillars, and increase the extent to which gender equality is systematically integrated into all of UNFPA's work (i.e., by working on an issue from both a gender and a RH or P&D angle).

Recommendation 2: UNFPA should improve its systems and internal capacity at all levels for results-based analysis and reporting under SP Goal 3.

As noted throughout the Phase I and II evaluation reports, one key challenge for conducting a meaningful assessment of UNFPA's progress towards SP Goal 3 was the absence of information on actual results rather than on activities. Effective reporting on results is essential to UNFPA's accountability and its ability to mobilize resources for gender equality in the future. Especially in light of the evolving UN environment, it will be increasingly important for UNFPA to provide evidence of its contributions to development results, and clearly communicate its particular niche in relation to gender equality and women's human rights issues.

Suggestions

2.1. Invest in RBM training and/or coaching for UNFPA staff and partners. UNFPA may want to explore options for further strengthening the RBM knowledge and skills of field-based staff members, particularly in results-oriented analysis and reporting. The Regional Offices can play an important role in reviewing country-level reports and providing feedback to COs. Further, given that CO reporting is to a large extent dependent on the information that a CO receives from national implementing partners, it may also be helpful to also invest more effort and resources in capacity development or coaching on results-focused planning and reporting for these partners.

2.2 Monitor the cumulative, longer term effects of UNFPA's work. At the country and regional levels, UNFPA may consider monitoring and reporting – at least periodically – on the cumulative results of its development interventions around GE over time. This type of information is not currently available given that COARs focus on one year at a time. While COs and ROs will not be able to conduct this kind of data collection and analysis for each area of work, they might do so for one or more selected issues per country/region. An additional suggestion is to ensure that evaluations (of country or regional programmes) and/or thematic evaluations include short case studies that explore whether and how UNFPA's continued activities on GE have contributed to development changes over time. If feasible, these case studies could also consider the sustainability of results, and the extent to which UNFPA's individual activities and areas of engagement at the country level 'come together' to form a coherent GE programme.

2.3 Further explore and define the notions of 'capacity' and 'capacity development' in the context of GE and women's human rights, and what it means at UNFPA. While UNFPA has defined its general understanding of 'capacity' and 'capacity development' based on the respective UNDG definitions, it would benefit from further exploring and defining the concept based on its experiences and priorities on the ground. UNFPA is already taking an important step in this direction by developing a reference set of corporate outputs around its work on capacity development. In addition UNFPA may want to embark on further reflection and analysis on how to operationalize its general understanding of CD, e.g. by differentiating between individual and organizational capacity and their interrelationship, by further exploring the role of cultural, political, and economic environments for translating capacity into actual behaviour changes, by analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of different strategies used to support CD processes, or by further reflecting about what it means to treat CD as a process owned by the respective national partners and what implications this understanding has for UNFPA's role.

Goal 3 Results Chain

Recommendation 3: UNFPA should refine the SP Goal 3 results chain to improve the logic and coherence between intended results – from country programme outputs, to corporate SP outcomes, to goals.

The evaluation noted several challenges with regard to the logic and clarity of Goal 3 outcomes and indicators. It also noted the need to clarify the Strategic Plan's role in defining corporate accountability for development results, and pointed out the missing logical link between the many and diverse country programme outputs and the SP outcomes.

Specifically, UNFPA should:

- Revise the Goal 3 outcome statements to ensure that they describe specific, realistic, and achievable development results that UNFPA's work on the ground can contribute to.
- Review and clarify the intended relationship between the four Goal 3 outcomes.
- Clarify how country programme results (outputs and outcomes) are intended to contribute to the SP outcomes and goal.
- Develop outcome indicators that are useful, measurable, and sufficient for measuring each outcome.

Suggestions

3.1 Develop a theory of change (narrative or visual) that illustrates how UNFPA's intended results are logically linked, from the country level to the corporate level, and how outcomes are envisaged to 'come together' and complement each other.

3.2 Identify both short-term and potential longer term revisions to Goal 3 outcome statements and indicators. In the short term, UNFPA may want to revise the current outcome statements (especially for Outcomes 2 and 3) to clarify the specific intended development results.⁷⁸ In the longer term UNFPA will need to decide what outcomes are most appropriate for capturing UNFPA's work on GE during the next SP period. This will depend in part on UNFPA's evolving role within the UN system and its decisions on the foci of its gender related work.

3.3 Develop and implement shared reference outputs that link to corporate outcomes. Carefully formulated 'generic' reference outputs defined at the corporate level can help provide more coherence to UNFPA's work and help COs (as well as regional and global programmes) link their work to the corporate objectives outlined in the SP, while still providing room for COs to make context-specific programming decisions in each country.

As noted in the report, UNFPA is developing a *reference set of outputs* for systematically capturing information on the Fund's work around supporting national capacity development related to RH, P&D and Gender. Based on the difficulties that UNFPA has faced in conducting this kind of aggregated analysis, the evaluation team strongly supports this initiative. Looking ahead, UNFPA may consider treating this initial set of reference outputs as a 'pilot' that, if it proves to be helpful, could be broadened to cover all major types of outputs (i.e., not only those for capacity development). This seems feasible, at least in relation to SP Goal 3, given that the work of all reviewed COs already tends to focus on the same core types of short-term results, in particular:

⁷⁸ The notion of SMART results (Specific, Measurable or Observable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) may be helpful in revising the outcome statements. The annotated version of the results framework (Appendix VII) may also provide suggestions.

- Enhancing the amount and quality of available *information and tools* on a particular issue (e.g., GBV, FGM/C, SRHR, gender equality in general);
- Enhancing the *knowledge and awareness* of specific stakeholder groups (e.g., duty bearers, opinion leaders, men and boys, women) as well as their *willingness to engage* in promoting and protecting, or asserting women's human rights (Evidence-based advocacy, using the information and tools noted above, is a key strategy.);
- Supporting the *capacity development* of individuals (both duty bearers and rights holders) and organizations or institutions to support and work towards the promotion and protection of women's human rights, in particular their reproductive rights.⁷⁹

3.4 Align country programme outcomes with SP outcomes. COs should make explicit how the results identified in the country programme framework link to and contribute to the results areas outlined in the SP.⁸⁰ Most of the reviewed country programme results frameworks include their own outputs and also their own outcomes. A review of these frameworks highlighted the need to improve the logical relationships between country programme outcomes and outputs, (i.e., ensuring that outcomes describe higher level results than outputs, and that the described outputs are relevant to the respective outcome). In addition, for the overall Goal 3 results chain to work, country programmes will need to use the corporate (SP) outcomes, or formulate outcomes in a way that clearly marks them as *immediate* outcomes that are less complex and that contribute to the *intermediate* or *end outcomes* defined in the SP.

Integration of Gender, Human Rights, and Culture

Recommendation 4: UNFPA should broaden its efforts to collect, analyze, and share data that demonstrates the added value of integrating gender, human rights, and culture in achieving and sustaining development results.

UNFPA documents and guidance notes convincingly outline the relevance of integrating human rights-based, culturally-sensitive, and gender mainstreaming approaches. UNFPA is beginning to systematically collect data on how these approaches are put into practice and on the benefits and challenges related to their application. In order for this to be a practical programming tool, and not just a theoretical framework, UNFPA needs to further explore and demonstrate how the integration of these approaches can enhance programming effectiveness and/or the sustainability of development results.

One question to be further explored is whether and how programming that deliberately integrates approaches for gender, human rights, and culture differs from programming that is based on other principles for 'good development' such as, for example, those implied by the UN's commitment to a human rights-based approach, or the Paris Declaration's commitment to national ownership of results.

Suggestions:

4.1 Identify when, how and why approaches for GE, HR, and/or culture can be translated into concrete programming decisions. The examples of actual programming collected in the reviewed COs indicate a number of key entry points where taking into account GE, HR, or cultural issues can directly influence programming decisions. These include:

⁷⁹ While the specific development partners will differ between country, regional, and global programmes, the *types* of results UNFPA is aiming to achieve are likely to be the same and include the categories outlined here.

⁸⁰ Some of the reviewed COs (e.g., Georgia) have identified the links between the country programme and other results frameworks (SP, UNDAF) that they aim to be aligned with.

- *Conceptualizing the development issue:* As noted in Phase I of the evaluation, UNFPA's work with communities on the abandonment of FGM/C illustrates how cultural sensitivity can help UNFPA and its partners 'frame' (describe and perceive) the issue they are trying to address (e.g., by understanding and acknowledging that FGM/C fulfills a perceived social need in a community, COs can help partners develop appropriate strategies and interventions).
- *Seeking strategic partnerships with opinion leaders to advance change from within:* Individuals and organizations of authority within a specific cultural setting (e.g., civil society groups representing indigenous people, or faith-based organizations) can be valuable allies in advocating for change around GE and women's human rights.
- *Communicating effectively in a cultural context:* Using culturally-appropriate language (i.e., understandable and inoffensive) can be a key factor in ensuring (or losing) the support of national partners. Several reviewed COs noted that using the 'right' language helped to identify common ground and goals.
- *Establishing a conducive environment for programming and collaboration:* Taking deliberate steps to acknowledge and value the opinions and priorities of national partners (e.g., through regular consultations during planning and implementation) can enhance their acceptance, interest, and ownership of development results.

4.2 Identify and address the needs of UNFPA staff at HQ, RO, and CO levels with regard to integrating gender, human rights and culture. Consultations with staff members in all five regions suggest that they need some additional support from HQ and/or ROs in integrating these approaches (e.g. through training, coaching, supplying 'best practice' examples and other data or evidence). UNFPA's current initiative to compile country case studies on using culturally-sensitive programming is a useful step in this direction, and may also be an *incentive* for CO teams to focus more on GE, HR and/or culture.

Organizational Structures and Relationships

Recommendation 5: UNFPA should clarify or define its expectations for gender equality and gender mainstreaming at all levels of the organization.

The evaluation noted the need for stronger UNFPA mechanisms for: i) monitoring, analyzing, and synthesizing GE- related achievements and experiences at country, regional, and corporate levels, and ii) holding units accountable for their obligations around Goal 3 results achievement and gender mainstreaming.

Suggestions:

5.1 Develop minimum expectations for Country Office investments in gender equality. These could include: percentage of overall budget allocated to GE; the number and contractual level of gender officers in relation to the number and level of staff working on RH and P&D; and/or ensuring that responsibilities for gender mainstreaming are explicit in the TOR of both gender officers and P&D/RH teams.

5.2 Explore ways to strengthen communication and collaboration on GE between units to ensure that the widely distributed responsibilities for GE and related knowledge and experiences come together more coherently. This could include defining more explicitly, and/or formalizing, the relationship between GHRCB and gender programme officers (advisors, specialists, focal points) at all levels.

5.3 Assign clear responsibilities and allocate dedicated resources for conducting and tracking gender mainstreaming (GM). Unless GE is an explicit responsibility of individuals and/or units, gender will most likely continue to be seen as an 'add on' to their regular work. By defining gender as a corporate priority, with specific results and a dedicated budget, UNFPA has taken an important step towards ensuring that gender concerns are addressed, and RH and P&D teams are making efforts to address GE in their work.

However, UNFPA's corporate approach to supporting gender mainstreaming could be strengthened if GM efforts were conducted more systematically. This could include, but would not be limited to, the following:

- Ensure (in the mid to longer term) that work under SP Goal 3 is closely linked and relevant to RH and/or P&D issues.
- Include explicit responsibilities for gender mainstreaming in the job descriptions of selected P&D and RH officers (at CO, RO, and HQ levels), and ensure that the individuals in these positions have the required knowledge, skills and experience in GM.
- Consider allocating specific resources for gender mainstreaming at different organizational levels and/or require each of the three pillars to earmark resources for GM.
- Systematically track and report on efforts and successes in gender mainstreaming - if not under the Development Results Framework, then possibly under the Management Results Framework.
- Hold COs, ROs, and HQ units accountable for ensuring that gender is mainstreamed systematically in their work, thus sending a strong message from senior leadership that GM is important.

5.4 Ensure that RO staff have the explicit responsibility and the required resources to support and guide COs in their work on GE. The Regional Offices have the potential to play an important role in addressing some areas for improvement that were noted in the evaluation (e.g., reviewing and synthesizing country-level results and experiences; linking these to work at the regional level; providing guidance and assistance to COs in translating UNFPA's corporate policies and strategies into programming on the ground).

- In order for RO staff to provide effective support to Country Offices in the area of GE, their roles and responsibilities for GE need to be clearly defined and relevant to CO needs.
- Until the regional rosters of GE experts/consultants have been established and are functional, UNFPA may want to consider giving RO gender specialists/advisors permission and resources to conduct regular visits to COs in their respective regions.⁸¹

⁸¹ This may not be equally applicable/relevant for all (Sub)regions, e.g. in the AP region regional advisors can travel to COs to provide technical input upon request of the respective CO, which also covers related costs.

Appendix I Evaluation Terms of Reference

Mid-term Evaluation of UNFPA Strategic Plan Organizational Goal 3 GENDER EQUALITY

Background

In the context of the UN System, gender equality (equal human rights between women and men, girls and boys) has been a major theme in the global commitments emerging from the world conferences of the 1990s and first decade of 2000, including the International Conference on Social Development; the International Conference on Population and Development and its follow-up; the Fourth World Conference on Women and its follow-up; and the Millennium Declaration for the MDGs. The international community made strong commitments to gender equality and the empowerment of women at these conferences, based on the common understanding that gender is integral to successful development.

UN efforts to mainstream gender entail the incorporation of gender equality as an integral part of all activities across all programmes. In 1997, ECOSOC adopted the following definition of gender mainstreaming:

'The process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programme, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women's as well as men's concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equality and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality'⁸²

The same report identified a number of principles underpinning gender mainstreaming:

- 1) Forging and strengthening political/institutional commitment to achieve gender equality and equity at the national, regional and global levels.
- 2) Incorporating a gender perspective into planning, monitoring and evaluation processes.
- 3) Using sex disaggregated data in social and economic analysis to reveal how policies, programmes and projects impact differently on women and men and on girls and boys.
- 4) Contributing to efforts oriented towards increasing the numbers of women in decision-making positions in government, the private and public sectors, and at the corporate level.
- 5) Developing and disseminating tools and providing training on gender awareness, gender analysis and gender planning to decision-makers, senior managers, staff and key stakeholders.
- 6) Forging linkages between governments, the private sector, civil society and other stakeholders to advocate gender equality and the importance of mainstreaming gender towards achieving this end.

To date evaluations of gender mainstreaming in the UN and other development agencies have pointed to a large gap between rhetoric and reality, and an equally large gap between theoretical knowledge and practical application of that knowledge in a manner that affects transformational change. This evaluation is intended to produce practical and feasible recommendations that can be implemented to make UNFPA's progress on gender equality more effective and transformational.

⁸² <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/pdf/ECOSOCAC1997.2.PDF>

Rationale

Gender Equality is one of UNFPA's three main organizational goals and is a cross-cutting objective for other programme areas. The [UNFPA Strategic Plan 2008-1011](#) is the framework for all UNFPA programmes and has been extended to 2013. Global, regional and country programmes will all contribute to the achievement of the Strategic Plan results, which have been approved by the governing body of UNFPA, the Executive Board. The overall purpose of the [global and regional programme \(GRP\)](#) is to assure that UNFPA exercises effective global and regional leadership in providing support to countries in implementation of the ICPD Programme of Action and contributions to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The global and regional programme is linked to country operations and mutually reinforces policy, technical and programme dimensions through provision of the multi-disciplinary technical assistances, reinforcement of the policy dialogues and programming, including joint programming where viable

The Global Programme Action Plan identifies a monitoring and evaluation plan for each of the pillars of the organizational mandate, of which gender equality is one. The plan for gender equality specifies that in 2010 an evaluation will be conducted to assess UNFPA's progress against this Strategic Plan goal. There are two key products that will be made available to provide context and background to this evaluation.

- In 2007/2008 UNFPA undertook a global gender capacity assessment. Recommendations from this report were presented to the Executive Committee, discussed with a number of senior managers and are being implemented (or implementation is planned) through the regular work programme of the GHRCB from 2009 to 2013.
- In December 2009 CIDA undertook a rapid Gender Equality Institutional Assessment of UNFPA which examined the extent to which UNFPA plans for, achieves and reports on results related to gender equality. The report is not finalized, but the draft findings are available for consideration as part of the desk review for the evaluation.

At this point in the Strategic Plan period, evidence about the effectiveness of programming for gender equality is needed to guide decision-making and facilitate mid-term adjustments to programming for results. The findings of the two assessments noted above will provide a platform on which to build proactive, practical and feasible evaluative recommendations to support UNFPA to improve achievement and reporting on gender equality and human rights results. UNFPA's commitment to the achievement of human rights and gender equality is grounded in the integration of three approaches – gender mainstreaming, the human rights based approach, and culturally sensitive approaches (GHRC) and the evaluation must include this commitment to integration as a specific element of the methodology and factor it into recommendations for mid-term adjustments.

Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to understand UNFPA's performance in supporting gender equality and human rights initiatives and processes in line with Goal 3 of the Strategic Plan and in the context of aid effectiveness. The evaluation will assess where and how the integration of gender mainstreaming, women's empowerment approaches, and the human rights based approach and culturally sensitive approaches are being used. The emphasis of the evaluation will be at the national level so as to gain as clear a picture as possible of where successes for gender equality are being achieved and what is driving those successes, as well as understanding what factors undermine success.

Objectives

The overarching objectives of the mid-term evaluation are to assess performance on achieving the organizational goal for gender equality as well as performance in mainstreaming gender across the other programmes. In addition the evaluation will focus on the relevance of UNFPA's work on integrating gender, human rights and culture to create an effective and efficient approach to programming. This

integrated approach aims to progress the goals of human rights and gender equality. The evaluation will examine the interaction of all three organizational levels with a focus on results at the country level.

Specifically the evaluation will:

- 1) Assess whether Strategic Plan 2008 – 2013 objectives for gender equality and human rights are being achieved, or will be achieved by the end of the plan. This will include assessment of the Global and Regional Plan components of the Strategic Plan.
- 2) In the context of Goal 3, review the accuracy and logic of the results chain with a focus on the indicators for the goal, the four outcomes under that goal, and the associated outputs. The review will consider accuracy, coherence and usefulness of the results chain for monitoring and will include assessment of baseline and target information.
- 3) Determine whether UNFPA's commitment to integrating gender mainstreaming, the human rights based approach and culturally sensitive approaches is effectively contributing to achievement of the Strategic Plan goals and objectives for gender equality and human rights across all areas of its mandate. This to be done with a focus on clarifying UNFPAs areas of competitive advantage in gender equality as related to the overarching ICPD mandate.
- 4) Examine how the organizational arrangements and relationships between HQ, Regions and COs support progress in achieving Goal 3 and identify constraints to progress, support factors and good practice in relation to the evaluation categories.

Scope of the Evaluation

It is anticipated that the evaluation will involve work at all levels of the organization: interviews and desk reviews at HQ and RO level and field visits to selected countries. The evaluation will take place over 2 calendar years. In 2010 two regions will be evaluated and in 2011, 3 regions will be evaluated.

The evaluation will cover a minimum of 2 countries per region through field work and will include desk review of other countries. Regional Offices and the Advisory Group will be asked to identify countries for evaluation with an emphasis on diversity – selecting countries that i) have had more and less success integrating GHRC into their programming and ii) have produced varying levels of gender equality results to-date.

Field work for the 2010 component of the evaluation was undertaken in two regions, two countries per region for a total of four countries:

- 1) **Arab States** – Proposed countries: Egypt and Yemen.
- 2) **Africa** – Rwanda and Mali.

Field work for the 2011 component of the evaluation will be undertaken in three regions, 2 countries per region for a total of 6 countries:

- 1) **Latin American and Caribbean (LAC)** - CONFIRMED - Jamaica, Guatemala, and Panama Regional Office.
- 2) **Asia Pacific** – Bangladesh, Philippines, and Bangkok Regional office.
- 3) **EECARO** – CONFIRMED – Armenia and Georgia for country visits. Belarus, BiH, and Kyrgyzstan for phone/Skype interviews (with Azerbaijan as a back-up).

The desk review will cover those aforementioned regions and proposed countries. It is proposed that review of the regional programme, CPAPs, and COARs will provide both region-wide context and illuminate the scale of variation of results for Goal 3 between countries in each region. Phone and email communication may be used to supplement desk review and field work information and demonstrate the scope of issues across the region.

A final evaluation report will be provided to i) summarize key findings in regard to the above points, ii) highlight regional differences, strengths and challenges that may also create opportunities for S-S learning, and iii) provide a concise set of practical, feasible, affordable and recommendations that can be implemented at headquarters, regional and country level.

Process and Methodology

Preparation and Inception

- Preliminary communication to clarify terms of evaluation between consultants and advisory team (including identifying countries for evaluation and time frame for visits).
- Delivery of brief 3 – 5 page inception report detailing consultants understanding of the work required, the proposed approach to work, analysis approaches, travel schedules and timeframes for product delivery.

Desk Review

- Desk review of documents from all organizational levels to assess existing evaluation related knowledge, and production of a final evaluation plan and methodology.
- Desk review of regional and country documents to support the regional overview section.
- Phone and email communication to supplement the desk review and field work preparation.

Preliminary Consultations with UNFPA HQ

- The international consultant will hold telephone and email consultations with HQ, and UNFPA will provide relevant documents outlining HQ issues, results, supporting and constraining factors. This information will be used to develop a global overview section of the report draft and final reports. This will be grounded in the findings of the 2008/09 Capacity Assessment Report to and will ensure that the evaluation carries those findings further and does not reinvent them.

Consultations with Regional and Country Offices

- Travel to regions and countries to collect documented information, conduct interviews, and evaluate progress and results in line with the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. Regional and Country Offices will provide relevant files and documents. Regional and Country Offices will provide meeting rooms and coordinate logistics of appointments and interviews with relevant staff and stakeholders.
- It is anticipated that consultants will spend 5 days in each regional office and 5 days in each country office.
- Production of a concise interim **stage two report** outlining regional and country level issues, results, supporting and constraining factors. This will be an interim deliverable to be shared with Advisory Committee members for preliminary feedback.

Draft Report Preparation

- During the draft report preparation stage the consultants may conduct additional electronic information collection with those who have been interviewed, and to supplement the regional overview and comparison between countries.

Review Process

- As each regional report is finalized, the draft report will be circulated to the relevant Advisory Committee member(s) for a set review period. It may also be circulated to an additional limited set of reviewers.

- After the evaluation (2011) of all 5 regions is complete, UNFPA will host a consultation meeting on the draft report with representatives from the countries evaluated, regions and HQ staff. The international consultant will lead facilitation of this meeting with UNFPA HQ staff.

Final report prepared

- The consultants will incorporate comments from reviewers in consultation with the Advisory Committee members.
- The consultants will submit a complete, copy-edited and cleanly formatted report as a Word document.

Advisory Committee Role

Composition

- The Advisory Committee will be appointed by Regional Office Directors, TD and PD.

Responsibilities

- The responsibilities of the Advisory Committee are to support the evaluation process in general. As the evaluation team travels to regions, Advisory Committee members will facilitate consultations, document collection and will provide advice and contextual information for the consultants.

Indicative time frames for 2011 countries

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| • Engagement of evaluators | January 2011 |
| • Planning and consultation with Advisory Committee | February 2011 |
| • Evaluations conducted HQ, regions, countries | February - May 2011 |
| • Draft findings produced | May 2011 |
| • UNFPA review period | May 2011 |
| • Final report | June 15, 2011 |

Travel Costs

UNFPA will pay:

- Daily Subsistence Allowance – including terminal allowances – in line with UN standard rates for each city where work is undertaken, and
- Economy class travel costs based on the most economical and direct route.

Skills and experience required

It is anticipated that the evaluation will be undertaken by an international consultant and that the evaluation team will include regional consultants with development experience, expertise in gender, in the human-rights based approach, and an understanding of socio-cultural determinants of development.

The time period for the evaluation is limited therefore the team must be equipped to undertake multiple tasks simultaneously.

Consultants must have a mix of relevant experience in mainstreaming gender, experience in evaluations, regional and national level experience in development and/or humanitarian settings, knowledge of evaluation methodology, and experience and in-depth knowledge of the UN system.

Qualifications

The consultant team must offer the following demonstrated experience, knowledge and competencies, and any regional consultants selected will ideally have the same qualifications and will be required to have in-depth knowledge of the UN and development issues in the region:

- Significant knowledge and experience of evaluation concepts and approaches.
- Good knowledge of the UN system, national programmes, principles of aid effectiveness, and awareness of the role of UN civil society partners at regional and national levels.
- Excellent consultation and involvement skills.
- Recent experience with gender equality issues and knowledge of mainstreaming gender equality into policies, programming and development.
- Sound understanding of the Human Rights Based Approach to development.
- Considerable experience working on development issues in developing countries.
- Facilitation skills and skills in involvement of diverse and inter-disciplinary stakeholders.
- Strong quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis skills.
- Language skills in English, French and preferably Spanish.
- Excellent analytical and communication skills.
- Excellent writing and reporting skills.
- Computer literacy in Word, Excel and PowerPoint.
- Postgraduate qualifications in social sciences and/ international development.

Appendix II Evaluation Framework

Area of Inquiry	Key Questions and Sub-Question	Indicators	Means of Verification
1. Environment Scan	<p>1. What have been key developments in the programme's environment that have affected its performance?</p> <p>1.1 What have been relevant key developments in the global, regional, and national environments since 2008?</p> <p>1.2 What have been key developments in the UN and UNFPA environments?⁸³</p> <p>1.3 What implications have these developments had for UNFPA's effectiveness and relevance in relation to GE?</p>	Types of documented changes and their implications for UNFPA's work on gender equality.	<p><u>Document review</u>: Documents and websites relevant in view of global, regional and country level contextual developments.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u>: with key informants in UNFPA HQ, ROs, COs, and selected partners knowledgeable of the global context.</p>
2. Results Achievement in Gender Equality and Human Rights	<p>2a To what extent have envisaged results (outcomes) for GE and HR as described in the UNFPA Strategic Plan 2008-2011 been achieved in the reviewed regions?</p> <p>2.1 To what extent have the selected UNFPA country and regional programs achieved their stated outputs under Goal 3?</p> <p>2.2 What evidence is there for the country and regional level results having contributed to progress towards global outcomes under Goal 3?</p> <p>2.3 What results have been achieved as a consequence of mainstreaming GE in the areas of population and development, and reproductive health (Goals 1 and 2)?</p> <p>2.4 What, if any, have been unexpected results (positive/negative) to which UNFPA's programming efforts have contributed? (E.g. in relation to MDG achievement, UN coordination, national/regional level changes.)</p>	<p>Results and indicators as outlined in its Strategic Plan as well as in regional/country level workplans and results frameworks.</p> <p>Documented/confirmed examples of positive achievements/results at country and regional levels.</p>	<p><u>Consultations</u> with UNFPA staff and stakeholders at the country and regional levels and at HQ.</p> <p><u>Document review</u>: Global, regional and country level annual planning documents, annual and other progress reports, external evaluations, monitoring documents, products/publications.</p> <p><u>Observations</u> during site visits.</p> <p>The review of results achievement will focus on progress and results in the six countries selected for site visits. This will be supplemented by desk review and selected interviews/email consultations related to UNFPA's work in up to 10 additional countries in the three regions and with consultations at the regional level.</p>
	<p>2b To what extent are envisaged GE results likely to be achieved by the end of the SP?</p> <p>2.5 What evidence is there to suggest that work at the country and regional levels is contributing to the GE objectives as outlined in the SP being achieved by 2013?</p>	<p>Results and indicators as outlined in UNFPA Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions of existing potential for further change.</p>	

⁸³ Special emphasis will be put on the official launch of UN Women in early 2011 and its (actual or potential) implications for UNFPA.

Evaluation of UNFPA Goal 3 - Gender Equality

Area of Inquiry	Key Questions and Sub-Question	Indicators	Means of Verification
3. Effectiveness of UNPFA's Integrated Programming Approach	<p>3. To what extent has UNFPA's commitment to an approach that integrates gender mainstreaming, a human rights based approach, and culturally sensitive approaches contributed to progress towards SP Goals and outcomes?</p> <p>3.1 How has UNFPA's commitment to integrating the three approaches translated' into actual programming on the ground?</p> <p>3.2 How has this contributed or led to results achievement in relation to gender equality and human rights?</p> <p>3.3 What challenges has UNFPA faced in relation to applying the integration of the three approaches?</p>	<p>Documented examples of application of integrating the three approaches and related effects.</p> <p>Stakeholder (staff and partner) perceptions of benefits/challenges of the concept.</p>	<p><u>Document review:</u> UNFPA Strategic Plan and other corporate documents (e.g. framework on gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment) providing definitions and practical advice on how to operationalize the integrated approach.</p> <p><u>Consultations</u> with UNFPA staff in HQ, ROs and Cos. Consultations with programme stakeholders at the regional and country level.</p>
4. Strategic Plan Goal 3 Results Logic ⁸⁴	<p>4. How useful is the Goal 3 Results Chain?</p> <p>4.1 Are the results and indicators suitable for providing UNFPA (at different organizational levels) with the type of information needed for planning, accountability, and internal learning?</p>	<p>Evidence of usefulness and appropriateness of results chain including indicators for UNFPA's planning, accountability and learning purposes.</p>	<p><u>Document and database review:</u> SP development and management results frameworks, Atlas system. Annual and other progress reports.</p> <p><u>Consultations</u> with UNFPA staff in ROs and COs.</p>
5. Organizational Structures and Relationships	<p>5. How have organizational arrangements and relationships between HQ, Regions and COs supported or hindered UNFPA's performance in relation to gender equality and human rights?</p> <p>5.1 What roles do HQ, ROs and COs have respectively in view of achieving GE and HR related objectives?</p> <p>5.2 Are these roles and their inter-relationship clearly defined and agreed upon?</p> <p>5.3 How appropriate have resource allocations for GE related work been at different organizational levels?</p> <p>5.4 What do staff members at different organizational levels see as the key strengths and areas for improvement in view of organizational arrangements and relationships?</p>	<p>TORs for different organizational units and positions.</p> <p>Staff perceptions of strengths and weaknesses of current organizational arrangements and relationships.</p> <p>Resource allocations for work under Goal 3 and related to gender mainstreaming.</p>	<p><u>Consultations</u> with UNFPA staff at HQ, ROs and COs, as well as with members of the Executive Board.</p> <p><u>Document review:</u> Relevant UNFPA documents outlining its organizational structure, arrangements, roles and responsibilities, resources, and changes to any of these.</p>

⁸⁴ In this section we have deleted two questions (“Is there an evident logical link between the Goal statement, the related outcomes, outputs and indicators?” and “What Theory of Change (explicit or implicit) is underlying the results logic? Is this theory plausible?”) that were already addressed during Phase I of the evaluation based on the analysis of UNFPA’s Strategic Plan’s Development Results Framework. Phase II is building on these findings. What the second phase can contribute in terms of additional insights is related to the application of the results framework in the three regions under review – as is captured in the remaining question as shown in the matrix.

Area of Inquiry	Key Questions and Sub-Question	Indicators	Means of Verification
6. Lessons Learned and Recommendations	<p>6a What have been key lessons learned that can inform future UNFPA programming at country, regional and global levels?</p> <p>6.1 What have been the key lessons learned regarding results achievement/performance under Goal 3?</p> <p>6.2 What have been the key lessons learned in view of the results logic and indicators?</p> <p>6.3 What have been the key lessons learned in view of UNFPA's commitment to an integrated programming approach?</p> <p>6.4 What have been key lessons learned in relation to organizational arrangements and relationships?</p>	Analysis of above	Analysis of data and observations/findings generated in relation to previous questions both during Phase I and Phase II of the evaluation.
	<p>6b What recommendations derive from the evaluation?</p> <p>6.5 What are key recommendations to inform UNFPA's programming under Goal 3 and its gender mainstreaming work?</p> <p>6.6 What are key lessons and/or recommendations that can inform the 2011 phase of the evaluation, which will review an additional three regions?</p>	Analysis of above	Analysis of data and observations/findings generated in relation to previous questions during Phases I and II of the evaluation.

Appendix III Data Sources: People

Individuals marked with a * are members of the Evaluation Advisory Group.

Name	Position/Organization	Method of Consultation
UNFPA Headquarters NY		
Aminata Toure*	Chief, Gender Human Rights and Culture Branch (GHRCB)	Telephone Consultation
Gayle Nelson*	Gender Advisor, GHRCB	Telephone Consultation
Stakeholders consulted during site visits		
Armenia		
Anahit Tevosyan	Center for Psychological Counseling "Tatev - 95" NGO	Group Interview
Father Harutyun	Father, Armenian Apostolic Church, participant of ART FBO/UNFPA CGBV Joint Initiative, Tsakhkadzor (town in Kotayk Marz)	Group Interview
Father Shahan	Father, Armenian Apostolic Church, participant of ART FBO/UNFPA CGBV Joint Initiative, Tsakhkadzor (town in Kotayk Marz)	Group Interview
Mr. Alexander Ter-Hovakimyan	Scientific Association of Medical Students of Armenia NGO (SAMSA)	Interview
Mr. Artyush Petrosyan	Head of the Family, Children and Women Issues Department, Hrazdan town, Kotayk Marz (region)	Group Interview
Mr. Ashot Yesayan	Legal expert (former Minister of Labour and Social Issues)	Interview
Mr. Dirk Boberg	DRR, UNDP	Group Interview
Mr. Filaret Berikyan	Deputy Minister of Labour and Social Affairs	Group Interview
Mr. Gagik Gevorgyan	Member of the State Council on Statistics	Group Interview
Mr. Garik Hayrapetyan	UNFPA Assistant Representative	Group Interview/ Interview
Mr. Hovhannes Hovhannesian	RoA Public Council, Chair of the Committee on Civil Society	Group Interview
Mr. Vahe Gyulkhasian	UNFPA SRH Project Coordinator	Group Interview
Mr. Vladimir Osipov	Researcher, Institute of Philosophy and Rights, National Academy of Science	Group Interview
Ms. Aida Ghazaryan	UNFPA National Program Office	Group Interview/ Interview
Ms. Anna Hovhannisyan	UNFPA SP&D Project Coordinator	Group Interview

Evaluation of UNFPA Goal 3 - Gender Equality

Name	Position/Organization	Method of Consultation
Ms. Arevik Saribekyan	Director, British Council Armenia	Interview
Ms. Armenuhi Tanashyan	Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs Gender Focal Point	Group Interview
Ms. Dafina Gercheva	UN Resident Coordinator/UNDP Representative/UNFPA Representative	Group Interview
Ms. Diana Martirosova	Head of Households Survey Division, NSS	Group Interview
Ms. Gayane Avagyan	Ministry of Health Gender Focal Point	Group Interview
Ms. Gohar Gabrielyan	Family, Children and Women issues Department, Hrazdan town, Kotayk Marz (region)	Group Interview
Ms. Ilona Ter-Minasyan	IOM Country Representative	Group Interview
Ms. Jemma Hasratyan	Armenian Association of Women with University Education NGO (AAWUE)	Group Interview
Ms. Jina Sargizova	UNFPA, "Combating GBV in the South Caucasus" National Project Coordinator	Group Interview/ Interview
Ms. Karine Kuyumjyan	Head of Census and Demography Division, NSS	Group Interview
Ms. Lilit Zakaryan	Provost of the Armenian North University, member of the State Commission on Educational Standards, Gender Expert	Group Interview
Ms. Marine Aghajanyan	Ministry of Education and Science Gender Focal Point	Group Interview
Ms. Nara Ghazaryan	USAID	Interview
Ms. Nelli Duryan	RA Police Gender Focal Point	Phone
Ms. Rubina Devrikyan	ART FBO/UNFPA CGBV Joint Initiative Coordinator	Group Interview
Ms. Susanna Grigoryan	UNHCR Protection Officer	Interview
Ms. Tamara Hovnatanyan	"Women and politics" newspaper, Editor-in-Chief	Group Interview
Nver Sargsyan	ILO Anti-trafficking project	Interview
Rev. Fr. Vardan Navasardyan	Director of the Christian Education Center of the Mother See of Holy Etchmiadzin	Group Interview
Tsovinar Harutyunyan	Gender Focal Point/National Project Officer, OSCE Office in Yerevan	Interview
Georgia		
Besik Tserediani	IDP Community Development Centre	Interview / Group Interview
Darejan Shengelia	Patriarchy	Interview
Eva Csergo	Development Cooperation Attache, French Embassy, Tbilisi	Interview
Giorgi Kalakashvili	NSS Gender	Group Interview
Irakli Khvedelidze	CSMA Director	Group Interview
Irina Badurashvili	GCPR Director	Group Interview

Evaluation of UNFPA Goal 3 - Gender Equality

Name	Position/Organization	Method of Consultation
Irina Kacheishvili	Chief Editor, Amarta Magazine	Interview
Irma Aladashvili	ATIP MOLSHA	Group Interview
Iulia Kharaisvili	MRA and member of the GEI Council at the Parliament	Interview / Group Interview
John Kvinikadze	Trainer Men talking to Men	Group Interview
Koba Bochorishvili	Center for Protection of Constitutional Human Rights	Group Interview
Lali Papiashvili	Chairperson, Interagency Council on DV, State Chancellery of the Gov't of Georgia	Group Interview
Lela Bakradze	Programme Analyst, UNFPA	Group Interview
Lia Cherkezishvili	NSS Gender	Group Interview
Liana Sigua	Norwegian Honorary Consul	Interview
Lika Sidamonidze	IAC DV State Chancellery of the Gov't of Georgia	Group Interview
Maia Kuprava-Sharvshidze	NGO	Group Interview
Maka Peradze	Head of Project Coordination and Cooperation with International Organizations Unit, Ministry of Interior	Group Interview
Mari Meskhi	ATIP MOLSHA	Group Interview
Mariam Bandeladze	National Project Coordinator, UN Joint Project on GE, UNFPA Georgia	Group Interview
Maya Rusetskaja	NGO Women's Information Centre	Group Interview
Nana Berikashvili	ICCN	Group Interview
Natalia Zakareishvili	Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, UNFPA Georgia	Interview/ Group Interview
Natia Chekezishvili	UNDP	Group Interview
Natia Natsvlshvili	Governance Team Leader, UNDP	Interview
Nato Shavlakadze	NGO Antiviolence Union	Group Interview
Nino Javakhetishvili	TSU	Group Interview
Paata Shavishvili	Head of Demographic Division, NSS	Interview
Rusudan Kervalishvili	Vice Speaker of Parliament, Chairperson, Parliamentary Council on Gender Equality	Interview
Rusudan Pkhakadze	NGO	Group Interview
Rusudan Telia	CEO, Partner, ACT Research	Group Interview
Shota Khinchagashvili	Trainer Men talking to Men	Group Interview
Tamar Khomasuridze	Assistant Representative, UNFPA CO Georgia	Group Interview
Tamar Sabeledashvili	UN Women Gender Adviser for Georgia	Interview / Group Interview
Tamar Tatunashvili	Main Specialist, Project Coordination and Cooperation with International Organizations Unit, Ministry of Interior	Group Interview
Tatia Vashkakidze	GBV Project Communication specialist, UNFPA	Interview
Tea Jaliashvili	National Project Coordinator, GBV-SC, UNFPA	Group Interview

Evaluation of UNFPA Goal 3 - Gender Equality

Name	Position/Organization	Method of Consultation
Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office		
Ana Elena Badilla Kathy Taylor	UNFPA LACRO	Group Interview
Beatriz Castellanos	Regional Advisor for Monitoring and Evaluation	Interview
Marcela Suazo	Regional LACRO Director	Interview
Marta Perez del Pulgar	Focal point for Humanitarian Assistance and Disasters	Interview
Guatemala		
2 representatives from each group	Alliance for Action to Detain Femicide: CICAM Citizenship Convergence of Women; Survival Foundation	Interview
Alejandro Silva	UNFPA Program Officer. SRH Component	Interview
Ana Luisa Rivas	Assistant Representative of UNFPA Guatemala	Interview
Andrea Barrios	Artisan House	Interview
Bianka Hernández, Directora	Conjuve, Government entity for youth public policy	Interview
Cecilia Alfaro	Director of the Gender and Ethical pertinence Unit of the Ministry of Education	Interview
Cleotilde Cu and Evelyn Curruchich	Indigenous People Defense Entity- Get to know the model of integral attention of violence	Interview
Dinora Morales	Criminal Politics Unit	Interview
Dr. Silvia Palma, Vice Minister of Health and Technical Team	National Program of Reproductive Health, Gender and Indigenous peoples Unit	Interview
Ekaterina Parrilla	Executive Director, Sub Secretary of Public Policy. Secretary of Planning and Programming of the Presidency - SEGEPLAN	Interview
Fabiola Ortíz, Director	CONAPREVI, State agency for the eradication of violence against women	Interview
Guatemala UNFPA office staff except the gender unit	Meeting	Interview
Juana María Camposeco and Gretel Guerra	Swedish Embassy Spanish Development Agency	Interview
Julieta Solórzano	Interagency secretariat, interagency group on gender and the advances of women, GIGAM.	Interview
Karelia Ramos	UNFPA HIV/Aids Consultant	Interview
Leonor Calderón	UNFPA representative in Guatemala	Phone Interview
Lisslet Díaz	UNFPA Regional Project Coordinator	Interview
Magistrate Thelma Aldana	Judicial Organism	Interview

Evaluation of UNFPA Goal 3 - Gender Equality

Name	Position/Organization	Method of Consultation
Marciano Castillo	National Institute of Statistics - in charge of Gender and Indigenous Peoples Unit	Interview
Marielos Monzón	More Women More Politics	Interview
Marta Julia Ruiz	Population Council	Interview
Myrna Ponce, and Legislator Zury Ríos	Reproductive Health Observatory	Interview
René Mauricio Valdés	Meeting with the Resident Coordinator of the UN system in Guatemala	Interview
Rita Cassissi	UN Women, Regional Coordinator	Interview
Sonia Escobedo, Angelina Aspuac and Lins Tillit,	Presidential Secretariat of Women	Interview
UNFPA CO Gender Team	Meeting	Interview
Vice Minister: Dora Mejía	Ministry of Government	Interview
World Health Organization	Technical focal point - joint Program of the United Nations to strengthen institutions of women in Guatemala	Interview
Yolanda Ávila	UNFPA Program officer, gender component	Interview
Yolanda Jocholá	Technical Coordinator of the Program to strengthen to empower	Interview
Jamaica		
Althea Buchanan	Advocacy Specialist	Interview
Carlos Ellis	Regional Census Adviser	Interview
Carlos Valencia	International Operations Manager	Interview
Derven Patrick	Maternal Health Thematic Trust Fund - Guyana	Telephone interview
Director	Jamaica Womens Centre	Interview
Dr. Barbara Bailey	Caribbean Gender Expert	Telephone interview
Dr. Dalia Dean	Institute for Gender & Development Studies , UWI	Telephone Interview
Dr. Hernando Agudelo	Officer-In-Charge/Deputy Director	Interview
Dr. Mario Aguilar	Regional SRH Adviser	Interview
Dr. Marvin Gunter	HIV/AIDS Advisor UNFPA	Interview
Dr. Peter Weller	Caribbean Male Action Network (CariMAN)	Telephone Interview
Dr. Pierre Somse	UNAIDS	Interview
Erika Goldon	Assistant Representative - Belize	Telephone interview

Evaluation of UNFPA Goal 3 - Gender Equality

Name	Position/Organization	Method of Consultation
Glen Smith	National Programme Officer, PDS	Interview
Isiuwa Iyahan	Assistant Representative – Barbados	Telephone interview
Jewel Quallo-Rosberg	Regional Gender Specialist	Interview
Judith Brielle	Assistant Representative - Suriname	Telephone interview
Melissa McNeil-Barrett	Assistant Representative – Jamaica	Interview
Ms. Roberta Clarke	Regional Programme Director, UN Women	Telephone Interview
Patrice Lafleur	Assistant Representative – Guyana	Telephone interview
Sub Director and Technical Assistant	Jamaican Bureau of Women’s Affairs	Interview
Tammy Yates	Assistant Representative (Actg.) – Trinidad & Tobago	Telephone interview
Technical Team and Director	Jamaica National Family Planning Board	Interview
Technical Team and Director	Jamaica Network of Serpositives	Interview
Vertha Dumont	Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist	Interview
Asia and the Pacific Regional Office		
Ali Shirazi	Program Specialist, UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office	Interview
Amasarna Darisuren	Human Rights Specialist, UN Women East and Southeast Asia Region	Telephone Interview
Ana Maria Leal	Program Officer-Detailed, UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office	Group Interview
Anne Harmer	Socio-Cultural Adviser, UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office	Interview
Chaiyos Kunanusont	Technical Director on HIV/AIDS, UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office	Group Interview
Chandani Galwaduge	National Program Officer-Regional Health, UNFPA Sri Lanka Country Office	Group Interview
Donald Henry Clarke	Chief, Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Section, Social Development Division, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP)	Interview
Emma Fulu	Research Specialist, Partners for Prevention, (UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women, UNV Regional Joint Program for Asia and the Pacific)	Group Interview
Florence Tayzon	Assistant Representative, UNFPA Philippines Country Office	Group Interview

Evaluation of UNFPA Goal 3 - Gender Equality

Name	Position/Organization	Method of Consultation
Galanne Deressa	Program Specialist, UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office	Group Interview
James Lang	Program Coordinator, Partners for Prevention	Group Interview
Jane Wilson	Adviser GIPA, Gender and Human Rights Regional Support Team Asia and the Pacific, UNAIDS	Interview
Josephine Sauvarin	Technical Adviser, HIV/AIDS and Adolescent and Sexual Reproductive Health, UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office	Group Interview
Kiran Bhatia	Technical Adviser-Gender, UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office	Interview
Mobashar Haneef Malik	National Program Officer, UNFPA Pakistan Country Office	Group Interview
Moni Pizani	Representative and Regional Program Director, UN Women East and Southeast Asia Regional Office	Group Interview
Najib Assifi	UNFPA Representative in Thailand & Deputy Regional Director, UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office	Interview
Nobuko Horibe	Regional Director, UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office	Interview
Richard H. Columbia	Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor, UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office	Interview
Rizvina Dealwis	Program Specialist, UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office	Group Interview
Rosilawati Anggraini	Humanitarian Officer, UNFPA Indonesia Country Office.	Group Interview
Ryrat Rangsitpol	Regional Program Officer, UN Women East and Southeast Asia Regional Office	Group Interview
Samma Mathai	Regional Team Coordinator and Adviser on Maternal Health, UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office	Interview
Sathyanarayanan Doraiswamy	Humanitarian Response Specialist, UNFPA Nepal Country Office	Group Interview
Shiv Khare	Executive Director, The Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development	Interview
Soyoltuya Bayaraa	Program Specialist, UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office	Interview
Bangladesh		
Abdur Razzaque	Assistant Secretary, Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers & Exporters Association (BGMEA)	Group Interview
Arthur Erken	Country Representative, UNFPA Bangladesh	Interview
Ashraf Hossain	Director General, Department of Women Affairs, Ministry of Women & Children Affairs	Interview
Khondker Zakiur Rahman	National Professional Project Personnel, UNFPA Bangladesh	Interview

Evaluation of UNFPA Goal 3 - Gender Equality

Name	Position/Organization	Method of Consultation
Mahmuda Farzana Akhter	National Professional Project Personnel - Gender, UNFPA Bangladesh	Interview
Manir Uzzaman	Director of Administration/ Superintendent of Police, Police Staff College	Group Interview
Mathiur Rahman Sheikh	Director of Training/ Superintendent of Police, Police Staff College	Group Interview
Mozaharul Islam Khan	Senior Programme Officer – Monitoring and Evaluation, UNFPA Bangladesh	Interview
Naheed Ahmed	Programme Manager, UNWomen Bangladesh	Interview
Naim Ahmed	Rector/ Additional Inspector General of Police, Police Staff College	Group Interview
Nizamuddin Al-Hussainy	Director, Department of Women Affairs/ Project Director - Promotion of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, Ministry of Women and Children Affairs	Interview
Noor Mohammad	Assistant Representative – Gender; Population and Development, UNFPA Bangladesh	Interview
Ruchira Tabassum Naved	Head, Gender, Human Rights and Health Program, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research (ICDDR, B), Bangladesh	Interview
Shammin Sultana	Senior Programme Officer – Gender, UNFPA Bangladesh	Interview
Syed Zakir Hossain	Chief Medical Officer, Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers & Exporters Association (BGMEA)	Group Interview
Zaman Ara	Senior Programme Officer – Reproductive Health & Safe Motherhood, UNFPA Bangladesh	Interview
Cambodia		
Ann Lund	Senior UN Coordination Specialist, Office of the UN Resident Coordinator, Cambodia	Interview
Begoña Castro-Vazquez	Gender Adviser, Promotion of Women's Rights Project, GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit), The Ministry of Women's Affairs, Cambodia	Interview
Chandy Chea	Program Manager-Gender, UNFPA Cambodia	Interview
Chantum Chea	Professional Staff, Ministry of Planning	Group Interview
Chayrin Tong	Advisor, Ministry of Planning	Group Interview
Chim Yeng	Assistant, Ministry of Planning	Group Interview
Chun Chorvy	Department Deputy Director, Ministry of Planning	Group Interview
Juan Pita	General Coordinator of the Spanish Cooperation in Cambodia, Embassy of Spain, Cambodia	Interview
Kengnavuth Noup	Ministry of Planning	Group Interview

Evaluation of UNFPA Goal 3 - Gender Equality

Name	Position/Organization	Method of Consultation
Khiev Hok	Deputy Director of Administrative Development, Ministry of Health	Group Interview
Lina Hang	Deputy General	Group Interview
Meuk Samean	Deputy Director- National Blood Transfusion	Group Interview
Nanda Pok	Executive Director, Women for Prosperity: A Non-governmental Organization	Interview
Nesim Tumkaya	Officer-In-Charge, UNFPA Cambodia	Group Interview
Nhean Sochetra	Director, Gender Equality Department, Ministry of Women's Affairs	Interview
Ouk Monna	Biologist, Secretary of State for Health	Group Interview
Phorn Phasoka	Radio Executive Producer, Women's Media Centre of Cambodia	Group Interview
Pros Nguon	Program Assistant to Cambodian Midwives Council, UNFPA	Group Interview
Putheany Chul	Department Director, Ministry of Planning	Group Interview
Rany Pen	Program Analyst-Governance Cluster, UNDP Cambodia	Interview
Ratana Chap	Population Development Assistant, UNFPA Cambodia	Group Interview
Rothmony Meas	Professional Staff, Ministry of Planning	Group Interview
Sarah Knibbs	Deputy Representative, UNFPA Cambodia	Group Interview
Satoko Nadamoto	Project Formulation Advisor- Governance and Gender, Japan International Cooperation Agency, Cambodia Office	Group Interview
Soktha Yi	Population Development Manager, UNFPA Cambodia	Group Interview
Sokun Sok	Reproductive Health Manager, UNFPA Cambodia	Group Interview
Sopha Va	Professional Staff, Ministry of Planning	Group Interview
Sovandy Poch	Deputy General, Ministry of Planning	Group Interview
Soviry Vuon	Radio Station Manager, Women's Media Centre of Cambodia	Group Interview
Theary Khon	Auditor, Ministry of Planning	Group Interview
Theary Sok	Department Deputy Director, Ministry of Planning	Group Interview
Thyda Pich	Program Officer, Japan International Cooperation Agency, Cambodia Office	Group Interview
Tum May	Assistant Representative, UNFPA Cambodia	Group Interview
Vichet Heng	Professional Staff, Ministry of Planning	Group Interview
Vuthy Vong	Professional Staff, Ministry of Planning	Group Interview
Wenny Kusuma	Country Director, UN Women Cambodia	Interview

Evaluation of UNFPA Goal 3 - Gender Equality

Name	Position/Organization	Method of Consultation
Stakeholders consulted by telephone and email consultations in countries <u>not</u> visited		
Aleta Miller*	Gender and Human Rights Specialist and GHR Team Leader, UNFPA New York	Telephone Consultation
Ana Lorena Flores Salazar	Costa Rica. National Institute of Women	Telephone /Email Consultation
Beatriz Garcia Beltrán	Gender and Huminatiran affairs , UNFPA Peru	Telephone Interview
Danijela Alijagic	Programme Analyst, Assistant Representative, UNFPA BiH	Telephone Consultation
Esmeralda Ruiz	Advisor Gender and Rights, Colombia	Telephone/Email Consultation
Fathimath Yumna	Ministry of Health and Family, Department of Gender and Family Protection Services, Maldives	Email Consultation
Gabrijela Jurela	Joint UNFPA/UNDP Project manager for GBV Project, BiH	Skype Consultation
Gulnara Kadrykulova	P&D Specialist and P&D Cluster Lead, UNFPA Almaty	Telephone Consultation
Jorge Parra	UNFPA Representative in Ecuador	Interview
Julien Pellaux	Gender and Human Rights Specialist and Member of Gender Team, UNFPA Almaty	Telephone Consultation
Karen Daduryan	Regional Team Coordinator, UNFPA Istanbul	Skype Consultation
Kathy Shein	Association Francois-Xavier Bagnoud (AFXB), Myanmar	Email Consultation
Khin Zar Naing	UNFPA Programme Officer on Gender, Gender Focal Point, Focal Point of UNFPA in UN Gender Theme Group, UNFPA Myanmar	Email Consultation
Lorna Gamez	Costa Rica Social Security , Costa Rica	Telephone Interview
Lucy Wartenberg	Assitant Representative UNFPA Colombia	Telephone Interview
Marcela Encizo Gaitan	Advisor on womens rights to the attorney general in Colombia	Email Consultation
Maria Lafuente Funes, Cooperante	UNFPA Peru, Gender Unit	Telephone Interview
Maria Paola Romo	Legislator, Ecuador Congress	Interview
Maria Teresa Duque	Public Policy Specialist. Integral program of gender based violence. Gender Spanish MDG Fund. Colombia	Telephone interview
Marianne Lizana	Gender program office in Costa Rica	Telephone Interview
Marie Jennie Dador Tozzini	Director, Manuela Ramos, Peru	Telephone Interview

Evaluation of UNFPA Goal 3 - Gender Equality

Name	Position/Organization	Method of Consultation
Marina Artemenko	Head of the Department of Family and Gender Policy of the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection, Minsk, Belarus	Telephone Consultation
Meder Omurzakov	Assistant Representative, UNFPA Kyrgyzstan	Telephone Consultation
Mima Bernachea	Assistant Representative, UNFPA Peru	Telephone Interview
Nikolai Botev	Director of Sub-Regional Office, UNFPA Almaty	Telephone Consultation
Norma Mayo	CONAIE, Indigenous Movement of Ecuador	Interview
Nurgul Kinderbaeva	National Program Analyst on Gender, UNFPA Kyrgyzstan	Telephone Consultation
Pansy Tun Thein	Assistant Representative, Head of Reproductive Health Unit, Co-Chair of Women's Protection Technical Working Group, UNFPA Myanmar	Email Consultation
Patricia Salgado	UNFPA representative in Costa Rica	Telephone Interview
Polini Boseto	Former UNFPA National Officer in Solomon Islands	Email Consultation
Priscila Carbrera	JPO Gender Focal Point, Ecuador	Interview
Raniya Sobir	UNDP Poverty Reduction Programme, Gender Focal Point	Email Consultation
Riet Groenen Lorna Mosese Rolls	Gender and Human Rights Adviser, UNFPA Sub-Regional Office for the Pacific Assistant Representative, UNFPA Pacific Sub-Regional Office	Telephone Interview
Shadiya Ibrahim	UNFPA Maldives	Email Consultation
Sivananthi Thanenthiran	Program Manager (Information, Communication and Research), The Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women, Malaysia	Telephone Interview
Tatyana Haplichnik	Assistant Representative, Gender Component, Chairperson of UN Gender Theme Group, UNFPA Minsk	Skype Consultation
Tatyana Pronko	Programme Associate, UNFPA Minsk	Skype Consultation

Appendix IV Data Source: Documents and Websites

UNFPA Corporate Level Documents

“Annual Report 2008.” [UNFPA](#) 2009.

“Annual Report 2009.” [UNFPA](#) 2010.

“Beijing at Fifteen. UNFPA and Partners Charting the Way Forward.” [UNFPA](#). 2010.

“RBM Terminology and Definitions.” [Environmental Scanning and Planning Branch \(ESPB Programme Division\)](#) April 2010.

“Strategic Plan 2008-2011 Results Framework Indicators Guidelines & Methodologies.” (Updated Version). [Environmental Scanning and Planning Branch Programme Division UNFPA](#). January 19, 2009.

“UNFPA Strategic Plan 2008-2011: Accelerating progress and national ownership of the ICPD Programme of Action.” Report of the Executive Director. [UNFPA](#) 27 July 2007.

“UNFPA Strategic Plan 2008-2011 Development and Management Results Frameworks Indicators, Baselines and Targets.” [UNFPA](#) 4 September 2008.

“UNFPA Strategic Plan Development Results Framework. Reference Set of Outputs - Approach and Methodology for global aggregation of results.” DRAFT Version. [UNFPA](#). April 2011

UNFPA Thematic Documents with focus on Gender Equality and Human Rights

“2007 Delivering on the Promise of Equality: UNFPA’s Strategic Framework on Gender Mainstreaming and Women’s Empowerment 2008-2011.” [UNFPA](#).

“Delivering on the Promise of Equality UNFPA’s Strategic Framework on Gender Mainstreaming and Women’s Empowerment 2008-2013.” [UNFPA](#). 2008.

“Guidelines for Engaging Faith-based Organizations (FBOs) As Agents of Change.” UNFPA 2009.

“Integrating Gender, Human Rights and Culture in UNFPA Programmes.” [UNFPA](#). 29 April 2010.

“UNFPA Strategy and Framework for Action to Addressing Gender-based Violence.” [UNFPA](#) 2008.

Executive Board Documents

“Policy Note on Implementing a Human Rights-Based Approach to Programming in UNFPA.” UNFPA/RR/04/8. [UNFPA Office of the Executive Director](#). 2004.

“Review of the Organizational Structure of UNFPA Report of the Director Corrigendum DP/FPA/2007/16/Corr.1.” [Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund](#) 7 September 2007.

“Review of the Organizational Structure of UNFPA Report of the Director DP/FPA/2007/16.” [Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund](#). 24 July 2007.

“UNFPA Report of the Executive Director for 2010. Cumulative Analysis of Progress in Implementation of the UNFPA Strategic Plan, 2008-2013.” [UNFPA](#). 2011.

“UNFPA Report of the Executive Director for 2009: Progress and Achievements in Implementing the UNFPA Strategic Plan.” UNFPA Annual Report of the Executive Director. [UNFPA](#). 2010.

“United National Population Fund Global and regional programme, 2008-2011 DP/FPA/2007/19.” Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund 17 July 2007.

TORs

“Country Office TORs.” UNFPA December 2007.

“Information and External Relations Division TORs.” UNFPA December 2007.

“Introduction Terms of Reference for UNFPA Units.” UNFPA 2007.

“Programme Division TORs.” UNFPA December 2007.

“Regional Office TORs.” UNFPA December 2007.

“Technical Division TORs.” UNFPA December 2007.

“Terms of Reference for UNFPA Units.” revised/new. 2007.

Previous UNFPA Capacity Assessment Reports

“Capacity Assessment Report: Gender Human, Rights and Culture Mainstreaming in UNFPA”. UNFPA Gender Human Rights and Culture Branch. 2008

“DFID Gender Benchmarking Study of UNFPA, UNDP, UNAIDS, WHO, UNICEF and FAO.” DFID 2010.

“Gender Equality Institutional Assessment (GEIA) – UNFPA.” CIDA 22 December 2009.

Regional and Country Level Documents

Eastern Europe and Central Asia

“2010 Annual Report EECA Regional Office.” UNFPA. January 11, 2011.

“Combating Gender Based Violence in the South Caucasus 2008-2010 Interim Report.” UNFPA.

“Combating Gender Based Violence in the South Caucasus.” Ankara. UNFPA. January 2007.

“Eastern Europe and Central Asia Regional Office Standard Progress Report 2008.” UNFPA EECARO. 2008.

“EECA Regional Annual Workplan and Monitoring Tool Gender Component 2010.” UNFPA EECARO. 2010.

“Mid-Term Review Regional Programme 2008-2013 UNFPA Eastern Europe & Central Asia Regional Office (EECARO).” Wedden, Laura. March, 2011.

“United Nations Population Fund Regional Programme for Eastern Europe and Central Asia 2008-2013.” Suggested Draft Format for RPAP Revision. UNFPA. November 2010.

Armenia

“2008 Country Office Annual Report (COAR)”. UNFPA. 2009.

“2009 Country Office Annual Report Armenia”. UNFPA. 2010.

“Annual Work Plan 2010.” Armenian Ministry of Health, Armenian Ministry of Defence, Armenian Institute of Perinatology, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Armenian Ministry of Labor and Social Issues, Armenia National Statistical Service, UNFPA. 2009.

“Assessment of the Republic of Armenia National Legislation from Gender-Based Violence Perspective: Summary.” UNFPA, Yerevan (8 pages).2009.

- “Combating Gender Based Violence in the South Caucasus 2008-2010, Annex 1: Cooperating/implementing partners 2010.” UNFPA, Norway, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia . 2009.
- “Combating Gender Based Violence in the South Caucasus 2008-2010, Annex 2: Financial Implementation within the reporting period 1 February 2010-31 August 2010 and planned budget for 1 September 2010-31 March 2011.” UNFPA, Norway, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia. 2009.
- “Combating Gender Based Violence in the South Caucasus 2008-2010, Financial Implementation for KAU-08/003 within the reporting period 1 February 2009-31 January 2010 and planned budget for the 3rd phase of the Project (1 February 2010-31 March 2011).” UNFPA, Norway, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia. 2009.
- “Combating Gender Based Violence in the South Caucasus 2008-2010, KAU-08/003, Interim Report, Reporting period: 1 February 2009- 31 August 2009.” UNFPA, Norway, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia. 2009.
- “Combating Gender Based Violence in the South Caucasus 2008-2010, KAU-08/003, Report, Reporting Period: 1 April 2008- 31 January 2009.” UNFPA, Norway, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia. 2009.
- “Combating Gender-Based Violence in the South Caucasus, KAU-08/003, Progress Report 2009.” UNFPA, Norway, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia. 2009.
- “Combating Gender-Based Violence in the South Caucasus, Project Proposal.” Ankara, January 2007. UNFPA. 2007.
- “Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2010-2015” between the Government of the Republic of Armenia and United Nations Population Fund, Yerevan, Armenia. Government of the Republic of Armenia and United Nations Population Fund. 2010.
- “Country programme document for Armenia, DP/FPA/CPD/ARM/1,” 11 October 2004. UNFPA. 2004.
- “Draft Country Programme Document for Armenia, DP/FPA/CPD/ARM/1. ” Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund: United Nations Population Fund.
- “Faith and Development – Armenia Case Study, ‘Capacity Building of Priests on ICDP Issues’ and ‘Armenian Churches against Gender-Based Violence’.” UNFPA Armenia . 2010.
- “Nationwide Survey on Domestic Violence Against Women in Armenia 2008-2009: Executive Summary.” UNFPA, Yerevan. 2010.
- Various newspaper inserts Women and Politics (in Russian) December 2008 – November 2010.
- “Resource Mobilization Plan, 2nd Country Programme 2010-2015.” July 2010. UNFPA, Armenia. 2010.
- Survey on Family as an Institution. UNFPA, Yerevan. 2006.
- “The Butterfly.” Documentary on domestic violence in Armenia. 17 minutes. UNFPA.2010.
- “UNFPA Armenia Communication Strategy.”
- “UNFPA Country Programme Action Plan, UNFPA Country Programme for Armenia, 2005-2009.” Yerevan, Armenia.
- “UNDAF United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2005 – 2009 Armenia.”
- “UNDAF United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2005 – 2009 Armenia, Annex One: Diagram of Rights-Based Strategy”.

Belarus

- “2009 Country Office Annual Report Belarus.” UNFPA. 2010.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

“2009 Country Office Annual Report Bosnia and Herzegovina.” UNFPA. 2010.

Georgia

“2006-2010 Country Programme Performance Summary as of December 2009.” UNFPA 2009.

“Annual Work Plan Monitoring Tool, Project “Advocacy and Capacity Building for Gender Equality” ”. UNFPA, Advisory Council on Gender Equality Issues at the Speaker of the Parliament, Government Commission on Gender Equality Issues (GCGE). 2006.

“Annual Work Plan Monitoring Tool, UN Joint Project “UN Initiative in Support of Greater Gender Equality in Georgia.” ” UNFPA, UNDP, UNIFEM, UNICEF and UN RC Office in Georgia. 2008.

“Annual Work Plan Monitoring Tool , UN Joint Project “UN Initiative in Support of Greater Gender Equality in Georgia” “. UNFPA, UNDP, UNIFEM, UNICEF and UN RC Office in Georgia. 2009.

“Annual Work Plan Monitoring Tool , UN Joint Project “UN Initiative in Support of Greater Gender Equality in Georgia.” ” UNFPA, UNDP, UNIFEM, UNICEF and UN RC Office in Georgia. 2010.

“Country Office Annual Report Georgia,” 2006. UNFPA. 2007.

“Country Office Annual Report Georgia,” 2007. UNFPA. 2008.

“Country Office Annual Report Georgia,” 2009. UNFPA. 2010.

“Gender Relations in Modern Georgian Society”. Badurashvili, I. et al. 2008.

“Law of Georgia on Gender Equality,” 26 March 2010, unofficial English translation.

“Monitoring of Implementation of the Action Plan on Elimination of Domestic Violence and Protection and Support to its Victims (2007-2008).” Aladashvili, I., Chkheidze, K. 2008.

“Monitoring Report of Implementation of the Action Plan on Elimination of Domestic Violence and Protection and Support to its Victims for 2009-2010.” Chkheidze, K., Bochorishvili, K. 2010.

“National Research on Domestic Violence Against Women in Georgia, Final Report.” Tbilisi, ACT/CSS/UNFPA. Chitashvili, M. et al. 2010.

“Review of the Gender Equality Strategy and Monitoring of the 2007-2009 National Action Plan on Gender Equality in Georgia.” Aladashvili, I., Chkheidze, K. 2009.

“The Collection of Normative Acts on Prevention of Domestic Violence, Protection and Assistance of Victims of Domestic Violence in Georgia.” Tbilisi. UNFPA (publisher). 2010.

“UNFPA and GCPR: Gender Relations in Modern Georgian Society.” Tbilisi. 2008.

“UNFPA: CAP Planning and Tracking Tool, CAP cycle 2006-2010.” UNFPA Georgia internal document.

“UNFPA Country programme document for Georgia, DP/FPA/CPD/GEO/1.” 2006-2010. Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund. 2005.

“UNFPA First Country Program Evaluation Report, Reproductive Health, P&D and Gender Components.” Saakashvili, N., Gotsadze, T., Avaliani, N. 2010.

“UNFPA Georgia Country Programme Results Linkages with UNFPA Strategic Plan (2008-2013), UNDAF (2011-2015) and National Development Frameworks.” Internal document UNFPA Georgia.

Kyrgyzstan

“2009 Country Office Annual Report Kyrgyzstan.” UNFPA. 2010.

“2005-2011 Kyrgyzstan Country Program.” UNFPA Kyrgyzstan. 2011.

Latin America and the Caribbean Region

“2010 Annual Report Latin America/Caribbean Regional Office.” UNFPA. January 11, 2011.

“2010 Report on the UNFPA – AECID Fund.” (Spanish Fund). November 2010.

“Actividades en genero de las Oficinas de Pais 2010.” UNFPA LACRO. January 2011.

“Estrategia Regional de Igualdad de Genero 2008/2011.” Fondo de Poblacion de las Naciones Unidas Division para America Latina y El Caribe.

“Evaluación de Medio Término de la Implementación del Programa: “Campaña de Promoción de la Salud Materna desde una Perspectiva Intercultural y de Derechos” Eje 3 del Fondo de Cooperación AECID-UNFPA.” Informe Final. Faundez Melendez, Alejandra y Weinstein Cayuela, Marisa. November 26, 2010.

“Informe de los Aportes del UNFPA al cumplimiento del Consenso de Quito en America Latina y el Caribe.” Presentado a la XI Conferencia Regional de la Mujer, realizada en Brasilia, Brasil, del 13 al 16 de Julio de 2010. UNFPA.

“Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office Annual Work Plan 2010.” UNFPA. 2010.

“Midterm Evaluation of the Project RLA6G21A , Strengthening capacities of Indigenous Women to affect maternal health with an intercultural focus.”

“Mid Term Review of UNFPA Regional Programme for Latin America and the Caribbean 2008 – 2011.” Panama. March 2011.

“UNFPA Gender Regional Strategy 2008/2011.” UNFPA LACRO Division.

Colombia

“2009 Country Office Annual Report Colombia.” UNFPA. 2010.

“Colombia Country Programme Action Plan 2008 – 2012.” DCI/AB No.66642. Ministry of External Relations Colombian Republic.

“Country Program Colombia and Plan of Action 2008 -2012.” UNFPA.

“UNFPA Evaluation of the V program 2008, 2009 and 2010.” Bogota. Henao, Juanita. January 2011.

Costa Rica

“2009 Country Office Annual Report Costa Rica.” UNFPA. 2010.

“Plan of Action of the Country Programme between the Government of Costa Rica and UNFPA 2008 – 2012.” UNFPA and Government of Costa Rica.

Ecuador

“2009 Country Office Annual Report Ecuador.” UNFPA. 2010.

“Ecuador Country Plan of Action 2010-2014.” UNFPA.

Guatemala

“2009 Country Office Annual Report Guatemala.” UNFPA. 2010.

“2010 Country Office Annual Report Guatemala.” UNFPA. 2011.

Guatemalan National Demographic database.

“Guatemala UNDAF 2005-2009.”

“Integral Education on Sexuality documents.” Photographs Mark Tuschman. UNFPA and MINEDUC.

“MDG Fund Projects; Gender Project and Peace Project”

“Proposal for the Strengthen to Empower Project.” May 2009.

“UNFPA Gender Component 2010-2014.” Presentation.

“Strategy and Plan of the Integral National Policy to promote women and the equal opportunities plan. Ministry of Education.”

“Indigenous Women’s Agenda.” Guatemala. December 2010.

Jamaica

“2009 Country Office Annual Report Jamaica.” UNFPA. 2010.

“2010 Country Office Annual Report Jamaica.” UNFPA. 2011.

“Bureau of Women’s Affairs Annual Report to UNFPA 2009.” March 2010.

“Draft UN Sub regional Analysis January 2011-04-26.” Jackson, Jason.

“Evaluation Report on UNFPA Fourth Multi-Country Programme of Assistance for English and Dutch Speaking Caribbean Countries 2007-2011.” Russell-Brown, Pauline – RH/Gender (Team Leader), Ramautarsing, Winston – PDS. November 19, 2010.

“Gender Expenditure Analysis. LAC Budget Activities for Gender. SRO for the Caribbean 2009 – 2010.” UNFPA.

“Jamaica Progress Report 2010 VAW. Violence Against Women; Addressing the Gaps in Jamaica. Progress Report.” February 2011.

“Latin America and the Caribbean budget for the activities of gender in the period 2009-2010 Sub-regional office for the Caribbean.” UNFPA.

“Prostitution, Sex Work and Transactional sex in the English, Dutch and French Speaking Caribbean; A literature Review of Definitions, Laws and Research.” York University. Kempadoo, Dr.Kamala. June 30, 2009.

“Report on United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) Partnership project “Violence Against Women. Addressing the Gaps.” In collaboration with the Bureau of Women’s Affairs and Women Inc 2010.” Activity Report.

“Wise Up: a Television series on GBV.”

Peru

“2009 Country Office Annual Report Peru.” UNFPA. 2010.

“Peru Country Programme Project 2006- 2010.” Joint Executive program of UNFPA. DP/FPA/DCP/PER/7. UNFPA. 13 May 2005.

Asia and the Pacific Region

“1325 and the Solomon Islands Truth and Reconciliation Commission.” UNIFEM Pacific and Sub-Regional Office. 2010.

“1325+10: Women Count for Peace. 10th Anniversary of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325.” Thailand: Bangkok, 2010. UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office. 2010.

“2010 Annual Report Asia and the Pacific Regional Office.” UNFPA. January 14, 2011.

“Addressing Gender Equality and Gender-based Violence.” Powerpoint Slide Presentation. 2/14/2011. Bhatia, Kiran. 2011.

“AFPPD 2009 – A Review.” Thailand: Bangkok. Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development. 2009.

“Agenda for Accelerated Country Action for Women, Girls, Gender Equality and HIV.” Switzerland: Geneva. UNAIDS. 2010.

“Annual Report 2009.” Malaysia: Kuala Lumpur, 2009. Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women. 2009.

“Annual Work Plan 1 January - 31 December, 2011.” Thailand: Bangkok. Partners for Prevention. 2010.

“APRO Organogramme (proposed).” Updated on 30 November 2010. UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office. November 2010.

“Arrows for Change.” Vol 12, No. 3. Malaysia: Kuala Lumpur. Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women. 2006.

“Arrows for Change.” Vol 13, No. 2. Malaysia: Kuala Lumpur. Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women. 2007.

“Arrows for Change.” Vol 14, No. 3. Malaysia: Kuala Lumpur. Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women. 2008.

“Arrows for Change.” Vol 15, No. 1. Malaysia: Kuala Lumpur. Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women. 2009.

“Asia and the Pacific Regional Program Annual Standard Progress Report.” Thailand: Bangkok. UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office. 2010.

“Asian Forum Newsletter.” No. 8, October 2010. Thailand: Bangkok. Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development. 2010.

“Asian Forum Newsletter.” No. 9, November-December 2010. Thailand: Bangkok. Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development. 2010.

Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development/ UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office (2009). *Maternal Health and Rights: Asia and the Pacific Consultation*, 13-15 August, 2009 Bali, Indonesia.

“Asia-Pacific Unite: United Nations Secretary General’s Campaign to End Violence Against Women.” Thailand: Bangkok. United Nations Asia-Pacific Regional Coordination Mechanism Thematic Working Group on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women. November 2010.

“Bangladesh at a Glance.” Leaflet. Thailand: Bangkok. UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office. 2009.

“Basic Facts About UN Women: Establishment, Mandate and Functions.” UN Women. 2011.

“Engaging Parliamentarians in Women’s Empowerment and Gender Equality: A Report on AFPPD Gender Advocacy.” Thailand: Bangkok. Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development 2011. Updated January 2011.

“Gender-Based Violence Issue Paper.” Vietnam: Hanoi. United Nations Vietnam. 2010.

“Gender, Reproductive Health & Rights: A Report on the National Development Plans of Ten Pacific Island Countries.” Fiji: Suva. UNFPA Pacific Sub-regional Office. 2008.

“Getting To Zero: 2011-2015 Strategy – Joint Program on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS).” Switzerland: Geneva. UNAIDS. 2010.

- “Health Sector Response to Gender-based Violence: An Assessment of the Asia Pacific Region.” Thailand: Bangkok. UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office. 2010.
- “Health Sector Response to Gender-based Violence: Case Studies of the Asia Pacific Region.” Thailand: Bangkok. UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office. 2010.
- “Mainstreaming Gender and Inclusion in UNDAF Action Plan, UN Maldives.” Powerpoint Slide Presentation July 19-20, 2010. Jha, Chhaya. 2010.
- “Maternal Health: An Advocacy Guide for Parliamentarians.” Thailand: Bangkok. Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development. 2010.
- “Maternal Health and Rights: APRO Review of Reproductive Health/ Maternal Health Policies and Strategies.” Powerpoint Slide Presentation. Thailand: Bangkok. 3/7/2011. UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office. 2011.
- “MDG 5 in Asia: Progress, Gaps and Challenges 2000 – 2010.” Malaysia: Kuala Lumpur, 2009. Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women. 2010.
- “Pacific Island Countries at a Glance.” Leaflet. Thailand: Bangkok. UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional. 2009.
- “Partners for Prevention Mid-term Review 2010.” Thailand: Bangkok. Menon-Sen, Kalyani. November 2010.
- “Program Overview Leaflet.” Partners for Prevention.
- “Reclaiming and Redefining Rights: ICDP+15 – Status of Sexual and Reproductive Health Rights in Asia.” Malaysia: Kuala Lumpur. Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women. Thanenthiran, Sivananthi and Racherla, Sai Jyothirmai.
- “Regional Program for Asia and the Pacific at a Glance.” Leaflet. Thailand: Bangkok. UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office. 2009.
- “Report of the Asia-Pacific High-level Forum on ICPD at 15: Accelerating Progress towards the ICPD and the Millennium Development Goals.” Thailand: B. UNESCAP/ UNFPA. 2009.
- “Report of the Regional Workshop on Parliamentary Advocacy for the Prevention of Violence Against Women in South Asia, 18 – 19 March, 2003.” Bangladesh: Dhaka. Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development/ UNFPA Bangladesh and Country Technical Services Team for South and West Asia. March 2003.
- “Resolution 64/289. System-wide Coherence.” 21 July, 2010. United Nations General Assembly. 2010.
- “Resolution 64/588. Comprehensive Proposal for the Composite Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women: Report of the Secretary General.” 6 January 2010. United Nations General Assembly. 2010.
- “Sex Ratio at Birth in Southeast Asia with a focus on Vietnam: An Annotated Bibliography Designed to Guide Further Policy Research.” Vietnam: Hanoi. UNFPA Vietnam Country Office. October 2010.
- “Solomon Islands Family Health and Safety Study: A Study on Violence Against Women and Children.” Solomon Islands: Honiara. Secretariat of the Pacific Community. 2009.
- “Strategic Plan, 2008-2011: Accelerating Progress and National Ownership of the ICPD Program of Action.” 27 July, 2007. Executive Board of the United Nations Development Program and of the United Nations Population Fund. 2007.
- “Swimming Against the Tide: Lessons Learned from Field Research on Violence Against Women in the Solomon Islands and Kiribati.” Fiji: Suva. UNFPA Pacific and Sub-Regional Office. August 2010.

“Thailand at a Glance.” Leaflet. Thailand: Bangkok. UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office. 2009.

“The 7th Asia-Pacific Women Parliamentarians’ and Ministers’ Conference on Parliamentarians’ Actions for Gender Issues.” Thailand: Bangkok. Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development. 2009.

“The Dhaka Declaration for Eliminating Violence against Women in South Asia.” Adopted at the Regional Workshop on Parliamentary Advocacy for the Prevention of Violence against Women in South Asia, Bangladesh: Dhaka, 18-19 March, 2003.

“Understanding the Critical Linkages between Gender-based Violence and Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights: Fulfilling Commitments Towards MDG+15.” Malaysia: Kuala Lumpur, 2010. Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women. 2009.

“UNFPA Guidance Note on Prenatal Sex Selection.” Thailand: Bangkok. UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office. 2010.

“Violence Against Women in Melanesia and East Timor: Building on Global and Regional Promising Approaches.” Australia: Canberra. Office of Development Effectiveness, AusAID. 2008.

“Violence Against Women in South Asia: A Regional Analysis”. Nepal: Kathmandu. Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development/ UNFPA Bangladesh and Country Technical Services Team for South and West Asia. April 2003.

“Workshop Report: Capacity Development Workshop on United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325.” Thailand: Bangkok. UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office/ United Nations Development Fund for Women. 2010.

Bangladesh

“An Update of the Gender Component – 7TH Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP).” Bangladesh: Dhaka. UNFPA Bangladesh.

“2009 Country Office Annual Report Bangladesh.” 2009 COAR. UNFPA. 2010.

“Project Implementation Summary of Powerpoint Presentation: Promotion of Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Project.” Bangladesh: Dhaka. Department of Women Affairs – Ministry of Women and Children Affairs.

“Project Summary Leaflet: Promotion of Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Project.” Bangladesh: Dhaka. Department of Women Affairs – Ministry of Women and Children Affairs.

“The Multi-Year Funding Framework Cumulative Report 2004-2007.” New York: UNFPA. United Nations Population Fund. 2007.

“United Nations Development Assistance Framework in Bangladesh 2006-2010.” Bangladesh: Dhaka. Government of Bangladesh/ United Nations. 2005.

Cambodia

“A Fair Share for Women: Cambodia Gender Assessment.” The Kingdom of Cambodia: Phnom Penh. Ministry of Women’s Affairs. 2008.

“Cambodia at a Glance.” Leaflet. Thailand: Bangkok. UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office. 2009.

“2009 Country Office Annual Report Cambodia.” 2009 COAR submission in the i-Track Remote Data Entry Facility (RDEF). UNFPA. 2010.

“Country Program Document for Cambodia.” Executive Board of the United Nations Development Program and the UNFPA. 2005.

“Five Year Strategic Plan 2009-2013: Neary Rattanak III.” The Royal Government of Cambodia: Phnom Penh. Ministry of Women’s Affairs. 2009.

“Gender Mainstreaming: Involving Women could be the Key to Growth” in “Economics Today” 16-30 June 2010. Chhun, Kosal. June 2010.

“National Action Plan to Prevent Violence on Women.” The Royal Government of Cambodia: Phnom Penh. Ministry of Women’s Affairs. 2009.

“National Strategic Development Plan Update 2009-2013.” The Kingdom of Cambodia: Phnom Penh. The Royal Government of Cambodia. 2010.

“Outline of the Project on Gender Mainstreaming Phase 2.” Powerpoint Slide Presentation. Phnom Penh. Japan International Cooperation Agency. February 2011.

“Standard Progress Report: Cambodia.” Thailand: Thailand. UNFPA Asia and the Pacific Regional Office. March 2010.

“United Nations Development Assistance Framework in Cambodia 2006-2010.” Government of the Kingdom of Cambodia/ United Nations. 2005.

“United Nations Development Assistance Framework in Cambodia 2011-2015 - Results Matrix and M&E Framework.” Government of the Kingdom of Cambodia/ United Nations. 2010.

“Violence Against Women 2009 Follow-up Survey – Final Study Report.” The Kingdom of Cambodia: Phnom Penh. Ministry of Women’s Affairs. 2009.

“Women and Men in Cambodia.” The Kingdom of Cambodia: Phnom Penh. National Institute of Statistics, Ministry of Planning. 2008.

Maldives

“2009 Country Office Annual Report Bosnia and Herzegovina.” UNFPA. 2010.

Myanmar

“2009 Country Office Annual Report Bosnia and Herzegovina.” UNFPA. 2010.

Solomon Islands

“2009 Country Office Annual Report Solomon Islands.” UNFPA. 2010.

Other

“End of Programme Evaluation. UNFPA 5th Country Programme 2007-2011.” The Government of the Republic of Sao Tome and Principe and UNFPA. July 2010.

“Evaluation of the Sixth UNFPA Country Programme to the Philippines 2005-2010.” UNFPA Country Office, Manila, the Philippines. November 2010.

UN Publications

“Commission on the Status of Women. Report on the 54th session, Economic and Social Council, Official Records 2010.” Supplement No.7. E/2010/27. <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing15/index.html>

“Global Strategy for Women’s and Children’s Health.” Every Women Every Child. UN. http://www.un.org/sg/hf/global_strategy_commitments.pdf

“High Level Segment of the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC): Focus on gender equality and women’s empowerment.” UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service. http://www.un-ngls.org/spip.php?page=article_s&id_article=2702

“UNiTE to End Violence against Women.” United Nations Secretary-General’s Campaign. UN. <http://www.un.org/en/women/endviolence/about.shtml>.

Websites

UNFPA corporate website <http://www.unfpa.org> and various sub-sites (please see references in the report text).

White Ribbon Campaign. <http://www.whiteribbon.ca/>

Appendix V Interview and Email Consultation Protocols

1. Interview protocol – UNFPA staff (Country Offices)

The open ended questions outlined in the left-hand column will be used to structure the interview. The ‘prompts’ in the right-hand column can help clarify the respective question or encourage a respondent to elaborate on a reply. Evaluation team members do not have to use the exact formulations but use the protocol as a guideline for key content matters to be covered during the conversation.

Questions	Prompts
1. Introduction and Context	
1.1 What is your role? How does your work relate to or address Gender Equality issues?	<i>Is GE explicitly mentioned in your terms of reference? Since when have you worked in this position?</i>
1.2 In your view, what have been the three most relevant changes in the <u>national</u> environment since 2008 that have affected UNFPA’s work in relation to gender issues?	<i>E.g. changes in the political, economic, socio-cultural environment, donor environment</i>
1.3 What if any have been relevant changes within the <u>regional</u> environment?	<i>E.g. changes in regional political, economic, socio-cultural environment, donor environment.</i>
1.4 What if any have been relevant changes in the UN and UNFPA environments?	<i>E.g. UNFPA organizational restructuring, Creation of UN Women, One UN.</i>
2. Results Achievement in Gender Equality and Human Rights	
2.1 What do you consider to be the country programme’s most important achievements in relation to Gender Equality since 2008?	<i>Please give specific examples of progress/results.</i>
2.2 What factors have contributed to or have hindered the country programme’s work on GE?	<i>Please give specific examples of both supporting and hindering factors.</i>
2.3 How effective has the programme been in mainstreaming gender equality in UNFPA’s work on Reproductive Health, and Population and Development?	<i>Please give specific examples of how GE related achievements in these areas.</i>
2.4 What, if any, unexpected results have been achieved in relation to gender equality?	<i>E.g. in view of UNFPA’s role within the UN system or among donor agencies. Please give specific examples</i>
2.5 In this country, where do you see UNFPA’s particular niche/role in relation to gender equality and human rights?	<i>E.g. related to specific sectors, types or size of support, networks, technical expertise...</i>

Questions	Prompts
3. Integrating Gender Equality, Human Rights, and Culture	
3.1 To what extent has the country programme ‘translated’ UNFPA’s commitment to integrating gender, human rights and culture into actual programming on the ground?	<p><i>What tools or technical support have you used to help you operationalize this commitment?</i></p> <p><i>What partnerships support working in a way that integrates gender, human rights and culture? That is culturally sensitive?</i></p> <p><i>How do you build partnerships and national capacity? How do you encourage partners to own the issues and become agents of change?</i></p>
3.2 What benefits and challenges have you observed in relation to integrating gender, human rights and culture?	<p><i>Please give specific examples of ‘success stories’, or of challenges encountered.</i></p>
4. SP Goal #3 Results Logic	
4.1 How relevant and useful are the current outcomes and indicators under Goal 3 for your work?	<p><i>Phase I of the evaluation found that COs used SP Goal 3 Outcomes for reporting to UNFPA HQ, but that actual program planning and day to day management at country level were guided by the <u>UNDAF</u>, and/or national government priorities. → Your experience?</i></p> <p><i>Also, most COs considered the SP Outcome indicators as ‘too broad’ and not applicable to country program level work. What is your experience?</i></p>
5. Organizational Structures and Relationships	
5.1 What roles do HQ, ROs and COs have respectively in view of achieving GE and HR related objectives?	<p><i>Are these roles and their inter-relationship clearly defined and agreed upon?</i></p> <p><i>Who is accountable for gender equality and human rights achievements at country/regional/global levels?</i></p>
5.2 What do you perceive as the key strengths and areas for improvement in view of UNFPA’s organizational arrangements and relationships around GE and HR?	<p><i>E.g. related to planning, reporting, accountability, technical support, overall guidance.</i></p> <p><i>E.g. related to specific units/organizational levels</i></p>
5.3 How appropriate have been resource allocations for the work on Goal 3 and on Gender Mainstreaming?	<p><i>Changes compared to previous periods? Compared to allocations for RH and P&D? To what extent is it possible to track allocation of resources for GE mainstreaming?</i></p>
6. Lessons Learned and Recommendations	
6.1 Are there any lessons that have been learned to date with regard to programming for gender equality and human rights?	<p><i>E.g. lessons related to successful and less successful strategies, human resource requirements, financial needs, time requirements etc.</i></p>

Questions	Prompts
6.2 Can you share any recommendations that could benefit programming for GE and HR in the remaining period of the current Strategic Plan?	<i>What should change? What should stay the same?</i>

2. Interview protocol – UNFPA staff (Regional and Sub-Regional Offices)

Questions	Prompts
1. Introduction and Context	
1.1 What is your role? How does your work relate to or address Gender Equality issues?	<i>Is GE explicitly mentioned in your terms of reference? Since when have you worked in this position?</i>
1.2 In your view, what have been the three most relevant changes in the <u>regional</u> context since 2008 that have affected UNFPA’s work in relation to gender issues?	<i>E.g. changes in the political, economic, socio-cultural context, donor contexts at regional level</i>
1.2 What if any have been relevant changes within the global UN and UNFPA contexts?	<i>E.g. changes in political, economic, socio-cultural context, donor contexts. UNFPA organizational restructuring, creation of UN Women, One UN</i>
2. Results Achievement in Gender Equality and Human Rights	
2.1 What do you consider to be the regional programme’s most important achievements in relation to Gender Equality since 2008?	<i>Please give specific examples of progress/results.</i>
2.2 What factors have contributed to or have hindered work on GE at regional and country levels?	<i>Please give specific examples.</i>
2.3 How effective has the programme been in mainstreaming gender equality in UNFPA’s work on Reproductive Health, and Population and Development??	<i>Please give specific examples of how GE related achievements.</i>
2.4 What, if any, unexpected results have been achieved in relation to gender equality?	<i>E.g. in relation to UNFPA’s role within the UN system or among donor agencies. Please give specific examples</i>
2.5 In this region, where do you see UNFPA’s particular niche/role in relation to gender equality and human rights?	<i>E.g. related to specific sectors, types or size of support, networks, technical expertise...</i>

Questions	Prompts
3. Integrating Gender Equality, Human Rights, and Culture	
3.1 How has the regional programme and its country programmes ‘translated’ ‘translated’ UNFPA’s commitment to integrating gender, human rights and culture into actual programming on the ground?	<p><i>What tools or technical support have you used to help you operationalize this commitment?</i></p> <p><i>What partnerships support working in a way that integrates gender, human rights and culture? How do you build partnerships and national capacity? How do you encourage partners to own the issues and become agents of change?</i></p>
3.2 What benefits and challenges have derived from integrating gender, human rights and culture?	<p><i>Please give specific examples of ‘success stories’, or of challenges encountered.</i></p>
4. SP Goal #3 Results Logic	
4.1 How relevant and useful are the current outcomes and indicators under Goal 3 for your work?	<p><i>To what extent are the regional/global outcomes helpful for work planning, monitoring and reporting at regional and country levels?</i></p> <p><i>Phase I of the evaluation found that COs used SP Goal 3 Outcomes for reporting to UNFPA HQ, but that actual program planning and day to day management at country level were guided by the UNDAF, and/or national government priorities. Also, most COs considered the SP Outcome indicators as ‘too broad’ and not applicable to country program level work.</i></p> <p><i>What is the experience in this region?</i></p>
5. Organizational Structures and Relationships	
5.1 What roles do HQ, ROs and COs have respectively in view of achieving GE and HR related objectives?	<p><i>Are these roles and their inter-relationship clearly defined and agreed upon?</i></p> <p><i>Who is accountable for gender equality and human rights achievements at country/regional/global levels?</i></p> <p><i>What is the (formal and actual) relationship of ROs and COs with regard to GE?</i></p>
5.2 What do you perceive as the key strengths and areas for improvement in view of UNFPA’s organizational arrangements and relationships?	<p><i>E.g. related to planning, reporting, accountability, technical support, overall guidance at all levels.</i></p>
5.3 How appropriate have been resource allocations for the work on Goal 3 and on Gender Mainstreaming?	<p><i>Changes compared to previous periods? Compared to allocations for RH and P&D? To what extent is it possible to track allocation of resources for GE mainstreaming?</i></p>
6. Lessons Learned and Recommendations	
6.1 Are there any lessons that have been learned with regard to programming for GE and HR?	<p><i>E.g. related to successful and less successful strategies, human resource requirements, financial needs, time requirements etc.</i></p>

Questions	Prompts
6.2 Can you share any recommendations that could benefit programming for GE and HR in the remaining period of the current Strategic Plan?	<i>What should change? What should stay the same?</i>

3. Interview protocol –UNFPA Partners and Stakeholders⁸⁵

Questions	Prompts
1. Introduction and Context	
1.1 What is your role? What is your (your organization's) relationship with UNFPA?	<i>In what capacity and on what occasions have you worked with UNFPA on gender equality related issues? When?</i>
1.2 In your view, what have been the three most relevant changes in the <u>national</u> context for gender equality since 2008?	<i>E.g. changes in the political, economic, socio-cultural context, donor context.</i>
1.2 What have been key changes in the regional context?	<i>E.g. changes in the political, economic, socio-cultural context, donor context.</i>
2. Results Achievement in Gender Equality and Human Rights	
2.1 What do you see as the most relevant achievements in relation to gender equality and human rights at the national level that UNFPA has contributed to?	<i>Please give specific examples of progress/results. Please describe what particular role UNFPA has played/what support it has provided to your org. or others and how relevant this support was.</i>
2.2 What factors have supported or hindered your collaboration with UNFPA in relation to gender equality and human rights?	<i>Please give specific examples that illustrate your answer.</i>
2.3 Where do you see UNFPA's particular niche/role in relation to gender equality and human rights in this country?	<i>E.g. related to specific sectors, types or size of support, networks, technical expertise...</i>
3. UNFPA's Integrated Programming Approach	
3.1 In its programming UNFPA strives to integrate the dimensions of <u>gender equality, human rights and culture</u> . To what extent does your experience with UNFPA illustrate this commitment?	<i>E.g. to what extent do you perceive UNFPA programming as being culturally sensitive? Please give examples. What partnerships support working in a way that integrates gender, human rights and culture? How does UNFPA help build national capacity related to gender equality and human rights?</i>
4. SP Goal #3 Results Logic - NA	
5. Organizational Structures and Relationships - NA	

⁸⁵ National government and non-governmental organizations & International organizations including other UN agencies.

Questions	Prompts
6. Recommendations	
6.1 Can you share any suggestions or recommendations that could benefit UNFPA programming for GE and HR in the remaining period of the current Strategic Plan (until 2013)?	<i>What should change? What should stay the same?</i>

4. Interview protocol – UNFPA Regional Partners and Stakeholders

Questions	Prompts
1. Introduction and Context	
1.1 What is your role? What is your (your organization's) relationship with UNFPA?	<i>In what capacity and on what occasions have you worked with UNFPA on gender equality related issues? When?</i>
1.2 In your view, what have been the three most relevant changes in the <u>regional</u> context for gender equality since 2008?	<i>E.g. changes in the political, economic, socio-cultural context, donor context.</i>
1.2 What have been key changes in the <u>global</u> context?	<i>E.g. changes in the political, economic, socio-cultural context, donor context.</i>
2. Results Achievement in Gender Equality and Human Rights	
2.1 What do you see as the most relevant achievements in relation to Gender Equality and human rights at the regional level that UNFPA has contributed to?	<i>Please give specific examples of progress/results. Please describe what particular role UNFPA has played/what support it has provided to you or others.</i>
2.2 What factors have contributed to or have hindered your collaboration with UNFPA in relation to gender equality and human rights?	<i>E.g. availability of staff, expertise, funding, personal relationships. Please give specific examples that illustrate your answer.</i>
2.3 Where do you see UNFPA's particular niche/role in relation to gender equality and human rights in this region?	<i>E.g. related to specific sectors, types or size of support, networks, technical expertise...</i>
3. UNFPA's Integrated Programming Approach	
3.1 In its programming UNFPA strives to integrate the dimensions of <u>gender equality, human rights and culture</u> . To what extent does your experience with UNFPA illustrate this commitment?	<i>E.g. to what extent do you perceive UNFPA programming as being culturally sensitive? Please give examples.</i> <i>What partnerships support working in a way that integrates gender, human rights and culture?</i> <i>How does UNFPA help build national capacity?</i>
3. SP Goal #3 Results Logic - NA	
5. Organizational Structures and Relationships - NA	

Questions	<i>Prompts</i>
6. Recommendations	
6.1 Can you share any suggestions or recommendations that could benefit UNFPA programming for GE and HR in the remaining period of the current SP?	<i>What should change? What should stay the same?</i>

5. E-mail Consultation Tool

Example: Consultation Tool for UNFPA staff members (Country Office)

We would be grateful for your input in response to the following questions.

1. Context/Environment

1.1 In your view, what have been the three most relevant changes in the national environment since 2008 that have affected UNFPA's work on gender equality?

1.2 What have been relevant changes within UNFPA at national, regional or global levels?

2. Results Achievement in Gender Equality and Human Rights

2.1 What do you consider to be the country programme's most important achievements in relation to Gender Equality since 2008?

2.2 What factors have contributed to or hindered UNFPA's work on gender equality?

2.3 How effective has the programme been in mainstreaming gender equality in UNFPA's work on Reproductive Health, and Population and Development?

2.4 In this country, where do you see UNFPA's particular niche/role in relation to gender equality and human rights? Why?

3. Integrating Gender Equality, Human Rights, and Culture

3.1 How has the country programme 'translated' UNFPA's commitment to integrating gender, human rights and culture into actual programming? Are there examples of specifically culturally sensitive programming approaches?

3.2 What benefits and challenges have you observed in relation to integrating gender, human rights and culture?

4. SP Goal #3 Results Logic

4.1 How relevant and useful are the current outcomes and indicators under Goal 3 for your work?⁸⁶

5. Organizational Structures and Relationships

5.1 What roles do HQ, ROs and COs have respectively in view of achieving GE and HR related objectives?

5.2 What do you perceive as the key strengths and areas for improvement in view of organizational arrangements and relationships when it comes to UNFPA's work on gender equality and human rights?

⁸⁶ Phase I of the evaluation found that most consulted COs used the Strategic Plan Goal 3 Outcomes for reporting to UNFPA HQ, but that actual program planning and day to day management at country level were guided by the UNDAF, and/or national government priorities. Further, most consulted COs considered the SP Outcome indicators as 'too broad' and not applicable to country program level work. What is your experience?

5.3 How appropriate have been resource allocations for the work on Goal 3 and on Gender Mainstreaming?

6. Lessons Learned and Recommendations

6.1 Are there any lessons that have been learned to date with regard to programming for gender equality and human rights?

6.2 Can you share any recommendations that could benefit programming for GE and HR in the remaining period of the current Strategic Plan?

Thank you very much for your kind assistance with this evaluation.

Appendix VI UNFPA Organizational Units and their (explicit and implicit) GE responsibilities

Based on: Terms of Reference for UNFPA Units, 2007

Division/Branch	Selected Responsibilities
Technical Division Gender, Human Rights and Culture Branch (GHRCB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generating evidence base and policy and programmatic guidance of the nexus of gender, human rights and culture • Supporting the mainstreaming of culturally sensitive programming, gender equality and human rights in national policies and programmes • Supporting evidence-based advocacy to strengthen political and community ownership for gender equality • Providing knowledge and guidance for program support for gender/cultural sensitive approaches and human rights based approaches throughout the Fund • Working within UN processes and inter agency initiatives, inter faith constituencies and civil society organizations to further the same principles
Sexual and Reproductive Health Branch (SRHB); HIV/AIDS Branch (HIB); Reproductive Health Commodity Security Branch (RHCSB), Population and Development Branch (PDB)	Branches are expected to identify and address Gender equality dimensions in all their respective areas of work. This includes, but is not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrating gender and human rights into SRH • Addressing the feminization of the HIV epidemic and links between GBV and HIV/AIDS • Generating an evidence base and guidance for policy dialogue and incorporation of gender and human rights perspectives in MDGs, SWAps, PRSPs and other national development processes • Articulating inter-linkages between population dynamics, reproductive health, HIV, gender and poverty reduction
Programme Division Environmental Scanning and Planning Branch (ESPB), Programme Support and Regional Desks Branch (PSRDB), Humanitarian Response Branch (HRB)	Guiding the organization to achieve its vision and strategic direction ⁸⁷ . This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing the strategic plan and monitoring and reporting on its implementation (including on results achievement in relation to GE) • Developing and sharing standards for results based management (RBM) and providing guidance for the implementation of an RBM approach.⁸⁸ • guiding the development of UNFPA policy and strategy on emergency preparedness , humanitarian response and recovery, and ensuring that the programming, monitoring and reporting processes are consistent with the policy • Placing the ICPD agenda (and thus gender equality concerns) into the emergency preparedness, crisis response and recovery agendas of partners

⁸⁷ Including in relation to gender equality.

⁸⁸ This creates the potential for ensuring that results planning, monitoring and reporting incorporates gender dimensions.

Division/Branch	Selected Responsibilities
<p>Information and External Relations Division (IERD) Media and Communications Branch (MCB), Executive Board/External Relations (EBERB) Resource Mobilization Branch (RMB)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote the ICPD agenda and UNFPA positions/policies (including GE as an explicit part of UNFPA's mandate) • Accurately reflect UNFPA's position and work on GE related issues in media relations and public information materials such as the SWOP and the Annual Report • Establishing standards and systems to facilitate knowledge sharing (implied: including on GE/Gender Mainstreaming) at all levels of the organization
<p>Regional Offices⁸⁹</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the strategic positioning of UNFPA and of the ICPD agenda at the regional level • Engage in strategic partnerships with networks of institutions, including inter-governmental bodies, within the region, ensuring that the ICPD agenda is an integral part of their strategies for assisting countries in the region to achieve the MDGs • Advocate for and participate in UN initiatives at the regional level, ensuring that the ICPD agenda is mainstreamed within the UN system in the region • Provide leadership, guidance, support, coordination and oversight to ensure effective and quality policy dialogue and programming at the country level • All ROs have at least one full time technical advisor responsible for GHRC who usually focuses on gender equality issues
<p>Country Offices</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen the Country's capacity to implement the ICPD Programme of Action within the context of its national development efforts for the achievement of the MDGs • Assist the program country to achieve its own population and development goals, clarify how gender equality is linked to both UNFPA's mandate and existing national priorities, and build the required institutional capacity • Promote South-South cooperation for the achievement of ICPD goals • Mobilize and manage funds for ICPD-related humanitarian assistance • All COs have an assigned Focal Point for gender equality. Usually, GE is only one of several responsibilities of the respective staff member. In addition, some COs have dedicated Technical Advisors on Gender equality, Human Rights and Culture

⁸⁹ Five Regional Offices cover the Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Arab States, and Eastern Europe and Central Asia regions.

Appendix VII Annotated Goal 3 Results Chain

SP Goal 3 and related Outcomes	Analysis
<p>Goal 3 Gender equality advanced and women and adolescent girls empowered to exercise their human rights, particularly their reproductive rights, and live free of discrimination and violence.</p>	
<p>Indicators Ratio of girls to boys in primary and secondary education Percentage of women aged 20–24 who were married or in union before age 18</p>	<p>Neither the goal statement nor any of the Goal 3 Outcomes address the issue of girl education. It is unclear how the Outcomes can contribute to achievements that would be measurable under this indicator.</p> <p>At the same time some other indicators that are implied by the nature of the four outcomes under this goal are not included, e.g., indicators relating to the advancement of Women’s Human Rights, particularly their RR and the right to live free of violence.</p> <p>Some of the current Outcome level indicators (e.g., prevalence rate of FGM/C) would be appropriate as Goal 3 indicators..</p>
<p>Outcome 1: Gender equality and the human rights of women and adolescent girls, particularly their reproductive rights, integrated in national policies, development frameworks and laws.</p>	<p>The Outcome statement does not indicate a <i>change</i>, e.g., an <i>increase</i> in the number of national policies, development frameworks and laws that integrate GE, or a change in the behaviour of duty bearers with regard to implementing these policies, frameworks etc.</p>
<p>Indicators 1a Proportion of countries that implement/enforce policies and laws in line with the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security in conflict and post conflict. 1b Proportion of countries that have incorporate reproductive rights into the convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women (CEDAW) reports.</p>	<p>1a SCR1325 does not specifically focus on reproductive rights but on women in armed conflict/post conflict settings. The Outcome statement does not mention (post)conflict settings. It is unclear to what extent the indicator is suited to measure progress toward the current Outcome statement.</p> <p>1b CEDAW reporting is not a suitable <i>indicator</i> for measuring whether a country has included GE and women’s human rights into national policies, dev. frameworks and laws. CEDAW reports could be a <i>data source</i> in this regard.</p> <p>Based on the current Outcome statement, UNFPA appears to want to collect data on either i) the number of countries that have developed or expanded provisions for GE and women’s human rights/RR in national policies etc. with support from UNFPA, or ii) the number of national policies etc. that have been developed or improved with support from UNFPA. Neither are addressed by the indicators.</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Gender equality, reproductive rights and the empowerment of women and adolescent girls promoted through an enabling socio-cultural environment that is conducive to male participation and the elimination of harmful practices.</p>	<p>The Outcome statement is not dynamic, i.e., it does not indicate a change.</p> <p>The term socio-cultural environment is very broad. This can be a benefit as it can incorporate a large number of relevant socio-cultural changes, but it also poses a challenge in terms of pinning down specific changes. Further, an ‘enabling socio cultural environment’ describes, in our understanding, a set of supportive <i>conditions</i> for change. But in the Outcome statement this environment appears as an <i>actor</i> that promotes gender equality, reproductive rights and the empowerment of women and adolescent girls.</p>

SP Goal 3 and related Outcomes	Analysis
	<p>The phrase ‘that is conducive to male participation and the elimination of harmful practices’ qualifies the specific nature of the ‘enabling socio cultural environment.</p> <p>The conjunction with ‘and’ implies that male participation and the elimination of harmful practices are similar to each other both in relevance and nature. However, in our understanding, while the elimination of harmful practices describes a <i>type of envisaged change</i>, male participation is a <i>strategy</i> that can be used to bring about and/or consolidate social change.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>To what extent does the notion of ‘harmful practices’ overlap with the concept of GBV and thus with outcome 4?</p> <p>What is the actual change that the Outcome is trying to address? Changes in the socio-cultural environment (for what?) The elimination of harmful socio-cultural practices?</p>
<p>Indicators</p> <p>Female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM/C) prevalence rate</p> <p>Percentage of women who decide alone or jointly with their husbands/partners/others about their own healthcare</p>	<p>Neither indicator measures changes to the socio-cultural environment but potential effects of such changes (proxy indicators). This is not necessarily a problem, but implies that the Outcome statement may not be precise enough in terms of what specific change it addresses.</p> <p>Indicator 1: Can UNFPA be accountable or even claim significant contribution to changes at this high a level? (FGM/C prevalence rate). Would it be more appropriate to measure, for example, the number of communities that have abandoned FGM/C or the number of countries in which communities have done so? It is not fully clear how the second Indicator relates to the Outcome statement.</p>
<p>Outcome 3: Human rights protection systems (including national human rights councils, ombudspersons, and conflict-resolution mechanisms) and participatory mechanisms are strengthened to protect reproductive rights of women and adolescent girls, including the right to be free from violence.</p>	<p>This outcome <i>does</i> describe an intended change. This change is rather broadly defined and it is not fully clear what the intended unit of change is, and what ‘strengthened’ means in this regard. Does ‘human rights protection systems’ refer to specific <i>institutions/organizations</i> and their respective capacity? Or does it refer to broader systems that are made up by several different institutions in each country?</p> <p>What does ‘participatory mechanisms’ refer to? What is their relationship with HR protection systems?</p> <p>Does the outcome actually combine two different results, one related to the capacity of key (state) institutions/organizations and the other related to the ability of civil society to participate in Human Rights discussions relevant to protecting the RR of women and girls?</p> <p>Does ‘strengthening’ refer to enhancing institutional or system capacity? If so, what does ‘capacity’ mean? (Individual capabilities, organizational competencies, overall system capacity including factors affecting the respective institutions like the political and socio-cultural context?)</p> <p>To what extent does the reference to the right to be free from violence constitute an overlap with Outcome 4?</p>
<p>Indicators</p> <p>Proportion of countries with reproductive rights incorporated in national human rights protection system</p>	<p>Due to the broad term ‘HR protection system’ (see above) it is unclear what this indicator measures: changes in the operational frameworks/policies of specific institutions/organizations tasked with HR protection? Other?</p> <p>There is no indicator to measure changes in strengthening ‘participatory mechanisms’ that are mentioned in the outcome statement.</p>

SP Goal 3 and related Outcomes	Analysis
<p>Outcome 4: Responses to gender based violence, particularly domestic and sexual violence, expanded through improved policies, protection systems, legal enforcement and sexual and reproductive health and HIV-prevention services, including in emergency and post-emergency situations.</p>	<p>There appears to be significant overlap with Outcomes 1 (reference to improved policies), Outcome 2 (harmful practices as one form of GBV) and Outcome 3 (reference to protection systems). This is the only Outcome that makes specific reference to emergency and post emergency settings.</p>
<p>Indicators Proportion of countries that have mechanisms in place to monitor and reduce gender-based violence Proportion of countries that include gender based violence in pre- and in-service training of health service providers</p>	<p>The first indicator is rather broad, but this is not necessarily a problem as it allows for flexibility at regional and country levels to include a number of different mechanisms. Question whether 'proportion of countries' is meaningful information, or whether UNFPA had rather measure the number of new/improved mechanisms that are put in place to monitor and/or reduce GBV. (This may require two separate indicators).</p>

Appendix VIII Country Programme Results Frameworks

1. Gender related outcomes and outputs for the six countries included in site visits

Armenia ^{90 91}	Georgia ⁹²	Bangladesh ⁹³	Cambodia ⁹⁴	Guatemala ⁹⁵	Jamaica ⁹⁶
Outcomes					
<p>1) Capacity at different levels of governance to enhance transparency, accountability and inclusiveness is improved.</p> <p>2) Improved national structures and mechanisms at both centralized and decentralized levels ensure the progressive realization of human rights.</p>	<p>1) The capacity of civil society groups, especially youth, minorities, women and the elderly, to participate in decision-making processes, is enhanced.</p>	<p>1) Societal changes are realized to reduce discriminatory practices and to pursue equity and empowerment for women and girls.</p>	<p>1) Institutional mechanisms and socio-cultural practices promote and protect the rights of women and girls to advance gender equity.</p>	<p>1) Integrate gender equality and women's rights into public policies and legislative frameworks.</p> <p>2) Empowerment of women, adolescents and young people to demand and exercise their rights.</p>	<p>1) Contribute to social change by advancing gender equity and equality through national and regional level capacity-building of governments, institutions and civil society.</p>

⁹⁰ CPD 2010-2015

⁹¹ In the Armenia CPD 2005-2009 there is no gender component. However, under the third outcome falling within the reproductive health component, output 2 addresses gender, GE, and GBV: "Increased awareness and support of the public, the media and key decision makers at central and local levels in addressing reproductive health and reproductive rights issues, gender equality and gender equity, including gender-based violence and the trafficking of women and girls."

⁹² CPD 2006-2010

⁹³ CPD 2006-2010

⁹⁴ CPD 2006-2010

⁹⁵ CPD 2010-2014

⁹⁶ CPD 2007-2011

Armenia ^{97 98}	Georgia ⁹⁹	Bangladesh ¹⁰⁰	Cambodia ¹⁰¹	Guatemala ¹⁰²	Jamaica ¹⁰³
Outputs					
<p>Output 1: Increased national and local capacities to ensure gender equality, the empowerment of women, and to combat gender based violence.</p> <p>Output 2: Awareness and knowledge of population on gender, gender based violence, and sexual and reproductive rights increased.</p>	<p>Output 1: Enhanced awareness and capacity of civil society, particularly the mass media, community-based organizations and NGOs, to take part in monitoring processes, including human rights monitoring.</p>	<p>Output 1: Rights of women and girls promoted and gender equity enhanced.</p>	<p>Output 1: Strengthened capacity of priority ministries, selected commune councils and the media to promote the empowerment of women and youth.</p> <p>Output 2: Increased awareness and empowerment of women and youth in the priority areas to claim their rights to gender equity.</p>	<p>Output 1: Increased capacity of public institutions to apply, monitor and evaluate The National Policy on the Promotion and Integral Development of Women 2008-2023, applying a multicultural focus and taking human rights into account.</p> <p>Output 2: Increased capacity of public institutions and non-governmental organizations to apply programs of comprehensive care for women who are victims of violence, including sexual violence.</p>	<p>Output 1: Improved understanding of the interlinkages between gender relations, poverty, masculinities, women's empowerment, gender based violence and sexual and reproductive health, with an emphasis on HIV/AIDS, geared towards informing national policy design and programme implementation.</p> <p>Output 2: Increased and more effective networking among women's government structures and civil society organizations, including the promotion of common agendas within the context of the</p>

⁹⁷ CPD 2010-2015

⁹⁸ In the Armenia CPD 2005-2009 there is no gender component. However, under the third outcome falling within the reproductive health component, output 2 addresses gender, GE, and GBV: "Increased awareness and support of the public, the media and key decision makers at central and local levels in addressing reproductive health and reproductive rights issues, gender equality and gender equity, including gender-based violence and the trafficking of women and girls."

⁹⁹ CPD 2006-2010

¹⁰⁰ CPD 2006-2010

¹⁰¹ CPD 2006-2010

¹⁰² CPD 2010-2014

¹⁰³ CPD 2007-2011

Armenia ^{97 98}	Georgia ⁹⁹	Bangladesh ¹⁰⁰	Cambodia ¹⁰¹	Guatemala ¹⁰²	Jamaica ¹⁰³
				<p>Output 3: Increased capacity of women's organizations, including indigenous, adolescents, and young people's organizations, to engage in political dialogue with the government to analyze and promote the advancement of public policy through advocacy and social audits (that monitor the protection of human rights and the application of public policies).</p>	<p>CARICOM regional plan on gender, and follow-up and implementation of the ICPD Programme of Action and the Millennium Development Goals.</p> <p>Output 3: Advocacy for and policy design on gender equality and human rights use evidence gathered from testing innovative approaches, models and experiences that operationalize the gender approach.</p>

2. Gender related outcomes and outputs for 8 of the 10 reviewed countries *not* included in site visits¹⁰⁴

Maldives ¹⁰⁵	Solomon Islands ¹⁰⁶	Belarus ¹⁰⁷	Bosnia and Herzegovina ¹⁰⁸	Colombia ¹⁰⁹	Costa Rica ¹¹⁰	Ecuador ¹¹¹	Peru ¹¹²
Outcomes							
1) Improved fulfillment of the rights of women and girls.	1) The outcome is linked to Millennium Development Goal 3, on promoting gender equality and empowering women.	1) Prevention and protection systems are established to reduce gender-based violence, including domestic violence.	1) Security sector and law enforcement sector agencies integrate gender equality issues and mainstream gender into their policies and protocols, including those on gender-based violence.	1) Guarantee, protect and re-establish reproductive rights, particularly those of women and adolescents, by strengthening the legislative and judicial systems.	1) Strengthened capacities and abilities of public institutions and civil society to create conditions for achieving inclusive, sustainable and equitable human development. 2) Adopted and strengthened socio-cultural practices that promote and legitimize equitable, non-discriminatory relationships.	1) The promotion of the capacity of authorities, national public officials and civil society to improve knowledge and develop skills to apply public policies in accordance with international standards.	1) Consolidation of national and regional institutional mechanisms and socio-cultural practices that promote and protect the rights of women and advance gender equity and equality.

¹⁰⁴ The Myanmar CPD 2007-2010 as well as the 2005-2009 CPD for Kyrgyzstan did not include explicit separate gender equality components with outcomes and/or outputs.

¹⁰⁵ CPD 2008-2010

¹⁰⁶ CPD 2008-2012

¹⁰⁷ CPD 2011-2015, prior to this period, Belarus CO reported in the format of stand-alone projects.

¹⁰⁸ CPD 2010-2014. In *UNFPA BiH CP 2005-2008 Alignment with UNFPA SMP 2008-2011*, the “Gender Equality SMP Focus Area” differs from the Gender Component in CPD 2010-2014, and contains only one output, instead of two in the CPD 2010-2014. The 2005-2008 document consists of: “Outcome 1: Policy makers at state, entity and municipal levels provide leadership in coordinating development of national standards to implement and monitor national policies that affect the rights of youth and women’s rights. Output 1: Gender equality and women’s empowerment policies reflect the provision of ICPD including on sexual and reproductive health and rights.”

¹⁰⁹ CPD 2008-2012

¹¹⁰ CPD 2008-2012

¹¹¹ CPD 2010-2014

¹¹² CPD 2006-2010

Maldives ¹⁰⁵	Solomon Islands ¹⁰⁶	Belarus ¹⁰⁷	Bosnia and Herzegovina ¹⁰⁸	Colombia ¹⁰⁹	Costa Rica ¹¹⁰	Ecuador ¹¹¹	Peru ¹¹²
Outputs							
Output 1: Increased availability and utilization of gender-disaggregated data and information for equitable resource allocation and improved fulfillment of the rights of women and girls.	Output 1: Strengthened capacity of governments to integrate gender equality and human rights, including the reproductive rights of women and adolescent girls, into national policies and development frameworks and to implement relevant interventions.	Output 1: Strengthened legal and organizational mechanisms to prevent domestic violence and support the victims of such violence.	Output 1: National- and entity-level government officials have increased knowledge and skills to integrate gender and women's rights, including the adoption of United Nations resolution 1325, into multi-sectoral, inclusive social policies.	Output 1: Strengthened national capacity to design and implement legal and regulatory initiatives that promote gender equity, prevent sexual and gender-based violence, and protect and guarantee reproductive rights.	Output 1: National and local institutions have improved capacity to develop and implement policies and programmes on gender equality and equity, and to prevent and address violence against women.	Output 1: Gender Equality, the rights of women, adolescents and young people, and reproductive health rights incorporated into plans, policies and national laws using culturally sensitive criteria in selected geographic areas.	Output 1: National legislation is aligned with international women's rights covenants to safeguard gender equality, women's autonomy and protect women from gender-based violence.
Output 2: Improved awareness of women's rights at all levels and improved accountability of national policies and systems.	Output 2: Increased advocacy and mechanisms for programme planners, managers and communities to apply the findings of studies on gender-based violence in selected Pacific Island countries and to develop and implement effective interventions to reduce gender-based violence.	Output 2: Enhanced public knowledge and awareness of gender-based violence.	Output 2: Officials of entity-level ministries of justice and the interior, and police at local levels, have improved knowledge and skills to establish and enforce policies and protection systems for gender-based violence and to establish multi-sectoral referral mechanisms.		Output 2: National institutions have improved capacity to analyse gender inequality in the design of plans, and in budgetary and statistical planning.	Output 2: Increased knowledge of gender equality and GBV, and more effective application of measures to confront these problems within the government, especially in the judicial sector, the National Assembly, the police and armed forces.	Output 2: Regional and local authorities are capable of implementing laws and policies that protect women's rights among the most disenfranchised sector of the population, emphasizing protection against gender-based violence.

Evaluation of UNFPA Goal 3 - Gender Equality

Maldives ¹⁰⁵	Solomon Islands ¹⁰⁶	Belarus ¹⁰⁷	Bosnia and Herzegovina ¹⁰⁸	Colombia ¹⁰⁹	Costa Rica ¹¹⁰	Ecuador ¹¹¹	Peru ¹¹²
<p>Output 3: Strengthened capacities of key stakeholders to promote gender equality and the empowerment and protection of women and young girls.</p>					<p>Output 3: Women's organizations and civil society are strengthened to enable them to participate in designing, monitoring and evaluating public policies and in advocating gender equality and equity.</p>	<p>Output 3: Strengthened capacity of women, including indigenous women, women of African descent, community networks, and youth in the promotion, demand and monitoring of services related to reproductive and sexual health and rights.</p>	

Appendix IX List of Findings

- Finding 1: All consulted stakeholders described UNFPA as a highly respected and effective advocate for gender equality and women’s empowerment at the country level that often takes a leadership role among UN agencies and development partners. *Section 3.2. page 15.*
- Finding 2: There is considerable evidence that UNFPA activities at the country level are relevant to Goal 3 and contribute to its four stated outcomes. However, due to the lack of a comprehensive logic framework, it is not possible to assess UNFPA’s overall progress in terms of the stated outcomes and indicators of SP Goal 3, or how country-level results contribute to the organization’s intended overall results. *Section 3.2. page 16.*
- Finding 3: Consulted UNFPA staff and stakeholders noted that in light of the changing global context, especially the creation of UN Women, UNFPA may need to define an even clearer focus for its work related to gender equality. *Section 3.2. page 16.*
- Finding 4: While consulted staff members in the field had varying degrees of awareness of the corporate guidance note on integrating gender equality, human rights and culture, there was wide agreement that all three dimensions are at the core of ‘good’ development work. *Section 4.2. page 33*
- Finding 5: Country Offices in all regions reviewed use programming strategies that reflect UNFPA’s commitment to culturally sensitive programming. *Section 4.2. page 33*
- Finding 6: UNFPA has started to collect and share examples of experiences and lessons learned from using culturally-sensitive approaches, but there is further room for improvement in the way the agency systematically captures and uses country level data. *Section 4.2. page 36*
- Finding 7: While there are several examples of UNFPA having successfully integrated gender equality in the areas of Population and Development and Reproductive Health, Phase II evaluation data confirm UNFPA’s ongoing challenge in mainstreaming gender systematically. *Section 4.3. page 36*
- Finding 8: There is considerable room for improvement in the accuracy and coherence of the Goal 3 results chain. *Section 5. page 39*
- Finding 9: The links between country-level outputs and corporate SP outcomes are not always evident, explicit, or logical. This contributes to UNFPA’s difficulty in capturing progress on outcomes at regional and global levels. *Section 5. page 40*
- Finding 10: The SP facilitates the translation of UNFPA’s broad organizational priorities into programming, but it is not evident how the SP can be used in the *reverse* direction, to roll up country-level results into progress towards corporate outcomes and goals. This makes it difficult for UNFPA to capture its contributions to development results. *Section 5. page 41*
- Finding 11: There is room for strengthening UNFPA’s organizational structures and intra-organizational relationships to enhance communication on and accountability for GE. *Section 6. page 43*

Finding 12: While Regional Offices can and are contributing to GE programming at the country level, they are also facing some challenges in terms of their roles in technical assistance and ensuring the coherence of UNFPA programming on GE. *Section 6. page 45*