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# Background

UN Women (UNW), grounded in the vision of equality enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, works for the elimination of discrimination against women and girls; the empowerment of women; and the achievement of equality between women and men as partners and beneficiaries of development, human rights, humanitarian action and peace and security. Placing women’s rights at the centre of all its efforts, the UN Women leads and coordinates the United Nations system efforts to ensure that commitments on gender equality and gender mainstreaming translate into action throughout the world. It provides strong and coherent leadership in support of Member States’ priorities and efforts, building effective partnerships with civil society and other relevant actors.

UN Women plays an innovative and catalytic role in the State of Palestine. It focuses its activities on one overarching goal, namely, to support the implementation at the national level of existing international commitments to advance gender equality in line with the national priorities. In support of this goal, and thoroughly taking into consideration the specificities of the Palestinian context, UN Women concentrates its efforts and interventions toward the realisation of four impact areas:  (1) women have income security, decent work and economic autonomy; (2) women and girls live a life free of violence; (3) women lead, participate in and benefit from peace and security, humanitarian action and recovery efforts in Palestine; and (4) a comprehensive and dynamic set of global norms, policies and standards on gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls is strengthened and implemented.

## The UN Women Palestine Country Office Strategic Note is based on a theory of change informed by evidence-based gender analysis. The theory of change goal statement posits that if women lead, participate in and benefit from peace and security, and humanitarian action; if women have income security, decent work and economic autonomy; and if women and girls live a life free of violence then women will be empowered and enjoy their human rights, because a legislative and policy framework will be in place to prevent violence and empower those affected by violence to recover; structural barrier preventing women from economic participation will be addressed and women entrepreneurs will have the skills, the financial resources and the partnership to access a more equal share of the market; policy makers have the capacity to effectively implement, monitor and track WPS commitments and women’s rights will be at the centre of humanitarian action in Palestine.

In relation to ending violence against women, UN Women aims to support the Palestinian Government and civil society actors in strengthening their capacities to prevent violence and to deliver quality, accessible and coordinated services for victims and survivors of violence.  Through our work under this impact area we aim to contribute to the fulfilment of the SDGs 5 and 16 and in particular to eliminate all forms of violence against all women and girls in the public and private spheres, adopt and strengthen sound policies and enforceable legislation for the elimination of violence against women, significantly reduce all forms of violence against women and girls, end abuse and all forms of violence against and torture of children, and to develop effective, accountable and transparent justice and security institutions.

To this extent, UN Women jointly with UNFPA, UNODC and UN Habitat, launched the UN ‘Eliminating Violence Against Women in the West Bank and Gaza Strip’ Joint Programme (JP) in 2018 with the main goal of reducing vulnerability of women and girls in West Bank and Gaza to all forms of Violence against Women and from the threat of such violence . The five years JP, generously funded by the Government of Canada, through the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD), works on three fronts: 1) Decrease harmful practices and attitudes that perpetuate and validate violence against women and girls within targeted households and communities; 2) Increase access by women and girls of gender-responsive EVAW services (economic, medical, psychosocial, security, shelter) free of discrimination; 3.) Strengthen institutional capacity to develop and implement legal and policy frameworks that promote and protect women’s and girls’ rights with regards to VAW.

As the JP reached its implementation mid-point, the UN Participating Organizations (UNOP) and DFTAD plan to undertake a joint formative evaluation to assess progress towards the intended results, to compile lessons learned and best practices, and to generate knowledge to inform key stakeholders at policy and intervention level. This TOR details the assignment.

## **Contextual Background**

The prolongation of the occupation in the West Bank and Gaza, and the ongoing blockade and limitations on movement and access including the deteriorated humanitarian conditions continue to affect the Palestinian population’s wellbeing and aggravate existing gender inequalities within the society. Palestinian women’s lives are not only ruled by the occupation that disempowers them, violates their rights and restricts their freedoms as they also confront the consequences of the occupation while struggling traditional norms and attitudes within their society and communities. The IMAGES MENA (2017) research findings revealed that 59 per cent of men and 41 per cent of women respondents agreed or strongly agreed that “women should leave politics to men.”1 In addition, the results of the IMAGES MENA research showed that fewer than half of women felt that a man should have the final word about decisions in his home, compared with 80 per cent of men who claimed this prerogative, and only 3 per cent of men reported that their wives have independent decision-making power over whether she can leave the house.

Violence against women is a serious human rights violation and continues to be the main obstacle facing women’s worldwide. Women in Palestine face multiple layers of violence and discrimination. The preliminary findings of the national violence survey (conducted with partial support of the HAYA JP) shows that 29 per cent of ever married women were exposed to one form of violence by their husbands; 24 per cent in the West Bank compared to and 38 per cent in Gaza Strip. The preliminary findings indicates that out of those women exposed to violence, 56 per cent were exposed to psychological violence, 41 per cent were exposed to economical violence, 32 per cent were exposed to social violence, about 18 per cent were exposed to physical violence, and about 9 per cent were exposed to sexual violence.

Violence against women is widely prevalent and socially silenced in Palestine thereby contributing to the negative impact of women’s health especially sexual and reproductive health and women’s overall wellbeing. Violence against women restricts choices and decision making of those who experience it, curtailing their rights and opportunities across the life cycle to access critical information and services, including health, economic, social, security and justice. It is a risk factor concerning sexually transmitted infections including HIV/AIDS and unwanted pregnancy, in addition to causing direct physical and mental health consequences.

Per a 2015 study on VAW in the Gaza Strip, 39.6 per cent of women reported to have experienced at least one form of domestic violence during the 11 months following the Israeli offensive on Gaza in the summer of 2014. The most common form of violence was of psychological nature. Per data collected by SAWA in 2015, from 950 domestic violence cases, 18 per cent are victims of sexual abuse, 12 per cent of rape (data by SAWA). Available data reveals a very high percentage of rape committed by perpetrators from outside the victim’s family up to 20 per cent, together with 6 per cent attempted rape, 3 per cent of indecent behaviour and 18 per cent of unspecified abuse. Girl marriage is still a concern, as according to PCBS, early marriage rate of girls under the age of 18 is still high (20 per cent in 2015), a noticeable reduction was witnessed since the year 2000 as the rate stood at 36 per cent. From January to June 2017 data from the GBV Sub-Cluster chaired by UNFPA clearly shows that just less than 3 out of 4 women survivors of violence in Palestine are perpetrated by either an intimate partner (36 per cent) or family members (36 per cent). Additionally, more than half of the registered women survivors of violence are married (58 per cent), 16 per cent single, 14 per cent divorced, 9 per cent widowed, and 3 per cent separated. Per the Women’s Centre for Legal Aid and Counselling (WCLAC), 27 cases of the killing of women and girls in the Palestinian territory (West Bank and Gaza) were observed in 2014, and 15 cases in 2015, whereas from the beginning of 2016 until mid-August, 18 cases of femicide were documented.

As highlighted above, most of the available studies and surveys focus on VAW in the private and domestic spheres, very little information focus on violence against women and sexual harassment in public space, which has resulted in the absence of verifiable data and sound analysis. The lack of reliable data has made it more difficult for the relevant stakeholders and duty bearers to address public harassment against women and girls in any meaningful way.

The Palestinian Authority has yet to eliminate discriminatory policies and practices regarding the status of women. While the Palestinian Authority (PA) introduced some new legislation since the 1993 Oslo Accords, the bulk of laws on record draw from the Ottoman and British Mandate eras, as well as from dated Egyptian (in Gaza) and Jordanian (in West Bank) laws. East Jerusalem falls under Israeli civil legislative jurisdiction and Areas B and C of the West Bank are under Israeli military law. The political (Hamas-Fatah) divide has resulted in two separate lawmaking and enforcement processes further eroding the unity of Palestine. These legal frameworks are discriminatory against women particularly the laws related to inheritance, personal status, access to land and productive resources, inter alia. These weak legal frameworks combined with male dominated and discriminatory law enforcement structures result in women’s increased reluctance to seek resolution through formal mechanisms. Thus, tribal, customary and religious laws are frequently applied for resolving disputes especially at the local level or within families which are inherently discriminatory against women. The IMAGES MENA survey stated that there is strong agreement among men and women that gender equality has not been achieved in Palestine. 75% of men and nearly 87% of women agree with the statement, “We as Palestinians need to do more work to promote the equality of women and men”.

# Evaluation Focus: Description of the Development Intervention

The UN ‘Eliminating violence against women in West Bank and Gaza Strip’ Joint Programme, referred to hereinafter as ‘HAYA’ is a five-year programme launched by four UN Participating Organizations (UNPO), including UN Women, whom is also the Administrative Agent of the JP, UNFPA, UNODC, and UN Habitat with the generous support of the Government of Canada through DFTAD. HAYA implementation period extends from 1 April 2018 through 31 March 2023, with a total budget of CAD$17 million.

HAYA addresses the issue of building community justice for women and girls by preventing and combating violence against women. Eliminating violence against women requires interventions on both the side of service providers as well as service users. This will be achieved through supporting reforms to the health and social service sectors’ capacities to be effective and accountable for preventing, mitigating and responding to violence, but also very importantly through changes to the community’s utilization of services and the behaviors and attitudes related to violence against women on the part of all concerned parties.

The program builds on ongoing work across the UN system in West Bank and Gaza Strip and forms a coordinated, multi-sector, long term strategy designed to produce results in preventing and combating violence against women and girls through experimentation and documentation of ‘what works’ and lessons learnt. It also draws on the pending process of harmonizing legislation and regulations with international standards related to preventing and combating violence against women.

The programme focuses on comprehensive and integrated interventions that are designed from a proven evidence base. The interventions are targeted at different levels (the individual, the relationship between partners, the family, the community, including the physical environment, the society, local government, national government, grassroots civil society); across the three pillars of prevention, response and policy development (the intermediate outcome areas as outlined above); and with a longer-term time-frame recognizing that preventing and responding to violence against women requires sustained commitment of financial and human resources.

The overall ultimate outcome of HAYA is to reduce vulnerability of women and girls in West Bank and Gaza Strip to all forms of violence against women and from the threat of such violence. This *ultimate outcome* will be achieved by realization of the following *intermediate outcomes* and the associated *immediate outcomes*:

**Intermediate Outcome 1**: Decreased **harmful practices and attitudes** that perpetuate and validate violence against women and girls within targeted households and communities.

Immediate Outcome 1.1: Increased awareness and skills of educational institution’s staff and students regarding EVAW.

Immediate Outcome 1.2: Promoted equal and respectful relationships among women, men, girls and boys in WB and Gaza.

Immediate Outcome 1.3: Enhanced awareness on EVAW of the media.

Immediate Outcome 1.4: Increased knowledge and capacity to undertake comprehensive local interventions for prevention and response on EVAW by local authorities and municipalities.

**Intermediate Outcome 2**: Increased access by women and girls to gender-responsive **EVAW services** (economic, medical, psychosocial, security, shelter) free of discrimination.

Immediate Outcome 2.1: Increased ability of women and girls to freely and safely make informed decisions to use EVAW services and advocate for comprehensive EVAW services.

Immediate Outcome 2.2: Increased knowledge and capacity of women to demand budgeted and results oriented services to eliminate VAW.

Immediate Outcome 2.3: Improved capacity of services providers (PA, UNRWA, NGOs) to provide gender-responsive SRH, psychosocial, physical, forensic, and protection services for women and girls, particularly for survivors of VAW.

Immediate Outcome 2.4: Increased capacity of existing shelters to conduct outreach and provide quality services in a survivor focused manner.

**Intermediate Outcome 3**: Strengthened **institutional capacity** to develop and implement legal and policy frameworks that promote and protect women’s and girls’ rights with regards to VAW.

Immediate Outcome 3.1: Enhanced effectiveness and accountability of National authorities to develop, implement and monitor policies, strategies and actions plans on EVAW in an evidence based and coordinated manner.

Immediate Outcome 3.2: Strengthened the capacity of civil society and human rights actors to advocate for policy and legal frameworks for the protection of women and girls against VAW and for the promotion of their human rights.

The JP builds on ongoing work across the UN system in the West Bank and Gaza Strip and forms a coordinated, multi-sector, long term strategy designed to produce results in preventing and combating violence against women and girls through experimentation and documentation of ‘what works’ and lessons learnt. It also draws on the pending process of harmonizing legislation and regulations with international standards related to preventing and combating violence against women.

The programme focuses on comprehensive and integrated interventions that are designed from a proven evidence base. The interventions are targeted at different levels (the individual, the relationship between partners, the family, the community, including the physical environment, the society, local government, national government, grassroots civil society); across the three pillars of prevention, response and policy development (the intermediate outcome areas as outlined above); and with a longer-term time-frame recognizing that preventing and responding to violence against women requires sustained commitment of financial and human resources.

HAYA is fully aligned with national priorities in the area of eliminating violence against women as stated in the Cross Sectoral National Gender Strategy (2017-2022) and the National Strategy to Combat Violence against Women (2011-2019). It is also aligned with the UNDAF (2018-2022) focus on leaving no one behind; more specifically to UNDAF Strategic Priority 2:  Outcome 4: “State and national institutions promote and monitor gender equality and enforce non-discrimination for all” and Strategic Priority 4: Outcome 1 “The Palestinian population, especially the most vulnerable, benefit from safe, inclusive, equitable and quality services”. The Programme is further in line with Palestine’s commitments under nationalized Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), especially with Goal 5 and 16 and in particular to eliminate all forms of violence against all women and girls in the public and private spheres, adopt and strengthen sound policies and enforceable legislation for the elimination of violence against women, significantly reduce all forms of violence against women and girls, end abuse and all forms of violence against and torture of children, and to develop effective, accountable and transparent justice and security institutions. Furthermore, it is aligned with Palestine’s commitment to the Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, which Palestine acceded to in April 2014 without reservation, and to the concluding observations and recommendations of the CEDAW Committee to the State Initial Report to the Committee.

## **Stakeholders**

#### *Co-operation partners (executing agencies or implementing organizations)*

HAYA is implemented by a consortium of four UN Agencies consisting of UN Women, UNFPA, UN Habitat and UNODC. Key national partners in the programme include the Ministry of Women’s Affairs (MOWA), the Ministry of Social Development (MOSD), the Ministry of Justice (MoJ), and other relevant national counterparts such as the Ministry of Health (MoH), the Ministry of Education (MoE) and Ministry of Local Government (MoLG), municipalities, and community associations and civil society organizations active on eliminating violence against women and promoting women’s human rights.

#### *Primary stakeholders (direct beneficiaries*

Target beneficiaries of the programme are women and girls of the Palestinian society, who are victims of violence or vulnerable to VAW. Specific beneficiary groups include women and girl victims of violence and women from marginalized and vulnerable communities, including women from rural communities; women from area C and East Jerusalem; women with low economic households; and women in high risk of VAW.

#### *Donor organisations*

HAYA is funded by the Government of Canada, through the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development, who co-chairs the JP Steering Committee.

#### *Interested parties*

Men and boys will benefit by engaging in the program throughout its implementations.

# Rationale, purpose and use of the evaluation

## The joint UN – DFATD formative evaluation for HAYA JP has been commissioned at this point in time because the project has reached mid-point (July 2020).

The purpose of this joint evaluation is to:

* Inform stakeholders about the contribution of HAYA’s project to results;
* Inform improvements and course corrections to HAYA’s programme design and delivery;
* Inform improvements to HAYA’s interactions and communication lines (Internal, among UN agencies and External, with ministries, local partners and stakeholders).
* Learn from the HAYA programme, document good practices and use the evaluation to engage policy makers and other stakeholders at local, national and regional levels in evidence-based dialogues to advocate for gender-responsive strategies to eliminate violence against women and girls

The intended end users of this evaluation are DFATD and UN Women (both co-signatory of the HAYA JP), as well as UN Habitat, UNFPA and UNODC (members of the UN consortium-implementing partners), and the MOSD and the MOWA (co-chairs of the steering committee of the project). Furthermore, other national stakeholders - NGO partners, participating government institutions, and other local partners will be also closely involved in the evaluation process to increase ownership of findings, draw lessons learned and make greater use of this mid-term evaluation results. The evaluation is expected to provide actionable recommednations related to the theory of change, perfromance management framework, and strategic inteventions of the programme that will inform the improvement of the programme design and delivery taking into consideration emerging risks, challenges and opportunities and in light of the progress made so far.

The findings of the evaluation are expected to contribute to effective joint programming on gender equality and women empowerment in Palestine. The information generated by the evaluation will moreover be used to engage policy makers and other stakeholders at local, national and regional levels in evidence-based dialogues and to advocate for gender-responsive strategies to eliminate violence against women and girls.

# Evaluation Objectives, Criteria and Indicative Areas of Investigation of the Evaluation

The specific objectives of the evaluation are the following:

1. Assess and examine the relevance of HAYA Joint Programme design and implementation strategy and approaches to national development policy priorities and international agreements related to gender equality and human rights, including, but not limited to the Cross Sectoral National Gender Strategy, and examine how it has responded to the needs and priorities of the targeted beneficiaries and also adapted to contextual changes;
2. Assess and examine the contribution of the HAYA Joint Programme to the intermediate outcomes;
3. To assess the potential for sustainability of the results and the feasibility of ongoing, nationally-led efforts in the thematic areas tackled through the Joint Programme;
4. Assess and examine the extent to which and how HAYA engaged, worked, coordinated, and collaborated within the UN consortium and with Palestinian ministries, local partners, and key stakeholders. In particular, assess how these interactions contributed to or hindered results, national ownership, synergies and complementarities.
5. Analyse how and to what extent human rights approach and gender equality principles are integrated into the programme design and implementation.
6. Provide findings, conclusions, actionable recommendations, lessons learned and best practices to fulfill the evaluation purposes as stated above.

The evaluation must address the indicative areas of investigation presented in Table 2 below. These will be used as a starting point for developing a specific set of evaluation questions during the inception phase. The indicative areas of investigation are intended to give a more tangible format to the evaluation than using the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria. They articulate the key areas of interest that have emerged from consultation with stakeholders, thereby optimizing utility of the evaluation.

**Table 2. Indicative areas of investigation for the Formative Evaluation.**

| **Indicative Areas of Investigation  (DAC Criterion/Criteria Covered)** | **Additional Information/Explanations** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. The extent to which and how the Haya project design responded to the needs and priorities of the targeted beneficiaries and also adapted to contextual changes; (*Relevance*) | Under this issue, the Consultant’s Team should investigate to what extent and how:   1. HAYA interventions and outcomes were in line with the priorities and needs of the targeted beneficiaries; 2. HAYA design a) involved key national partners in the conceptualization, b) included a collaborative process, shared vision, strategies for joint delivery, c) is based on quality socio-economic and political analysis, gender and human rights based analysis, risk assessments 3. HAYA’S objectives aligned with the relevant national government policies and plans on gender equality, the corresponding governmental priorities and regional and internationally undertaken conventions and commitments ; 4. HAYA is aligned with Palestine’s UN Development Assistance Framework and nationalized SDGs. 5. HAYA, through technical leadership, helped shape and influence country policies, plans, and priorities when needed; 6. HAYA responded and timely adapted to partner and stakeholder needs over time as a result of a variety of contextual changes; 7. HAYA is contributing to the implementation of the UNPO and DFTAD strategic plans; 8. UNPO possess a comparative advantage in the intervention’s area of work. |
| 1. The extent to which and how the Haya project contributed to outcomes  (*Effectiveness*) | This assessment should look at how HAYA’s technical assistance has been used and what it has helped to achieve. This should be investigated from an external point of view as well as considering beneficiaries’ and stakeholders’ opinions. Assessment of this issue should examine the extent to which and how HAYA contributed to:   1. decrease harmful practices and attitudes that perpetuate and validate violence against women and girls within targeted households and communities. 2. increase access by women and girls to gender-responsive EVAW services (economic, medical, psychosocial, security, shelter) free of discrimination. 3. strengthen institutional capacity to develop and implement legal and policy frameworks that promote and protect women’s and girls’ rights with regards to VAW.   The assessment will investigate the extent to which HAYA intermediate and immediate outcomes have been achieved as planned for the evaluated period and what facilitating and hindering factors affected the realization of these intended results thus far. This includes looking into key challenges, if any, to building capacities of national stakeholders. Moreover, the evaluation will assess any unintended positive and/or negative changes resulting from HAYA, and if so, which ones and for whom.  Were risk assessments and mitigation measures applied? If so, to what extent efforts to minimize risk have been effective and what could be done differently? |
| 1. The extent to which and how HAYA project engaged, worked, coordinated, and collaborated within the UN consortium and with Palestinian ministries, local partners, and key stakeholders.  (*Value Added, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Relevance, Coherence, internal as well as external Coherence and Sustainability*) | This assessment should examine how HAYA’s institutional mechanisms and arrangements were efficient in delivering the intended results. The assessment should examine how HAYA engaged, worked, coordinated, and collaborated within the UN consortium and with Palestinian ministries (in particular, MoSD and MoWA), local partners (e.g. civil society, among others), and key stakeholders. This issue should examine the extent to which and how:   1. these interactions have contributed to/hindered results; 2. these interactions contributed to/hindered national ownership; 3. these interactions avoided duplication of efforts and fostered synergies among UN agencies, Palestinian ministries, civil society and other stakeholders that work on EVAW; 4. complementarities (each party’s organizational mandate and scope of activities) among UN agencies, Palestinian ministries, and civil society were respected and/or transparently and inclusively negotiated so as to maximize effectiveness and efficiency; 5. the intervention have succeeded in building individual and institutional capacities of rights-holders and duty-bearers to ensure sustainability of results. |
| 1. Analyse how and to what extent human rights approach and gender equality principles are integrated into the programme design and implementation.   *(Gender Equality and Human Rights)* | This assessment should look into assessing the following aspects:   1. Is the programme addressing the root causes of gender inequality and addressing structural causes of gender inequality and gender-based violence? 2. To what extent is the programme changing the dynamics of power in relationships between different groups? Has the programme been implemented according to human rights and development effectiveness principles: a. Participation/empowerment b. Inclusion/non-discrimination c. National accountability/transparency? 3. Which groups is the portfolio reaching the most, and which are being excluded, and if any, why excluded and what barriers for inclusion? |

# 

# Evaluation Scope

The formative evaluation of HAYA is to be conducted externally by a company selected through a competitive process. The team conducting the evaluation by the external company will be referred to hereinafter as the Consultant’s Evaluation Team (CET). It is planned to be conducted in the period of July-December 2021. The evaluation will cover project implementation period from 1 April 2018 until 30 June 2021 (39 months).

The evaluation will be conducted in Palestine, including East Jerusalem, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, where the programme has been implemented.

The evaluation will examine all the relevant documents of HAYA such as the logical framework of the project, its Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, annual work plan, annual reports to the donor, knowledge products produced in the frameworks of the project, etc. The fomative evaluation will examine the work directly implemented by the UNPO and by national partners.

# EVALUATION LIMITATIONS

The evolving COVID 19 pandemic may affect the availability of key informants and ability to carry out data collection in the field. The Company must thoroughly assess these constraints in order to inform the evaluation’s methodological choices which may require greater reliance on certain lines of evidence, minimized travel to the field, increased use of information and communication technologies (ICT), etc. As a result, the evaluation may be:

* delayed
* conducted with a narrower scope, or
* re-purposed: There may be cases where field data constraints and contextual changes are so important that it may be preferable to completely repurpose the evaluation to respond to the evaluations users’ needs. This may require different methodological approaches.

This evaluation will not assess impact of the programme as this is a mid-term evaluation. However, if in the process of evaluation, programme impacts are observed (planned unplanned, negative or positive) these will be documented and reported.

# Evaluation Methodology, Approach and process

The evaluation will follow a gender-responsive evaluation approach and be utilization-focused. The evaluation team will detail an evaluation approach and methodology which:

1. Responds to theneeds of intended users and their use of the evaluation results, primarily to improve the programme;
2. Integrates gender equality principles throughout the evaluation process including participation and consultation of key stakeholders;
3. Generates valid and reliable data to inform evidence-based answers to the evaluation questions; and
4. Provides sufficient detail and a ‘rich picture’ on what is changing (or not), for whom and how, in order to develop suitable and actionable recommendations.

Data should be disaggregated by relevant criteria (age, sex, disability status, geography, etc.) wherever possible.

The evaluation will follow the OECD/DAC (2010) *Quality Standards for Development Evaluation* and best practices in evaluation. Though references are made to the OECD/DAC criteria (effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence and sustainability), the evaluation must not be structured on the basis of the OECD/DAC criteria but rather on the basis of the Indicative Areas of Investigation detailed in Table 2 above.

Furthermore, the evaluation is to be conducted in line with UNEG [Norms](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21) and [Standards](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/22) for evaluation, the [UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluations in the UN System](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102), UN Women evaluation guidelines including Evaluation Policy, GERAAS evaluation report quality checklist, and the UN Women “How To Manage Gender-Responsive Evaluation” handbook.

The evaluation will be guided by WHO ethical guidelines on conducting research with the victims of violence.

The evaluation shall also be guided by the UN Women [Pocket tool for managing gender responsive evaluation during Covid 19.](https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2020/05/pocket-tool-for-managing-evaluation-during-the-covid-19-pandemic)

## **Theory of Change**

The evaluation will utilize a theory-based approach, which means that the evaluation methodology will be based on the careful analysis of the intended outcomes, outputs, activities, and the contextual factors (that may have had an effect on implementation of HAYA programming) and their potential to achieve the desired outcomes as outlined in Section 2. The analysis of the program’s theory of change, and the participatory validation/update of its intervention logic, will therefore play a central role in: the design of the evaluation (inception phase); the analysis of the data collected; the reporting of findings; and the development of conclusions and relevant, practical recommendations. The ToC may be reconstructed to elaborate on the objectives and articulation of the assumptions that stakeholders use to explain the change process represented by the change framework that the Action Plan considered.

## **Evaluation Questions and Assumptions**

The Consultant’s Evaluation Team (CET) will develop the evaluation questions through iterative exchanges with the evaluation’s main users (refer to Section 2.1). Evaluation Questions should clearly reflect the indicative areas of investigation listed in Table 2. They should also draw on the findings from the participatory validation/update of HAYA’s theory of change.

The evaluation questions must be complemented by sets of assumptions that capture key aspects of the intervention logic associated with the scope of each question; this will enable the CET to gauge if preconditions that allow for the contribution to obtained results are fulfilled. Key stakeholders (as identified by the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG – refer to Section 11) will be consulted on evaluation questions and assumptions in order to improve the utility of evaluation findings. The data collection for each of the assumptions will be guided by clearly formulated quantitative and qualitative indicators.

## 

## **Data Collection Tools**

The CET team will collect secondary data related to HAYA, including third party documents as well as socio-economic and health-related data (such as those from Demographic and Health Surveys) and do content analysis. The CET will also collect primary data by means of tools, including but not limited to, interviews, focus groups questionnaires/survey (see below), as well as through direct observations and field visits. Data will be disaggregated by relevant criteria (age, sex, geographic area, etc.) wherever possible. The evaluation will also be sensitive to fair power relations amongst stakeholders.

## **Evaluation Evidence Matrix**

To ensure that the collection and recording of data and information is done systematically, the CET is required to develop an Evaluation Evidence Matrix (EEM) during the inception phase, in accordance with Annex IV – Structure of the Evaluation Evidence Matrix. This matrix will help the CET consolidate in a structured manner all collected information corresponding to each evaluation question, and to identify data gaps and collect outstanding information before the end of the data collection phase. The EEM will play important but slightly varying roles throughout all stages of the evaluation process and therefore will require particular attention from the CET. Owing to the changing role and function of the EEM over the course of the evaluation, the matrix will need to serve as a series of working tools throughout the evaluation process. It is essential that the evaluation matrices (in the Desk-based Country Case Review, Country Case Study Notes and the Final Report) be structured and drafted in a manner that facilitates the easy access of evaluation users to the evidence that support the answer of each evaluation question.

## **Evaluation Process**

### Preparatory Phase

The Project Technical Team (PTT) at UN Women led the preparatory work, including the:

1. Preliminary compilation of HAYA project documentation from DFATD, UNPO, Palestinian Ministries and CSOs;
2. Preliminary stakeholder mapping.

### 

### Inception Phase

The Company conducting the evaluation will conduct the design of the evaluation in consultation with the Evaluation Management Group (EMG – See Section 11.1) and the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG). This phase will include:

1. An inception mission to Ramallah, with EMG members. The Evaluation Team Leader (ETL) along with another member of the Evaluation Consultant Team (ECT) will conduct this mission. The ECT is expected to have previously done an initial review of the documentation compiled by UN Women during the preparatory phase. (This documentation will be made available to the Consultant shortly after contract signature).
2. The compilation and review of all relevant documents (beyond those already provided) available from DFATD, UN Agencies and Palestinian Ministries. With the support from the members of the ERG, the CET will identify informants and information, documentation, and data from Haya project teams;
3. The update and completion of a stakeholder mapping (complementing the preliminary mapping prepared by UN Women in collaboration with HAYA project team). The stakeholder mapping will be used to facilitate and illustrate the different (sets of) stakeholders relevant to the evaluation and their relationships to each other;
4. The review and update of the intervention logic of HAYA (i.e. participatory validation/reconstruction/update of the theory of change);
5. The development of a list of evaluation questions addressing the main topics/issues identified in Section 4 above, and the identification of the assumptions to be assessed and the respective indicators, sources of information and methods and tools for data collection.
6. The development of the evaluation evidence matrix (EEM);
7. The development of a data collection and analysis strategy as well as a concrete work plan for data collection (desk-based, field-based, online surveys, workshops) and reporting phases;

### Data Collection Phase

Data collection will be undertaken according to the EMG-approved inception Report.

### Reporting Phase

The reporting phase must open with an internal analysis by the CET of the results of the data collection phase. The objective is to help the various team members to deepen their analysis with a strategy for identifying the evaluation’s findings, main conclusions and related recommendations.

The Consultant Company will be required to participate in an inception meeting in Ramallah via teleconference, videoconference, or in person, and to travel to East Jerusalem, the West bank and the Gaza Strip – as per the EMG approved Inception Report – for the field-based case studies.

Dates and times for the inception meeting in Ramallah will be confirmed at Contract award.

# Stakeholders partcipation

In order to facilitate a comprehensive review of the evaluation products and to ensure the participation of key stakeholders in the evaluation, A **joint evaluation reference group (ERG)** has been established to support the evaluation at key moments and to ensure broad participation in the conceptualization of the exercise, access to information, high technical quality of the evaluation products as well as learning and knowledge generation. The joint ERG will be consulted by the EMG on key aspects of the evaluation process. Technical staff from relevant divisions in the four UN agencies are represented in the joint ERG and will provide substantive technical inputs during the evaluation process as well as feedback on the evaluation results.

**Key roles and responsibilities** of joint ERG members include:

* Act as source of knowledge for the evaluation and coordinate feedback from other national stakeholders;
* Act as an informant of the evaluation process;
* Assist in the collection of pertinent information and documentation;
* Assist in identifying external stakeholders to be consulted during the process;
* Participate in any meetings of the reference group;
* Provide input and quality assurance on the key evaluation products: ToR, inception report and draft evaluation report;
* Provide input and feedback in relation to ethical considerations relating to all phases of the evaluation;
* Participate in the validation meeting of the final evaluation report;
* Participate in learning activities related to the evaluation report and play a key role in disseminating the findings of the evaluation and implementation of the management response;
* Fulfilling the responsibilities under Section 11 of this TOR including but not limiting it to insuring full compliance with the Term of Reference and Deliverables of UN Women Request for Proposal Reference No. RFP 2020/xxx.

Stakeholder consultation is fundamental to UN Women evaluations of development interventions; thus the Consultant must ensure that stakeholders are consulted throughout the evaluation process. Note: All deliverables must be approved by the EMG before broader circulation.This is required to ensure a robust quality assurance throughout the evaluation process.

# Timeframe

This evaluation, including the field mission, is expected to be carried out between August 2021and February 2022. The final evaluation report is to be submitted to the Project Technical Authority (PTA) (refer to Section 10 for description of the PTA) on or before 14 February, 2022.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Section** | | **Template** | **Indicative time schedule** | | | |
| **INCEPTION PHASE** | | | | | | | | |
|  | Inception Mission | 5.1 | | N/A | Held within 2 weeks of the start of the contract | | By 1 August 2021 | |
| 1 | Draft Inception Report | 5.2 | | A2.1 | Submitted within 4 weeks of the start of the contract | | By 1 September 2021 | |
| 2 | Final Inception Report | 5.2.1 | | A2.1 | Submitted within 2 weeks after reception of comments from the PTA on behalf of the EMG and ERG on draft inception report | | By 1 October 2021 | |
| **DATA COLLECTION PHASE** | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | In-country Debriefing | 5.3 | |  | 2 days before completing the data collection phase in the field | | | |
| **REPORTING PHASE** | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Post Data Collection Workshop | 5.4.1 | N/A | | | Held 2 weeks after field-based data collection phase is completed | | By 13 December 2021 |
| 5 | Draft Final Report | 5.4.1 | A2.4 | | | Submitted within 4 weeks after the Post data collection workshop | | By 10 January2022 |
| 6 | Recommendation Workshop | 5.4.1 | N/A | | | Held 2 weeks after reception of comments from the PTA on behalf of EMG and ERG on draft final report | | |
| 7 | Final Report | 5.4.1 | A2.4 | | | Submitted within 3 weeks after reception of comments from the PTA on behalf of EMG and ERG. | | By 14 February 2022 |
| 8 | Final Presentation | 5.4.1 | N/A | | | Date to be determined | | |

# Deliverables

## Deliverables for Inception Phase:

Deliverable 1: Draft Inception Report

The Consultant must produce a draft inception report, displaying the results of the above-listed steps and tasks. The inception report must follow the structure as set out in Annex I. The draft inception report will be submitted in both Arabic and English.

Prior to submission to the PTA, the Consultant must ensure that it was internally quality controlled. The EMG will control the quality of the submitted draft inception report. If the quality of the draft inception report is satisfactory (form and substance), the draft inception report will be circulated by the EMG to the ERG for comments. In the event that the quality is unsatisfactory, the Consultant will be required to produce a new version of the draft inception report.

Deliverable 2: Final Inception Report

The Consultant must address all the comments and make appropriate amendments to the inception report prior to submission to the PTA for review and approval. The final inception report will be submitted in both Arabic and English.

For each and every comment, the Consultant indicates in writing how they have responded (“trail of comments”), using the proposed format set out in Annex II. The trail of comments document is to be submitted to the PTA at the same time as the updated inception report.

The inception report will be considered final upon approval by the PTA on behalf of EMG.

## Deliverable of Data collection phase

Deliverable 3: In-Country Debriefing

The Consultant will present preliminary data to in-country key stakeholders, participating UN agencies, Palestinian ministries and DFATD staff (in-country or via tele- or video-conference) for discussion two days before completing the data collection phase in the field. The debriefing will be in English with translation provided by the consultant.

Note: The in-country debrief is needed to review data with selected key stakeholders, increase the Consultant’s understanding of data accumulated so far, and identify data issues or gaps that may be addressed/collected/revisited before leaving the country. The in-country debrief is not to be used to present preliminary findings as the data analysis is not yet completed and could mislead stakeholders.

Presentation material is to be submitted to the PTA prior to the debriefing session, in both Arabic and English. Minutes and any supplementary material provided during the session are to be submitted one week after the session, in both Arabic and English.

## Deliverables for the Reporting Phase

Deliverable 4: Post Data Collection Workshop

The Consultant’s Team Leader will conduct a workshop session to be held in Ramallah after finalizing the data collection phase and beginning data analysis. If travel to Ramallah is not feasible the workshop may be held via tele-conference. The presentation is to include preliminary findings responding to the evaluation questions. The presentation will be conducted in English with translation provided by the evaluation team.

Presentation material is to be submitted to the PTA at least five working days prior to the session in Arabic and English. Minutes and any supplementary material provided during the session are to be submitted one week after the session in Arabic and English.

Deliverable 5: Draft Final Report

The draft evaluation report must conform to the UNEG (2017) *Norms and Standards for Evaluation* or the OECD/DAC(2010) *Quality Standards for Development Evaluation* andfollow the structure and instructions as set out in Annex III, include an executive summary (following the outline provided in Annexe V) and includes all the relevant annexes. The draft evaluation report will be submitted in Arabic and English.

Prior to submission to the PTA, the Consultant must ensure that the draft evaluation report has undergone an internal quality control process through the Consultant’s Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS). If the quality of the draft evaluation report is deemed satisfactory by EMG (form and substance), the draft evaluation report will be circulated to the ERG and other stakeholders as necessary for comments. In the event that the quality is unsatisfactory, the Consultant will be required to produce a new version of the draft evaluation report.

The PTA is responsible for sharing the draft report and collecting stakeholder comments. ***The draft report will be approved by the EMG before broader circulation for quality assurance purpose.***

Deliverable 6: Recommendation Workshop

Approximately two weeks after comments from the EMG/ERG have been shared with the CET, the findings, conclusions and draft recommendations must be presented by the Consultant during a workshop in Ramallah in person or via teleconference. The workshop will include participants from the EMG and the ERG. Any presentation material is to be submitted to the PTA at least three days prior to the session.

Deliverable 7: Final Report

The Consultant must address all the comments and make appropriate amendments to the evaluation report prior to submission to the PTA for review and approval.

For each and every comment, the Consultant indicates in writing how they have responded (“trail of comments”), using the format set out in Annex II. The trail of comments document is to be submitted to the PTA at the same time as the updated evaluation report.

Note: As per the *OECD/DAC (2010) Quality Standards for Development Evaluation*, “Relevant stakeholders are given the opportunity to comment on the draft report. The final evaluation report reflects these comments and acknowledges any substantive disagreements. In disputes about facts that can be verified, the evaluators investigate and change the draft where necessary. In the case of opinion or interpretation, stakeholders’ comments are reproduced verbatim, in an annex or footnote, to the extent that this does not conflict with the rights and welfare of participants.”

The evaluation report will be considered final upon approval by the PTA on behalf of EMG.

Deliverable 8: Final presentation

The Consultant’s Team Leader will prepare and conduct a workshop to present the findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons of the evaluation in Ramallah and at a time to be decided by the PTA. If travel to Ramallah is not feasible the workshop may be held via tele-conference.

The Consultant’s Team Leader will conduct the presentation after PTA approval of the Final Report.

# Evaluation Management

The evaluation is managed jointly by an interagency joint evaluation management group (EMG) comprised of representatives from UN Women, UNFPA, UNPDC, UN Habitat and DFATD. The roles and responsibilities of the EMG are outlined in Section 11.1.

UN Women will act as the Project Technical Authority (PTA), the main interlocutor between the Consultant (Company). The PTA will be represented by the Evaluation Manager, and with the support of the joint evaluation management group, will facilitate interactions with other agencies’ counterparts to ensure a smooth implementation process.

## **Evaluation Management Group (EMG)**

As the evaluation will be conducted jointly by the UNPO and the Evaluation Division at Canada DFATD, a **joint evaluation management group (EMG)** has been established as the main decision-making body for the evaluation. The main responsibilities are to support and oversee the evaluation management and act as a liaison for the evaluation with the appropriate technical units within their own organizations. Using a pragmatic approach that works within the given budget and time, the EMG will manage the entire evaluation process from the selection of the Consultant (Company) for the evaluation through to dissemination and follow-up to the final evaluation report. UN Women will lead management of the process, but all milestone decisions will be taken jointly by the EMG on the basis of inputs from collaborating agencies. The joint EMG is responsible for ensuring the quality and independence of the evaluation and to guarantee its alignment with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines.

**Key roles and responsibilities of the joint EMG** include:

* To lead the recruitment of the team of external consultants, reviewing proposals and approving the selection of the evaluation team;
* To supervise and guide the evaluation team at each step of the evaluation process, facilitate access to documentation and stakeholders deemed of importance to the evaluation process includingcoordination of field missions;
* To review, provide substantive comments and approve the terms of reference, the inception report, including the work plan, analytical framework, methodology, the design and dissemination of the survey;
* To act as a source of knowledge for the evaluation and coordinate feedback from the participating partner organisations as well as from DFATD headquarters, the regions and from the field, in particular to facilitate access to information and documentation;
* To review and provide substantive feedback on the draft and final evaluation reports, for quality assurance purposes;
* To approve the final evaluation report;
* To contribute to learning, knowledge sharing, the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response;
* To liaise with the joint ERG and convene review meetings with the evaluation team;
* To identify and ensure the participation of relevant stakeholders in coordination with the joint ERG throughout the evaluation process;
* To design a dissemination plan of the evaluation results in consultation with the ERG.
* Provide necessary support to the Evaluation Manager in fulfilling the responsibilities to ensure full compliance with the Evaluation Terms of Reference and in maintaining highest degree of independence during the entire evaluation process.

## **UN Women’s Role:**

As the PTA, UN Women Monitoring and Reporting Associate at the Palestine Country Office (Evaluation Manager) will chair and provide the secretariat function for the EMG, and will thus lead management of the process. The Evaluation Manager will be supported in the management of the evaluation by the members of evaluation management group.

The Evaluation Manager will be responsible for the following:

* Leading the recruitment of a company (Consultant) using the UN Women established procedures;
* Managing the Consultant’s contract;
* Acting as the main contact person for the Consultant;
* Providing guidance to the Consultant throughout all phases of execution and formally approving all deliverables;
* Ensuring the quality control of all deliverables with the members of EMG and in consultation with the ERG;
* Sharing approved deliverables with EMG and ERG, key stakeholders and those who may benefit from the evaluation;
* Collecting EMG and ERG members’ comments on the deliverables;
* Including the management response in the final Evaluation Report;
* Assessing the overall performance of the Consultant for the present mandate, in consultation with the members of the EMG.
* Fulfilling the responsibilities including but not limited to section 10.1 of this TOR in order to insure full compliance with the Term of Reference and Deliverables of UN Women Request for Proposal Reference No. RFP 2020/xxx.

## **Evaluation Reference Group**

## See Section 8 Above

## **Evaluation Steering Committee**

An evaluation Steering Committee, ESC, will be established as the key accountable body that will ultimately endorse the evaluation report and will be responsible for the development of an evaluation Management Response (MR) to address the recommendations included in the report. The specific functions of the ESC will include the following:

* Be informed by EMG during the entire evaluation process.
* Revise and endorse the different evaluation deliverables: inception report and final evaluation report.
* Lead in the development of the evaluation Management Response (MR) in coordination with relevant staff
* Endorse the MR, which will be made publicly available in the UN Women Global Accountability and Tracking of Evaluation (GATE) system.

# Evaluation team composition, skills and experience

The evaluation is to be conducted by a company which is expected to propose a team composed of the following categories:

1. Core Evaluation Team
2. Quality Assurance Personnel
3. Additional Non-Specialized Personnel

The roles and responsibilities of the Consultant’s proposed team members are to be defined by the Consultant in its Technical Proposal.

## 

## **Core Evaluation Team**

The Core Evaluation Team (CET) is composed of at least a senior Evaluation Team Leader (ETL) with proven experience of leading evaluation team, a senior expert on the thematic area of eliminating violence against women, preferably with evaluation experience, a national senior evaluation expert, and a national senior expert on EVAW. It may also include other subject matter experts. The Core Evaluation Team together should have:

a) extensive experience working on similar development evaluation as described in these ToR,

b) experience working in developing countries in the Middle East and specifically in the West Bank and Gaza, and

c) possess technical expertise and experience in i) gender-based violence, ii) gender equality iii) human rights-based approaches, iv) quantitative data collection and analysis and v) qualitative data collection and analysis.

The CET will also be proficient in Arabic.

The CET must be knowledgeable about ethical issues related to engaging vulnerable groups, including women and girls victims and survivors of violence, in evaluation processes.

Each member of the Core Evaluation Team must possess the following levels in English:

Oral = 4 – Advanced Professional Proficiency

Reading = Level 4 – Advanced Professional Proficiency

Writing = Level 4 – Advanced Professional Proficiency

The description associated with the language requirement can be found in Annex 1.6.

The Senior National Evaluation Expert and the Senior National Expert must possess the following levels in Arabic:

Oral = 4 – Advanced Professional Proficiency

Reading = Level 4 – Advanced Professional Proficiency

Writing = Level 4 – Advanced Professional Proficiency

**Qualifications of the Team Leader:**

The Team leader must have demonstrated capacity in designing and leading evaluation especially on EVAW and gender equality. The team leader should have:

* Post-graduate degree in social sciences, gender studies, human rights or international development or related fields;
* At least 15 years working experience in international development, gender equality and women empowerment;
  + Al least 10 years of experience in leading evaluations of complex, multi-stakeholder programmes and analytical reviews, and assessing institutional capacities on gender as well as leading a team
  + At least 7 years of demonstrated experience in evaluation, research and strategic studies related to eliminating violence against women and girls;
* Demonstrated experience in implementing qualitative and quantitative data collection methods and innovative evaluation methods and approaches;
  + Experience in similar assignments in producing evaluation reports to a publishable quality;
  + Demonstrated experience about ethical consideration, human rights-based approaches and gender responsive programming and evaluation on/of EAWA issues;
* Demonstrated experience in working with multi-stakeholders including governments and civil society in a wide range of contexts;
* Previous working experience in the West Bank and Gaza Strip is an asset;
  + Excellent analytical skills and communication skill;

**Qualifications of the senior expert on Eliminating Violence Against Women:**

The Senior Expert on Eliminating Violence Against Women should have:

* Post-graduate degree in social sciences, gender studies, human rights or international development or related fields;
* At least 7 years of relevant professional experience, at the international level in developing and implementing programms on ending violence against women and girls

• Demonstrated experience with human rights-based approaches to programming on EAWA issues, and skilled in working with a wide range of contexts;

* Demonstrated experience in evaluation and research about EVAW and with victims of violence;
* Previous working experience in the West Bank and Gaza Strip is an asset;

• Excellent analytical skills and communication skill;

**Qualifications of the Senior National Evaluation Expert:**

The Senior National Evaluation Expert should have:

* Post-graduate degree in social sciences or international development or related fields
* At least 7 years of leading evaluations on gender equality and empowerment of women and girls with at least five years of experience of conducting evaluations of EVAW programmes
* Demonstrated experience with and knowledge on eliminating violence against women and girls programming
* Knowledge with Palestinian legislations and practices related to EVAW;
* Experience with using ethical considerations, human rights approaches, protection and gender analysis in evaluations
* Proven record of applying mixed methods approach, participatory methodologies for conducting gender and human rights responsive evaluations and innovative evaluation methods and approaches
* Proven experience of working with Palestinian actors, including government institutions, Civil Society actors and Women CBOs, and grass roots organizations.
* Excellent analytical skills and communication skill;

**Qualifications of the National Senior Expert on EVAW:**

The National Senior Expert should have:

* Post-graduate degree in social sciences, gender studies, human rights or international development or related fields
* At least 7 years of relevant professional experience, at the national level in developing and implementing programms on ending violence against women and girls;
* Demonstrated experience in evaluation or research about EVAW and with victims of violence;

• Demonstrated experience about human rights-based approaches and gender responsive programming on EAWA issues, and skilled in working with a wide range of contexts;

* Proven experience of working with Palestinian actors, including government institutions, Civil Society actors and Women CBOs, and grass roots organizations.

• Excellent analytical skills and communication skill;

## **Quality Assurance Personnel**

As part of the evaluation’s quality assurance, the Bidder should hire quality assurance personnel that must be independent from the Core Evaluation Team and additional specialized or non-specialised personnel.

## **Additional Non-Specialized Personnel**

The Core Evaluation Team may draw upon other non-specialized staff, as necessary. These resources may include, but are not limited to:

* Researchers
* Editorial and communications staff
* Administrative and logistical assistance personnel
* Translators
* Enumeration personnel

# Ethical code of conduct

Evaluation must be conducted with the highest standards of integrity and respect for the beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environment; for human rights and gender equality; and for the “do no harm” principle for humanitarian assistance. As indicated under section 7, the evaluation will be guided by WHO ethical guidelines on conducting research with the victims of violence. Evaluators must respect the rights of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence, must ensure that sensitive data is protected and that it cannot be traced to its source and must validate statements made in the report with those who provided the relevant information. Evaluators should obtain informed consent for the use of private information from those who provide it. When evidence of wrongdoing is uncovered, it must be reported discreetly to a competent body (such as the relevant office of audit or investigation).

UN Women has developed a [UN Women Evaluation Consultants Agreement Form](file:///C:\Users\chaitali\Downloads\SiteDocuments__UNWomen%20-%20CodeofConductforEvaluationForm-Consultants.pdf) for evaluators that must be signed as part of the contracting process, which is based on the UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct. These documents will be annexed to the contract. The UNEG guidelines note the importance of ethical conduct for the following reasons:

1. Responsible use of power: All those engaged in evaluation processes are responsible for upholding the proper conduct of the evaluation.

2. Ensuring credibility: With a fair, impartial and complete assessment, stakeholders are more likely to have faith in the results of an evaluation and to take note of the recommendations.

3. Responsible use of resources: Ethical conduct in evaluation increases the chances of acceptance by the parties to the evaluation and therefore the likelihood that the investment in the evaluation will result in improved outcomes.

The evaluators are expected to provide a detailed plan on how the following principles will be ensured throughout the evaluation (see UNEG Ethical Guidance for descriptions): 1) Respect for dignity and diversity; 2) Right to self-determination; 3) Fair representation; 4) Compliance with codes for vulnerable groups (e.g., ethics of research involving women survivivors and victims of violence, young children or other vulnerable groups); 5) Redress; 6) Confidentiality; and 7) Avoidance of harm.

Specific safeguards must be put in place to protect the safety (both physical and psychological) of both respondents, including, but not limited to women survivors and victims of violence, and those collecting the data. These should include:

1. A plan is in place to protect the rights of the respondent, including privacy and confidentiality

2. The interviewer or data collector is trained in collecting sensitive information, particularly if the topic of the evaluation is focused on violence against women, they should have previous experience in this area

3. Data collection tools are designed in a way that are culturally appropriate and do not create distress for respondents

4. Data collection visits are organized at the appropriate time and place so as to minimize risk to respondents

5. The interviewer or data collector is able to provide information on how individuals in situations of risk can seek support.

The evaluation’s value added is its impartial and systematic assessment of the programme or intervention. As with the other stages of the evaluation, involvement of stakeholders should not interfere with the impartiality of the evaluation. The evaluator(s) have the final judgment on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation report, and the evaluator(s) must be protected from pressures to change information in the report.

Additionally, if the evaluator(s) identify issues of wrongdoing, fraud or other unethical conduct, UN Women procedures must be followed and confidentiality be maintained.

The [UN Women Legal Framework for Addressing Non-Compliance with UN Standards of Conduct](https://www.unwomen.org/-/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/about%20us/accountability/un-women-legal-framework-for-addressing-non-compliance-with-un-standards-of-conduct-en.pdf?la=en&vs=4503), and accompanying policies protecting against retaliation and prohibiting harassment and abuse of authority, provide a cohesive framework aimed at creating and maintaining a harmonious working environment, ensuring that staff members do not engage in any wrongdoing and that all allegations of wrongdoing are reported promptly, investigated and appropriate action taken to achieve accountability.

The UN Women Legal Framework for Addressing Non-Compliance with UN Standards of Conduct defines misconduct and the mechanisms within UN Women for reporting and investigating it.

# Quality Assurance

The Consultant must have an Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS) that will be used throughout the evaluation process. That is, the Consultant must dedicate specific resources to quality assurance efforts and must have quality assurance mechanisms which will be applied throughout the evaluation process.

**Quality of evaluation deliverables**

The first level of quality assurance for evaluation deliverables will be conducted by the Consultant. That is, the Consultant must systematically quality control all deliverables prior to submission to the PTA.

The second level of quality assurance for evaluation deliverables will be conducted by the EMG. As part of UN Women’s and DFATD’s decentralized EQAS, a Quality Assurance Report (QAR) will be applied in the assessment of deliverables for this evaluation. The QAR uses evaluation quality standards that follow the United Nations Evaluation Group *UNEG* *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*, the OECD/DAC *Quality Standards for Development Evaluation*, but also best practices from the international evaluation community. To further enhance the quality and credibility of this evaluation, ERG will also comment on the deliverables (factual checks). The PTA maintains an oversight function and approves all deliverables.

# Annex I: Outline of the Inception Report

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

List of Tables (\*)

List of Figures (\*)

1. **Rationale, Purpose and Specific Objectives of the Evaluation**

*Should include*: rationale, purpose, specific objectives and the scope of the evaluation.

1. **Development Context**

*Should include:* a description of key contextual element, specific to the development intervention.

1. **Evaluation Object and Scope**

*Should include:* a brief description of the development intervention (e.g. the time period; budget; geographical area; programming; intervention logic, stakeholder mapping; organizational set-up; implementation arrangements) including the theory of vhange of the programme

1. **Evaluability Assessment**

*Should include*: a review of previous evaluation(s), a review and an analysis of the logic of the development intervention, an assessment of the evaluation questions, an analysis of the evidence (existence and quality of data and availability of key informants), and an analysis of key factors that compromise the evaluation.

1. **Evaluation Questions**

*Should include*: a set of revised evaluation questions with the explanatory associated comments.

1. **Evaluation Approach and Methodology**

*Should include*: (i) a description and an explanation of the evaluation approaches, evaluation methodology and its application; including details of, and justification for, the methodological choices; (ii) description of the methods of data collection (desk and field-based) -- including data collection plan; preparation of interview and guides for focus groups; surveys; etc. (iii) description of samples, sampling choices/methods and limitations regarding the representativeness of samples for interpreting evaluation results. (iv); data analysis plan (i.e. how the information collected will be organized, classified, tabulated, inter-related, compared and displayed relative to the evaluation questions, etc.); (v) limitations.

1. **Reporting**

*Should include*: an explanation of the debriefing sessions.

1. **Evaluation Management**

*Should include:* team composition and distribution of tasks, roles and responsibilities; the Consultant’s approach to ensure quality assurance of all evaluation deliverables.

1. **Deliverables, Milestones, Schedule, Level of Effort and Budget**

*Should include:* a detailed plan for the next phases/stages of the evaluation; including detailed plans for field visits, including the list of interventions for in-depth analysis in the field (explanation of the value added for the visits), preparation process and logistics, recruitment of field teams, etc.

1. **Annexes**

*Should include:*

* Logic Model and PMF
* ToR (and amendments if applicable)
* Stakeholder Mapping and Analysis
* Evaluation Evidence Matrix
* Explanation of Sampling and Proposed Samples
* List of Documents Consulted for the Work Plan
* List of Individuals Consulted for the Work Plan (Disaggregated by Affiliation and Sex)
* Proposed Data Collection Tools / Protocols
* Proposed Field Work Schedule

(\*) *Tables, figures, graphs and diagrams should be numbered and have a title.*

# Annex II: Evaluation Trail of Comments Template

.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| DFATD QAR Comment | Page # | Consultant’s Response |
| 1. **[Please insert DFATD’s comments as stated in the QAR]** | **[p.XX]** | **[Please explain what modifications were made and why or provide a justification for rejecting the comment]** |
| 2. |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |
| 5. |  |  |
| 6. |  |  |
| 7. |  |  |

# Annex III: Outline of the Evaluation Report

Title and opening pages

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

List of Tables (\*)

List of Figures

**Executive Summary**

**1 Introduction**

*Should include*: rationale and purpose of the evaluation;

**2 Development Context**

*Should include:* a description of key contextual element, specific to the development Intervention;

**3 Evaluation Object**

*Should include:* a brief description of the development Intervention (e.g. the time period; budget; geographical area; programming; stakeholder mapping; organisational set-up; implementation arrangements);

**4 Evaluation Objective and Scope**

Should include

**5 Methodology**

Note: This is a standalone document. Information included in the inception report may be used (synthesized, copied and updated as needed) in this section while never referencing to the inception report. This section can be complemented in an annex.

*Should include*: a description and an explanation of the evaluation approaches and methodology (*details of*, and justification for, methodological choices) and its application (*details of* what was done along with limitations and shortcomings). The report acknowledges any constraints encountered and how these have affected the evaluation, including the independence and impartiality of the evaluation.

**6 Main findings and analysis**

This section is divided by evaluation questions. Under each evaluation question, key finding(s) are presented as follow:

**Finding # – Finding Statement** *[Findings are numbered successively to ease cross-references. The length of a finding statement is of 1 to maximum 2 lines in bold character]*

***1st Paragraph:*** *Explanation detailing the finding statement*

***Following Paragraph(s):*** *present the analysis of the data/info on which the finding is based. It provides sufficient detail on the sources of data/info so that the adequacy of the information can be assessed.* *The text is structurally presented in a way that eases cross-referencing to the Evaluation Evidence Matrix located in the annex while never referencing to the annex. i.e. a reader can read the text without the need to access the annex.*

***Following Paragraph:*** *present data gaps where the findings cannot be fully triangulated and/or discuss the validity and reliability of the data, as well as any weaknesses in the analysis used to support the finding.*

**7 Conclusions**

*Should include:* at least one conclusion for each evaluation issue. Additional conclusions may encompass more than one issue. Conclusions are presented as follow:

**Conclusion # – Conclusions Statement** *[Conclusions are numbered successively to ease cross-references. The length of a conclusion statement is of 1 to maximum 2 lines in bold character]*

***1st Paragraphs:*** *1) Explain the conclusion in more detail and 2) State the specific findings # to which the conclusion pertains.*

***Following paragraph:*** *present the analysis of the findings on which the conclusion is based (i.e. critically analyzes the findings which led to the conclusions and ensures a clear link between the conclusions and the recommendations)*.

**8 Recommendations**

Recommendations are clear, relevant, targeted and actionable so that the evaluation can be used to achieve its intended purpose(s), thus meeting the needs of the intended users. Recommendations must flow logically from the conclusions. The number of recommendations should be limited to a maximum of five. Recommendations are presented as follow:

*Should include* *for each recommendation*:

**Recommendation # – Recommendation Statement** *[Recommendations are numbered successively and ranked (prioritized) according to their relevance and importance to the evaluation purpose. The length of a recommendation**statement is of 1 to maximum 2 lines in bold character];*

**Targeted party:** [body targeted by the recommendation]

**Link to Conclusion:** *[e.g. #X and #Y]*

***Following paragraph:*** *1) Explain the recommendation in more detail and 2) State the specific conclusion # to which the recommendation pertains.*

**9 Lesson Learned**

This section describes the main lessons learned from the implementation.

**Annexes**

*Should include*:

* ToR (and amendments if applicable)
* Documents consulted
* Stakeholder Mapping
* List of institutions/stakeholders groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited (without direct reference to individuals)
* Evaluation Evidence Matrix duly completed
* Explanation of Sampling and Samples
* Methodological instruments used (survey, focus groups, interviews etc.)
* Bibliography
* Additional information on context, program or methodology and analysis as necessary.

(\*) *Tables, Graphs, diagrams, maps etc. presented in the final evaluation report are also to be provided to the PTA in their original version (in Excel, PowerPoint or word files, etc.)*

# Annex IV: Structure of the Evaluation Evidence Matrix

The table below represents the structure for the evaluation evidence matrix (EEM) in which each evaluation question must be included.

This matrix must become the starting point for subsequent versions of the EEM that the Consultant must use to compile and organize data and information throughout the evaluation process.

The EEM serves as a working tool throughout the evaluation process and will specifically be useful during the:

* **design of the evaluation (i.e., the inception phase),** the EEM is to be used to capture core aspects of the evaluation design: (a) what is to be evaluated (i.e. key investigation areas, evaluation questions and related issues to be examined); (b) how to evaluate (sources of information and methods and tools for data collection). In this way, the matrix is to also help the Consultant and DFATD to check the feasibility of evaluation questions and the associated data collection strategies.
* **data collection phase of the evaluation**, the EEM helps the Consultant to: (a) approach the collection of information in a systematic, structured way; (b) identify possible gaps in the evidence base of the evaluation; and (c) compile and organize the data to prepare and facilitate the systematic analysis of all collected information.
* **analysis and reporting phase**, the EEM helps the Consultant to conduct the analysis in a systematic and transparent way, by showing clear association between the evidence collected and the findings and conclusions derived on the basis of this evidence.
* **dissemination phase**, and the actual use of the evaluation, the EEM plays a key role for making sure that users of the report can understand how the Consultant’s team interpreted the available evidence to arrive at their findings, so that they are considered credible and valid.

***Outline for evaluation evidence matrix***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Question 1** | *[Text of Evaluation Question]* | | |
| **Rationale** | *[Summary of how the sub-questions will be used to answer the main evaluation question]* | | |
| Sub-Question 1.1 | *[Text of Sub-question 1.1]* | | |
| **Data / Indicators** | **Sources of information** | **Methods and tools for data collection** | **Notes** |
| Indicator or Data 1.1.1  Indicator or Data 1.1.2  Etc. |  |  | (e.g. representativeness of the sample when applicable) |
| Sub-Question 1.2 |  | | |
| Etc. |  |  |  |

# Annex V: Outline of the Executive Summary with instructions

*(MAXIMUM OF 6 PAGES)*

*Evaluation Title: Insert the complete name of the evaluation*

*Evaluation Type: Formative, summative, prospective, thematic, etc.*

*Commissioned by: The Department’s Program Branch (in the case of Joint evaluation; list agencies involved)*

*Consultant: Name of the firm/individual contracted to conduct the evaluation*

*Date: Month and year submitted*

**Rationale and Purpose of the Evaluation**

*As per the ToR.*

**Specific Objectives of the Evaluation**

*As per the ToR.*

**Scope of the Evaluation**

*As per the ToR.*

**Development Context**

*Description of the context in which the intervention was implemented, including key local government policies and strategies and socio-economic, political and cultural factors of relevance for the intervention.*

**Intervention**

*Description of the intervention being evaluated, including: ultimate outcome, start and end dates, budget, geographical area covered, main components, and crosscutting issues addressed (i.e. gender equality, environmental sustainability and governance).*

**Intervention Logic**

*List the ultimate, intermediate and immediate outcomes as per the Logic Model (LM).*

**Stakeholders**

*As per the ToR.*

**Evaluation Approach and Methodology**

*Description of the (1) Evaluation approach, (2) Methodology, (3) Techniques for data collection and analysis, (4) Sampling, and (5) Limitations of the evaluation.*

**Key Findings\***

*Select and list key findings.*

**Key Conclusions\***

*Select and list key conclusions.*

**Key Recommendations\***

*Select and list key recommendations.*

**Key Lessons**

*Select and list key lessons.*

\*The findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons listed above are those of the consultant and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department or the Government of Canada. The Department does not guarantee the accuracy of the information provided in this report.

**Management Responses**

Department’s response: *The program may wish to publish management responses where it is targeted by a recommendation. Otherwise, a generic response can be provided e.g. The Department took note of the consultant’s findings, conclusions and recommendations and has shared them with relevant stakeholders for consideration.*

Cooperation Partner(s) response(s): *Partners may wish to provide management responses where they are targeted by a recommendation. Otherwise, a generic response can be provided e.g. The partner(s) took note of the consultant’s findings, conclusions and recommendations and has(have) shared them within the organization(s) for consideration.*

**Language:** *This report is only available in (language). If you would like a copy, please contact* [*info@international.gc.ca*](mailto:info@international.gc.ca)

# Annex VI: Description of Language Scales/Levels

**Oral Proficiency Rating Scale**

| **Level** | **Proficiency** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | Educated Native Proficiency | Functionally equivalent to that of a highly articulate and well-educated native speaker. Reflects the cultural standards of the country where the language is spoken. Language usage and ability to function are superior throughout. |
| 4+ | Advanced Professional Proficiency, Plus | Speaking proficiency is regularly superior in all respects and is usually equivalent to that of a well-educated, highly articulate native speaker. Speaks effortlessly and smoothly on all topics. Understands all forms and styles of speech and shows strong sensitivity to social and cultural references. Language usage and ability to function are fully successful. There may be an occasional non-native slip. |
| 4 | Advanced Professional Proficiency | Able to use the language fluently and accurately on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Language usage and ability to function are fully successful. Can tailor language to audience and discuss in depth highly abstract or unfamiliar topics. Able to speak with a great deal of fluency, grammatical accuracy, complex vocabulary and in an idiomatic fashion. Understands all forms and styles of speech and shows strong sensitivity to social and cultural references. May have some difficulty with some dialects and slang. |
| 3+ | General Professional Proficiency, Plus | Able to use the language to satisfy professional needs in a wide range of sophisticated and demanding tasks. Operates at level 4 most of the time, but cannot sustain the performance across a variety of topics. Understanding is complete, including idioms, nuances, register shifts and humour or irony. Often matches a native speaker's strategic and organizational abilities. Basic and complex structures are fully controlled except for an occasional error in low-frequency structures. There are no patterned errors. |
| 3 | General Professional Proficiency | Able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy, vocabulary and cohesiveness in discourse to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics. Understanding is essentially complete. Can discuss with fluency and ease abstract issues and special fields of competence and interest. Can support opinion and hypothesize. Can provide a structured argument that is clear and well organized. While the influence of the speaker's first language can be felt (in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary), there are no patterned errors and errors never distract the listener or interfere with communication. |
| 2+ | Limited Working Proficiency, Plus | Able to satisfy most working requirements with language that is often, but not always, acceptable and effective. Operates at level 3 most of the time but is unable to sustain the performance across all topics, i.e. when called on to perform level 3 tasks, may avoid the tasks altogether or resort to simplification through the use of description or narration instead of argumentation or hypothesis. Also, may give concrete examples to illustrate a point instead of arguing the point abstractly. Often shows remarkable ease of speech but performance is uneven. Vocabulary may still be generic (general) rather than precise. Often strong in either grammar or vocabulary, but not in both. Comprehension of normal native speech is nearly complete. Can be understood by native speakers not used to dealing with foreigners. |
| 2 | Limited Working Proficiency | Able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements. Can handle with confidence, but not accuracy, complicated tasks. Speaks with ease and facility on concrete topics – giving facts and talking casually about topics of current public and personal interest – using general vocabulary and linking sentences together smoothly with appropriate connectors. When dealing with more complex or abstract topics or issues, fluency breaks down. Can narrate and describe in major time frames. Can understand main ideas and most details on a variety of topics, and discourse referring to different time frames or aspects. Can be understood without difficulty by native speakers. |
| 1+ | Elementary Proficiency, Plus | Can initiate and maintain predictable face-to-face conversations and satisfy limited social demands. Operates mostly at level 2 but cannot sustain the performance across all topics and tasks. Can converse with ease and confidence when dealing with routine tasks and social situations, describe people and places and narrate in present tense. May hesitate and change the intended message due to lack of language resources. Understanding of normal native speech is inconsistent due to failure to grasp details and, sometimes even main ideas. Influence of first language is evident in pronunciation, grammatical structures and vocabulary. However, can be understood by native speakers not used to dealing with foreigners, although repetition and reformulation may be needed. |
| 1 | Elementary Proficiency | Able to satisfy courtesy requirements and maintain simple face-to-face conversations on familiar topics. Can ask and answer simple questions and participate in simple conversations on topics beyond the most immediate needs. Speaks in sentences but often hesitates and pauses to search for adequate vocabulary. Able to understand sentence-length utterances on a variety of concrete topics, but understanding is uneven. Can be understood by native speakers used to dealing with foreigners. |
| 0+ | Memorized Proficiency | Able to satisfy immediate needs using mostly rehearsed utterances. Can handle level 1 tasks but cannot sustain the performance at that level. Shows little autonomy of expression, flexibility and spontaneity. Relies heavily on learned phrases or a recombination of these and words used by the interlocutor. Inability to conjugate verbs. Strong influence of first language in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary (borrowed words, literal translations). Can usually differentiate most significant sounds when produced in isolation, but when combined in words or groups of words, may have difficulty understanding. Can be understood by native speakers used to dealing with foreigners. |
| 0 | No Proficiency | Unable to function in the spoken language, except for a few isolated words and phrases. |

Note:

* Level 2/2+ is that on which much daily communication and social interactions are handled routinely and effortlessly among native speakers.
* Levels 3 and above entail a much more sophisticated control of the language and a breadth and depth of vocabulary not normally used in everyday exchanges.

**Reading Proficiency Rating Scale**

| **Level** | **Proficiency** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | Educated Native Proficiency | Reading ability is functionally equivalent to that of the well-educated native reader. |
| 4+ | Advanced Professional Proficiency, Plus | Near native ability to read and understand extremely difficult or abstract prose, a wide variety of vocabulary, idioms, colloquialisms, and slang. Strong sensitivity to and understanding of sociolinguistic and cultural references. |
| 4 | Advanced Professional Proficiency | Able to read fluently and accurately all styles and forms of the language in any subject as well as those pertinent to professional needs. Understands all sociolinguistic and cultural references. Can follow unpredictable turns of thought readily in editorial, conjectural, and literary texts, as well as in materials in own special field, including official documents and correspondence. Recognizes all professionally relevant vocabulary known to the educated non-professional native reader. Speed and accuracy is often nearly that of a well-educated native reader. |
| 3+ | General Professional Proficiency, Plus | Able to read with facility and appreciate a wide variety of texts as well as those pertinent to professional needs. Has a broad active general, specialized and abstract vocabulary. Able to comprehend many sociolinguistic and cultural references, as well as a considerable range of complex structures, low-frequency idioms, and connotations. However, accuracy is not complete, and here again some nuances and subtleties may escape the reader. |
| 3 | General Professional Proficiency | Able to read within a normal range of speed and with almost complete comprehension a variety of authentic texts on unfamiliar subjects. Reading ability does not depend on subject matter knowledge, except if the material is highly dependent on cultural knowledge or outside one's general experience and not accompanied by explanation. Text types include news stories, wire service reports, international news items, correspondence, technical material, etc. in one's professional field. Material may include hypothesis, argumentation, and supported opinions. Misreadings are rare. Able to read between the lines and derive the author's implicit intent, but may not detect or understand subtleties and nuances. May experience some difficulties with unusually complex structures and low-frequency idioms. |
| 2+ | Limited Working Proficiency, Plus | Able to understand most general factual prose as well as some discussions on concrete topics related to special professional interests. Has a good active reading vocabulary and is able to use the context to make sensible guesses about unfamiliar vocabulary and material. Can get the gist of the information and some secondary ideas. Weaknesses include slowness, uncertainty, inability to discern nuances. |
| 2 | >Limited Working Proficiency | Able to read simple and straightforward factual texts written for the general reader that are presented in a predictable sequence and contain high frequency sentence patterns. Persons who have professional knowledge of a subject may be able to scan and summarize texts that are well beyond their general proficiency level. In general, however, the person does not have a broad active vocabulary and is quite slow in reading. |
| 1+ | Elementary Proficiency, Plus | Able to read and understand simple texts for informative social purposes, such as biographical information or narration of events, straightforward newspaper headlines. Can guess at unfamiliar vocabulary if highly contextualized. Can locate main ideas and routine information of professional significance in more complex texts and in the professional specialty. |
| 1 | Elementary Proficiency | Able to read very simple descriptions of places, things and public events such as those simplified for tourists. Can get some main ideas and locate prominent items of professional significance in more complex texts. |
| 0+ | Memorized Proficiency | Unable to read connected prose, but can recognize high frequency elements of a syllabary or a character system. Able to read (but not always interpret accurately) some or all of the following: numbers, isolated words and phrases, street signs, office and shop designations. |
| 0 | No Proficiency | No practical ability to read the language. |

**Writing Proficiency Rating Scale**

| **Level** | **Proficiency** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | Educated Native Proficiency | Writing proficiency is functionally equivalent to that of a highly articulate educated native. There are no non-native errors of structure, spelling, syntax or vocabulary. Writing is both clear, explicit, informative, and imaginative. |
| 4+ | Advanced Professional Proficiency, Plus | Able to write the language precisely and accurately in a wide variety of prose styles pertinent to a variety of audiences and professional needs. Varied use of stylistic devices and flexibility within a style. Can both write and edit formal and informal correspondence, official reports and documents, and professional articles, including writing for special purposes which might include legal, technical, educational, literary and colloquial writing. The writer employs a very wide range of stylistic devices. |
| 4 | Advanced Professional Proficiency | Able to write the language precisely and accurately in a variety of prose pertinent to social issues and professional needs. Errors of grammar, syntax, punctuation and vocabulary are rare. Writing is consistently and explicitly organized with appropriate connectors and discourse devices (ellipsis, parallelisms, subordinates). |
| 3+ | General Professional Proficiency, Plus | Able to write in a variety of prose styles pertinent to general, social and professional needs. Good control of basic and complex structures, all verb tenses and tense sequence, morphology, syntax and punctuation. Usually uses cohesive devices well, but variety is limited. May not be able to express nuances or subtleties very well, nor tailor language to audience. |
| 3 | General Professional Proficiency | Able to use the language effectively in most formal and informal written exchanges on practical, social, and professional topics. Can write reports, summaries, short papers on current events and particular areas of interest, or on special fields with reasonable ease. Control of structure, general vocabulary and spelling is adequate to convey message accurately but style may be obviously foreign. Punctuation is generally controlled. Good control of grammar with occasional errors in complex structures and tense sequence. Consistent control of compound sentences. Relationship of ideas is consistently clear. |
| 2+ | Limited Working Proficiency, Plus | Shows ability to write with some precision and in some detail about most common topics. Can write about concrete topics relating to particular interests and special fields of competence. Often shows surprising fluency and ease of expression, but under time constraints and pressure language may be inaccurate. Can control basic and some complex structures, with some errors in more complex constructions (passives, relative clauses, word order, tense usage and sequence). Generally strong in either grammar or vocabulary, but not in both. Normally controls general vocabulary and some working vocabulary with some misuse. Can handle most social correspondence and take fairly accurate notes on what has been presented orally. |
| 2 | Limited Working Proficiency | Able to write routine social correspondence and prepare documentary materials required for most limited work requirements. Can write simply about a limited number of current events or daily situations. Good control of morphology and basic syntactic structures. Uses a limited number of cohesive devices. However, still makes common errors in spelling, punctuation, and constructions (plurals, articles, gender, prepositions, verb tenses, negatives). |
| 1+ | Elementary Proficiency, Plus | Able to meet most survival needs and limited social demands. Can write short paragraphs related to most survival needs (food, lodging, transportation, immediate surroundings and situations) and limited social demands (greetings, relating personal history, daily life preferences, etc.). Can express fairly accurate present and future time and some past verb forms, but not always accurately. Can control elementary vocabulary and basic syntactic patterns only. Generally cannot use basic cohesive elements of discourse (relative constructions, object pronouns, connectors). |
| 1 | Elementary Proficiency | Able to meet limited practical needs. Writes in simple sentences with errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation. Writing tends to be a loose collection of sentences or sentence fragments without much organization. At this level, can write simple phone messages, excuses, notes to service people and friends. |
| 0+ | Memorized Proficiency | Writes using memorized material and set expressions. Can produce 50 of the most common characters, write dates, own name, nationality, address, and a few short sentences. Spelling and characters may be incorrect. |
| 0 | No Proficiency | No functional writing ability. |

# Annex VII: UN Women Quality Assurance Review Criteria

UN Women GERAAS report quality standards, which are adapted UNEG report standards and integrate the United Nations System-wide Action Plan Evaluation Performance Indicator (UN-SWAP EPI), are used to assess the quality of evalua­tion reports produced by all UN Women offices, including the IEO. UN Women evaluations should adhere to the standards (see Tool 14,

[GERAAS evaluation report quality assessment checklist](https://genderevaluation.unwomen.org/-/media/files/un%20women/gender%20evaluation/handbook/geraas%20guidance%20note_aug%202019%20%20final.pdf?la=en&vs=4654), UN Women Evaluation Handbook. The evaluation team should have the standards in mind while writing the report and can use the checklist before delivering the draft and final reports.

The checklist can be used by the evaluation manager and commissioning unit in assessing compliance before accepting the report as final. The quality criteria assess the report structure and eight parameters:

**1)** Object and context of evaluation

**2)** Evaluation purpose

**3)** Objectives and scope

**4)** Evaluation methodology

**5)** Findings

**6)** Conclusions and lessons learned

**7)** Recommendations

**8)** Gender and human rights considerations

# Annex VIII: REFERENCE

1. UN Women Evaluation Handbook

<https://genderevaluation.unwomen.org/en/evaluation-handbook>

1. UN Women Global Accountability and Tracking of Evaluation Use (GATE)

<https://gate.unwomen.org/>

1. Impact of the COVID19 Outbreak and Lockdown on Family Dynamics and Domestic Violence in Palestine

<https://palestine.unfpa.org/en/publications/impact-covid19-outbreak-and-lockdown-family-dynamics-and-domestic-violence-palestine>

1. **DELIVERABLE SCHEDULE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Payment Amount** | **Timeframe** |
| deliverable 1: Final Inception Report *– The Final Inception Report will be preceded by the draft Inception Report as detailed in the TOR* | *20%* | *1 October 2021* |
| Deliverable 2: Draft Final Evaluation Report – *The Draft Final Evaluation Report will be preceded by the in country debriefing and the post data collection workshops as detailed in the TOR.* | *30%* | *10 January 2022* |
| Deliverable 3: Final Evaluation Report – *The Final Evaluation Report will be preceded by the Recommendation Workshop as detailed in the TOR.* | *35%* | *14 February 2022* |
| Deliverable 4: Final presentation | *15%* | *20 February 2022* |

# Evaluation Criteria

**Preliminary Examination Criteria**

All criteria will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis and checked during Preliminary Examination.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Documents to establish compliance** |
| Completeness of the Proposal | All documents and technical documentation requested in Instructions to Vendor have been provided and are complete |
| Vendor accepts UN Women General Conditions of Contract | Proposal Submission Form (Online Form) |
| Proposal Validity | Proposal Submission Form (Online Form) |

**Minimum Eligibility and Qualification Criteria**

Minimum eligibility and qualification criteria will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.

If the Proposal is submitted as a Joint Venture, Consortium or Association, each member should meet the minimum criteria, unless otherwise specified.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Eligibility Criteria** | **Documents to establish compliance** |
| Vendor is a legally registered entity | Proposer Information Form (Online Form) |
| Vendor is not suspended, nor otherwise identified as ineligible by any UN Organization, the World Bank Group or any other International Organisation in accordance with Instructions to Vendors. | Proposal Submission Form (Online Form) |
| No conflicts of interest in accordance with Instructions to Vendors. | Proposal Submission Form (Online Form) |
| The Vendor has not declared bankruptcy, in not involved in bankruptcy or receivership proceedings, and there is no judgment or pending legal action against the vendor that could impair its operations in the foreseeable future | Proposal Submission Form (Online Form) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Qualification Criteria** | **Documents to establish compliance** |
| History of non-performing contracts: Non-performance of a contract did not occur as a result of contractor default within the last 3 years. | Eligibility and Qualification Form (Online Form) |
| Litigation History: No consistent history of court/arbitral award decisions against the vendor for the last 3 years. | Eligibility and Qualification Form (Online Form) |
| Previous Experience: |  |
| Minimum 7 years of relevant experience. | Eligibility and Qualification Form (Online Form) / Technical Proposal |
| Financial Standing: |  |
| Liquidity: the ratio Average current assets / Current liabilities over the last 3 years must be equal or greater than 1. Vendor must include in their Proposal audited balance sheets cover the last two years | Copy of audited financial statements for the last three years. / Eligibility and Qualification Form (Online Form) |
| Turnover: Vendors should have annual sales turnover of minimum USD 100,000 for the last three years.  *(For JV/Consortium/Association, all Parties cumulatively should meet requirement).* | Copy of audited financial statements for the last three years. Eligibility and Qualification Form (Online Form) |

**Technical Evaluation Criteria**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 1. Expertise and Capability of Proposer** | | **Points** |
| 1.1 | Organizational Architecture: Overall governance/management structure of the organization, including gender elements. | 10 |
| 1.2 | Adverse judgments or awards:   * *The proposer is in sound financial condition based on the financial documentation and information furnished in their proposal which should not show any financial concerns, such as negative net worth, bankruptcy proceedings, insolvency, receivership, major litigation, liens, judgments or bad credit or payment history.*   *The proposer has not declared bankruptcy, are not involved in bankruptcy or receivership proceedings, and there is no judgment or pending legal action against them that could impair their operations in the foreseeable future.* | 10 |
| 1.3 | General Organizational Capability which is likely to affect performance (i.e. size of the organization, strength of management support, nature of the proposing organization, overall mission of the organization, core services of the organization) | 30 |
| 1.4 | Extent to which any work would be subcontracted (subcontracting carries additional risks which may affect delivery, but properly done it offers a chance to access specialized skills.) | 20 |
| 1.5 | Quality assurance procedures  Notes: The Consultant must have an Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS) that will be used throughout the evaluation process. That is, the Consultant must dedicate specific resources to quality assurance efforts and must have quality assurance mechanisms which will be applied throughout the evaluation process. | 50 |
| 1.6 | Organizational experience and proven track record/credibility on gender and development, RBM and its application to key processes (e.g., planning, programming, monitoring, reporting and evaluation), and other areas of expertise relevant to the services required relevant experience in partnerships with UN Women, other UN agencies, governments, NGOs, and other development actors | 70 |
| **Total Points** for Section 1 | | 190 |
| **Section 2. Proposed methodology approach and implementation plan** | | **Points** |
| 2.1 | Evaluation Approach, Methodology- including Proposer’s understanding of UN Women’s work, adherence to procurement principles and TOR. | 320 |
| 2.2 | Management Services – Timeline and deliverables, roles and responsibilities of the proposed key personnel | 50 |
| 2.3 | Environmental Considerations:  Compliance Certificates, Accreditations, Markings/Labels, and other evidences of the Bidder’s practices which contributes to the ecological sustainability and reduction of adverse environmental impact (e.g. use of non-toxic substances, recycled raw materials, energy-efficient equipment, reduced carbon emission, etc.), either in its business practices or in the goods it manufactures. | 10 |
| **Total Points** for Section 2 | | 380 |
| **Section 3. Resource Plan, Key Personnel** | | **Points** |
| 3.1 | Composition of the team proposed to provide, and the work tasks (including supervisory)  Guiding Notes:  The evaluation is to be conducted by a company which is expected to propose a team composed of the following categories:   1. Core Evaluation Team 2. Quality Assurance Personnel 3. Additional Non-Specialized Personnel   The roles and responsibilities of the Consultant’s proposed team members are to be defined by the Consultant in its Technical Proposal.  The Core Evaluation Team (CET) is composed of at least a senior Evaluation Team Leader (ETL) with proven experience of leading evaluation team, a senior expert on the thematic area of eliminating violence against women, preferably with evaluation experience, a national senior evaluation expert, and a national senior expert on EVAW. It may also include other subject matter experts.  The Core Evaluation Team together should have:  a) extensive experience working on similar development evaluation as described in these ToR,  b) experience working in developing countries in the Middle East and specifically in the West Bank and Gaza, and  c) possess technical expertise and experience in i) gender-based violence, ii) gender equality iii) human rights-based approaches, iv) quantitative data collection and analysis and v) qualitative data collection and analysis.  The CET will also be proficient in Arabic.  The CET must be knowledgeable about ethical issues related to engaging vulnerable groups, including women and girls victims and survivors of violence, in evaluation processes.  Each member of the Core Evaluation Team must possess the following levels in English:  Oral = 4 – Advanced Professional Proficiency  Reading = Level 4 – Advanced Professional Proficiency  Writing = Level 4 – Advanced Professional Proficiency  The description associated with the language requirement can be found in Annex 1.6.  The Senior National Evaluation Expert and the Senior National Expert must possess the following levels in Arabic:  Oral = 4 – Advanced Professional Proficiency  Reading = Level 4 – Advanced Professional Proficiency  Writing = Level 4 – Advanced Professional Proficiency  As part of the evaluation’s quality assurance, the Bidder should hire quality assurance personnel that must be independent from the Core Evaluation Team and additional specialized or non-specialised personnel.  The Core Evaluation Team may draw upon other non-specialized staff, as necessary. These resources may include, but are not limited to:   * Researchers * Editorial and communications staff * Administrative and logistical assistance personnel * Translators * Enumeration personnel   Curriculum vitae of the proposed team that will be involved either full or part time**.**  **Qualifications of the Team Leader:**  The Team leader must have demonstrated capacity in designing and leading evaluation especially on EVAW and gender equality. The team leader should have:   * Post-graduate degree in social sciences, gender studies, human rights or international development or related fields * At least 15 years working experience in international development, gender equality and women empowerment * Al least 10 years of experience in leading evaluations of complex, multi-stakeholder programmes and analytical reviews, and assessing institutional capacities on gender as well as leading a team * At least 7 years of demonstrated experience in evaluation, research and strategic studies related to eliminating violence against women and girls * Demonstrated experience in implementing qualitative and quantitative data collection methods and innovative evaluation methods and approaches; * Experience in similar assignments in producing evaluation reports to a publishable quality * Demonstrated experience about ethical consideration, human rights-based approaches and gender responsive programming and evaluation on/of EAWA issues * Demonstrated experience in working with multi-stakeholders including governments and civil society in a wide range of contexts * Previous working experience in the West Bank and Gaza Strip is an asset; * Excellent analytical skills and communication skill   **Qualifications of the senior expert on Eliminating Violence Against Women:**  The Senior Expert on Eliminating Violence Against Women should have:   * Post-graduate degree in social sciences, gender studies, human rights or international development or related fields * At least 7 years of relevant professional experience, at the international level in developing and implementing programms on ending violence against women and girls * Demonstrated experience with human rights-based approaches to programming on EAWA issues, and skilled in working with a wide range of contexts * Demonstrated experience in evaluation and research about EVAW and with victims of violence * Previous working experience in the West Bank and Gaza Strip is an asset * Excellent analytical skills and communication skill   **Qualifications of the Senior National Evaluation Expert:**  The Senior National Evaluation Expert should have:   * Post-graduate degree in social sciences or international development or related fields * At least 7 years of leading evaluations on gender equality and empowerment of women and girls with at least five years of experience of conducting evaluations of EVAW programmes * Demonstrated experience with and knowledge on eliminating violence against women and girls programming * Knowledge with Palestinian legislations and practices related to EVAW * Experience with using ethical considerations, human rights approaches, protection and gender analysis in evaluations * Proven record of applying mixed methods approach, participatory methodologies for conducting gender and human rights responsive evaluations and innovative evaluation methods and approaches * Proven experience of working with Palestinian actors, including government institutions, Civil Society actors and Women CBOs, and grass roots organizations * Excellent analytical skills and communication skill   **Qualifications of the National Senior Expert on EVAW:**  The National Senior Expert should have:   * Post-graduate degree in social sciences, gender studies, human rights or international development or related fields * At least 7 years of relevant professional experience, at the national level in developing and implementing programms on ending violence against women and girls * Demonstrated experience in evaluation or research about EVAW and with victims of violence * Demonstrated experience about human rights-based approaches and gender responsive programming on EAWA issues, and skilled in working with a wide range of contexts * Proven experience of working with Palestinian actors, including government institutions, Civil Society actors and Women CBOs, and grass roots organizations * Excellent analytical skills and communication skill | 130 |
| **Total Points** for Section 3 | | 130 |
| **TOTAL POINTS** | | 700 |

# Format of Financial Proposal

The vendor is required to prepare the Financial Proposal following the below format and submit it in an envelope **separate** from the Technical Proposal as indicated in the Instruction to Vendors. The inclusion of any financial information in the Technical Proposal shall lead to disqualification of the Vendors. The Financial Proposal should align with the requirements of the Terms of Reference and the vendor’s Technical Proposal.

**Table 1: Summary of Overall Prices**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Amount** |
| **Professional Fees (from Table 2)** |  |
| **Other Costs (from Table 3)** |  |
| **Total Amount of Financial Proposal** |  |

**Table 2: Breakdown of Professional Fees**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Position** | **Fee Rate** | **No. of days / months / hours** | | **Total Amount** |
| *A* | *B* | | *C=A\*B* |
|  | **Team Leader** |  |  | |  |
|  | **Senior Expert on Eliminating Violence Against Women** |  |  | |  |
|  | **Senior National Evaluation Expert** |  |  | |  |
|  | **National Senior Expert on EVAW** |  |  | |  |
| **Subtotal Professional Fees:** | | | |  | |

**Table 3: Breakdown of Other Costs**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Unit of Measure** | **Quantity** | **Unit Price** | | **Total Amount** |
| International flights | Return trip |  |  | |  |
| Subsistence allowance | Day |  |  | |  |
| Local transportation costs | Lump sum |  |  | |  |
| Out-of-pocket expenses |  |  |  | |  |
| Other costs (specify) |  |  |  | |  |
| **Subtotal Other Costs:** | | | |  | |

**Table 4: Breakdown of Price per Deliverable / Activity**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable / Activity description** | **Time**  (person days) | **Professional Fees** | **Other Costs** | **Total** |
| Deliverable 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Deliverable 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Deliverable 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |