



MID-TERM EVALUATION
BUSINESS AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN ASIA:
Enabling Sustainable Economic Growth through
the Protect, Respect and Remedy Framework
1 January 2020 – 31 December 2023

Inception Report
(Containing Work Plan and Evaluation Matrix)

Date submitted: 3rd March 2022

Evaluation Consultant: Joanna Brooks

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	3
1.1 BACKGROUND.....	3
2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVE, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	4
3. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS.	6
4. EVALUABILITY ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION RANKING SCALE	6
5. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	7
<i>Phase 1 – Desk research, document review and Inception Report</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Phase 2 – Virtual Data Collection, Analysis and Validation</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Phase 3 – Drafting, Revision and Finalisation</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Anticipated Challenges and Limitations of the Evaluation</i>	<i>10</i>
7. EVALUATION MATRIX	11
8. SCHEDULE OF KEY MILESTONES.....	11
9. RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS.....	12
10. OUTLINE OF THE DRAFT/FINAL REPORT	12
ANNEX I – KEY EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS	17
ANNEX II – DRAFT INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDES.....	19
ANNEX III - EVALUATION MATRIX	0
ANNEX IV LIST OF EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS	11

ABBREVIATIONS

AICHR	ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BHR	Business and Human Rights
B+HR Asia	Business and Human Rights Asia Project
BRH	Bangkok Regional Hub
CO	Country Office
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
EU	European Union
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GCN	Global Compact Network
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
JSC	Joint Steering Committee
KII	Key Informant Interview
NAP	National Action Plan
NHRI	National Human Rights Institution
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Criteria
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
RPD	Regional Programme Document
RRF	Results and Resources Framework
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNGP	United Nations Guiding Principles
UNWG	United Nations Working Group

MID-TERM EVALUATION BUSINESS AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN ASIA

1. Background and context

1.1 Background

The UN Guiding Principles (UNGPs) on Business and Human Rights (BHR) are widely recognised as the most authoritative, normative framework guiding efforts to reduce or eliminate the adverse impact of business operations on human rights. The UNGPs consist of three pillars and are grounded on a polycentric governance framework promoting a so-called “smart mix of measures.” The first pillar of the UNGPs concerns the State duty to protect human rights in business operations under established international human rights law. The second pillar addresses the responsibility of business enterprises to respect human rights through policy commitments and processes. The third and final pillar stresses the need for both State and non-State actors to promote access to effective remedies to victims of business-related abuses through providing or cooperating in judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms

In Asia, governments and business are more widely aware of the UNGPs and its importance to ensuring high volumes of trade and investment. Thailand adopted Asia’s first stand-alone National Action Plan on BHR (NAP) on Business and Human Rights in 2019, followed by Japan and Pakistan. Other States in Asia are following suit with NAPs in development in India, Indonesia, Malaysia and Mongolia ~~and Pakistan~~. There is a unique opportunity to build momentum in the region, building on existing political commitments from states, while engaging business and civil society under a wider heading of responsible or sustainable business practices.

The UNDP Asia-Pacific, Bangkok Regional Hub, Business and Human Rights unit, has been playing a central role in promoting the implementation of the UNGPs in Asia. Based on a year-long piloting phase including scoping missions between June 2017 and March 2018, funded by the Regional Development Cooperation Section at the Embassy of Sweden in Thailand, UNDP identified seven countries— Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam to accelerate regional momentum taking place in Asia towards the implementation of the UNGPs. As regional momentum took shape, the European Union (EU), Service for Foreign Policy Instruments was approached to deepen engagement at the country level, which would eventually include India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Thailand.

The Project, “Business and Human Rights in Asia: Enabling Sustainable Economic Growth through the Protect, Respect and Remedy Framework,” (B+HR Asia) was thus designed with an aim to promote the implementation of the UNGPs in Asia at the country level, focused on advocacy, policy development, technical advisory support, capacity building, awareness-raising, innovation platforms, regional peer learning events, and South-South cooperation. With support from the EU, the project has been driving progress on BHR in the region, engaging diverse stakeholders including governments, businesses, civil society organisations (CSOs), and independent national human rights institutions (NHRIs). Importantly, in mid-2020, the EU approached UNDP to provide for supplementary funding to support the opening of activities in Mongolia and for the uptake of regional level work linking BHR to environmental issues. An amended project document was agreed on November 2020.

This project contributes to the UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Programme Output 2.3 Institutions, networks and non-state actors strengthened to promote inclusion, access to justice, and protect human rights (UNDP Strategic Plan 2.2.2 and 2.2.3). Project activities are channelled towards four

(4) principal outputs:

- 1) To engender greater awareness and knowledge, and strengthen political will in furtherance of policy convergence and compliance with the UNGPs;
- 2) To enhance communication and public diplomacy around Business and Human Rights thereby building public interest and support;
- 3) To support access to remedy and other rights-based solutions such that human rights abuses are prevented; and
- 4) To explore inter-linkages between adverse environmental and human rights impacts by business operations is better understood and policy action is more clearly articulated.

2. Evaluation objective, purpose and scope.

The Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) aims to inform UNDP B+HR Asia team and its partners of lessons learned, results achieved and areas for improvements, while drawing out progress toward specific EU-supported B+HR Asia project deliverables, identifying any gaps in programming, and recommending any course correction required for the second half of programming.

Furthermore, the findings of MTE will inform the future designing of UNDP's work on BHR in the region along with the final evaluation. As this project is one of the first initiatives developed in UNDP on BHR, the MTE will be able to produce valuable lessons and experiences, providing useful findings to the other relevant BHR projects and various initiatives organised by UNDP Regional Hubs as well as Country Offices (COs) globally.

Responding to the Theory of Change (ToC) as described in the project document, the agreed results and resources framework (RRF) and the approved workplans, the MTE will look at the relevance of the project, quality of the project design, effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation to date, sustainability of the overall project results, impact of intervention made to date, and forward-looking directions for future. To meet these ends, the MTE will seek to:

- Assess project performance and progress against the expected outcomes, outputs and targets including indicators presented in the RRF
- Review and document the success and draw out lessons for deepening impact
- Assess the effectiveness of the project's engagement with diverse stakeholders including governments, businesses, civil society organisations, national human rights institutions, human rights defenders and other rights-holder groups in the implementation of the UNGPs and the development process of the NAPs
- Review the role of the project in enhancing the importance of and the space for the UNGPs at the national, and to a lesser extent, the regional level, while contributing knowledge, guidance and the development and application of the UNGPs through advocacy, policy development, technical advisory support, capacity building, awareness raising, innovation platforms, regional peer learning events, and South-South cooperation
- Identify challenges and the effectiveness of the strategic approaches that the project adopted for addressing those challenges
- Ascertain the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the project interventions
- Outline recommendations, including potential realignments in scope and approach in line with the project's desired outcome
- Provide forward-looking recommendations to inform the future of UNDP's work on BHR in the region along with the final evaluation. These will be in line with UNDP's newly launched Regional Programme document (RPD) for Asia and the Pacific.

The Scope of the MTE

The MTE is expected to assess the B+HR Asia project progress against the project ToC and the achieved results from 1 January 2020 to 31 December 2021, and propose recommendations, which will inform and help improve the implementation of the project during 2022 – 2023 and designing any future projects. The MTE will be based on a desk review of project related documents and in-depth virtual interviews as outlined in the methodology section. The MTE will evaluate the project against the RRF contained in the project document and not the separate M&E framework developed for the EU, which contains different indicators and targets.

The MTE’s geographical coverage includes the project’s targeted countries in Asia Pacific, namely India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Thailand. The MTE may examine the regionality aspect of the project, but should focus primarily at country level, and as measured by resources available.

The Project’s Theory of Change

The theory of change for the project, as presented in the project document, articulates:

Theory of Change
<i>If</i> , UNDP, the EU and their various partners, demonstrate sufficiently, how respect for human rights can assist firms in managing risk, and help countries to enhance trade flows and attract FDI, thereby enhancing transparency; and
<i>If</i> UNDP, the EU and their various partners encourage more public attention to human rights risks and abuses in the production of goods, commodities and services; and
<i>If</i> UNDP, the EU and other international, regional and national organisations and make their respective comparative advantages converge through an agreed international framework, namely the UNGPs; and
<i>If</i> the efforts of UNDP, the EU and their various partners, lead to the effective adoption and implementation of the UNGPs in the selected countries, with a specific focus on the provision of remedy;
<i>Then</i> stronger human rights conditions, instead of being seen as a burden for profitable business, would be perceived as a comparative economic advantage by governments, as well as the private sector, in a similar situation in the region, and as a necessary precondition for engaging in fruitful sustainable trade relations with other regions; and
Policy makers, consumers and business actors would become more aware of the potential adverse impacts of business operations on human rights, and work to prevent these risks, or ensure in greater measure that remedies are provided for abuses that have occurred; and
Human rights conditions would be strengthened and the risks of disruptions to commercial flows between the EU and Asia would be mitigated, leading to heightened levels of prosperity, stronger levels of sustainable development, and greater recognition of the positive role of trade and increased mutual respect between regions; and
Greater legitimacy would be conferred to multilateralism as the preferential way to promote and

defend values at a global level.

There is no visualisation of the theory of change included in the project document.

While the MTE is criteria-based and is not a theory-based evaluation, the consultant will also review the project's theory of change as part of the analytical process.

3. Evaluation criteria and questions.

The MTE will be conducted in line with UNEG's Evaluation Guidelines and Norms and Standards for Evaluation as well the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria - (a) relevance; (b) effectiveness; (c) efficiency; and (d) sustainability. The evaluation will also consider any impact that the project has had to date, as well as assessing the potential future impact of the project interventions.

As per the ToR, the consultant has been asked to consider a number of key questions shaped around the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria. The key evaluation questions are provided in Annex I. While not specifically contained in the ToR, the consultant will also assess the project's integration of gender and the human rights-based approach (HRBA).

The consultant will endeavour to engage with as many stakeholders as possible to ensure that the evaluation is as inclusive and participatory as possible. The proposed list of external stakeholders is included at Annex IV. Stakeholders include the project and programme team, UNDP senior management, United Nations Working Group (UNWG) on BHR, UNDP CO focal points on B+HR Asia project, government counterparts, NHRIs, CSOs, business representatives, and research and think tanks. In order to avoid stakeholder fatigue as a result of both the EU's Evaluation of Partnership Instrument Action on Responsible Business Conduct, Women's Economic Empowerment and Social and Solidarity Economy, as well as the evaluation of the SIDA funded B+HR project, the consultant has liaised carefully with the project team to select a final list of stakeholders to be included in the evaluation.

4. Evaluability Analysis and Evaluation Ranking Scale

The consultant will evaluate the project and its outputs as presented in the RRF in the project document against the evaluation criteria as well as against its context, theory of change and organisational performance. The theory of change will be unpacked and the consultant will also take into account elements not necessarily captured in the theory of change, such as policy dialogue, contextual changes and coordination (within the project, the donor and UNDP). The assumptions underpinning the theory of change will be assessed for their continuing validity.

In short, the consultant proposes to organise primary data collection and analysis to review B+HR Asia against its context, theory of change, and organisational performance. Data will then be analysed to inform a complementary assessment against OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

The consultant proposes using a rating scale to rank each evaluation criteria – relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability. The consultant proposes to evaluate the project against a 4-fold rating scale as described below. This will be agreed in advance with UNDP B+HR Asia project team.

- Highly Satisfactory (4)

- Satisfactory (3)
- Moderately satisfactory (2)
- Unsatisfactory (1)

Scoring of Project Performance:

Rating	Performance description
4 Highly satisfactory (Always/almost always)	Performance is clearly very strong in relation to the evaluation question/criterion. Weaknesses are not significant and have been managed effectively.
3 Satisfactory (Mostly, with some exceptions)	Performance is reasonably strong on most aspects of the evaluation question/criterion. No significant gaps or weaknesses, or less significant gaps or weaknesses have mostly been managed effectively.
2 Moderately satisfactory (Sometimes, with many exceptions)	Performance is inconsistent in relation to the question/criterion. There are some serious weaknesses. Meets minimum expectations/requirements as far as can be determined.
1 Unsatisfactory (Never or occasionally with clear weaknesses)	Performance is unacceptably weak in relation to the evaluation question/criterion. Does not meet minimum expectations/requirements.

5. Evaluation approach and methodology

The evaluation will be guided by the basic methodology as set out in the ToR, in line with the UNEG, the revised UNDP Evaluation Guidelines from June 2021 and the OECD/DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, and keeping in mind the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. As required by the ToR, the evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the project.

The evaluation will be multi-faceted and the methodological approach will use mixed (qualitative and quantitative) methods, as the best vehicle for meeting the evaluation’s needs. The consultant will ensure that the evaluation is conducted through a participatory and consultative process, which includes all relevant stakeholders.

The methodological approach has been synthesised into an Evaluation Matrix (see Annex III), which will guide the consultant and provide an analytical framework for conducting the evaluation. The evaluation matrix sets out the relevant evaluation criteria, key questions and sub-questions, data sources, data collection methods/tools, indicators and methods for data analysis. The evaluation matrix has been divided into each of the 4 evaluation criteria – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Within the effectiveness criteria, each of the project’s outputs will be individually scrutinised.

The evaluation’s principal guide will be the project document for the B+HR Asia project and in

particular the Results Framework containing its logframe and M&E framework, which contain indicators, targets and “means of verification” (i.e., data and documents) for the project’s outputs. This will allow the consultant to conduct a critical analysis of the Project’s logframe indicators and targets. In addition, because this is an EU-funded project, the project also has additional M&E tools and processes. To this end, the project’s M&E Plan for the EU – a living document last updated in November 2021, will also be scrutinised, although the evaluation as such will be conducted against the indicators included in the RRF.

The consultant will identify a cross-section of data sources in order to optimise data collection and ensure triangulation. A large focus of the evaluation will be on obtaining qualitative data through interviews and focus group discussions with relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries, as per the stakeholder list provided below. As already mentioned, efforts will be made not to duplicate with the EU and SIDA evaluation processes that took place in the second half of 2021, to avoid stakeholder fatigue.

The consultant will conduct as many interviews as possible given the complexities of conducting the evaluation remotely using virtual tools, in order to ensure the integrity and the comprehensiveness of the evaluation. Wherever possible data gathered, both qualitatively and quantitatively will be triangulated, through cross verification from more two or more sources. For interviews, this will be done through posing a similar set of questions to multiple interviewees. For the document review it will be accomplished through crosschecking data and information from multiple sources to increase the credibility and validity of the material. Draft Informant Guides are provided at Annex II, which provide an indication and outline as to the set of questions that the consultant will ask each group of stakeholders. Additional questions are provided in the Evaluation Matrix.

A complete list of stakeholders to be consulted is included at Annex IV. This has been developed based on consultations with the project team as well as extensive inputs from the in-country project specialists. The list of stakeholders reflects a broad mix of government, civil society, NHRI and business representatives. In addition, the evaluator will also conduct an in-depth FGD with the in-country project specialists, and individual BHR project and programme team interviews.

The consultant will analyse the potential for further outcomes to which the project may contribute in the longer term. The methodological approach selected by the consultant allows for a non-linear approach, which enables an evidence-based analysis of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability of the project’s interventions to promote the implementation of the UNGPs in Asia through the Respect, Protect and Remedy Framework, through awareness raising of the UNGPs and peer to peer exchanges to build political will in furtherance of policy convergence and compliance with the UNGPs; communication and public diplomacy to build public support for the BHR agenda, promotion of access to remedy and linkages between the environment and BHR.

Coupled with this, the consultant will adopt a political economy approach that recognises the local and regional contexts and the incentives faced by the actors engaged in it, i.e., the internal and external factors that determine success. This will help the consultant to understand who seeks to gain and lose from the B+HR Asia project, as well as to identify who has vested interests and the social and cultural norms that need to be taken into account. Applying political economy analysis will help answer why things are the way they are and help unpack the enabling environment by understanding the political economy drivers behind the business and human rights agenda in Asia.

The non-linear, sequential methodology for conducting the evaluation of the B+HR Asia project consists of three main phases:

Phase 1 – Desk research, document review and Inception Report

Phase 1 is focused on the desk research, document review and preparation of this Inception Report, including the evaluation matrix and the data collection tools and instruments. In addition, a preliminary series of discussions will be held with UNDP B+HR Asia project and programme teams, senior management and other key experts. The desk research and document review includes, but is not limited to:

- Project document and other general information
- Approved Annual Work Plans – 2020 and 2021 as part of the MTE and looking forward to 2022
- Project budgets and expenditure, delivery rates
- Joint Steering Committee Minutes and presentations
- Project reports – annual and quarterly, UNDP and EU
- Project Specific Plans – human resources, communications, M&E
- UNDP M&E Framework
- Strategic Review EU
- UNDP Strategic Plans 2018-2021, 2022-2025
- UNDP Asia and the Pacific Regional Programme Document and its MTE
- Relevant EU strategic documents
- EU Evaluation of Partnership Instrument actions on Responsible Business Conduct, Women’s economic empowerment and Social and Solidarity Economy

The detailed Inception Report defines the evaluation methodology, including the Evaluation Matrix, which provides an overview of data collection tools, data sources and stakeholders to be interviewed. The Inception Report will be submitted to UNDP for review and approval.

Output: Submission of Inception Report containing Evaluation Matrix and Work Plan to UNDP for review and approval.

Phase 2 – Virtual Data Collection, Analysis and Validation

Phase 2 will form the largest part of the evaluation and will consist of the consultant conducting the virtual data collection throughout the region, which will be undertaken remotely. The consultant will conduct interviews and focus group discussions with relevant stakeholders and project beneficiaries, as per the stakeholder consultation list at Annex IV.

The evaluation approach will be as *participatory* as possible, given the complex realities on the ground, and the additional challenges of conducting the evaluation remotely. This will allow opportunity for stakeholders and final beneficiaries of the project to express themselves. The approach will be *inclusive*, in order to guarantee the effective participation of all stakeholders and beneficiaries. As with all participatory approaches, the key to success is to be flexible and innovative in the use of appropriate tools, and to be willing to adapt to local circumstances. In addition to being participatory and inclusive, the consultant’s approach will also be based on the principles of *gender equality* and the *human rights based approach*.

The evaluation criteria and key evaluation questions are provided at Annex I.

Upon conclusion of the data-gathering portion of the Evaluation, the Consultant will debrief UNDP, Joint Steering Committee Members, EU and other relevant stakeholders on the preliminary findings and recommendations.

Output: Presentation/de briefing: With the support of UNDP, the consultant organises a de-briefing at the end of the data collection phase to brief UNDP on the preliminary findings and recommendations.

Phase 3 – Drafting, Revision and Finalisation

Phase 3 is focused on analysing and validating the data, findings and recommendations and drafting the evaluation report. The consultant will prepare a first draft of the report and will submit it to UNDP for consolidated comments. The consultant will revise the draft evaluation Report, addressing all received comments and suggestions and preparing an updated version of the Evaluation Report. This will then be presented to UNDP, following on from which, any final comments and suggestions will be addressed and a final evaluation report will be prepared and submitted.

Output: Draft evaluation report; Final evaluation report containing as a minimum an Executive Summary (maximum 3 pages), an overview of the evaluation mandate, and the evaluation’s main findings and recommendations. A proposed structure for the evaluation report is provided under section 10 below.

Anticipated Challenges and Limitations of the Evaluation

There are several *potential* challenges and limitations confronting the evaluation. First, is the potential limitation of available data and information. In order to track progress towards the outcomes and outputs, the consultant will require data, information and statistics from the project. The consultant is aware that in evaluations, it is often challenging to obtain data and that what exists can often not be disaggregated. The consultant will endeavour to collect as much data – both qualitative and quantitative as possible during the data collection phase and from the documents made available by UNDP.

A second limitation relates to the challenges of conducting the evaluation remotely using virtual tools. This assumes that the stakeholders will have access to online methods of communication as well as to the Internet. Stakeholders may not be willing to meet in this way or may be more reticent to speak openly. An additional challenge relates to the time differences among the different countries subject to the evaluation and the consultant. The consultant will do their best to schedule meetings and reschedule if necessary, and be as accommodating and flexible as possible. The consultant will rely on UNDP to facilitate this process to the greatest degree by sending out requests for meetings as far in advance as possible. Similarly, stakeholders may not be willing to contribute to the online surveys/questionnaires if conducted. To mitigate this, the consultant will allow sufficient time for respondents to contribute and will send reminders, also reassuring the anonymity and confidentiality of all responses.

Thirdly, the consultant may be faced by some key biases, including the following:

- *Recall bias:* BHR has conducted many activities to date and it is quite possible that key informants may not accurately remember particular specific B+HR Asia project intervention activities. A similar problem could be that participants in multiple UN activities – in particular activities under the EU funded B+HR Asia project and the SIDA funded B+HR Asia project - and may blend their experiences into a composite memory or response and, subsequently, will not distinguish between them as separate activities in their responses.
The consultant will mitigate this bias primarily through a semi-structured interview protocol that calls questioning about specific activities.
- *Response bias:* Informants may give the consultant positive remarks about the project because they would like to stay involved with the intervention in the future and they think that a negative evaluation could mean the end of project opportunities.

The consultant will adopt two main strategies for mitigating this bias. First, she will stress for each informant that she will maintain confidentiality and then will explain the evaluation’s independence from both UNDP and the project. Second, as with recall bias, questions designed to elicit specific examples will help to identify response bias.

- *Selection bias*: Beneficiaries provided by UNDP and its partners could mean that the consultant hears only from people who had positive experiences. As with the other forms of bias, multiple sources of data and questions eliciting specific examples will help to mitigate the risk of this bias.

7. Evaluation matrix

Please see Annex III for the evaluation matrix, which will guide the consultant and provide an analytical framework for conducting the evaluation. The evaluation matrix sets out the relevant evaluation criteria, key questions and sub-questions, data sources, data collection methods/tools, indicators and methods for data analysis. The evaluation matrix has been divided into each of the 4 evaluation criteria – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Within the effectiveness criteria, each of the project’s outputs will be individually scrutinised.

8. Schedule of key milestones

Please see below for a summary of the deliverables and responsibilities including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting).

Phases of the evaluation	Activity/ies	Deliverable	Dates
Phase 1 – Desk research, document review and Inception Report including workplan and methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reviewing all relevant project documentation; national strategies & policies; international reports etc.; conducting detailed research on BHR in Asia; undertaking preliminary analysis of documentation, drawing preliminary findings on basis of document review - Drafting Inception report including Work Plan, methodology and evaluation matrix 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inception report with Work Plan, including evaluation matrix and data collection tools 	<p>Draft Inception Report to be submitted 11 February 2022, Comments from UNDP, addressing comments and Final Inception Report submitted 3 March 2022</p>
Phase 2 – Data collection, analysis and validation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conducting interviews, meetings, focus groups; data analysis, triangulation and validation - Preliminary findings and recommendations - De-briefing to UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data collection, analysis and validation; drawing preliminary findings and recommendatio 	<p>Data collection 7 – 18 March 2022</p> <p>De-brief – w/c 21 March 2022</p>

		ns; presenting de-brief	
Phase 3 – Drafting, revision & finalisation	- Presentation of draft evaluation report, addressing comments & suggestions; validating data, findings & recommendations	- Draft and final evaluation report	Submission of draft evaluation Report 4 April 2022 Revised Evaluation Report – 20 April 2022 (subject to consolidated comments being timely received) Audit trail – 20 April 2022
BHR Programme Analysis	3-4 page analysis of the effectiveness of BHR programme at the regional level; including but not limited to how integration efforts between SIDA and EU-funded projects have succeeded or fallen short, with recommendations to strengthen integration and impact.	Programme Analysis Report	11 April 2022

9. Resource requirements

The evaluation is being conducted exclusively virtually so resource requirements are minimal. The evaluation will rely on UNDP to schedule the stakeholder meetings and focus group discussions, and to organise these in the most efficient way possible given the time difference constraints, as well as challenges for stakeholders to participate online. The consultant will also rely on UNDP to facilitate the online surveys/questionnaires should they be conducted.

10. Outline of the draft/final report

The consultant proposes the following structure for its final evaluation report in line with the UNEG evaluation report template.

1. Title and opening pages:

- Name of the evaluation intervention.
- Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report.
- Countries of the evaluation intervention.
- Names and organisations of evaluator.
- Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation.
- Acknowledgements.

2. Project and evaluation information details to be included in the final version of the

evaluation report on the second page will be as per the required template.

3. Table of contents, including boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

4. List of acronyms and abbreviations.

5. Executive summary (four-page maximum).

A stand-alone section of two to three pages will:

- Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation
- Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
- Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
- Summarise principal findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- Include the evaluators' quality standards and assurance ratings.

6. Introduction

- Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
- Identify the intervention of the evaluation
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.

7. Description of the intervention

This will provide the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description will provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. It will:

- Describe what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit and the problem or issue it seeks to address.
- Explain the expected results model or results framework, implementation strategies and the key assumptions underlying the strategy.
- Link the intervention to national priorities, UNDAF/UNSDCF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or Strategic Plan goals, or other programme or country-specific or regional-specific plans and goals.
- Identify the phase in the implementation of the intervention and any significant changes (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- Identify and describe the key partners involved in the implementation and their roles.
- Identify relevant crosscutting issues addressed through the intervention, i.e., gender equality, human rights, marginalised groups and leaving no one behind.
- Describe the scale of the intervention, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
- Indicate the total resources, including human resources and budgets.
- Describe the context of the social, political, economic and institutional factors, and the geographical landscape within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
- Point out design weaknesses (e.g., intervention logic) or other implementation constraints (e.g., resource limitations).

8. Evaluation scope and objectives.

The report will provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.

- Evaluation scope. The report will define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
- Evaluation objectives. The report will spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
- Evaluation criteria. The report will define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report will explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
- Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report will detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

9. Evaluation approach and methods

The evaluation report will describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The report should specify how gender equality, vulnerability and social inclusion were addressed in the methodology, including how data-collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholders' groups. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology will include discussion of each of the following:

- Evaluation approach.
- Data sources: the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders) as well as the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
- Sample and sampling frame. If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women under age 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalising results.
- Data-collection procedures and instruments: methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data-collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity, as well as gender-responsiveness.
- Performance standards: the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
- Stakeholder participation in the evaluation and how the level of involvement of both men and women contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
- Ethical considerations: the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants.
- Background information on evaluators: the composition of the consultant, the background and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.

- Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

10. Data analysis.

The report will describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It will detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.). The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

11. Findings

Findings will be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed. Findings should reflect a gender analysis and cross-cutting issue questions.

12. Conclusions

Conclusions will be comprehensive and balanced and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of intended users, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

13. Recommendations.

The report should provide practical, actionable and feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. Recommendations should be reasonable in number. The recommendations will be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable. Recommendations will also provide specific advice for future or similar projects or programming. Recommendations should also address any gender equality and women's empowerment issues and priorities for action to improve these aspects.

14. Lessons learned.

As appropriate, the report will include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstances that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons will be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

15. Report annexes.

Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

- TOR for the evaluation.
- Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data-collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate.
- List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited. This can be omitted

in the interest of confidentiality if agreed by the consultant and UNDP.

- List of supporting documents reviewed.
- Project or programme results model or results framework.
- Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets and goals relative to established indicators.
- Code of conduct signed by evaluator.

ANNEX I – KEY EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

Relevance: review the progress against project outputs and contribution to outcome level results as defined in the project’s theory of change and ascertain whether assumptions and risks remain valid. Identify any other intended or unintended, positive or negative, results using the following guiding questions:

1. To what extent was the project in line with the regional development priorities and UNDP Strategic Plan and its direction on human rights?
2. To what extent does the project contribute to the ToC for the relevant regional programme outcomes?
3. To what extent were the project activities in target countries in line with national development priorities and country development programme outputs and outcomes?
4. To what extent is the overall design and approaches of the project relevant?
5. To what extent were the inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results?
6. To what extent did the project achieve its overall outputs? Are the project’s contributions to outcomes clear?
7. To what extent was/is the project able to raise awareness of the UNGPs in the region and translate them into country-level action plans for implementation of the UNGPs and development of the NAPs?
8. To what extent did the project contribute to promoting responsible business practices as well as overall human rights conditions in the region?
9. To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment?
10. To assess whether the results achieved had a differentiated impact on women and other vulnerable groups?
11. To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the COVID- 19 pandemic as well as other political, legal, economic, institutional changes in target countries and the region?
12. To what extent have the component parts of the programme (both SIDA and EU funded projects) worked effective together in reaching objectives, and what further integration efforts might be undertaken?

Effectiveness: Effectiveness of implementation approaches: review the project’s technical as well as operational approaches, the regionality and deliverables, quality of results and their impact, alignment with national priorities and responding to the needs of the stakeholders; covering the results achieved, the partnerships established, as well as issues of capacity using following guiding questions:

1. To what extent have the project activities been delivered effectively in terms of quality, quantity, and timing?
2. How effective were the strategies used in the implementation of the project?
3. To what extent was the project successful in enhancing the capacity of States to implement the UNGPs and the development process of the NAPs into the governments’ priorities?
4. What are the key internal and external factors (success & failure factors) that have contributed, affected, or impeded the achievements, and how have UNDP and other partners managed these factors?
5. In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?

6. In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
7. To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation? To what extent are project management and implementation participatory?
8. To what extent have project deliverables been facilitated by work done by the SIDA-funded B+HR Asia project at the regional level, and vice versa?

Efficiency: Efficiency of the project management structure and the added value of the project's regional approach: review planning, management, monitoring and quality assurance mechanisms for the delivery of the project interventions and the added value of the regionality of the project set up in the context of fiscal reform at national and subnational level using following questions:

1. To what extent is the existing project management structure appropriate and efficient in generating the expected results?
2. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
3. Was the process of achieving results efficient? Were the resources effectively utilised?
4. Did the project activities overlap, and duplicate other similar interventions funded nationally, and/or by other donors?
5. To what extent did the project produce synergies within UNDP and with other development partners and play complementary roles to each other?
6. What is the added value of the project's approach for influencing the implementation of the UNGPs and development process of the NAPs at the national level?
7. How does the project align with other regional and national level initiatives/activities on BHR; including with other BHR programming at UNDP at the regional level? How efficiently are national and regional activities connected and complement each other?

Sustainability: Sustainability of the project results and risks along with opportunities related to future interventions: review and assess if the current project setup has plans for future resource mobilisation, synergy, long term partnership and / or taking into account institutionalisation of the project impact for continued support after the project end using the following questions:

1. What is the likelihood of the continuation and sustainability of national level dialogues engaging various stakeholders and strengthening national and regional partnership architectures, made up of UN system, NHRIs, CSOs, and private sector actors working on BHR?
2. How were capacities of a various set of BHR stakeholders strengthened at the national level through regional peer-learning and south-south cooperation?
3. Describe key factors that will require attention to improve the prospects of sustainability of Project outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach?
4. To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
5. To what extent will financial and economic resources as well as political will be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
6. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardise sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
7. What have the benefits or return on investment of the outputs of the project, and which can be reasonably sustained and/or scaled up over time?

ANNEX II – Draft Informant Interview Guides

Interview questions for government counterparts

1. What is the policy and legislative framework with regards to BHR in your country and the region?
2. What steps are in place to develop a National Action Plan on BHR or if you already have an NAP on BHR, how would you assess the implementation of this Plan?
3. Are you familiar with UNDP's B+HR Asia project? Is the project relevant to strengthening BHR in your country and/or in the region? Among the activities conducted under the project, which of them are most relevant and why? Are there any less relevant activities?
4. Have you participated in any events organised by the project? If so, which ones and to what extent have they been relevant and applicable to you?
5. Have you used any knowledge products developed by the project? If so, which ones and to what extent have they been relevant and applicable to you?
6. Has the project strengthened national capacity for BHR? If yes, in what areas?
7. What are the main challenges with respect to BHR in your country? How would you assess the awareness of different stakeholders with regards to BHR? Are there different challenges for different groups in terms of BHR in your country– e.g., women, migrant workers, IPs PWDs etc.?
8. What remedies are available in your country for victims of BHR abuses? How would you assess the effectiveness of these remedies? What are the gaps and how can these be addressed?
9. To what extent do you cooperate with other stakeholders active in the field of BHR such as CSOs, NHRIs, media, and businesses?
10. What have been the greatest results and achievements of the project to date and what were the drivers behind these successes?
11. In your view what is the long-term impact made by the project activities?
12. Have you noticed any unintended consequences, whether negative or positive of the project? Give examples
13. In your view, do the project activities contribute to larger reform efforts in the country and region, in particular those linked with achievement of the SDGs?
14. Will the government continue with any of the project activities beyond the lifespan of the project? If so, which ones? And if not, why not?
15. What are your priorities in terms of BHR in the short (1-2 years) and mid-long term (3+years)? How can the project support you with these priorities?
16. In which areas do you think the project should focus on in the short-term (1-2 years) and longer term (3+ years and beyond)?

Interview Questions for National Human Rights Institutions

1. What is the mandate of your Institution?
2. What are the main challenges with respect to BHR in your country? Are there different challenges for different groups in terms of BHR in your country– e.g., women, migrant workers, PWDs etc.?
3. What remedies are available for these victims? How would you assess the effectiveness of these remedies? What are the gaps and how can these be addressed?
4. Are you familiar with UNDP's B+HR Asia project? Is the project relevant to strengthening BHR in your country? Among the activities conducted under the project, which of them are most relevant and why? Are there any less relevant activities?
5. Have you participated in any events organised by the project? If so, which ones and to what extent have they been relevant and applicable to you?

6. Have you used any knowledge products developed by the project? If so, which ones and to what extent have they been relevant and applicable to you?
7. To what extent do you cooperate with other stakeholders active in the field of BHR such as CSOs, governments, media, academia, and businesses?
8. Has the project strengthened local/national capacity for BHR? If yes, in what areas?
9. What have been the greatest results and achievements of the project to date and what were the drivers behind these successes?
10. In your view what is the long-term impact made by the project activities?
11. Have you noticed any unintended consequences, whether negative or positive of the project? Give examples
12. In your view, do the project activities contribute to larger reform efforts in the country in particular those linked with achievement of the SDGs?
13. Will your institution continue with any of the project activities beyond the lifespan of the project? If so, which ones? And if not, why not?
14. What are your priorities in terms of BHR in the short (1-2 years) and mid-long term (3+years)? How can the project support you with these priorities?
15. In which areas do you think the project should focus on in the short-term (1-2 years) and longer term (3+ years and beyond)?

Interview questions for Civil Society Organisations

1. What is the mandate of your organisation?
2. What are the main challenges with respect to BHR in your country? Are there different challenges for different groups in terms of BHR in your country– e.g., women, migrant workers, IPs, PWDs etc.?
3. What remedies are available for these victims? How would you assess the effectiveness of these remedies? What are the gaps and how can these be addressed?
4. Are you familiar with UNDP’s B+HR Asia project? Is the project relevant to strengthening BHR in your country? Among the activities conducted under the project, which of them are most relevant and why? Are there any less relevant activities?
5. Have you participated in any events organised by the project? If so, which ones and to what extent have they been relevant and applicable to you?
6. Have you used any knowledge products developed by the project? If so, which ones and to what extent have they been relevant and applicable to you?
7. To what extent do you cooperate with other stakeholders active in the field of BHR such as NHRIs, governments, media, academia, and businesses?
8. Has the project strengthened local/national capacity for BHR? If yes, in what areas?
9. What have been the greatest results and achievements of the project to date and what were the drivers behind these successes?
10. In your view what is the long-term impact made by the project activities?
11. Have you noticed any unintended consequences, whether negative or positive of the project? Give examples
12. In your view, do the project activities contribute to larger reform efforts in the country and region, in particular those linked with achievement of the SDGs?
13. Will your institution continue with any of the project activities beyond the lifespan of the project? If so, which ones? And if not, why not?
14. What are your priorities in terms of BHR in the short (1-2 years) and mid-long term (3years)? How can the project support you with these priorities?
15. In which areas do you think the project should focus on in the short-term (1-2 years) and longer term (3 years and beyond)?

Interview questions for UNDP

1. To what extent is implementation matching your vision for the project? Why/why not?
2. Has the project been able to reach all target groups that it had intended to reach? How has the project mainstreamed gender into its activities?
3. How has the changing context impacted on the programme implementation?
4. How was the project able to adapt to the COVID-19 context?
5. Which aspects of the project, and which of the approaches used were most successful in bringing about change and why? Which approaches did not work and why?
6. Why is progress under output 4 significantly less than under the other outputs?
7. In your opinion what are the biggest challenges in implementing the project? What have been the key results to date?
8. How does the approach of the project complement the regional approach funded through the SIDA project? How do you ensure complementarity while avoiding overlap?
9. How satisfied are you with the partnerships created by the project? Is the project working with the right partners? Are there gaps? How do you reach rights holders? Do you benefit from the partnership architecture developed by the SIDA project?
10. What is the composition (gender, ethnicity, etc.) of project staff and does it reflect the diversity of project stakeholders?
11. What avenues did women and vulnerable groups have to provide feedback on the project, or otherwise influence how and what the project was delivering?
12. What are the project's mechanisms for MEL? Why does the project have both EU and UNDP M&E frameworks? Why are these not unified?
13. Is there evidence that the project advanced any key national human rights, gender or inclusion policies?
14. Have you observed any unintended impact (could be negative as well as positive) of the project?
15. What have been the greatest results and achievements of the project to date and what were the drivers behind these successes?
16. Overall, which were the most important or relevant changes you have noticed as a result of the project?
17. How has the project contributed to and been influenced by the evolving BHR discourse both regionally and globally?
18. To what extent do you think the project has been able to adapt and be flexible to changing needs and demands?
19. What would you do differently now, if you were to start the B+HR Asia project again?
20. What advice would you give to other UNDP Regional Hubs or COs who are interested in BHR programming?
21. What are the short and longer-term priorities of the project and how do these synergise with the Global BHR programme and the UNWG's Global Roadmap?
22. What are the key lessons learned to date?

Interview Questions for the EU

1. To what extent was EU involved in the inception phase of the project and the design of the full project?
2. Were your views/inputs taken into account?
3. How satisfied are you with the communication procedures and mechanisms with the project and with UNDP?
4. Do you receive narrative and financial reports in a timely manner?
5. How satisfied are you with the results achieved by the project to date?
6. What have been the biggest challenges in the project?

7. What have been the greatest results and achievements of the project to date and what were the drivers behind these successes? Are there any specific results related to gender?
8. What are your current development priorities and how does the project fit into these?
9. What are your long-term priorities for the Asia region?
11. Are you satisfied with the level of coordination with the EU B+HR Asia project? Are there any gaps or areas, which could be strengthened?
10. Why did you choose to support a UNDP project? What do you perceive UNDP's comparative advantages to be? Do you feel that you are getting value for money with UNDP?
11. Would you support a UNDP project again in the future? If not, why not?
12. Are you satisfied with the coordination, cooperation, visibility etc. between the EU and SIDA funded B+HR projects? Are there gaps? Overlaps or duplication? What could be done differently? Moving into the second phase would you like to see a closer programmatic approach between the two projects or a more distinct implementation framework?

Interview questions for Country Office National Specialists

1. How relevant is BHR in your country? Is the project tailored to meet BHR needs and demands in your country? How does it match the priorities in your CPD and UNSDCF?
2. What have been the greatest results and achievements of the project to date and what were the drivers behind these successes? How is gender mainstreamed into the project activities?
3. What have been the biggest challenges of the project in your country to date?
4. Which strategies have been the most and least effective in terms of achieving results? What were the enabling and constraining factors?
5. Is the project working with the right partners in your country? Are there any gaps?
6. How are you reaching rights holders and ensuring that no one is left behind?
7. What are the sustainability prospects of the project activities in your country?
8. How satisfied are with the communication and coordination tools and mechanisms in place between your CO, the BHR team at the Bangkok Regional Hub and with other COs involved in the project? What is working well? What could be improved? Are you involved in planning processes?
9. How do you coordinate with the SIDA Regional B+HR project and ensure complementarity while avoiding duplication? Are the right mechanisms in place to facilitate this?
10. What are the priorities of the country going forward on BHR and how do these correspond with the project?
11. In which areas do you think the project should focus in the short and long term?
12. What are the key lessons learned to date?

Interview questions for Business Representatives

1. Are you familiar with the UNGPs and the BHR agenda in your country?
2. How important do you think the linkages between business and human rights are and how relevant is this in your day-to-day work?
3. What are the biggest challenges that you see or face in terms of BHR?
4. Are you aware of complaints mechanisms or remedies for victims of BHR abuses?
5. Are you familiar with UNDP's B+HR Asia project? Is the project relevant to strengthening BHR in your country? Among the activities conducted under the project, which of them are most relevant and why? Are there any less relevant activities?
6. Have you participated in any events organised by the project? If so, which ones and to what extent have they been relevant and applicable to you?
7. Have you used any knowledge products developed by the project? If so, which ones and to what extent have they been relevant and applicable to you?

8. To what extent do you cooperate with other stakeholders active in the field of BHR such as CSOs, NHRIs, governments, media, academia, and other businesses?
9. What have been the greatest results and achievements of the project to date and what were the drivers behind these successes?
10. What are your priorities in terms of BHR in the short and longer term? How can the project support you with these priorities?
11. In which areas do you think the project should focus in the short and longer term?

ANNEX III - EVALUATION MATRIX

Relevant Evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods/Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis
<p>The relevance of B+HR Asia's project design, with a specific focus on its theory of change and how the project outputs realistically and effectively contributed to its overall objective.</p>	<p>*To what extent was the project in line with the regional development priorities and UNDP Strategic Plan, Regional Programme Document, UNWG Priorities and its direction on human rights? *To what extent is the project in line with and has influenced Phase IV of UNDP's Global RoL programme? *To what extent does the project contribute to the ToC for the relevant regional programme outcomes? *To what extent were the project activities in target countries in line with the national development priorities and country development programmes' outputs</p>	<p>* Were any stakeholder inputs/concerns addressed at the project formulation stage? Was the EU included? *How does the project align with related national strategies? *How does the project address the human development needs of intended beneficiaries? *What analysis was done in designing the project – context, stakeholder, PEA etc.? *Was the project able to adapt to evolving needs/changing context? *How well were gender aspects taken into account into project design and concretely and effectively implemented? *What project revisions were made and why?</p>	<p>*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans in the 7 target countries *UNDP Strategic Documents incl. UNSDCF, UNDP GP B+HR, UNDP BRH Regional Programme *B+HR Asia Project Document *B+HR Asia Progress Reports *B+HR Asia Quality Assurance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review and desk research • Independent external research and reports • Key informant interviews • Focus group discussions • Online surveys if conducted • Email, phone and online follow-up where necessary 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the B+HR Asia team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to consultant

	<p>and outcomes? *To what extent the overall design and approaches of the project were relevant? *To what extent, the inputs and strategies identified were realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? *What is the degree to which the BHR project activities were overlapping with and/or complementing other interventions in the domain – in particular the SIDA funded project? *What is the level of acceptance for and support to the Project by relevant stakeholders?</p>	<p>*To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women, social inclusion and the human rights-based approach? *To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the target countries throughout the project period, including the COVID-19 pandemic?</p>	<p>report, results orientated monitoring reports *Relevant partner reports</p>			
<p>Effectiveness – The overall effectiveness of the implemented project activities towards the</p>	<p>*To what extent the project activities were delivered effectively in terms of quality, quantity, and timing? *How effective were the strategies used in the implementation of the project? *To what extent the</p>	<p>- In what way did the Project come up with innovative measures for problem solving? - What good practices or successful experiences or transferable examples were identified? - What is the level of expertise and acceptance</p>	<p>*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans in the 7 target countries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review and desk research • Independent external research and reports 	N/A	<p>*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation</p>

<p>expected results</p>	<p>project was effective in enhancing the capacity of States on implementing UNGPs and the development process of the NAPs into the governments' priorities? *What are the key internal and external factors (success & failure factors) that have contributed, affected, or impeded the achievements, and how UNDP and the partners have managed these factors? *In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements? *In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome? *To what extent have</p>	<p>of UNDP work on BHR: which added value does UNDP have and what are its comparative advantages in the sector? - What are the direct and indirect results (at both output and impact level) of the project implementation and their sustainability? -How does the project complement/overlap with other UNDP and UN initiatives – in particular the SIDA B+HR Asia project?</p>	<p>*UNDP Strategic Documents incl. UNSDCF, UNDP GP B+HR, UNDP BRH Regional Programme *B+HR Asia Project Document *B+HR Asia Progress Reports *B+HR Asia Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports *Relevant partner reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interviews • Focus group discussions • Online surveys if conducted • Email, phone and online follow-up where necessary 		<p>*Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the B+HR Asia team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to consultant</p>
-------------------------	---	--	---	---	--	--

	<p>stakeholders been involved in project implementation? *To what extent are project management and implementation participatory? *To what extent have the South-South cooperation and knowledge management contributed to the national (and regional) momentum on developing the NAPs? - What were the constraining and facilitating factors and the influence of the context on the achievement of results?</p>					
<p>Output 1: Policy convergence and compliance with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights increased</p>	<p>- How many NAPs or their equivalent have been developed to date? How many consultation processes? National Baseline Assessments? - What role has the project had in the development of these NAPs (advocacy, policy development, technical advisory support, capacity building,</p>	<p>- What are the key achievements under this output? - What are the key challenges? - Is progress on track? - What are the main lessons learned so far? - Has the approach changed during the project implementation period? If so, why?</p>	<p>*B+HR Asia Project Document *B+HR Asia Progress Reports *B+HR Asia Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review and desk research • Independent external research and reports • Key informant interviews • Focus group discussions 	<p>1. Number of National Actions Plans or their equivalent developed Baseline 2019 - 0 Target 2023 - 4</p>	<p>*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the consultant and</p>

	<p>awareness raising etc.)? - How would you assess political will and interest in BHR in the target countries – has this increased during the lifespan of the project? - What have been the main outcomes of the NAPs? Is the project monitoring or supporting their subsequent implementation? - How does the project facilitate peer-to-peer exchanges and what have been the results of this?</p>		<p>*Relevant partner reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online surveys if conducted • Email, phone and online follow-up where necessary 		<p>the B+HR Asia team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to consultant</p>
<p>Output 2: Public awareness of the Business and Human Rights Agenda enhanced</p>	<p>- To what extent has public awareness of the UNGPs and the BHR agenda increased during the project implementation period – how are you tracking and measuring this? - Have you conducted any impact assessments of your awareness raising activities and/or knowledge products? - Which strategies and approaches are proving</p>	<p>- What are the key achievements under this output? - What are the key challenges? - Is progress on track? - How do you measure results? - What are the main lessons learned so far? - Has the approach changed during the project implementation period? If so, why?</p>	<p>*B+HR Asia Project Document *B+HR Asia Progress Reports *B+HR Asia Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports *Relevant partner reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review and desk research • Independent external research and reports • Key informant interviews • Focus group discussions 	<p>2.1 Number of communications products shared with the public Baseline 2019 – 0 Target 2023 – 24</p> <p>2.2 Number of knowledge products, including issue briefs, think pieces, and research products shared with the public Baseline 2019 – 0</p>	<p>*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the B+HR Asia team</p>

	<p>most effective and why? Which are least effective and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How do you tailor your approaches to different stakeholders? - How do you ensure that the hardest to reach are reached through the public awareness and that no one is left behind? - To what extent have discussion been held on the HR dimensions of trade and investment policy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To what extent are gender and HRBA considerations addressed in the design and implementation of awareness raising and communication activities? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online surveys if conducted • Email, phone and online follow-up where necessary 	Target 2023 – 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to consultant
<p>Output 3: Access to remedy and other rights-based solutions increased</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What approaches has the project used to enhance access to remedy and which have been the most successful? - How many capacity development and training events have been organised under this output and what have the results of these events been? Who have been the recipients? - In what ways has the project addressed the issue of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the key achievements under this output? - What are the key challenges? - Is progress on track? - How do you measure results? - What are the main lessons learned so far? - Has the approach changed during the project implementation period? If so, why? - To what extent are Gender and HRBA considerations addressed 	<p>*B+HR Asia Project Document</p> <p>*B+HR Asia Progress Reports</p> <p>*B+HR Asia Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports</p> <p>*Relevant partner reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review and desk research • Independent external research and reports • Key informant interviews • Focus group discussions • Online surveys if conducted 	<p>3.1 Number of beneficiaries in pursuit of access to remedy supported by civil society actors</p> <p>Baseline 2019 – 0</p> <p>Target 2023 – 70</p> <p>3.2 Number of training and events organised or supported to reinforce skills and competencies of businesses to conduct human rights due diligence and operate effective grievance mechanisms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the B+HR Asia team *Verification of data with Stakeholders

	<p>grievance mechanisms and access to them?</p> <p>- How has the project strengthened justice institutions to address HR abuses in a business context?</p>	<p>in the design and implementation of activities?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Email, phone and online follow-up where necessary 	<p>Baseline 2019 – 0 Target 2023 - 16</p>	<p>*Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to consultant</p>
<p>Output 4: Interlinkages between adverse environmental and human rights impacts by business operations is better understood so that policy action is more clearly articulated</p>	<p>- How does the project measure increase in awareness of national stakeholders on the UNGPs and linkages between human rights and the environment?</p> <p>- What awareness raising activities have been conducted and how has the project measured the impact of these activities?</p> <p>- What trainings have been conducted and to whom? How is impact measured? Are pre and post training assessments conducted?</p> <p>- How many knowledge products and communication products have been disseminated? Is any follow-up</p>	<p>- What are the key achievements under this output?</p> <p>- What are the key challenges?</p> <p>- Is progress on track?</p> <p>- How do you measure results?</p> <p>- What are the main lessons learned so far?</p> <p>- Has the approach changed during the project implementation period? If so, why?</p> <p>- To what extent are Gender and HRBA considerations addressed in the design and implementation of activities?</p>	<p>*B+HR Asia Project Document</p> <p>*B+HR Asia Progress Reports</p> <p>*B+HR Asia Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports</p> <p>*Relevant partner reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review and desk research Independent external research and reports Key informant interviews Focus group discussions Online surveys Email, phone and online follow-up where necessary 	<p>4.1 Number of knowledge products, including issue briefs, think pieces, and research products shared with the public</p> <p>Baseline 2020 – 0 Target 2023 – 5</p> <p>4.2 Number of events organised or supported to enhance multi-stakeholder dialogues on the impact of Asian business operations and supply chains on the human rights and environment nexus</p> <p>Baseline 2020 – 0 Target 2023 – 5</p> <p>4.3 Number of communications products shared with the public</p>	<p>*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis</p> <p>*Data synthesis</p> <p>*Descriptive statistical analysis</p> <p>*Process tracing</p> <p>*Triangulation</p> <p>*Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the B+HR Asia team</p> <p>*Verification of data with Stakeholders</p> <p>*Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to consultant</p>

	conducted to measure usage/impact etc.?				Baseline 2020 – 0 Target 2023 - 12	
<p>Efficiency in delivering outputs</p> <p>The cost efficiency of the implemented project activities towards the expected results</p>	<p>*To what extent is the existing project management structure appropriate and efficient in generating the expected results? *Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes? *Was the process of achieving results efficient? *Were the resources effectively utilised? *Did the project activities overlap, and duplicate other similar interventions, in particular the SIDA funded project? *To what extent did the project produce synergies within UNDP and with other development partners and play complementary roles each other? *How does the project</p>	<p>*Does the project coordinate its activities sufficiently with other initiatives in the field? *Is the project being implemented within deadline and cost estimates? *Has UNDP solved any implementation issues promptly? *Are project resources focused on the set of activities that were expected to provide significant results *Is there any unified synergy between UNDP initiatives that contributed towards reducing costs? (In particular SIDA project) *How often has the project board met? *How did UNDP programming overlap, if at all with other initiatives?</p>	<p>*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans in the 7 target countries *UNDP Strategic Documents incl. UNSDCF, UNDP GP B+HR, UNDP BRH Regional Programme *B+HR Asia Project Document *B+HR Asia Progress Reports *B+HR Asia Quality Assurance report, results orientated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review and desk research • Independent external research and reports • Key informant interviews • Focus group discussions • Online surveys • Email, phone and online follow-up where necessary 	N/A	<p>*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the B+HR Asia team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to consultant</p>

	<p>align with other regional and national level initiatives/activities on BHR? How efficiently are national and regional activities connected and complement each other?</p> <p>*Have the implementation modalities been appropriate and cost-effective?</p> <p>*Did the B+HR Asia staffing structure and management arrangements ensure cost-efficiency, value-for-money, and effectiveness of implementation strategies and overall delivery of results?</p> <p>*Was there good coordination and communication between partners in the project?</p> <p>*What impact did COVID-19 have?</p>	<p>*To what extent were UNDP able to synergise with other UN agencies?</p> <p>*Is the project fully staffed and are the staffing/management arrangements efficient?</p> <p>*Are procurements processed in a timely manner?</p> <p>* Are the resources allocated sufficient/too much?</p> <p>*What were the reasons for over or under expenditure within the Project?</p>	<p>monitoring reports</p> <p>*Relevant partner reports</p>			
Sustainability of the outcome	<p>*To what extent has the project driven momentum for implementation of the UNGPs and development of the</p>	<p>How has UNDP addressed the challenge of building national capacities? (if not covered above)</p>	<p>*National policy documents including relevant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document requests • Stakeholder interviews, in particular with UNDP 	<p>% of Government Co-financing procured by project?</p>	<p>*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis</p> <p>*Data synthesis</p>

	<p>NAPs? *To what extent are the project activities and results likely to be institutionalised and implemented by each country after the completion of this project? *What is the likelihood of the continuation and sustainability of national level dialogues engaging various stakeholders and strengthening national and regional partnership architectures, made up of UN system, NHRIs, CSOs, and private sector actors working on BHR? *How were capacities of a various set of BHR stakeholders strengthened at the national level? *Describe key factors that will require attention to improve the prospects of sustainability of Project outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach?</p>	<p>*What is the level of national/regional ownership of the project activities? * To what extent has the project created a shift in attitudinal and cultural behaviour towards BHR in the target countries? *Has the project managed to procure Gov. co-financing for any of the deliverables? *Is it anticipated that the project will secure financing for 100% of the project activities? If not, why not and what was the shortfall? *Does the project provide for the handover of any activities? *What are the perceived capacities of the relevant institutions for taking the initiatives forward? * Were initiatives designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks?</p>	<p>strategies and action plans *UNDP Strategic Documents *B+HR Asia Project Document *B+HR Asia Progress Reports *B+HR Asia Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementin g partners progress reports</p>	<p>and other bilateral donors and the national institutions included in the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent external research and reports • Focus groups • Email, phone and Skype follow-up where necessary 	<p># of activities absorbed by national/regional partners/other UNDP projects</p>	<p>*Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the B+HR Asia team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to consultant</p>
--	---	--	--	---	---	---

	<p>*To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?</p> <p>*To what extent will financial and economic resources as well as political will be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?</p>					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

ANNEX IV List of External Stakeholder Consultations

Country	Sector	Name of Interviewee	Institution	Email
India	Government	Mr. Rajesh Verma, Secretary	Ministry of Corporate Affairs	secy.mca@nic.in
India	Government	Mr. Abhijit Phukon, Director	Ministry of Corporate Affairs	abhijit.phukon@nic.in
India	Civil Society	Ms. Nandini Sharma -Director	Centre for Responsible Business	nandini@c4rb.in
India	Civil Society	Mr. Anand Kumar Bolimera - CEO	Change Alliance	AKumar@changealliance.in
India	Other	Ms. Sarayu Natarajan	Aapti Institute	sarayu@aapti.in
Indonesia	Government	Ms. Hajerati	Director, Ministry of Law and Human Rights	hajeratimasud@gmail.com ; stafdirjenham@yahoo.com ; sofia151mn@gmail.com ; ibrahim_reza@hotmail.com
Indonesia	Business	Ms. Eni Widiyanti	Ministry of Women Empowerment and Law Protection	enimaera@gmail.com
Indonesia	Civil Society	Mr. Reynaldi Istanto	Expert Staff to the Minister, Ministry of State-Owned Enterprises	reynaldi.istanto@bumn.go.id
		Mr. Billy Esratian	Executive Office of the President	besratian@llm16.law.harvard.edu
Indonesia	NHRIs	Mr. Bahtiar Manurung	Director of Operations, Foundation for International Human Rights Reporting Standard (FIHRRST)	bahtiar.manurung@fihrrst.org
Indonesia	Other	Ms. Resi Hardiyanti	EuroCham	resi.hardiyanti@eurocham.id
Malaysia	Government	Yusof Ali	Legal Affairs Division, Prime Minister's Department	yusof.ali@bheuu.gov.my
Malaysia	Civil Society	Edmund Bon	Collective of Applied Law & Legal Realism (CALR)	ebon@calr.com.my
Malaysia	NHRIs	Dr. Cheah Swee Neo	Human Rights Commission of Malaysia	cheah@suhakam.org.my
Malaysia	Other	Jodelyn Mitra	ILO	mitra@ilo.org

Mongolia	Government	Navchaa Ts.	Head, Human Rights Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Dep09-09@mfa.gov.mn
Mongolia	Business	Batbuyan S.	Partner, MDS&KhanLex LLP	batbuyan@mdsa.mn
Mongolia	Civil Society	Ariunaa Sh.	Head, Mongolian Women's Employment Support Federation	mwesf1@gmail.com
Mongolia	NHRIs	Undrakh U.	Head, International Law and Cooperation Division, National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia	u.undrakh@nhrcm.gov.mn
Myanmar	Business	Nicolas Delange	Yever	nicolas@yever.org
Myanmar	Business	Karina Ufert	EuroCham Myanmar	director@eurocham-myanmar.org
Myanmar	Civil Society	Daw Hla Hla Yee	Legal Clinic Myanmar	legalclinicmyanmar@gmail.com
		Saw Emaric Aye (Alternative)		programmanager.lcm@gmail.com
Sri Lanka	Business	Selyna Peiris	Selyn	selyna@selyn.lk
Sri Lanka	Civil Society	Hemantha Withanage	Centre for Environment Justice	
Sri Lanka	Civil Society	Padmini Weerasooriya & Gayani Gomes	Women's Centre	wcpmheadoffice@gmail.com
				ww.shelter@gmail.com
Sri Lanka	Other	Semini Satarasinghe	Germna Chamber of Industry and Commerce	communication@srilanka.ahk.de
Sri Lanka	Other	Amar Gunatilleke	Marga Institute	amar@margasrilanka.org
Sri Lanka	Other	Sandun Thudugala	Law and Society Trust	sthudugala1980@gmail.com
Thailand	Government	Nareeluc Pairchaiyapoom	Rights and Liberties Protection Department, Ministry of Justice	moomeey@hotmail.com

Thailand	Business	Dr. NETITHORN PRADITSARN	Global Compact Network Thailand	netithorn.pra@cp.co.th , CC: raksina.chi@cp.co.th , poom.sir@cp.co.th
Thailand	Civil Society	Sor.Rattanamanee Polkla	Community Resources Centre Foundation (CRC)	sorrattana1@gmail.com
Thailand	Other	Asst. Prof. Dr. Darunee Paisanpanichkul	Chaing Mai university	darunee.pais@cmu.ac.th

