

**MATRIX TO CONSOLIDATE COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS TO THE
DRAFT FINAL REPORT**

In order to ease the process of sharing information and ensuring a smooth compilation of the different perspectives of the evaluation reference group. We kindly ask you to use this matrix to group your comments and suggestions to the evaluation report. When referring to the text in the report be specific on the paragraph

Topics to comment and suggestions	This column shall be used by the members of the evaluation reference group	This column is for the comments of the evaluators
<p>1. Indicate the information you consider is incomplete in the report In case there is any incomplete information, please complete.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please add further information/analysis on the context to explain why certain things may not have happened by explaining constraints in the context that the Joint Programme operated. 2. For the outputs not delivered, please add explanation on why they were not delivered, with information on constraints, etc. 3. (2.4, page 19) The most severe constraint is the <u>absence of a functional internal M&E system</u> to be used as a part of the management system of the JP. 4. Please explain more about the M&E system mentioned in this part, to make distinctions from the Monitoring and Evaluation Systems that were used in the JPGE (e.g. quarterly colour-coded progress report, monthly monitoring of activities at the JPGE taskforce meeting, PMU meeting, ME Results Framework included in the Project Document, etc). 5. (2.4, page 19) Thus a robust statement about JPGE implementation outside Ha Noi (coverage) cannot be made. 6. Please include information about the contacts with the four participants from the provincial level and share information on the brief assessments based on the 	<p>1 Constraints are mentioned where they were available and plausible.</p> <p>2 Heavy bureaucratic procedures as one of the constraints mentioned in the comments to the DFR as an inhibiting factor. However, this factor was known prior to JPGE start and might not have been considered sufficiently as a risk to implementation and in forward planning.</p> <p>3, 4 Please refer to the MTE report, chapter 4.2, The JPGE results framework, and the figure 2, The Theory of change, exposed on page 9.</p> <p>Colour coded table and monitoring of activities at the JPGE TF meetings are tools and can be considered as elements of a system, but cannot replace a system with set targets at the results levels, with SMART indicators at all levels.</p> <p>5.6 done as far as found professional, as no field visit was scheduled and four participants cannot replace a fully fletched training assessment.</p>

	<p>information shared by the four participants.</p> <p>7. (Point related to “Capacity Development Plan” in various places, including in page 23), e.g. Absence of a commonly agreed capacity development plan.</p> <p>8. Please provide more explanation on this Capacity Development Plan. In a way, the Project Document was the overall and common Capacity Development Plan for the JPGE. For the plan referred by the evaluators, developing a capacity development plan for the GSO would mean the change of the project design. Is your point of capacity development plan related to the revision of the project design? Is your point related to the Capacity Development Plan for the whole JPGE, covering duty bearers from different stakeholders, or the plan for each NIP?</p> <p>9. (Page 25) Furthermore, a very urgent revision of the existing M&E Results Framework for the JPGE was never performed.</p> <p>10. Please include the information that the revision of the existing ME Results Framework could not be done due to heavy and long bureaucratic process. However, the discussion was held at the JPGE workshop following the MTE to revise the outcome targets.</p> <p>11. (Page 25) The set up and implementation of an M&E framework for the implementation of the GEL and the DVL are with GED of MOLISA and the Family Department of MOCST respectively. They have been developed and are pending official issuance by the respective departments.</p> <p>12. Please note the updated information as follows: The final draft of the M&EF on GEL has been completed. It can be used and applied by the relevant users (line ministries). The PMU will go ahead with the contract liquidation process before 27 March 2012. DVL MEF has been developed and it is with the Family Department of MOCST for further</p>	<p>9,10,11,12 If standard management practices as for example the introduction of SMART indicators cannot be implemented due to bureaucracy an important risk has not been anticipated and no strategy developed. There were three years time for introduction and amendments.</p> <p>Update of 23 March 2012 is noted.</p> <p>11,12but were not shared (also not in draft) with the evaluators while on mission in Viet Nam in February 2012, though being main outputs of the JPGE. Thus no further comment on completeness, quality etc. can be made.</p> <p>The question remains why they have not been approved earlier? Cannot be due to heavy procedures, as they were agreed outputs of the JPGE from the very beginning.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>application.</p> <p>13. For the points related to the human resources (JPGE Focal Points) (e.g. page 29), it would be better if the points can be further clarified so that the issue is clearly pointed out and discussed. Salary may be a part of the factors, but it is not the only factor, and other factors such as commitment and time allocation of staff by UN agencies may be also included (Keeping a good balance may be important - if we hire dedicated/separate focal point by per agency, it may not have other implications, e.g. gender focal point somewhat detached from the agency's core work. In addition, it may not be realistic/feasible for some smaller agencies to hire additional staff for the JPGE).</p> <p>14. (Page 36) At the point of the MTE the implementation of the JP remained mainly activity oriented. – Please explain more about this point.</p> <p>15. (Page 40) Table with statistical data does not have sufficient and clear reference to sources. Please be clearer. Also, the DV data in 2006 and 2010 are not comparable as they were collected using different methods.</p> <p>16. (Page 42) The indicated allocation from the State budget: VND790 billion, or approximately 38 Mio USD, (including VND 326 billion from the national budget and VND 464 billion from local budget) - Information is not correct. Please check again</p> <p>17. (Page 44): Please add another bullet point: there is not yet availability of a comprehensive minimum intervention package for GBV victims</p>	<p>13 Argument appreciated.</p> <p>14 Activity orientation means for ex. number of people trained in a ToT training. It is just a number for an activity, no result. An indicator used in results based management could be number of trained trainers successfully providing trainings to their peers or to other targeted groups. See in detail "Results based management". http://www.un.org/depts/oios/mecd/un_pparbm/p069.htm</p> <p>15 Fully aware of the non comparability. Prior to the study on DV against women other indicators were used, so it appeared as if the DV rate has increased since 2006. Reference to sources is made and context is explained.</p> <p>16 Has been amended.</p> <p>17 This point is integrated in the narrative where suitable, however the list on page 44 refers to "following remaining challenges addressed in the One Plan's rationale for outputs 2.4.3 and 2.4.4, respectively". Thus the indicated paragraph does not fit into the context of this listing.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>18. (Page 47) Table on SOWT analysis: Suggest to add “participation of various gender stakeholders through the GAP”, and “partnership with CSOs through the JPGE supported mechanisms such as the GAP” as strengths and opportunity respectively.</p> <p>19. (Page 53, Recommendation 10) Issue/s to be addressed: In course of the JPGE some QA issues have been detected, i.e. provision of capacity building measures without a detailed plan of what kind of capacity is going to be built. Greater attention need to be paid to the sustainability of capacities developed.</p> <p>20. This point sounds as if the JPGE did not know what kind of capacity was going to be built but in each activity (whether it be workshops, study tours, etc). However, we had clear objectives to be achieved and were clear about type of capacity to be built and they were indicated in the Information Note for each activity as well as in the contents of the training programme.</p> <p>21. Issue/s to be addressed: Constant lack of suitable consultant was addressed by the JPGE coordinator as one of the hampering factors of the JPGE. Availability of consultants had often determined the time of the work not the process necessities.</p> <p>22. There were mainly three factors: limited number of qualified consultants. Many activities were happening at the same time (requiring the same consultants). Some activities were new and we did not know who may be able to do it, and applied consultants did not meet qualifications required.</p>	<p>18 GAP is mentioned in the SWOT analysis.</p> <p>21, 22 This was already addressed as a problem felt by the JPGE in the report.</p>
<p>2. Point out any discrepancies with the information and/or assessments included in the report In case there are any discrepancies you should provide relevant evidence to support your point.</p>	<p>1. (Status of the MTE recommendations, page 23) The status of the Recommendation 1, Point b is not correct.</p> <p>2. Discussed. The revised outcome statements and targets have been developed for operational use. However, they were not reflected in the official document due to long and heavy bureaucratic process it would take to reflect in the official document. Please refer to the JPGE Improvement Plan, Annex 2, page 12 for the Revised Outcome Statements. Please note that these changes could not be</p>	<p>1 – 10 Table was carefully revisited and some amendments were made for some of the results or parts of it. In other points evaluators and JPGE steering committee members still disagree in their assessment.</p> <p>Worthwhile to mention that there have been contradictions between (1) the verbal comments provided by stakeholders</p>

	<p>reflected in the official document due to heavy and long bureaucratic process it requires, considering the limited time left for the Joint Programme.</p> <p>3. (Status of the MTE recommendations, page 23) The status of the recommendation 4 is not correct.</p> <p>4. This point was discussed and clarified. Please refer to the JPGE Improvement Plan, Annex 2, page 9.</p> <p>5. (Status of the MTE recommendations, page 23) The status of the recommendation 5 is not correct.</p> <p>6. The status should be partially achieved. The JGPE Taskforce prioritized the CA report recommendations, and discussed how they may be addressed in the JPGE during the remaining period. Follow-up actions to address these recommendations were integrated into the Workplan 2011-2012. Please refer to the JPGE Improvement Plan, Annex 2, page 9.</p> <p>7. (Status of the MTE recommendations, page 24) The status of the recommendation 7 is not correct.</p> <p>8. The status should be “achieved”. This point was discussed, and it was decided that Thuy (former JPGE Programme Officer) and Aya would go see the Viet Nam Women’s Union to learn their practice of assessing training results. Thuy and Aya met with the Viet Nam Women’s Official on 21 Feb 2011 but it was found that the Viet Nam Women’s Union did not have a standard practice to assess the results of their training activities. The Viet Nam Women’s Union carries out general assessment of the performance of their staff annually.</p> <p>9. (Status of the MTE recommendations, page 24) The status of the recommendation 9 is not correct.</p>	<p>during interviews regarding each of the recommendations of the MTE and its achievement or non achievement, respectively, and (2) how it was argued in the response to the DFR.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>10. The status should be “achieved”. Following the MTE, it was decided that the JPGE progress was shared at every GAP meeting. The JPGE progress was also shared at the Gender PCG Mid-term and Annual Review Meetings. The Gender Specialist of the JPGE also met with the relevant donors regularly to share updates and to exchange ideas.</p> <p>11. This capacity assessment, however, was only available around half time of JPGE implementation.</p> <p>The CA finished at the end of the 1st year implementation of the JPGE.</p> <p>12. (Page 25) Composition of the study groups</p> <p>13. The composition of the groups followed the criteria of the national implementing partners</p>	<p>11 Dates provided by JPGE when CA was finished and shared with all stakeholders. It is between 1 and 1.5 years. The assessment should have in any case started prior to start of training, so choice of trainings being a result of assessment.</p> <p>13 This does not exclude the counter signatories from their accountability. Criteria should be jointly agreed and followed up, i.e. the match between criteria and participants’ profiles.</p>
<p>3. Comments and suggestions on the methodology used</p> <p>Please reflect and contribute with your comments and suggestions to the improvement of the evaluation process (evaluation focus, collection of data, analysis methods, etc). Please bear in mind the limitations and constraints on time and resources when contributing your comments</p>		

<p>4. Comments and suggestions on findings and conclusions</p> <p>Please assess if the findings and conclusions of the evaluation report are sustained by credible evidence and if they are consistent with the data collected and the methodology used during the evaluation process</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (Page 25) For a similar amount of budget per person other strategic decisions could have been taken. Disagree with this point. The study tours were conducted prior to the finalization of the Capacity Assessment because of the delay in finalizing the report. However, the study tours had been included in the project document from the design stage. (Page 35) Increased awareness is mentioned in the section on the Ownership of the Process. Please make a better linkage and relevance between the contents of this paragraph and the section title on the ownership. (Page 42) The NGOs with gender focus involved in the JPGE are also forming a sustainable element as they will continue to work for the same cause. – Please explain more about this point. At the end of the JPGE there are also a number of elements that could not be sustained¹ (M&E systems, Capacity Development Plan, Introduction/Alignment of Training Assessment Methods) Not true in case of GEL MEF. Please also clarify ME systems for what in terms of sustainability? National Statistical Indicator System on Gender Development may be considered one of the ME Systems which will be sustained. Please also provide further explanation on having sustainable capacity development plan, and training assessment methods. (Page 48) Through the JPGE and its coordination mechanism, dialogue between MOLISA and MOCST got closer - Not only dialogue between those ministries is closer, but the partnership and coordination among Gov partners and the partnership between Gov and UN also improved a lot 	<p>1 No changes.</p> <p>3 Done.</p> <p>4 Is explained</p> <p>5 Achievement status and narrative have been updated. So far we have not seen evidence for the existence of the two M&E systems. GSISGD were never part of the two distinct M&E systems, but are an(other) element of JPGE that can be sustained.</p> <p>6 Explained which M&E systems to be sustained.</p> <p>7 Was mentioned already.</p>
--	---	--

¹ For Joint Outcome 1 the Prodoc states that it “will ensure sustainability by working with SMA and key line ministries to develop a core of tools that can be replicated for future in workshops, publications and initiatives”.

	<p>8. It may be worth to note that whatever changes which may affect the signed document (e.g. changing the ME Results Framework, or changing activities which may mean changes in budget, and changes to the budget of more than one participating agency) is very difficult, at the level of almost impossible, considering the time spent to negotiate and to reach agreement (as time could be spent on negotiating only without actually delivering). From this perspective, having necessary framework and good design from the beginning becomes more important for Joint Programmes, than for a single agency project.</p>	<p>8 There is a certain flexibility inbuilt in the MDG-F design related to the reallocation of budget. The UN system with its different financial and managerial set ups is not fostering flexibility in implementation and it shows the current limits of Delivery as One.</p>
<p>5. Asses the utility of the recommendations and contribute with suggestions and comments to its improvement.</p> <p>As an example , you may consider the recommendations are too broad and you might need a set of more specific ones that can apply to the joint programme in the short term</p>	<p>1. It would be more helpful if the recommendations are structured better (e.g. according to certain sub-sections of e.g. design, implementation, management structure, M&E, etc)</p> <p>2. Please re-consider the point of gender expert of UNRCO assuming the role of coordination with the background that the UN Women is now assuming the responsibility of coordination</p> <p>3. Recommendation 12 may not be feasible unless it is included in the signed project document, as each agency has the authority and power to follow their procedures.</p>	<p>1 Done, structured</p> <p>2 Done, and role of UN WOMEN mentioned</p>
<p>6. Other comments and suggestions that you consider</p>	<p>Comments from the MDG-F Secretariat (Received on 21 March 2012):</p> <p>1. Overall the final evaluation report is good and comprehensive, however the findings on achievement of results need to be further analyzed/assessed, reflecting on progress/ achievement of each expected output and outcome and reflecting on why in some cases these were not achieved.</p> <p>2. The issue of M&E and capacity building strategy are key, and very well documented – however they do seem to be a bit repetitive throughout the text.</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <p>3. Please avoid making reference to a certain individual (e.g. page 37, 3.3.1, table 8, Output 1.2: “according to the coordinator....”</p>	<p>2 Was streamlined.</p> <p>3 There was reference to a key function, not to individuals. However, removed in the final version.</p>

4. Please include a section on “Description of the development interventions carried out” as stated in the suggested report outline in the TOR
5. Please remove “Recommendations for the MDG-F Secretariat for future JPs” as it was felt that it would be more appropriate to have these recommendations in another occasion and not in this evaluation where recommendations to the MDG-F are not required
6. Suggest to delete the Abbreviations not mentioned in the report
7. The Table of Contents is missing some sub-sections and having some doubles
8. Please review the assignment of numbers to the table (some doubles, e.g. there are two Table 9s)

5 Recommendations for MDG-F Secretariat are now in Annex 7

6 Done.

7 Corrected.

8 Corrected.