



**Terms of Reference
For
The Final Evaluation of
The Joint Programme to Address Violence Against Women**

English - November 2012

TOR FOR FINAL EVALUATIONS OF MDG-F JP VAW

1. GENERAL CONTEXT:

1.1. MDG ACHIEVEMENT FUND (MDG-F)

In December 2006, the UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of €528 million with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. In addition, on 24 September 2008 Spain pledged €90 million towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDG-F supports joint programmes that seek replication of successful pilot experiences and impact in shaping public policies and improving peoples' life in 50 countries by accelerating progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and other key development goals.

The MDG-F operates through the UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme mode of intervention and has currently approved 130 joint programmes in 50 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards progress on the MDGs, National Ownership and UN reform.

The MDG-F Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy

A result oriented monitoring and evaluation (M&E) strategy is under implementation in order to track and measure the overall impact of this historic contribution to the MDGs and to multilateralism. The MDG-F M&E strategy is based on the principles and standards of UNEG and OECD/DAC regarding evaluation quality and independence. The strategy builds on the information needs and interests of the different stakeholders while pursuing a balance between their accountability and learning purposes.

The strategy's main objectives are:

1. To support joint programmes to attain development results.
2. To determine the worth and merit of joint programmes and measure their contribution to the 3 MDG-F objectives, MDG, Paris Declaration and Delivering as one.
3. To obtain and compile evidence based knowledge and lessons learned to scale up and replicate successful development interventions.

Under the MDG-F M&E strategy and Programme Implementation Guidelines, each programme team is responsible for designing an M&E system, establishing baselines for (quantitative and qualitative) indicators and conducting a final evaluation with a summative focus.

The MDG-F Secretariat also commissioned mid-term evaluations for all joint programmes with a formative focus. Additionally, a total of nine-focus country evaluations (Ethiopia, Mauritania, Morocco, Timor-Leste, Philippines, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Colombia, Honduras and Ecuador) are planned to study more in depth the effects of joint programmes in a country context.

1.2 JP VAW in Bangladesh

The Joint Programme addressing violence against women in Bangladesh (JP VAW) combines the efforts of 11 ministries (Ministry of Information; Ministry of Social Welfare; Ministry of Youth and Sports; Ministry of Women and Children Affairs; Ministry of Religious Affairs; Ministry of Education; Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs; Ministry of Expatriates' Welfare and Overseas Employment; Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives (Local Government Division); Ministry of Health and Family Welfare; Ministry of Labor and Employment) and 9 UN agencies (UNFPA, UNWOMEN, UNICEF, UNDP, IOM, UNAIDS, ILO, UNESCO and WHO) towards the elimination of all kinds of violence against women in the country. The creation of the JP VAW took about four years. The approval date of the JP was 10 December 2009 with a programme budget of \$7,997,378. Funds were received on 14 April 2010 (first disbursement) which is also the starting date of the programme. The first year of the programme was centered on the development and finalization of Technical Project Proposals (TPPs) or work plans between GoB and the respective UN agencies, and an Inception Workshop was organized on 19-20 January, 2011. Thorough coordination mechanisms were set in place from August 2011. The three year JP VAW programme (2010-2012) received a 6 months no-cost extension due to late start, and will close on June 30, 2013.

The JP has three specific outcomes directly contributing to the UNDAF-Bangladesh pillar 7 outcome II "social and institutional vulnerabilities of women including the marginalized and disadvantaged reduced" which subsequently leads to improved human security and poverty reduction. The JP VAW has the following three outcomes and seven outputs;

OC1: Policies and legal framework aimed at preventing violence against women (VAW), protecting and supporting survivors adopted, implemented and monitored (ILO/WHO/UNFPA/UNWOMEN)

OC1, Output 1: Enhanced capacity of GOB officials and civil society to implement CEDAW

OC1, Output 2: Capacity strengthened for implementation of laws and policies aimed at preventing VAW and protecting the victims

OC1, Output 3: Information systems on VAW improved

OC2: Social attitudes and behaviour changes effected to reduce VAW and discriminatory practices (ILO/IOM/UNAIDS/UNESCO/UNDP/UNFPA/UNWOMEN)

OC2, Output 1: Strengthened advocacy and public awareness on VAW

OC2, Output 2: Established a national network of gatekeepers and stakeholders to prevent VAW and protect the victims of VAW

OC2, Output 3: Develop the capacity of gatekeepers and stakeholders for preventing VAW

OC3: Conducive environment created, and capacities enhanced for providing support to women and girls vulnerable to/have survived, violence (IOM/UNAIDS/UNFPA/UNICEF)

OC3, Output 1: Increased availability of and access for victims of VAW to shelter, medical, psychological, legal support and vocational training

The programme mainly aims to impact on the MDG 3 (Gender Equality) but interventions supported under the programme contribute to other MDGs as well:

- reducing poverty (MDG 1) by addressing the feminization of poverty;
- universal education (MDG 2) by revising the existing curriculum from a gender perspective;
- child and maternal health (MDGs 4 and 5) by facilitating access and quality of healthcare for women and girls; and
- Combating HIV/ AIDS (MDG 6) by addressing women's vulnerability to HIV/ AIDS.

The JP VAW is fully aligned with GoB's strategic priorities as expressed in its perspective plan 2010-2021 and the sixth five-year plan, thus ensures national ownership by the GoB and Civil Society in general. Non Government Organizations and Civil Society are placed at the core of the interventions. Moreover the JP VAW is making full use of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and related harmonization instruments and modalities applicable to the UN system. The principles of cost-effectiveness and minimization of transaction costs guides the implementation of the JP VAW. Strong monitoring is ensuring that the highest standards in quality are followed by the programme.

The JP VAW programme is complex partly due to its number of partners (the biggest programme in Bangladesh ever in terms of partners) and its types of interventions. A summary of programme interventions are attached in Annex 1.

The JP VAW Result Framework (RF) was revised in July 2011, and the programme has since then followed the Revised Result Framework (RRF). The Mid-term Review was conducted in February 2012 with the final report on April 6, 2012. Now that the project enters its last 6 months of implementation, it is imperative to assess achievements and constraints to date and draw conclusions of project effectiveness, identify lessons learned and best practices, which will feed into the design of future interventions and/or strategic plans of GoB, UN agencies, and other partners. The commissioner of the evaluation is therefore seeking for high-qualified consultants to lead the final evaluation of this joint programme.

To supplement this evaluation, a formative study covering 9 indicators of the JP VAW programme was completed in July 2012. The study was meant to be a baseline study but due to its delay, it is considered to be a status update. The end line study of this project is planned to start from February 2013, followed by the final evaluation. Apart from this, ILO conducted a baseline survey in four selected sectors and a situation analysis of female migrants and domestic workers. UNWOMEN conducted a study on sexual harassment at tertiary level educational institutions, and UNESCO conducted an impact evaluation of its interventions. Apart from the studies / researches conducted under JP VAW, there are also some relevant national surveys such as Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics Gender Based Violence Survey 2011. The JP VAW decided not to include household survey collecting prevalence data in the above mentioned formative study due to time constraints and in order to avoid duplication as BBS 2011 data could be used to provide baseline values for some of the impact level indicators.

2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The final evaluation will focus on measuring development results generated by the JP VAW, based on the scope and criteria included in this term of reference.

The unit of analysis or object of study for this evaluation is the JP VAW, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs which were detailed in the JP VAW programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation.

This final evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

1. Measure to what extent the JP VAW has contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase.
2. Measure the JP VAW's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised, and measure the interrelationship and dynamics of the multi partner efforts.
3. Measure to what extent the JP VAW has attained development results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants whether individuals, communities, institutions, etc, and consider individual partner contribution.
4. Identify and document substantive lessons learned, good practices and also opportunities for scaling up of the JP VAW in Bangladesh.
5. Measure how the development results addresses Bangladesh context and the commitments of Bangladesh, as well as the lead agency role of UNFPA
6. Measure the joint programme contribution to the objectives set in their respective specific thematic windows as well as the overall MDG fund objectives at local and national level. (MDGs, Paris Declaration and Accra Principles and UN reform).

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS OF ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the programme.

Design level:

- **Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and the Millennium Development Goals.**
 - a) To what extent was the design and strategy of the development intervention relevant (assess including link to MDGs, UNDAF and national priorities, stakeholder participation, national ownership design process)?
 - b) How much and in what ways did the JP VAW contribute to solve the (socio-economical) needs and problems identified in the design phase?
 - c) To what extent was this programme designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated jointly? (see MDG-F joint programme guidelines.)
 - d) To what extent was JP VAW the best option to respond to development challenges stated in the programme document?
 - e) To what extent the implementing partners participating in JP VAW had an added value to solve the development challenges stated in the programme document?
 - f) To what extent did JP VAW has a useful and reliable M&E strategy that contributed to measure development results?
 - g) To what extent did this programme has a useful and reliable communication & advocacy strategy?

- h) If the programme was revised, did it reflect the changes that were needed? Did the JP follow the mid-term evaluation recommendations on the programme design?

Process level

- **Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results.**
 - a) To what extent did JP VAW management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) was efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
 - b) To what extent was the implementation of JP VAW intervention (group of agencies) more efficient in comparison to what could have been through a single agency's intervention?
 - c) To what extent the governance of the fund at programme level (PMC) and at national level (NSC) contributed to efficiency and effectiveness of JP VAW? To what extent these governance structures were useful for development purposes, ownership, for working together as one? Did they enable management and delivery of outputs and results?
 - d) To what extent and in what ways did JP VAW increase or reduce efficiency in delivering outputs and attaining outcomes?
 - e) What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices have the implementing partners used to increase efficiency in delivering as one?
 - f) What was the progress of the JP VAW in financial terms, indicating amounts committed and disbursed (total amounts & as percentage of total) by agency? Where there are large discrepancies between agencies, these should be analyzed.
 - g) What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did JP VAW face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?
 - h) To what extent and in what ways did the mid-term evaluation have an impact on JP VAW? Was it useful? Did this programme implement the improvement plan?

- **Ownership in the process: Effective exercise of leadership by the country's national/local partners in development interventions**
 - a) To what extent did the targeted population, citizens, participants, local and national authorities made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation (leadership) have driven the process?
 - b) To what extent and in what ways has ownership or the lack of it, impacted in the efficiency and effectiveness of JP VAW?

Results level

- **Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved.**
 - a) To what extent did JP VAW contribute to the attainment of the development outputs and outcomes initially expected /stipulated in the programme document? (detailed analysis of: 1) planned activities and outputs, 2) achievement of results).
 - b) To what extent and in what ways did this JP VAW contribute?
 1. To the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels?
 2. To the goals set in the thematic window (gender equality and women's empowerment)?
 3. To the Paris Declaration, in particular the principle of national ownership? (Consider JP's policy, budgets, design, and implementation)
 4. To the goals of delivering as one at country level?
 - c) To what extent were JP VAW's outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to produce development results? What kinds of results were reached?
 - d) To what extent did JP VAW had an impact on the targeted citizens?
 - e) Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.
 - f) What type of differentiated effects are resulting from JP VAW in accordance with the sex, race, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population, and to what extent?
 - g) To what extent has this JP VAW contributed to the advancement and the progress of fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policies, UNDAF, etc.)
 - h) To what extent did JP VAW help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement on development issues and policies?
 - i) To what extent and in what ways did the mid-term evaluation recommendations contribute to the JP's achievement of development results?

- **Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.**
 - a) To what extent JP VAW decision making bodies and implementing partners have undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the joint programme?
 - b) At local and national level:
 1. To what extent did national and/or local institutions support JP VAW?
 2. Did these institutions show technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme or to scale it up?
 3. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?
 4. Did the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme?

- c) To what extent will JP VAW be replicable or scaled up at national or local levels?
- d) To what extent did JP VAW align itself with the National Development Strategies and/or the UNDAF?

5. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The methodological approach of the study is based on the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs which were detailed in the JP VAW programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation. The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the inception report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

The methodology of the final evaluation will consist of three different phases:

- a) Desk review:
An initial desk review phase in order to become familiar with the program, its objectives, the challenges and context, and prepare an inception report with the theory of change to be presented and agreed with UN RC and UNFPA Bangladesh.
- b) In-country visit
A second phase consists of an in-country mission taking place in project sites. The in-country visit includes an inception meeting, first hand observation, interviews and discussion groups with key staff, national counterparts, partners and beneficiaries.
- c) Preliminary report and validation process for final report
A preliminary report will be shared with the JP VAW team for validation. A final report will be drafted which will take into consideration observations, corrections and suggestions made to the preliminary report.

6. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The consultant is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the commissioner and the manager of the evaluation:

- **Inception Report** (to be submitted within 10 days of the submission of all programme documentation to the evaluation team).

This report will be 10 to 15 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. This report will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the consultant and the evaluation managers. **The report will follow the outline stated in Annex 1.**

- **Draft Final Report** (to be submitted within 10 days after the completion of the field visit)

The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 20 to 30 pages in length. This report will be shared among the evaluation reference group. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 2 pages that includes a brief description of JP VAW, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The draft final report will be shared with the evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions. This report will contain the same sections as the final report, described below.

- **Final Evaluation Report** (to be submitted within 05 days after reception of the draft final report with comments)

The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than 2 pages that includes a brief description of JP VAW, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group. **This report will contain the sections establish in Annex 2.**

7. EVALUATION REPORT QUALITY STANDARDS

The following UNEG standards should be taken into account when writing all evaluation reports¹:

1. The **final report should be logically structured, containing evidence-based findings**, conclusions, lessons and recommendations and should be free of information that is not relevant to the overall analysis (S-3.16).

NOTE: Using evidence implies making a statement based on valid and reliable facts, documents, surveys, triangulation of informants' views or any other appropriate means or techniques that contribute to create the internal validity of the evaluation. It is not enough to just state an informed opinion or reproduce an informant's take on a specific issue.

2. **A reader of an evaluation report must be able to understand:** the purpose of the evaluation; exactly what was evaluated; how the evaluation was designed and conducted; what evidence was found; what conclusions were drawn; what recommendations were made; what lessons were distilled. (S-3.16)
3. In all cases, evaluators should strive to **present results as clearly and simply as possible** so that clients and other stakeholders can easily understand the evaluation process and results.(S-3.16)
4. **The level of participation of stakeholders in the evaluation** should be described, including the rationale for selecting that particular level. (S-4.10)
5. **The Executive Summary should "stand alone"**, providing a synopsis of the substantive elements of the evaluation. The level of information should provide the uninitiated reader with a clear understanding of what was found and recommended and what was learned from the evaluation. (see Outline in Annex 2 for more details). (S-4.2)
6. **The JP VAW being evaluated should be clearly described** (as short as possible while ensuring that all pertinent information is provided). It should include the purpose, logic model, expected results chain and intended impact, its implementation strategy and key

assumptions. Additional important elements include: the importance, scope and scale of JP VAW; a description of the recipients/ intended beneficiaries and stakeholders; and budget figures. (S-4.3)

7. The role **and contributions of the UN organizations and other stakeholders to JP VAW** being evaluated should be clearly described (who is involved, roles and contributions, participation, leadership). (S-4.4)

¹ See UNEG Guidance Document “Standards for Evaluation in the UN System”, UNEG/FN/Standards(2005).
http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22

8. **In presenting the findings, inputs, outputs, and outcomes/ impacts should be measured to the extent possible (or an appropriate rationale given as to why not).** The report should make a logical distinction in the **findings, showing the progression from implementation to results with an appropriate measurement** (use benchmarks when available) and analysis of the results chain (and unintended effects), or a rationale as to why an analysis of results was not provided. Findings regarding inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from outputs, outcomes. (S-4.12)
9. Additionally, reports should **not segregate findings by data source.** (S-4.12)
10. **Conclusions need to be substantiated by findings** consistent with data collected and methodology, and represent insights into identification and/ or solutions of important problems or issues. (S-4.15)
11. **Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis,** be relevant and realistic, with priorities for action made clear. (S-4.16)
12. **Lessons, when presented, should be generalized beyond the immediate subject being evaluated** to indicate what wider relevance they might have. (S-4.17)

8. KEY ROLES AND RESPONSABILITIES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

There will be 3 main actors involved in the implementation of MDG-F final evaluations:

1. The **Resident Coordinator Office as commissioner** of the final evaluation will have the following functions:
 - Lead the evaluation process throughout the 3 main phases of a final evaluation (design, implementation and dissemination);
 - Convene the evaluation reference group;
 - Lead the finalization of the evaluation ToR;
 - Coordinate the selection and recruitment of the evaluation team by making sure the lead agency undertakes the necessary procurement processes and contractual arrangements required to hire the evaluation team;
 - Ensure the evaluation products meet quality standards (in collaboration with the MDG-F Secretariat);
 - Provide clear specific advice and support to the evaluation manager and the evaluation team throughout the whole evaluation process;
 - Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to

the evaluation;

- Take responsibility for disseminating and learning across evaluations on the various joint programme areas as well as the liaison with the National Steering Committee;
- Safeguard the independence of the exercise, including the selection of the evaluation team.

2. The programme coordinator as evaluation manager will have the following functions:

- Contribute to the finalization of the evaluation TOR;
- Provide executive and coordination support to the reference group;
- Provide the evaluators with administrative support and required data;
- Liaise with and respond to the commissioners of evaluation;
- Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation;
- Review the inception report and the draft evaluation report(s);
- Ensure that adequate funding and human resources are allocated for the evaluation.

3. The Programme Management Committee will function as the evaluation reference group.

This group will comprise the representatives of the major stakeholders of JPVAW and will:

- Review the draft evaluation report and ensure final draft meets the required quality standards;
- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design;
- Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation;
- Providing input and participating in finalizing the evaluation Terms of Reference;
- Facilitating the evaluation team's access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods;
- Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation the quality of the process and the products;
- Disseminating the results of the evaluation.

4. The MDG-F Secretariat will function as a quality assurance member of the evaluation, in cooperation with the commissioner of the evaluation, and will have the following functions:

- Review and provide advice on the quality the evaluation process as well as on the evaluation products (comments and suggestions on the adapted TOR, draft reports, final report of the evaluation) and options for improvement.

5. The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation study by:

- Fulfilling the contractual arrangements in line with the TOR, UNEG/OECD norms and standards and ethical guidelines; this includes developing an evaluation matrix as part of the inception report, drafting reports, and briefing the commissioner and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations, as needed

9. EVALUATION PROCESS: TIMELINE (expected during May- June 2013)

Evaluation Phase	Activities	Who	# of working days (approx)	Date (deadline)
Design	Review of the documents, project reports, coordination workshop reports, mid- term evaluation report's recommendations and improvement plan, sustainability plan, work plans, RTTPs, the baseline study reports and end line study reports	Team leader	10 days	16 May 2013
Design	Inception report describing the methodology and process of the final evaluation	Team Leader	10 days	16 May 2013 19 May 2013 (Presentation)
Conduct Final Evaluation	Conduct field visit in the project sites, conduct interview and discussion sessions with the project beneficiaries, stakeholders, project directors and UN focal points	Team Leader and evaluation Assistant	15 days	6 June 2013
Draft Report	Prepare draft report and share with RCO	Team Leader	15 days	13 June 2013
Dissemination	Dissemination of the Draft Final Evaluation Report	Team Leader	0.5 day	20 June 2013
Finalize Report	Submit Final Report	Team leader	5 days	27 June 2013

Duration of consultancy: 1 May 2013 – 27 June 2013 (in-country assignment for an Team Leader (international consultant): 19 May 2013 – 20 June 2013) (To be finalized later)

* (CE) Commissioner of the evaluation ** (ERG) Evaluation Reference group *** (EM) Evaluation manager

**** (ET) Evaluation team ***** (MDG-FS) MDG-F Secretariat ^ (NSC) National Steering Committee

10. USE AND UTILITY OF THE EVALUATION

Final evaluations are summative exercises that are oriented to gather data and information to measure the extent to which development results have been attained. However, the utility of the evaluation process and products should go far beyond what was said by programme stakeholders during the field visit or what the evaluation team wrote in the evaluation report.

The momentum created by the evaluations process (meetings with government, donors, beneficiaries, civil society, etc.) it's the ideal opportunity to set an agenda for the future of the programme or some of their components (sustainability). It is also excellent platforms to communicate lessons learnt and convey key messages on good practices, share products that can be replicated or scaled-up at the country and international level.

The commissioner of the evaluation, the reference group, the evaluation manager and any other stakeholder relevant for JP VAW will jointly design and implement a complete plan of dissemination of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations with the aim of advocating for sustainability, replicability, scaling-up, or sharing good practices and lessons learnt at local, national or/and international level.

11. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION

The final evaluation of JP VAW is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the consultant and the heads of JP VAW in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.
- **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence.** The consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the Secretariat of the MDGF. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat of the MDGF in these terms of reference.
- **Validation of information.** The consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.

- **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

12. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE CONSULTANT/TEAM OF CONSULTANTS

The Consultants should have expertise in the following areas:

- The evaluator should have at least 10 years of recognized expertise in conducting or managing evaluations, research or review of development programmes, and experience as main writer of an evaluation report.
- Minimum five years of technical and practical experience in assessing gender and VAW related programme
- Research design and implementation expertise in the area of Gender and VAW
- Previous UN work experience of minimum 5 years.
- Advanced communication skills
- Fluency in English

In the case of hiring more than one evaluator, one consultant should be experienced in the sector or technical areas addressed by the evaluation, or have a sound knowledge of the subject to be evaluated. The other should be an evaluation specialist and be experienced in using the specific evaluation methodologies that will be employed for that evaluation. (UNEG S3.13)

13. DISSEMINATION AND COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

The consulting team will present the key findings at a dissemination event to stakeholders within the country. A PowerPoint presentation will be submitted as part of the deliverables from the programme.

² See UNEG Guidance Document “Standards for Evaluation in the UN System”, UNEG/FN/Standards (2005). http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22

14. ANNEXES

ANNEX I: INCEPTION REPORT OUTLINE

1. Introduction
2. Background to the evaluation: objectives and overall approach
3. Identification of main units and dimensions for analysis and possible areas for research
4. Main substantive and financial achievements of the joint programme
5. Methodology for the compilation and analysis of the information
6. Criteria to define the mission agenda, including “field visits”

ANNEX II: DRAFT & FINAL REPORT OUTLINE

- **Cover Page**
Including JP title, thematic window, report date, name of the evaluator/s.
 - **Table of contents**
Including page references for all chapters & annexes.
 - **Acronyms page**
 - **Executive Summary**
No more than 2 pages. Summarize substantive elements of the report, including a brief description of JP VAW, purpose and objectives of the evaluation, evaluation methodological approach, key findings and conclusions, main recommendations.
1. **Introduction**
Explain why the evaluation is being conducted, including the following content:
 - **Background**
MDG-F, thematic window, joint programme.
 - **Purpose, Goals and Methodology of Evaluation:**
Purpose and goal of the evaluation, methodologies used (including evaluation criteria, scope), constraints and limitations on the study conducted.
 - **Description of the development intervention**
Provide sufficient detail on JP VAW so that the readers of the report can easily understand the analysis done in the next chapter.
 - **Context**
Social, political, economic, institutional factors that affects the JP.)
 - **JP description**
Title, timeframe, intervention logic, objectives, intended outcomes/outputs, scale of the intervention, total resources, geographic location, etc.)
 2. **Levels of Analysis**
This section should be evidence based, guided by the evaluation criteria and questions.
 - **Design | Relevance**
Include a description of the initial concept and subsequent revisions, and all pertinent information for the reader to clearly understand the analysis done in this section. Assess the design relevance and address all evaluation questions (including link to MDGs, UNDAF and

national priorities, stakeholder participation, national ownership design process, M&E framework and communications strategy and implementation of mid-term evaluation recommendations).

- **Process | Efficiency, Ownership**

Include a description of the JP's governance structure, coordination mechanisms, administrative procedures, implementation modalities, UN coordination, national ownership in the process and all pertinent information to clearly understand the analysis done in this section. Address all evaluation questions (including JP's level of financial progress and implementation of mid-term evaluation recommendations).

- **Results | Effectiveness, Sustainability**

Assess the level of attainment of the development results compared to what was initially expected. Show progression of implementation with an appropriate measure and analysis of the results chain (organized by outcome, and distinguishing findings on completion of activities and outputs from outcomes). If some of this analysis is not included, explain why it is not. Also, include an analysis of the effect of the mid-term evaluation on the JP's results achievement. For sustainability, please mention availability of financial resources and examples of or evidence for replicability and scale up of JP. Address all evaluation questions.

3. Conclusions

4. Lessons Learned

Define the scope of each lesson (joint programme, national policy, local intervention, etc.)

5. Recommendations

Prioritized, structured and clear. The scope and relevant stakeholder should be clearly defined for each recommendation.

6. Annexes

ANNEX III: DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED

MDG-F Context

- MDGF Framework Document
- Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
- General thematic indicators
- M&E strategy
- Communication and Advocacy Strategy
- MDG-F Joint Implementation Guidelines

JP VAW Documents

- JP VAW Document: results framework and monitoring and evaluation framework
- Mission reports from the Secretariat
- Quarterly reports
- Monitoring reports
- Biannual monitoring reports
- Annual reports
- Coordination workshop reports
- Annual work plan
- PMC and NSC meeting minutes

- Outcome groups meeting minutes
- Advocacy & communication strategy
- Financial information

Other in-country documents or information

- Evaluations, assessments or internal reports conducted from JP VAW
- Baseline and impact assessment conducted by JP VAW implementing ministries
- MTE final report, improvement plan and sustainability plan
- Relevant documents or reports on the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels
- Relevant documents or reports on the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action in the country
- Relevant documents or reports on One UN, Delivering as One

Annex 1: Summary of programme interventions

UN Agency/ Ministry	Major interventions	Targeted participants	Intervention districts (geographical scope)	Financial resource/budget	GoB	Other stakeholders
UNFPA	Institutional capacity strengthening in providing service for survivors	Victims of domestic violence, street based sex workers, religious leaders and religious educated women, members of youth and sports clubs, community people	Dinajpur, Rangpur, Kurigram, Bogra, Mymensingh, Sylhet, Rajshahi, Natore, Kushtia, Dhaka, Faridpur, Brahmanbaria, Comilla, Jessore, Gopalganj, Barisal, Khulna, Noakhali, Chittagong, Cox's Bazar, Bhola = 21	4,889,867	Ministry of Information Ministry of Social Welfare Ministry of Youth and Sports Ministry of Women and Children Affairs Ministry of Religious Affairs	Men Engage Network; ICDDR,B; Partners for Prevention
UNDP	Provide capacity development training to Union Parishad and other stakeholders	Women Crew members, Women Development Forum members, Union Facilitation Team members	Sirajganj, Habiganj, Narsingdi, Barguna, Feni, Satkhira = 6	385,200	Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives (Local Government Division)	BRAC
UNICEF	Established Women Friendly Hospital Initiative	Treatment for the victims of domestic violence and provision of legal support	Nilphamari, Thakurgaon, Gaibandha, Jamalpur, Narail, Moulvibazar = 6	321,000	Ministry of Health and Family Welfare	Naripakkha
UNWOMEN	Orientation on CEDAW, develop CEDAW bench book, National consultation on CEDAW and capacity development	GoB officials, CSOs	Rangpur, Rajshahi, Sylhet, Gazipur, Dhaka, Faridpur, Chittagong, Barisal = 8	590,212	Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs Ministry of Expatriates Welfare and Overseas	BRAC; Bangladesh Debate Federation; STEPs towards Development

UN Agency/ Ministry	Major interventions	Targeted participants	Intervention districts (geographical scope)	Financial resource/budget	GoB	Other stakeholders
	of GoB officials				Employment	
UNESCO	Mainstreaming gender in lower secondary, secondary & higher secondary school curricula & text books and teacher education curricula	Students and teachers	64 districts	262,150	Ministry of Education	
UNAIDS	Form a national network of 29 groups of sex workers, provide training and IGA support, capacity development interventions for the MPs and students	PLHIV women, sex workers network, Parliamentarians and students of Mass Communication Department	Sylhet, Dhaka, Chittagong, Khulna = 4	337,050		Sex Workers Network of Bangladesh; Network of people living with HIV in Bangladesh
WHO	Conduct research on VAW, public perception survey	Nurses and doctors	Dhaka = 1	171,200	Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (GNSPU)	Dhaka University
IOM	Needs assessment for female migrant workers, provide orientation for the migrant workers,	Migrant workers, Judges	Rajshahi, Bogra, Tangail, Manikganj, Comilla, Jessore, Chittagong, Faridpur, Dhaka = 9	569,899	Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs Ministry of Expatriates' Welfare and oversea	Dhaka Ahsania Mission; Thengamara Mohila Sabuj Sangha; Association for Community

UN Agency/ Ministry	Major interventions	Targeted participants	Intervention districts (geographical scope)	Financial resource/budget	GoB	Other stakeholders
	Training on VAW for judges				Employment	Development
ILO	ILO code of practice adapted and submitted for adoption	Bangladesh Employers Federation, NCCWE, NGOs	Rangpur, Bogra, Rajshahi, Natore, Mymensingh, Gazipur, Narsingdi, Jessore, Barisal, Madaripur, Narayanganj, Chittagong = 12	470,800	Ministry of Labor and Employment	National Coordination Committee for Worker's Education; Bangladesh National Women's Lawyers' Association; BRAC