

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**For the Evaluation of the UN Joint Programme to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia (UNJP)**

**Country: Georgia**

**Project name: UN Joint Programme to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia (UNJP)**

**Duty Station: Tbilisi, Georgia**

**Starting Date: September 15, 2014**

**Duration of Contract: 17 weeks, 15 September – 10 January 2015**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

With the support of the Swedish Government, the UN Joint Programme to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia (hereinafter the “UNJP”) is being implemented by UNDP, UN Women and UNFPA for 36 months, starting from December 2011. The overall goal of the UNJP is to promote gender equality and women’s empowerment through strengthening capacities in the government, civil society, and communities.

The Joint Programme directly supports further realization of the women’s rights and gender equality commitments undertaken by Georgia at international as well as national levels and upscales results achieved by the country with the support of the international community, including UN agencies, in the area of gender equality and women’s empowerment through innovative initiatives. Furthermore, it contributes and responds to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF’s) stated goals on enhanced protection and promotion of human rights, access to justice and gender equality and of improved access to quality health, education, legal aid, justice and other essential social services.[[1]](#footnote-1)[1] The UNJP is directly linked to national priorities and it closely follows and derives from the aims, objectives and priorities of the Gender Equality National Action Plans (2011-2013) and (2014-2016) and Domestic Violence National Action Plans (2011-2012) and (2013-2015). The UNJP adopts an integrated approach by simultaneously targeting three interrelated levels:

* **Policy and decision-making**
* **National** **and local institutions**
* **Work with civil society and grassroots communities**

In the frameworks of the current Programme, UNJP plans to undertake the Joint Programme’s external joint evaluation as provided in the Programme Document. Basic information on the Programme and documents can be found on the following website: <http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/JGE00>.

The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess the progress made towards the achievement of the overall goal and respective outcomes, including of expected and achieved accomplishments, examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality, in order to understand achievements or the lack thereof. The evaluation also aims to gather lessons learned to provide recommendations and identify best practices that focus on key components to guide future joint programming of UNDP, UN Women, and UNFPA in the area of enhancing gender equality.

The main users of the evaluation include the UN agencies involved in the UNJP (UNDP, UN Women, and UNFPA), UNJP Steering Committee[[2]](#footnote-2), Swedish Government, the Government of Georgia and civil society organizations.

The findings of the evaluation reports will be reviewed jointly by UNDP, UN Women and UNFPA, and UNJP donor – Swedish Government, as well as relevant national stakeholders and partners to ensure that UNJP implementation responds to the set outcomes and objectives. The evaluation, including its recommendations will be used as a resource to inform future programming and direction, including the design of the second phase of this joint Programme or new projects as relevant.

1. **CONTEXT**

The Joint Programme is fully aligned with the priorities of the Millennium Development Goals, Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), Beijing Platform for Action, and International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo and is in full compliance with national priorities in the area of gender equality and women’s empowerment as spelled out in the following: *Gender Equality Law of Georgia* of 2010*,* *Law of Georgia on Elimination of Domestic Violence, Protection of Victims of Domestic Violence and their Assistance* (hereafter the DV Law) of 2006, *National Action Plans Gender Equality* (2011-13 and 2014-16) and *National Action Plans on Domestic Violence* (2011-12 and 2013-15).

The overall goal of the UNJP is planned to be achieved by realization of the following outcomes:

1. Enhanced women’s political and economic empowerment;
2. Creating an enabling environment to eliminate violence against women, especially domestic violence (DV);
3. Gender Equality advanced by creating enabling environment to realize Sexual and Reproductive Rights of population;

The UNJP adopts an integrated approach by simultaneously targeting three interrelated levels:

* **Policy and decision-making level:** advocating for the streamlining of national legislation and policies related to gender equality, recommending improvements and supporting an informed dialogue among policy-makers, executives, women’s rights and gender equality advocates and communities at grassroots level;
* **National** **and local institutions:** enhancing the capacities of national and local governments for planning and implementing gender sensitive policies and actions;
* **Work with civil society and communities at grassroots level:** strengthening their capacity and awareness of the need to address the issue of gender equality and women’s empowerment.
1. **OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess progress made towards the achievement of the overall goal and respective outcomes, including evaluation of achievements, gaps and lessons learned to provide recommendations and identify best practices that focus on key components to guide future programming of UNDP, UN Women and UNFPA in the area of enhancing gender equality.

The specific objectives will be:

* To assess the extent to which UNJP objectives and results are relevant to UN and national development goals and policies;
* To assess the extent to which planned results, including agreed outputs and outcomes have been achieved as a result of UNJP efforts;
* To determine the efficiency of the UNJP in the achieving intended or unintended results in the area of gender equality, elimination of violence against women and realization of SRH&R;
* To assess the overall sustainability of UNJP results, including the level of national ownership, national capacity development, partnership between the implementing UN agencies and national partners, as well as sustainability aspects in UNJP design and strategy;
* To assess the extent to which the UNJP created synergies within the UN system and with the government and civil society stakeholders that contribute to gender mainstreaming in UN efforts at the national level.

The geographic scope of the evaluation will cover Tbilisi and Kutaisi, as well as Kakheti and Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti Regions reflecting the geographic coverage of the UNJP.

1. **EVALUATION CRITERIA AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

The key importance throughout the evaluation is the assessment of the design and quality of the Joint Programme.

The evaluation will use the following criteria:

**Relevance:** of the planning, design and implementation processes of the UNJP to international and national commitments, policies and priorities in the area of gender equality, elimination of violence against women, in particular domestic violence and realization of SRH&R.

Efficiency: the extent to which the UNJP outputs and outcomes have been achieved with the appropriate resources (funds, time, expertise, administrative cost an etc.);

**Effectiveness**: a measure of the extent to which the UNJP has achieved its outputs and the extent to which these outputs have contributed to the achievement of the outcomes;

**Sustainability**: an assessment of the likelihood that the project results will endure after the active involvement of the UNJP has ended. To what extent the changes (and benefits) brought by the UNJP funded initiatives can be expected to last after projects completion;

**Coordination**: the extent of synergies among UNJP implementing UN agencies, coordination with the UNCT and broader stakeholders in the area of gender equality;

**Added value**: the extent to which UNJP adds benefits to the results from other development actors interventions.

The study will answer the following questions:

**Relevance** of the planning, design and implementation processes of the UNJP to international and national commitments, policies and priorities in the area of gender equality, elimination of violence against women and realization of SRH&R

* To what extent has the UNJP conceptualized, planned and designed jointly to respond to the international, regional and national commitments on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment; to establish coherence and capitalize on the comparative advantages of participating UN agencies?
* Is there synergy or complementarity between the development actors in Georgia regarding gender equality?
* What is the UNJP’s overall relevance for future programming purposes?

**Effectiveness** - a measure of the extent to which the UNJP has achieved its outputs and the extent to which these outputs have contributed to the achievement of outcomes;

* Has the UNJP achieved its objectives and how did the UNJP inputs and activities lead to output and outcomes?
* What were the constraining and facilitating factors and how far did the changing environment affect the achievement of the results?
* Has the partnership strategy utilized by the UNJP been appropriate and effective?
* What is the influence of the specific country context and circumstances on the achievement of UNJP results and operational effectives?
* To what extent have been the key objectives of the UNJP been attained?

**Efficiency** - the extent to which the UNJP outputs and outcomes have been achieved with the appropriate resources (funds, time, expertise, administrative cost an etc.);

* Has the UNJP led to improved efficiency in the management of resources and what has been the relationship between increased/decreased efficiency and UNJP’s results?

**Sustainability** - an assessment of the likelihood that the project results will endure after the active involvement of the UNJP has ended. To what extent the changes (and benefits) brought by the UNJP funded initiatives can be expected to last after projects completion;

* Is the project likely to have lasting results after its entire implementation and how can these results translate into future programming?
* Has the UNJP strengthened national ownership through the participation and inclusion of national governments and civil society groups in their Programming process and what were the related challenges and opportunities?

**Coordination**: the extent of synergies among UNJP implementing UN agencies, coordination with the UNCT and broader stakeholders in the area of gender equality;

* To what extent and how has the UNJP led to complementary and synergistic effects on broader UN efforts to achieve GE/WE (e.g. enhanced collaboration and coordination among UNCT, improved UN programming on GE/WE, etc.)?
* What are the key contributions and added value in terms of short and long term, intended and unintended, positive and negative results achieved by the UNJP to date?

**Added Value:** the extent to which UNJP adds benefits to the results from other development actors interventions.

* What are the main comparative strengths of the UNJP? Are these strengths a result of UNJP corporate features or are they specific to the separate UN (UNDP, UN Women, UNFPA) agency feature?
* To what extent would the results observed within the UNJP have been achieved without UNJP implementation?
* What is the main added value in the country context as perceived by the national stakeholders and/or partners?
1. **METHODOLOGY**

The methodology should use a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods that are appropriate to address the main evaluation questions. These methods should be applied with respect of human rights and gender equality, and facilitate the engagement of key stakeholders. The key components of the evaluation will include desk review, interviews, site visits, focus groups, and analysis of the information.

The evaluation will draw from different sources:

1. A comprehensive desk review of relevant background documents on the Joint Programme, including their sub-project documents and other relevant documents and reports;
2. Selected existing monitoring reports of UNJP supported projects;
3. Interviews with relevant UNDP, UN Women and UNFPA employees, NGOs, and other partners and stakeholders, including representatives of the national and local government, parliament and donors and UNJP beneficiaries on grassroots’ level;
4. Site visits to the UNJP supported activities.

The methodology should allow for the assessment of the range of potential effects of activities, including those related to capacity development, empowerment of national stakeholders, potential intangible effects and the added value of working “jointly”. The methodology should explicitly outline how it will integrate a human rights based approach and explore the possibility of utilizing participatory methods. Data should be disaggregated by sex and according to other relevant parameters.

The evaluation will follow UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN system and abide by UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct and any other relevant ethical codes. (<http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>).[[3]](#footnote-3)

**Validation Mechanisms**

A variety of methods should be used to ensure validity of the data collected. Besides the systematic triangulation of data sources and data collection methods and tools, where possible, the validation of data will be sought through regular exchange with the internal reference group.

**Stakeholders’ participation**

The evaluation should adopt an inclusive approach, involving a broad range of partners and stakeholders. The evaluation team should perform a stakeholders mapping in order to identify UNJP direct and indirect partners. These stakeholders may include representatives from the government, civil society organizations, UN organizations, other multilateral organizations, bilateral donors and most importantly grassroots communities – the beneficiaries of the UNJP.

1. **EVALUATION PROCESS**

The evaluation will unfold in three phases, each of them including several steps.

1. **Design phase**

This phase will include:

* a desk review of all of relevant background documents on the Joint Programme, including their sub-project documents and other relevant documents and reports; Also, the publications and knowledge products produced in the framework of the UNJP
* stakeholder mapping – the evaluation team will prepare a mapping of stakeholders relevant to the evaluation. The mapping exercise will include state and civil-society stakeholders and will indicate the relationships between different sets of stakeholders;
* an analysis of the intervention logic of the UNJP, - i.e., the theory of change meant to lead from planned activities to the intended results of the Programme;
* the finalization of the list of evaluation questions;
* development of a data collection in the context of possible scarcity of data and analysis strategy as well as a concrete work plan for the field phase.

At the end of the design phase, the evaluation team will produce an **inception report**, covering the results of the above-listed steps and tasks, inception report to be validated by the internal reference group.

1. **Field phase**

After the design phase, the evaluation team will undertake a two to three week in-country mission to collect and analyze the data required in order to answer the evaluation questions, final list consolidated at the design phase.

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team will provide UNJP with a debriefing presentation on the preliminary results of the evaluation, with a view to validating preliminary findings and testing tentative conclusions and/or recommendations.

1. **Synthesis phase**

During this phase, the evaluation team will continue the analytical work initiated during the field phase and prepare a first draft of the evaluation report, taking into account comments made by the UNDP, UN Women and UNFPA programme staff at the debriefing meeting. Comments made by the UNDP, UN Women and UNFPA programme staff and consolidated by the UNDP will then allow the evaluation team to prepare the final report, which should be validated by internal reference group prior to presenting to the external reference group.

1. **EVALUATION DELIVERABLES**

The key products expected for the evaluation are:

* + - 1. ***Inception report****: stakeholder mapping; evaluation matrix the evaluation matrix (including the final list of evaluation questions and indicators) ; the overall evaluation design and methodology, with a detailed description of the data collection plan for the field phase;*
			2. ***A debriefing presentation document*** *(Power Point) synthesizing the main preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation, to be presented and discussed with the CO during the debriefing meeting foreseen at the end of the field phase;*

***A draft final evaluation report*** *(potentially followed by a second draft, taking into account potential comments from UNDP, UN Women and UNFPA staff);*

* + - 1. ***Final report****, based on comments UNDP, UN Women and UNFPA staff at the debriefing meeting.*

For quality assurance, all deliverables will be approved by the UNDP Assistant Resident Representative, UN Women National Programme Officer and UNFPA National Programme Officer. Pending this approval, payments will be made accordingly.

1. **MANAGEMENT**

The contractor will work under direct supervision of the UNDP Assistant Resident Representative, UN Women National Programme Officer and UNFPA National Programme Officer. The administrative manager of the Evaluation will be UNDP Assistant Resident Representative.

The UNJP staff will serve as the internal reference group during the implementation of the Evaluation. The external reference group for finalizing the evaluation report will consist of the members of the Gender Equality Council of the Parliament, representatives of the donor, partner CSOs and Public Defenders Office.

1. **TIMEFRAME**

It is expected that the evaluation will be conducted over a period of 19 weeks, with the final report completed by 20 November, 2014.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Phases** | **Dates** |
| 1.2.3.  | **Inception Phase*** A Desk Review
* Stakeholder mapping
* An Analysis of the interventional logic of the UNJP

**Field Phase*** Two to three week in-country mission
* A debriefing presentation prepared

**Synthesis Phase*** Draft final evaluation report
* Final report
 | **September 2014****October2014****October 2014** **November 2014****January 2015** |

Company shall present a detailed workplan timeframe of all activities with the relevant resource allocations.

1. **REQUIREMENTS**

**Minimum requirements for the Organization:**

1. At least 5 years of past international experience in the field of monitoring and evaluation of projects preferably in the area of women’s rights and gender equality;
2. Demonstrated experience of the organization to produce high quality monitoring and evaluation reports (verified by at least one letter of recommendation)
3. Experience of working in Georgia or in a country with the similar political, economic and social situation, preferably with particular focus on women’s rights and gender equality;
4. Experience in working with multiple stakeholders is an asset: governments, civil society, community based organizations, and the UN/multilateral/bilateral institutions.
5. Financial Sustainability of the Organization
6. General Organizational Capacity

The evaluation team should consist of at least four specialists - international gender expert - Team Leader, experienced in evaluation of women’s political and economic empowerment interventions, two more international experts – one with background in domestic violence and the other with background in reproductive health and rights and a local /national gender expert.

**Minimum requirements to Team Leader:**

* Advanced (Masters or Equivalent)university degree in social sciences, gender studies, political science, economics, development studies, or other related field;
* Substantive international (eastern Europe, CIS) experience (at least seven years) in the field of gender equality in the field of women’s political and economic empowerment interventions;
* Three years of international experience in managing monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes;
* Experience in working with the UN/multilateral/bilateral organizations;
* Knowledge of the United Nations system, practices, and procedures, including UNDP, UN Women and UNFPA programme modalities an advantage

**Minimum requirements to Team Members:**

**Senior International Expert:**

* Advanced (Masters or Equivalent) university degree in social sciences, gender studies, political science, Health, development studies, or other related domain;
* Substantive international (eastern Europe, CIS) experience (at least seven years) in the field of gender equality with focus on combatting violence against women and domestic violence;
* Three years of international experience in evaluating projects or Monitoring and evaluation experience

**Senior International Expert:**

* Advanced (Masters or Equivalent) university degree in social sciences, international relations, political science, Health, development studies, or other related domain;
* Substantive international (eastern Europe, CIS) experience (at least seven years) in the field of reproductive health and rights;
* Three years of international experience in evaluating projects or Monitoring and evaluation experience

**Senior Local Expert:**

* University degree in social sciences, gender studies, political science, Health, development studies, or other related domain;
* Experience (at least five years) in the field of gender equality; Three years of experience in evaluating projects or monitoring and evaluation experience
1. **SELECTION OF THE EVALUATION COMPANY**

The selection of the evaluation company will be based on the fulfilment of the specifications established in the TOR. The submitted proposals will be assessed on three main categories: the expertise and competencies of the evaluation company and evaluators, as reflected in the company documentation and CVs of the experts; the technical proposal for the specific evaluation. The categories will be assigned different weighting, which will total to 100 %. Technical passing score of 700 (70%) points.

**I. The company and team composition (60%)**

The company and the team’s experience and qualifications meet the criteria indicated in the ToR. The team is gender balanced.

**II. Proposed Methodology (40%):**

1. Evaluation matrix. The matrix clearly addresses the TOR, relating evaluation Questions with evaluation Criteria, with Indicators and with Means of verification.

2. Evaluation approach and methodology. The proposal presents a specific approach and a variety of techniques for gathering and analysing qualitative and quantitative data that are feasible and applicable in the timeframe and context of the evaluation, and incorporates human rights and gender equality perspectives.

3. Work plan. The timeframe and resources indicated in the work plan are realistic and useful for the needs of the evaluation.

**Annex 5**

**Technical Proposal Evaluation Form**

|  | **Percent total score** | **Max Points obtainable** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The company and team composition**  | **60%** | **600** |
| **Company Qualification** | 12% | **120** |
| At least 5 years of past international experience in the field of monitoring and evaluation of projects preferably in the area of women’s rights and gender equality; | 3% | 30 |
| Demonstrated experience of the organization to produce high quality monitoring and evaluation reports (verified by at least one letter of recommendation)*Two letters of recommendation – 40**One letter of recommendation - 20* | 4% | 40 |
| Experience of working in Georgia or in a country with the similar political, economic and social situation, preferably with particular focus on women’s rights and gender equality;*Experience in Georgia – 20**Experience in similar country -10* | 2% | 20 |
| Experience in working with multiple stakeholders is an asset: governments, civil society, community based organizations, and the UN/multilateral/bilateral institutions*Demonstrated experience – 20* | 2% | 20 |
| Financial Sustainability of the Company : Latest Audit Report*(For the last 3 years)* | 0.5% | 5 |
| General Organizational Capacity: Business Licenses – Registration PaperTax Payment certificate Detailed bank requisites | 0.5% | 5 |
| **Minimum requirements to Team Leader :** |  | **120** |
| Advanced (Masters or Equivalent)university degree in social sciences, gender studies, political science, economics, development studies, or other related field; ***(min. requirement)***  | 3% | 30 |
| Substantive international (eastern Europe, CIS) experience (at least seven years) in the field of gender equality in the field of women’s political and economic empowerment interventions; ***(min. requirement)***  | 5% | 50 |
| Three years of international experience in managing monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes; ***(min. requirement)***  | 2% | 20 |
| Experience in working with the UN/multilateral/bilateral organizations; ***(min. requirement)*** Experience: 10No Experience: 1  | 1% | 10 |
| Knowledge of the United Nations system, practices, and procedures, including UNDP, UN Women and UNFPA programme modalities an advantage*Experience with UN - 10**No experience -1* | 1% | 10 |
| **Minimum Requirements to Senior International Expert:** |  | **120** |
| Advanced (Masters or Equivalent)university degree in social sciences, gender studies, political science, Health, development studies, or other related domain; ***(min. requirement)***  | 2% | 20 |
| Substantive international (eastern Europe, CIS) experience (at least seven years) in the field of gender equality with focus on combatting violence against women and domestic violence; ***(min. requirement)***  | 5% | 50 |
| Three years of international experience in evaluating projects or Monitoring and evaluation experience ***(min. requirement)***  | 5% | 50 |
| **Minimum Requirements to Senior International Expert:** |  | **120**  |
| Advanced (Masters or Equivalent)university degree in social sciences, gender studies, political science, Health, development studies, or other related domain; ***(min. requirement)***  | 2% | 20 |
| Substantive international (eastern Europe, CIS) experience (at least seven years) in the field of reproductive health and rights; ***(min. requirement)***  | 5% | 50 |
| Three years of international experience in evaluating projects or Monitoring and evaluation experience ***(min. requirement)***  | 5% | 50 |
| **Minimum Requirements to Senior Local Expert:** |  | **120** |
| University degree in social sciences, gender studies, political science, Health, development studies, or other related domain ***(min. requirement)***  | 2% | 20 |
| Experience (at least five years) in the field of gender equality; ***(min. requirement)***  | 5% | 50 |
| Three years of experience in evaluating projects or monitoring and evaluation experience ***(min. requirement)***  | 5% | 50 |
| **Total:**  |  |  |
| **Proposed Methodology:**  | **40%** | **400** |
| Appropriateness of Methodology. The proposal presents a specific approach and a variety of techniques for gathering and analysing qualitative and quantitative data that are feasible and applicable in the timeframe and context of the evaluation, and incorporates human rights and gender equality perspectives.*Fully presents – 200**Fairly presents – 100* | 20% | 200 |
| Does the Company fully understand the task. Is the scope well defined and corresponds to Terms of Reference (TOR)Fully understands - 150Fairly understands - 135 | 15% | 150 |
| Work plan. The timeframe and resources indicated in the work plan are realistic and useful for the needs of the evaluation*Fully useful – 50**Fairly useful - 25* | 5% | 50 |
| **Total**  | **100 %** | **1000** |

1. [1] UNDAF Outcome:1.3 :  vulnerable groups enjoy improved access to quality health, education, legal aid, justice and other essential social services; 2.1: Enhanced protection and promotion of human rights, access to justice and gender equality with particular focus on the rights of minorities, marginalized and vulnerable groups; [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The Steering Committee, co-chaired by the UN Resident Coordinator and the Chair of the Parliamentary Council for Gender Equality, consists of the representatives of senior personnel of all signatories to the Joint Programme document with similar level of decision-making authority, including representatives of the Participating UN Organizations and national coordinating authorities. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Also: UNDP: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#handbook>

UNFPA: <http://www.unfpa.org/public/home/about/Evaluation/Methodology>

UN Women: <http://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2012/10/evaluation-policy-of-the-united-nations-entity-for-gender-equality-and-the-empowerment-of-women> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)