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1 SUMMARY

1. In mid-2018, the IAHE Steering Group chose “Empower and Protect Women and Girls”, one of the core transformations of the Agenda for Humanity, as the focus of its first-ever thematic evaluation. Following extensive consultations with relevant stakeholders and discussions in the IAHE Steering Group, key areas of focus have been identified and the title of the evaluation has been refined to “Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls” (GEEWG). This should ensure the inclusiveness of the evaluation to key gender-related aspects in humanitarian aid and to align the evaluation with established policy and practice.

2. The evaluation will particularly focus on the areas of gender-responsive programming, capacity-building and the participation of women and girls in the design and delivery of humanitarian programs, as well as their adequate inclusion in accountability mechanisms. Secondarily, the evaluation will analyze the collective use of gender strategies and policies by IASC organizations, in particular the IASC Gender Policy, and will consider the adequacy of financial and human resourcing allocated to it.

3. By adopting a case-study approach, the evaluation will provide an in-depth look at challenges associated with gender equality and empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action. The evaluation methodology will include a document review, data analysis, in-person and remote interviews, visits to countries selected as case studies and surveys with affected people and humanitarian aid workers.

4. The evaluation is formative with the aim of strengthening learning and identifying best practices in overcoming challenges associated with working towards gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action. Thus, the evaluation is intended to improve gender-responsive programming and aims to provide its main stakeholders, including policy-makers and practitioners, with evaluative evidence and practical advice to strengthen gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls.

2 BACKGROUND

5. Humanitarian crises worldwide have become more complex and persistent in the past decades and have unequal effects on different people, depending on their gender and other aspects of their social identity. Gender inequalities and differences in power, privilege and opportunity particularly constrain women and girls. While women, girls, men, and boys all suffer in a crisis, women and girls face greater obstacles to reaching their full potential and leading safe, healthy, and dignified lives due to structural gender inequalities. Disasters kill more women than men and hit women’s livelihoods hardest. Sixty per cent of all maternal deaths occur during pregnancy or childbirth in countries with poor or limited access to maternal care.

---

1 IASC Gender Policy
3 Ibid.
deaths take place in humanitarian settings, and all forms of gender-based violence against women and girls spike during disasters and conflict, affecting up to a reported 70 per cent of women in some conflict settings.\(^5\) In natural disasters, women and girls must travel longer distances to collect water, leading to lower school enrollment and risks of violence. Harmful practices, such as domestic violence, child marriage and female genital mutilation, increase during droughts and prolonged dry spells.\(^6\) Nevertheless, women are often the first responders to a crisis and play a central role in the survival and resilience of families and communities. Studies show that when women are included in humanitarian action, this reaps benefits for the entire community. The involvement of local women groups has also been found important to mobilize change and respond to crises.\(^7\)

6. There have been efforts to institutionalize and address empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action and much has been achieved by humanitarian actors. The Agenda for Humanity (AfH) described five core responsibilities, linked to 24 core transformations, that are needed to alleviate suffering, reduce risk and lessen vulnerability on a global scale. Core responsibility 3 of the AfH is “Leave no one behind” and linked to it is core transformation 3D “Empower and Protect Women and Girls”. This core transformation is directly related to Sustainable Development Goal number 5: “Achieve gender equality and empower women and girls”. Following the adoption of the Agenda for Humanity, leaders and stakeholders pledged support to several strategic initiatives during the World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016, to translate the responsibilities and transformations stated in the AfH into meaningful action. They included five core priorities under the overarching theme of “Women and Girls: Catalyzing Action to Achieve Gender Equality”, with references to empowerment, access to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights, gender-based violence, gender-responsive programming and compliance with humanitarian policies, frameworks and other documents related to gender equality, women’s empowerment and women’s rights.\(^8\)

7. Based on a 2015 review of the IASC Gender Equality in Humanitarian Action Policy Statement (2008) and the commitments made under the international agreements mentioned above, the IASC issued the IASC Policy on Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women and Girls in 2017. The Policy is accompanied by an Accountability Framework to track progress and implementation, and should be used alongside the IASC Gender Marker and IASC Gender Handbook, which was revised in 2017. The Accountability Framework focuses on collective actions of the IASC vis-à-vis gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls. While the evaluation will take the IASC Policy and Accountability Framework into consideration, it is not envisioned that the evaluation will measure collective progress against it. The IASC Policy itself is subject to review periodically every 5 years, the next review taking place in December 2022.

8. Based on the abovementioned developments in the humanitarian sector and the adopted policies, a theory of change for strengthening gender equality and empowering women and girls in humanitarian action can be established. Figure 1 presents a preliminary theory of change that should serve as a starting point for this evaluation. Focusing on all aspects of the theory of change equally would not be feasible for this evaluation and the scope and focus will be discussed in more detail in section 6. The evaluation will primarily focus on inputs, processes, and mechanisms that are believed to lead to improved results in regards to gender equality and empowerment of women and girls. Output and outcome results are therefore a secondary focus for this evaluation, since the primary interest is in ‘how’ gender responsive programming can be improved at the agency and collective level. Key assumptions underpinning the ToC will be defined in more detail by the evaluation team during the inception phase.

---

\(^{5}\) Ibid.


\(^{7}\) www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/humanitarian-action/facts-and-figures

\(^{8}\) https://agendaforhumanity.org/core-commitments
9. Several stakeholders are concerned that despite the increasing focus on gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls on the humanitarian agenda, there seems to be a disconnect between the increasing development of policies and strategies, and their successful implementation in the field. In the highly time- and resource-constrained environment of humanitarian operations, gender considerations continue to be secondary and the high potential resulting from empowering and involving women and girls in the design and delivery of humanitarian programs often appears to be overlooked. Various challenges and obstacles seem to prevent policies from being consistently applied and every humanitarian response is situated in a different organizational, social and cultural context, complicating the operationalization of policies even further. Thus, policy-makers as well as practitioners are looking for more practical tools and guidance to strengthen gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action. There is a desire to learn from best practices and to understand enabling factors better. This evaluation aims to provide policy-makers and practitioners with evaluative evidence and practical advice to respond to these challenges and to be able to continuously strengthen gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian programming.

3 INTER-AGENCY HUMANITARIAN EVALUATIONS

10. An Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation (IAHE) is an independent assessment of results of the collective humanitarian response by member organizations of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) to a specific crisis or theme. IAHEs evaluate the extent to which planned collective results have been achieved and how humanitarian reform efforts have contributed to that achievement. IAHEs are not an in-depth evaluation of any one sector or of the performance of a specific organization, and, as such, cannot replace

---

9 The Management Group for this IAHE has undertaken several scoping interviews in preparation for the evaluation. Impressions mentioned in this paragraph were voiced by the interviewed stakeholders.

10 Throughout, the reference to “IASC members” includes standing invitees which, in practice, have the same status as members.
any other form of agency-specific humanitarian evaluation, joint or otherwise, which may be undertaken or required.

11. IAHEs were introduced to strengthen learning and promote accountability towards affected people, national governments, donors and the public. IAHEs are guided by a vision of addressing the most urgent needs of people impacted by crises resulting from coordinated and accountable humanitarian action. IAHEs contribute to both accountability and strategic learning across the humanitarian system, and aim to improve aid effectiveness to ultimately better assist affected people. The dual purpose (accountability and learning) is common to all IAHEs; however, their balance in a specific IAHE may vary, based on relevance and utility. This IAHE will primarily focus on learning; the purpose of accountability is secondary.

12. IAHEs follow the United Nations Evaluation Group’s (UNEG) norms and standards\(^\text{11}\) that emphasize, among others: 1) the independence of the Evaluation Team, 2) the application of evaluation methodology, and 3) the full disclosure of results. IAHEs have a clear scope (defined in this TOR and in the inception report) with regard to the period, geographic areas and target groups to be covered by the evaluation.

4 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

13. The purpose of this IAHE is to enhance learning around gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian programming across the humanitarian system, making the evaluation formative in nature.

14. The main objective of the evaluation is to provide an independent assessment of collective performance in the area of gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls with a learning lens, focusing on the ability of the humanitarian community to implement the tools and frameworks that have been developed so far. A priority is given to the identification of best practices, enabling factors and tools that can be replicated. Recommendations that stem from the evaluation will serve to inform humanitarian actors at the policy and program level. The evaluation will also generate new ideas on how to strengthen gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls. Attention should be given to the wide dissemination of findings as well as the facilitation of trainings or workshops, which will enhance the learning component of the evaluation.

5 USERS OF THE IAHE

15. The IAHE is designed primarily to:

- Provide the IASC Principals, IASC Deputies Forum, Operations, Policy and Advocacy Group (OPAG), Emergency Directors Group (EDG) and other stakeholders with evaluative evidence contributing to the evidence base for decision-making and judgments about future humanitarian action, policy development and reform. This may include the periodic revision of the IASC Gender Policy, Gender Handbook and related documents.

- Provide Humanitarian Coordinators (HCs) and Humanitarian Country Teams (HCTs) with independent and credible evidence of collective progress towards achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian responses. This may, where relevant, complement internal review exercises in providing an opportunity to learn from best practices and improve weaknesses in the country’s humanitarian response.

- Provide other practitioners involved in designing and implementing humanitarian programs with evaluative evidence and practical advice to improve gender-responsive programming and strengthen efforts to empower women and girls.

\(^{11}\) [www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914)
16. In doing so, it will also:

- Provide national governments and disaster management institutions with evaluative evidence and analysis to inform their national policies and protocols for crises involving international agencies and other actors.
- Generate information that will serve to strengthen inclusion and accountability towards affected people. To the extent possible, efforts will be undertaken to provide information to affected people about the outcomes of the evaluation.
- Provide Member States of international organizations, donors, and learning and evaluation networks with evaluative evidence of collective efforts in the area of gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action for accountability and learning purposes.

6 EVALUATION SCOPE

17. The scope of the evaluation is global, it will assess the issue of gender equality and empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action across the international humanitarian aid system. Four country case studies will serve as a tool to review the issue in specific country contexts, in order to draw lessons for the wider humanitarian community. Selection criteria for country case studies will be identified by the Management Group and the Evaluation Team in consultation with the global Advisory Group, and will ensure that different humanitarian contexts are included.

18. The timeframe for the evaluation is limited to the years between 2017 and 2019. Since the evaluation is mainly designed to strengthen learning and is thus forward-looking, the focus should be on current efforts and the identification of strategies and best practices that will improve gender-responsive humanitarian programming in the future.

19. Figure 2 provides an overview of the key focus areas that the evaluation should look at. For each of the three main focus areas, (1) gender-responsive programming, (2) capacity-building and (3) participation, the evaluation will seek to identify main challenges and obstacles in strengthening gender equality and empowerment of women and girls from a policy and operational perspective, and will highlight strategies and best practices to overcome these challenges. Moreover, enabling factors and ‘game-changers’ should be determined, taking into account the different contexts in which humanitarian operations take place.

20. Policies and strategies related to gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls as well as human resources and financial resources invested in and provided for it, are considered the foundation for these efforts and should be included in the evaluation as such.

21. The evaluation will not specifically assess progress against stated objectives in a specific policy or accountability framework. However, relevant policy documents, in particular the IASC Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls, will serve as a framework and starting point to reconstruct the Theory of Change and analytical framework for the evaluation.
Key areas of focus

Gender-responsive programming
- Integration of gender across the humanitarian program cycle, including collection and analysis of data beyond disaggregation and outputs
- Addressing identified vulnerabilities of women and girls, including GBV
- Suitable performance indicators to collect and measure results of GEEWG programming and adequate data available to support them
- Factors that determine the success of gender-responsive programming, including but not limited to design, M&E, management, implementation, as well as organizational and contextual factors.

Capacity-building
- Localization and strengthening women’s organizations
- Ability of aid organizations to do gender-responsive programming
- Knowledge and skills of field staff and implementing partners

Participation
- Participation of women and girls in the design and delivery of humanitarian responses
- Adequate inclusion of women and girls in accountability mechanisms

Foundations

Policies and Strategies
Are existing policies relevant in practice? Are there obvious gaps in the existing body of strategies, policies and frameworks? What are practical challenges and gaps in the implementation of policies? What are good practices in operationalizing policies?

Human Resources and Financial Resources/Funding
Are financial and human resources adequate to address gender issues in humanitarian responses? How can resources allocated to enhancing GEEWG be tracked?

Figure 2: Evaluation Scope

Evaluation Criteria and Questions

22. In general, IAHEs apply internationally established evaluation criteria. They draw from the evaluation criteria in the UNEG norms and standards; OECD/DAC criteria for development programmes: i) relevance, ii) effectiveness, iii) efficiency, iv) impact and v) sustainability; and the ALNAP criteria for the evaluation of humanitarian action: a) appropriateness, b) effectiveness, c) efficiency, d) impact, e) connectedness, f) coverage, g) coherence, and h) coordination. The criteria used for this evaluation are listed below.

---

12 See the UNEG website: www.uneval.org
13 See the OECD/DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance. A factsheet can be found at: http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/49756382.pdf. The DAC Network on Development Evaluation is currently working on a revised set of evaluation criteria. These will be taken into consideration if feasible.
14 See the ALNAP guide for humanitarian agencies: Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD/DAC criteria at www.alnap.org/pool/files/eha_2006.pdf
23. The evaluation’s analytical framework will be structured around the following evaluation criteria and associated questions:¹⁵

I. **Relevance** – To what extent are humanitarian responses tailored to the needs and vulnerabilities of women and girls? How are humanitarian programmes aligned to existing policies and tools related to gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls?

II. **Coherence** – How consistent are existing system-wide policies, program guidance and tools implemented among relevant humanitarian actors?

III. **Effectiveness** – Based on the preliminary Theory of Change (Figure 1), how effective are existing processes and structures to strengthen gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian programming? What factors influence the effectiveness of existing process and structures?

IV. **Coordination** – To what extent are efforts by different organizations to strengthen gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian programming coordinated and complementary?

24. Under these evaluation criteria and questions, which are linked to the evaluation scope, the Evaluation Team will identify more detailed key areas of inquiry and develop the analytical framework during the inception phase through consultations with members of the global Advisory Group and other relevant stakeholders.

**Definitions**

25. For the purpose of this evaluation, the following definitions should be used:

   a. **Gender Equality**: Equal enjoyment by women, girls, men and boys of rights, opportunities, resources and rewards. It does not mean that women and men are the same but that their enjoyment of rights, opportunities and life chances are not governed or limited by whether they were born female or male.¹⁶

   b. **Gender Equity**: Gender equity refers to fairness and justice in the distribution of benefits and responsibilities between women and men, according to their respective needs. It is considered part of the process of achieving gender equality in terms of rights, benefits, obligations and opportunities.¹⁷

   c. **Empowerment of Women and Girls**: The ability of a woman or girl to control her own destiny. This implies that she must not only have equal capabilities (such as education and health) and equal access to resources and opportunities (such as land and employment), but that she must also have the agency to use these rights, capabilities, resources and opportunities to make strategic choices and decisions.¹⁸

7 **METHODOLOGY**

26. The IAHE will utilize a mixed-method approach and will carry out analyses of various sources of information including desk reviews, reviews of monitoring data, field visits, interviews with key stakeholders (affected populations, UN, NGOs, donors, the Government and others), individually and in focus groups, and through the cross-validation of data. This will ensure that the evaluation is inclusive of the views of diverse stakeholder groups.

27. The evaluation will be conducted by a team of independent evaluation experts with expertise in gender in humanitarian programming. The gender balance of the team will be ensured to the extent possible. If feasible,
the team will include independent national evaluators for each of the country case studies. Further details regarding the Evaluation Team can be found in section 11.

28. The evaluation process will include (1) an inception phase, including a desk review and remote interviews with key stakeholders, after which the Evaluation Team will submit an inception report, (2) a data gathering phase which includes staggered country visits to each of the chosen country case studies, including travel to affected areas outside the respective capital region and surveys with affected people, HQ and remote interviews and a survey among program staff, (3) a reporting phase at the end of which the team will submit the final evaluation report, and (4) a dissemination phase with active participation of the Evaluation Team to maximize learning through presentations, workshops, etc.

29. The inception phase serves to refine the evaluation questions, refine the analytical framework and methodology, including reconstructing the Theory of Change, based on the preliminary Theory of Change in Figure 1. Moreover, countries that will serve as case studies will be selected during the inception phase based on a mapping of selected criteria and in consultation with the Management Group and global Advisory Group. The selection of case studies should allow for a comparison of cases where gender-responsive programming is successful and good practices are evident, to cases where there has not been much progress on gender-responsive programming. This will allow for a better understanding of ‘game-changers’ and enabling factors.

30. The evaluation will make use of four in-country case studies. The selection of case study countries will be based on a combination of criteria including but not limited to: the type of emergency and associated humanitarian needs, geographic diversity, the presence/absence of a gender advisor in the HC/RC office, the presence/absence of an HCT/protection strategy, and the presence/absence of a SGBV sub-cluster. These criteria will be fine-tuned during inception, and the final selection of case studies will be presented in the inception report. A small number of additional countries will be identified to be prioritized for document reviews and stakeholder interviews.

31. The methodology will include a mapping and review of relevant existing policies, handbooks and tools, leading to a comprehensive and well-arranged overview to be included in the evaluation report, in line with the main purpose of the evaluation to increase knowledge and share best practices across the humanitarian system.

32. The detailed methodology, including standardized data collection instruments (surveys, interview guides, etc.) will be developed during the inception phase of the evaluation. The Evaluation Team will ensure that questions and approaches are in line with established norms and standards as described below, and the Humanitarian Principles.19

Special Considerations

33. Relevance to context: Attention should be given to the role of local contexts as well as cultural and social constructs in facilitating or impeding gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action. To enhance the Evaluation Team’s understanding of the local context and to improve ownership and communication with local communities, where relevant and possible, not only will the Evaluation Team include national evaluators for each country case study, but the IAHE will also seek to encourage the participation of national Governments throughout the evaluation process, as appropriate and possible. National and sub-national level disaster risk management institutions and local actors will be identified and interviewed.

34. Accountability to affected people: To enhance accountability to affected people, the IAHE will endeavor to gain their perspectives on the gender-responsiveness of humanitarian programs and to incorporate these views in the evaluation findings. Additionally, the Evaluation Team will seek to understand how women and girls are consulted especially in the prioritization of needs, decision-making processes and the ways in which

limitations to participation and inclusion are addressed. To this end, evaluators will strive to devote an appropriate amount of time during the field visit to consult communities and seek out the views of affected people, especially women and girls. Whenever possible, the Evaluation Team will seek to provide feedback on the evaluation findings to affected people.

35. **Inclusiveness:** The evaluation methodology will integrate participatory processes, especially at the community level, to adequately engage women, men, boys and girls of different ages and taking into consideration the existence of disadvantaged groups, such as people with disabilities. The evaluation process will aim to assess the extent to which the differential needs, priorities, risks and vulnerabilities of women, girls, men and boys are being identified, assessed and integrated in humanitarian responses. Further, the evaluation process will seek to understand the processes and methodologies utilized to enhance the equitable and effective inclusion, access and participation of women and girls in humanitarian activities (both at design and implementation) and in decision-making processes. A human rights perspective should be integrated into the evaluation methodology where feasible.

36. **Innovative solutions:** Wherever possible, the Evaluation Team will identify innovative solutions to overcome challenges to enhancing gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls and that can help improve gender responsive programming in the future.

37. **Different emergency contexts:** To achieve applicability of evaluation findings across the humanitarian system, case studies should represent a variety of different emergency contexts, such as protracted crises, conflict and natural disaster, as well as slow- and sudden-onset emergencies.

38. **Ethical considerations:** Due diligence will be given to effectively integrating good ethical practices and paying due attention to robust ethical considerations in the conduct of any IAHE as stipulated in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards, specifically Norm 6 and Standard 3.2.

---

8 **MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION**

### 8.1 Management Group (IAHE MG)

39. A small Management Group is established for this IAHE from among the IAHE Steering Group membership. The members of the MG are mandated by their respective Steering Group representations within all the delegation of authority of the MG to manage IAHE deliverables as per the present guidelines. Good practice is for individual MG members to closely coordinate and consult where relevant with their respective Steering Group representatives to avoid last-minute objections on deliverables. The Evaluation Manager will serve as the chair of the MG and perform the role and responsibilities as outlined in the IAHE Guidelines.

---

20 Such as: sex-separate focus group discussions, key informant interviews and targeted consultations with organized community groups such as women’s associations, youth groups, etc.

21 Norm 6: Ethics - Evaluation must be conducted with the highest standards of integrity and respect for the beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environment; for human rights and gender equality; and for the ‘do no harm’ principle for humanitarian assistance. Evaluators must respect the rights of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence, must ensure that sensitive data is protected and that it cannot be traced to its source and must validate statements made in the report with those who provided the relevant information. Evaluators should obtain informed consent for the use of private information from those who provide it. When evidence of wrongdoing is uncovered, it must be reported discreetly to a competent body (such as the relevant office of audit or investigation). (UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation, 2016)

22 Standard 3.2 – Ethics: All those engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluations shall conform to agreed ethical standards in order to ensure overall credibility and the responsible use of power and resources. (UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation, 2016)

23 For further details on the specific roles and responsibilities of the different IAHE stakeholders, please see “Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations of Large Scale System-Wide Emergencies (IAHEs): Guidelines, developed by the IAHE Steering Group, May 2018.

24 For further description of the roles and responsibilities of the Evaluation Manager, please see “Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations of Large Scale System-Wide Emergencies (IAHEs): Guidelines, developed by the IAHE Steering Group, May 2018.
40. The specific roles and responsibilities of the IAHE Management Group are to:

- Ensure the independence of the evaluation process and results
- Provide quality control and inputs throughout the entire evaluation to ensure that it meets agreed criteria and standards (including during the development of the TOR, Evaluation Team briefings, review and approval of the inception report, review of the draft report, preparing draft presentations, etc.)
- Support the Evaluation Manager in the preparation of the draft TOR and budget for the evaluation by either providing input before the Evaluation Manager prepares a first draft or by providing comments on documents drafted by the Evaluation Manager
- Support the Evaluation Manager in the collection of key reference documents and coordination mapping, including mapping of data availability and of planned, scheduled and ongoing data collection exercises
- Support the Evaluation Manager to review the proposals from the companies and/or consultants and then approve the selection of the external team to conduct the evaluation
- Review and provide feedback to the inception report and approve the final inception report (unless there are budget implications, in which case the MG would submit to the Steering Group for approval)
- When deemed useful by the MG, individual members can take part in evaluation missions, accompanying the team of independent consultants (or company)
- Review the evaluation report and clear it for submission to the Steering Group for approval
- Monitor and assess the quality of the evaluation deliverables and processes at all phases of the IAHE
- Facilitate the Evaluation Team’s access to key stakeholders and specific information or expertise needed to perform the evaluation
- Provide guidance and institutional support to the Evaluation Team especially on issues of methodology and other areas as necessary

41. Based on IAHE Guidelines and criteria, the Management Group for this IAHE was established on a voluntary basis by member organizations of the Steering Group and is composed of UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP and OCHA, who will serve as chair and Evaluation Manager.

8.2 IAHE Global Advisory Group

42. The IAHE Advisory Group represents stakeholders engaged in the thematic domain of gender equality and empowerment of women and girls. It plays a key role in advising the Evaluation Team and supporting the evaluation through the planning, implementation and follow-up stages. It serves in an advisory capacity only, without having decision-making authority. The specific roles and responsibilities of the IAHE AG are to:

- Serve as the main link between the IAHE Evaluation Team and key stakeholder groups who have a major stake and/or strategic and programmatic capacity or interest in the evaluation and/or have been selected as a case study
- Provide advice and support to the IAHE Evaluation Team, identifying priority questions for the evaluation to address and support data gathering
- Review and provide appropriate and timely feedback on draft documents related to the IAHE (e.g., inception report, evaluation report)
- Help promote ownership of respective stakeholder groups of the IAHE process and subsequent use of the report and recommendations and related deliverables

---

25 For further details on the establishment of the Management Group please see “Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations of Large Scale System-Wide Emergencies (IAHEs): Guidelines, developed by the IAHE Steering Group, May 2018.”
• Support the designated IASC body in the preparation of the management response, development of action plans to follow up on recommendations and monitoring of implementation of recommendations
• Assist with developing and implementing a communication strategy to promote the evaluation among the stakeholders, relevant national government counterparts, civil society and partners as appropriate

**Working Modalities**

43. The membership of the IAHE AG is based on a contextualized mapping of key stakeholders that have an interest in the evaluation and/or are active in the area of work covered by the evaluation. These comprise UN agencies, international NGOs, local NGOs, resource partners, governments, think tanks and research institutions, as well as individuals recognized as experts in the area of gender equality and empowerment of women and girls.

44. The Management Group will compile a long list of perspective members and the final membership will be approved by the Steering Group, using the criteria of finding a balance between different profiles and constituencies. At least one of the members should come from either the IASC OPAG or EDG.

45. The Advisory Group will be appointed on a pro bono basis and should have contingency lists in case members are unable to participate or have to drop out. The Chair of the Advisory Group is selected by its members; if no other member of the IAHE AG volunteers, the member of the IASC OPAG or EDG will also convene and chair the Advisory Group.

46. The IAHE AG will typically meet remotely during the inception phase, the evaluation phase and the reporting phase to provide inputs to the draft report.

47. Under the chairmanship, the IAHE AG will meet once the evaluation report has been finalized to discuss and provide inputs to the management response and action plan and subsequent updates as required.

**8.3 Steering Group (IAHE SG)**

48. As per IAHE Guidelines, the IAHE Steering Group will approve the IAHE Terms of Reference, the final evaluation report, as well as any decisions with budget implications, on the basis of the recommendations provided by the IAHE Management Group.

**9 DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

49. The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed according to the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation and the OCHA Quality Assurance System for Evaluations.

50. The inception and draft reports will be produced jointly by the members of the Evaluation Team and reflect their collective understanding of the evaluation. All deliverables listed will be written in good standard English in line with the OCHA Style Guide. If in the estimation of the Evaluation Manager the reports do not meet required standards, the Evaluation Team will ensure at their own expense the editing and changes needed to bring it to the required standards. Final products will be professionally graphic-designed.

**9.1 Inception Report**

51. The Evaluation Team will produce an inception report not to exceed 15,000 words, excluding annexes, setting out:
   • The team’s understanding of the issues to be evaluated (scope), and their understanding of the context in which the IAHE takes place
   • Any suggested deviations from the TORs, including any additional issues raised during the initial consultations
A comprehensive stakeholders mapping and analysis

A reconstruction of the Theory of Change underlying gender equality and empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian programming. Figure 1 presents a preliminary Theory of Change which should serve as a basis.

A detailed analytical framework that shows how data will be coded and analyzed

A final list of evaluation questions (building upon the initial list provided in the present terms of reference)

An evaluation matrix showing, for each question, the assumptions to be assessed, the indicators proposed and corresponding sources of information

A comprehensive methodological approach for the evaluation, including
  a. Details of the triangulation strategy
  b. Data collection and analysis tools that will be used to conduct the IAHE (survey instruments, interview guides, questions, document with the preparation of field visits and schedule of interviews, and other tools to be employed for the evaluation)
  c. Any limitations of the chosen methods of data collection and analysis and how they will be addressed
  d. How the views of affected people, in particular women and girls, will be included in the evaluation

Detailed fieldwork plan

Detailed timeline for the evaluation

Draft dissemination strategy of the evaluation findings (including with the IAHE Management Group and the IAHE Advisory Group)

A case study brief template, including a standard evidence table/matrix aligned with the overall evaluation matrix, to ensure comparability of the data gathered through country visits and through other data collection tools

9.2 Evaluation Report

52. The Evaluation Team will produce a single report of not more than 25,000 words / 50 pages (excluding the executive summary and annexes), written in a clear and concise manner that allows readers to understand the main evaluation findings, conclusions and corresponding recommendations, and their inter-relationship. The report should be comprised of:

• Table of contents
• Executive summary of no more than 2,500 words
• Summary table linking findings, conclusions and recommendations, including where responsibility for follow up should lie
• Analysis of context in which the evaluation is situated
• Methodology summary – a brief chapter, with a more detailed description provided in an annex
• Main body of the report, including an overall assessment and findings in response to the evaluation questions, synthesizing findings from the global assessment and the case studies, conclusions and recommendations.
• Annexes will include: (1) TOR, (2) detailed methodology, (3) list of persons met, (4) details of qualitative and quantitative analysis undertaken, (5) team itinerary, (6) all evaluation tools employed, (7) list of acronyms; and (8) bibliography of documents (including web pages, etc.) relevant to the evaluation, (9)
assessment of the usefulness of the IAHE guidelines and process and main recommendations for their improvement, (10) case study briefs for each country case study.

53. For accuracy and credibility, recommendations should follow logically from the evaluation findings and conclusions, and be:

- Categorized as a) Critical, b) Important, or c) Opportunity for learning
- Relevant and useful and reflect the reality of the context
- Specific, clearly stated and not broad or vague
- Realistic and reflect an understanding of the humanitarian system and potential constraints to follow-up
- Suggest where responsibility for follow-up should lie and include a timeframe for follow-up
- Built upon and take fully into consideration previous recommendations to avoid any contradictions unless justified by collected evidence

54. The draft report will be reviewed by the IAHE Management Group and the final version cleared by the IAHE Steering Group prior to dissemination.

9.3 Other evaluation products

55. For each case study, the Evaluation Team will produce a case study brief of approx. ten pages (excluding annexes). These case study briefs will follow a template developed during the inception phase to ensure comparability and will include a preliminary analysis of case study findings as well as an evidence table/matrix aligned with the overall evaluation matrix.

56. The Evaluation Team will produce presentations, as requested by the Management Group, including presentations to the HCs/HCTs of countries visited, IASC members, in-country presentations to local communities and affected people, etc. There will be one presentation summarizing the final evaluation report.

57. The Evaluation Team will prepare an overview of existing tools and manuals concerning gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian programming, which can serve as a useful guide for practitioners and policy-makers. If feasible, this guide can be enhanced through practical findings from the evaluation.

58. The Evaluation Team will produce a 1-page and a 5-page document, each summarizing the final evaluation report. Additional evaluation products such as briefs, video presentations or précis may be proposed in the inception report.

10 DISSEMINATION AND FOLLOW UP

59. The Evaluation Team will conduct the following presentations:

- At the end of each field visit, the Evaluation Team will conduct an exit brief with the HCT, the relevant Government counterparts and (remotely) the IAHE Management Group to share first impressions, preliminary findings and possible areas of conclusions and recommendations. The brief will help clarify issues and outline any expected pending actions from any stakeholders, as relevant, as well as discuss next steps.
- Upon completion of the draft evaluation report, the results of the IAHE will be presented by the Evaluation Team Leader (or Evaluation Manager) to the IASC in New York and Geneva.
- Once the evaluation is completed, presentations of the main findings and recommendations will be made available to various fora as decided by OCHA and the IAHE Management and Steering Groups. The Evaluation Team may be requested to assist with these presentations.

60. The IAHE final report will be submitted to the IASC OPAG, the EDG and the Principals.
61. Once the evaluation results are finalized, national evaluators will help feed back results to communities who participated in the evaluation and to affected people and communities. All outputs will be shared with relevant focal persons from the communities where data collection took place. All efforts will be made to conduct dissemination workshops with women’s organizations and implementing partners.

62. In addition to the Evaluation Report and oral briefings, the evaluation findings and recommendations can be presented through alternative ways of dissemination, such as websites, video, etc. The Evaluation Team will consider possible ways to present the evaluation and include a dissemination strategy proposal in the inception report.

63. The recommendations of the evaluation will be addressed through a formal Management Response Plan (MRP), as further detailed in the IAHE Guidelines.

11 THE EVALUATION TEAM

64. The Evaluation Team will be recruited through OCHA’s systems contracts for evaluative services. The evaluation will require the services of an Evaluation Team of four members – a team leader, a senior evaluator and two evaluators (recruited through international recruitment procedures) as well as national evaluators for each country case study – with the following collective experience and skills:

- Extensive evaluation experience of humanitarian strategies and programs, and other key humanitarian issues, especially gender equality and empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian emergencies
- Strong capacity in conducting global, thematic evaluations that incorporate multiple country-level case studies and the use of mixed methods in evaluation
- Experience with and institutional knowledge of UN and NGO actors, inter-agency mechanisms at headquarters and in the field
- Extensive knowledge of humanitarian law and principles, and experience with using human rights, protection and gender analysis in evaluations (all team members should have solid experience in gender analysis)
- Good understanding of cross-cutting issues, such as resilience, transition, conflict analysis etc.
- At least one team member should have extensive skills in data analysis and presentation as well as population surveys
- An appropriate range of field experience
- Experience in facilitating consultative workshops involving a wide range of organizations and participants
- The Team Leader should have excellent writing and communication skills in English. All team members must have working knowledge of English. In addition, knowledge in French and Arabic by at least one team member would be desirable.
- Context-specific knowledge and experience
- Additional skills and experience would be an asset

65. The Evaluation Team will include a Team Leader, who is responsible for the overall conduct of the evaluation in accordance with the TOR, including:

- Developing and adjusting the evaluation methodology
- Managing the Evaluation Team, ensuring efficient division of tasks between mission members and taking responsibility for the quality of their work
- Representing the Evaluation Team in meetings
- Ensuring the quality of all outputs
- Submitting all outputs in a timely manner
66. The Team Leader will have no less than 15 years of professional experience in humanitarian action, including experience in management of humanitarian operations. S/he will further have at least 7 years of experience in conducting evaluations of humanitarian operations and demonstrate strong analytical, communication and writing skills.

67. To the extent possible, national evaluators will play a key role in disseminating the evaluation results to affected communities.

68. To the extent possible, the Evaluation Team will be gender-balanced

12 SEQUENCE

69. The following presents a proposed schedule and description of each evaluation phase. Annex 1 gives an overview of the timeline with the tasks and deliverables expected in each phase.

70. Preparations and Scoping Phase (Month 1 – Month 5)

The scoping phase was conducted by the IAHE Management Group (MG). During the scoping phase: (1) the evaluation scope was further refined, clearly defining the focus and scope of the evaluation (2) the evaluation plan was defined in more detail and (3) data sources were identified. The scoping phase was a desk exercise with remote and in-person interviews for scoping purposes, but without a scoping mission.

Output: Terms of Reference

71. Evaluation Team Selection & Recruitment (Month 6 – Month 7)

Based on the Terms of Reference, the Evaluation Team will be recruited. The core Evaluation Team will consist of 4 people, including a team leader, a senior evaluator and two evaluators. National evaluators will be hired for each country case study. The team will be gender-balanced to the extent possible. At least two evaluators (including a national evaluator for the case studies) should have a strong profile in data collection and analysis, and, as agreed by the Steering Group, both the Evaluation Team and the Management Group would invest time at the beginning of the evaluation process in identifying data sources. The recruitment of the Evaluation Team can be done through OCHA’s systems contract for evaluations. Alternatively, if so is the preference of Steering Group members, through the UN Global Marketplace OCHA can use the systems contracts of any other UN agency to contract the Evaluation Team.

Output: Task Order signed with evaluation company

72. Inception Phase (Month 8 – Month 9)

The Inception Phase will be conducted by the Evaluation Team. In consultation with the Management Group and the Advisory Group, the country case studies will be selected and a draft inception report will be prepared. Before finalizing the inception report, a pilot mission to one of the countries selected as a case study will be undertaken, including to one or two field locations. The Evaluation Manager should accompany the Evaluation Team during the inception phase.

Output: Draft inception report and final inception report

73. Data Collection and Field Mission Phase (Month 10 – Month 12)

The evaluation phase includes field visits to 4 different case study countries for ten days each (final duration will be confirmed once the TORs are approved). Country visits should be staggered, with the first case study serving to test the evaluation tools and methodology. All members of the Evaluation Team will participate in the field missions and should be accompanied by the Evaluation Manager. Before leaving each country, the Evaluation Team will conduct a debriefing for the respective Humanitarian Country Team and the Management Group. The Evaluation Team will also conduct meetings on the global level, e.g., with the IASC EDG and the IASC OPAG. Moreover, a population survey to assess the views of affected people on the humanitarian assistance they received, as well as an aid worker survey, should be undertaken in each of the countries selected as a case study. Preliminary findings following the data collection phase will be shared...
with the Management Group to ensure the validation and direction of the evaluation is in line with the TOR. For each case study, a case study brief will be prepared.

74. **Reporting Phase** (Month 13 –17; draft report Month 14, final report by Month 17)

    Following the field missions and global level meetings, the Evaluation Team will analyze data, information and other material collected, and prepare the draft evaluation report, which will be circulated for inputs from various stakeholders. The final evaluation report will be presented following a reiterative process of revisions as needed. Throughout the reporting process, the Management Group may request periodic updates on report chapters, to ensure the focus of the report is in line with the TOR and to avoid many rounds of reiteration later.

    Output: Draft evaluation report and final evaluation report (including case study briefs)

75. **Dissemination of Results** (Month 18 and following)

    The Steering Group aims to improve the dissemination of evaluation results, and all group members should support this effort. The Evaluation Team leader is expected to travel to New York and/or Geneva to debrief IASC members. The budget also includes a line for graphic design, web design, the production of a video or other communication materials. Side events could also be organized at ECOSOC and at the UN General Assembly to further disseminate the findings in line with the Steering Group's Engagement and Communications Strategy.

    Output: Information products and presentations

76. **Implementation** (Management Response Plan by Month 19, implementation by Month 33)

    The Steering Group aims to strengthen its links to the Inter-Agency Standing Committee, to ensure that both the Humanitarian Country Teams and, at the global level, the IASC develop timely management responses and fully address all relevant recommendations.

    Output: Management Response Plan

77. The Management Group will share the following documents with the Steering Group: Terms of Reference, task order including information on individual team members, draft and final inception report, draft and final evaluation report, and information products.
**Annex 1: Timeline and Phases of the Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Tasks of the Evaluation Team</th>
<th>Deliverables for the Evaluation Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>January – May 2019</td>
<td>Preparation and Scoping</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft and Final Terms of Reference*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>June – July 2019</td>
<td>Evaluation Team Selection and Recruitment</td>
<td>Case study selection (with MG)</td>
<td>Task Order signed with Evaluation Company*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>August - September 2019</td>
<td>Inception Phase</td>
<td>Preparatory work, document review, analytical framework development, stakeholder mapping</td>
<td>Draft and final inception report (max. 15,000 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>October – December 2019</td>
<td>Data Collection and Field Mission Phase</td>
<td>Four staggered country visits (approx. 10 days) by two team members each and national evaluators as required</td>
<td>HCT briefing and debriefing in each country visited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>January – May 2020</td>
<td>Reporting Phase (reiterative process as needed)</td>
<td>Finalizing case study briefs</td>
<td>Draft case study briefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>January – May 2020</td>
<td>Reporting Phase (reiterative process as needed)</td>
<td>Preparing and drafting evaluation report</td>
<td>Final case study briefs (approx. ten pages per country)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>January – May 2020</td>
<td>Reporting Phase (reiterative process as needed)</td>
<td>Revising evaluation report based on comments (reiterative process as required)</td>
<td>Draft evaluation report by month 13 and final evaluation report by month 16 (max. 25,000 words / 50 pages)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 2: Additional information for evaluation companies to prepare financial proposals

- The Evaluation Team should consist of four people, including a team leader, one senior evaluator and two evaluators. For each country case study, national evaluators can be added as required.
- Country case study visits should be staggered, with the first case study serving to test the proposed methodology and tools.
- To estimate travel and DSA costs, use Juba/South Sudan as an example.
- For in-country travel, assume one in-country field visit with UNHAS flights for $1000 per round-trip.
- Budget for 5 additional days to be used by the team leader for engagement and dissemination purposes throughout the evaluation process.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18</th>
<th>June 2020</th>
<th>Dissemination of Results</th>
<th>Compiling information products</th>
<th>5-page summary of the evaluation report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HQ visits to New York and Geneva by the Team Leader</td>
<td>1-page summary of the evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PowerPoint Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other products to be determined in the inception phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>July 2020 – November 2021</td>
<td>IASC/HCT Response to Recommendations and Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management Response Plan*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* these tasks and deliverables do not fall under the responsibility of the Evaluation Team)