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FOREWORD

As the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development enters its full implementation with a set of 17 sustainable development goals and 169 targets, evaluation and, more specifically, gender-responsive evaluation has an important role to play throughout the implementation process. Evaluation needs to ensure that these ambitious targets are met, while leaving no one behind.


These events represented a first step towards reflecting on the follow-up and review mechanism for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) from an evaluation perspective. There was a commitment to moving forward in evaluating the SDGs with a more equity-focused and gender-responsive lens by increasing collaboration. Evaluation needs to drive the invitation to re-frame the SDG agenda for the next 15 years with an emphasis on transformative change. There is a need to focus on who is being left behind and identify ways of bringing them in, rather than staying with aggregate measures to understand the realities. Evaluators should become advocates and not just experts, and work together with policymakers to ensure evidence is brought back to the driver’s seat.

Marco Segone
Director, Independent Evaluation Office, UN Women
Chair, EvalGender+
Chair, UNEG
SUMMARY

The global community has a significant opportunity to continue bringing evaluation to the forefront of the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), as evidenced by a number of recent milestones including: the launch of Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2030 Agenda) in 2015, the review of national-level implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, the adoption of the UN General Assembly Resolution on evaluation capacity building (A/RES/69/237), the celebration of 2015 International Year of Evaluation, and the World Humanitarian Summit taking place in May 2016.

The new 2030 Agenda will shape discourse and action on sustainable and equitable development for the next 15 years. To meet the central imperative of “No one left behind”, the SDG Review and Follow-up Mechanism aims to monitor and evaluate progress for all. Among the nine principles that will guide the SDG Review and Follow-up Mechanism, there is an explicit mention of the need to:

• Use data that “will be rigorous and based on evidence, informed by country-led evaluations, and data that is high-quality, accessible, timely, reliable and disaggregated by income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts”

• Enhance capacity-building support for developing countries, including the strengthening of national data systems and evaluation programmes

• Develop processes that are people-centred, gender-sensitive, respectful of human rights and have a particular focus on the poorest, most vulnerable and those furthest behind

In line with the SDG Review and Follow-up Mechanism, the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action also calls for strengthening accountability mechanisms for gender equality, including national gender equality mechanisms, national human rights institutions and regulatory bodies.

In March 2016, a high-level event and technical seminar for the evaluation community was held in New York at the same time and location as the Commission on the Status of Women 60th Session. Attendees gathered to reflect on how to evaluate the SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens. The event marked the culmination of a multi-stakeholder dialogue on the same topic. The event was organized under the leadership of the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women), EvalGender+ and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) in collaboration with EvalPartners, Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation, International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE), United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Swiss Development Cooperation, CONEVAL Mexico, the Government of Sri Lanka and the Government of Tunisia.

The first step of the multi-stakeholder dialogue leading up to the event was a four week online consultation. It was started with a global live webinar held on 21 January 2016. The webinar was addressed by Marco Segone, UNEG Chair, Director of UN Women IEO, and Co-chair of EvalGender+ and Hon. Kabir Hashim, Minister of Public Enterprise Development, Sri Lanka and Chair of the Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation. With the webinar, the four week online consultation was initiated on the Gender and Evaluation Community Platform. The discussion was held in the “Community of Practice” section with queries posted in six languages. The high-level panel that followed was held at the Ford Foundation on 15 March and engaged ministers, parliamentarians, senior leaders from
international organizations, and civil society representatives. The panel was moderated by Marco Segone, UNEG Chair, Director of UN Women IEO, and Co-chair of EvalGender+.

The technical seminar was held on 16 and 17 March. It focused on three different themes that were facilitated by three distinguished Chairs. The seminar started with two panels on experts’ views and then the Chairs introduced themes in detail, followed by the workshops. The online consultation, high-level panel and technical seminar were based on three key themes:

1. Relevance of “new metrics” (measurement tools and indicators) for the evaluation of SDGs from an equity-focused and gender-responsive perspective
2. Evaluation and complexity: Dealing with the increasing complexity of development and interconnectedness of the SDGs to ensure “No one is left behind”
3. Demand for and use of evidence from evaluation: Understanding the political economy of equity-focused and gender-responsive evidence

On 17 March, the technical seminar participants gathered at the plenary for presentations from each workshop leader. Ziad Moussa, IOCE President and Co-chair of EvalPartners chaired the session. The session also included a presentation from Oscar Garcia, Director of the International Fund for Agricultural Development Evaluation Office who shared the outcome of a workshop on evaluability of SDG 2 that had been organized by United Nations (UN) agencies based in Rome.

The last session, titled “What have we learned? Key elements necessary for establishing a framework to evaluate SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens” was chaired by Andrea Cook, Director of the UNFPA Evaluation Office. It included the following speakers, who highlighted key learnings:

- Maria Bustelo, Rector’s Delegate for Equality, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, and former President, European Evaluation Society
- Michael Bamberger, Independent Consultant and former Senior Evaluator, World Bank
- Florence Etta, founder and former Chair, African Gender and Development Evaluators Network
- Rosario Cárdenas, Council Member, CONEVAL, Mexico
- Thomas Schwandt, Professor, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Marco Segone, UNEG Chair, Director of UN Women IEO and Co-chair of EvalGender+ facilitated the concluding remarks of the technical seminar.

Attendees of the event made a commitment to moving forward in evaluating the SDGs with a more equity-focused and gender-responsive lens by increasing collaboration. They concluded that:

- Evaluators should drive the invitation to reframe the SDG agenda for the next 15 years with an emphasis on transformative change.
- There is a need to focus on who is being left out and identify ways of “bringing them in”, rather than staying with aggregate measures to understand the realities.
- Evaluators should become activists, and not just experts, and work together with policymakers to ensure evidence is brought back to the driver’s seat.
CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND

Towards a framework to evaluate SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens

In the last decade, the global evaluation community has been developing evaluation approaches that are more equity focused and gender responsive. With the SDG calling for “No one left behind”, a new opportunity (and challenge) is arising to further strengthen national evaluation capacities to evaluate localized SDGs and national development policies and strategies with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens.

Gender equality and social equity are central to ensure the realization of sustainable and equitable development, including in emergency and humanitarian contexts. The persistence of social inequity and significant gender inequalities in the world—including in low, middle and high income countries—presents a major barrier to development, negating fundamental human rights and the expansion of human freedoms. The SDGs include gender equality and reducing inequalities as two stand-alone goals (SDG 5 and SDG 10). These are also mainstreamed within all goals. Given that the SDGs will be “localized” in national development goals and strategies, gender equality and social equity are expected to be among the key strategies and outcomes mainstreamed in global and national development strategies.

The new 2030 Agenda shapes the sustainable and equitable development discourse and action for the next 15 years. The central imperative of the 2030 Agenda provides an unprecedented opportunity to engender evaluation systems and policies, requiring the full coordinated participation of all interested stakeholders.

The recent UN General Assembly resolution on national evaluation capacity development, co-sponsored by 48 countries, encourages more coordinated support in strengthening national capacities for the evaluation of national development policies and programmes and recognizes 2015 as the International Year of Evaluation. In addition, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development introduces the need for a robust, effective, inclusive and transparent follow-up and review framework operating at the national, regional and global levels to help countries maximize progress in implementing the 2030 Agenda and promote accountability to citizens. The principles of the review processes that must complement and support national and regional reviews) are derived from paragraph 74 and include: voluntary and state-led nature; respect for national ownership; emphasis on means of implementation; increasing transparency, inclusiveness and participation; avoiding duplication and using existing platforms; and rigorous use of strong evidence and data that is timely, reliable and disaggregated by different categories, including gender.

EvalGender+ initiative

EvalGender+ is a global multi-stakeholder partnership under EvalPartners to strengthen the demand, supply and quality of equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluations. The agencies participating in EvalGender+ are UN entities, multilateral banks, civil society organizations, academic institutions and voluntary organizations for professional evaluation (VOPEs). This initiative was officially launched at the EvalPartners-sponsored Global Evaluation Week at the Parliament of Nepal in Kathmandu, November 2015.
The purpose of EvalGender+ is to contribute to sustainable, equitable and gender-responsive policy development through support to countries in their efforts to consolidate an effective, inclusive and transparent monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework to evaluate the SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens. EvalGender+ stands for the SDG principle of “No one left behind” and is especially concerned with gender equality and social equity. It believes that no one should be discriminated against on the basis of gender, race, age, origin, caste or class, ethnicity, location, income or property, language, religion, convictions, opinions, health or disability.

EvalGender+ initiatives address both the demand side (increasing evaluation policy uptake) by targeting parliamentarians, government decision-makers, and Member States representatives at the United Nations and in the multilateral organizations and the supply side (more relevant and improved evaluation results) by working with evaluation practitioners in partner governments, members of VOPEs, women’s organizations, UN agencies, multilateral banks, bilateral development agencies, academic institutions, specialized research centres and think tanks, private foundations and the private sector. EvalGender+ builds on the work already undertaken by EvalPartners on equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation to leverage existing initiatives.

Outcome-level objectives are:

• Better ability to evaluate the SDGs through a social-equity and gender-equality lens by capturing the newest knowledge and the experience of evaluating the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in forthcoming “Guidance for evaluating the SDGs through a social-equity and gender-equality lens”

• Increased capacity to evaluate the SDGs well by strengthening of national evaluation systems and professional development of evaluators in applying the guidance through technical assistance, training and broad dissemination

• Increased political demand for social equity and gender responsiveness from politicians and policymakers through training of parliamentarians and awareness-raising among policymakers at the global, regional and national levels

Through social mobilization, EvalGender+ will enable policymakers, members of parliaments, government officials, evaluators, civil society representatives and advocates, and other interested actors in coordinating efforts to better engender national evaluation systems and policies. EvalGender+ will facilitate innovation in equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation by engaging the community of policymakers and evaluators to advance and promote the demand, supply and use of new approaches, strategies and methodologies that can respond to achieving gender equality and social equity. Finally, EvalGender+ will serve as a platform to share knowledge, learning and experiences on the best ways to strengthen the demand, supply and use of equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluations.

Multi-stakeholder dialogue and technical guidance development

In the context of introducing the SDGs and call for equitable and inclusive development, the EvalGender+ network and several stakeholders initiated a multi-stakeholder dialogue to develop an evaluation framework that will facilitate national evaluation capacity processes. The process is composed of several parts:

• A four-week online consultation on evaluating SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens started with a global webinar.

• A high-level event to engage delegates from member states, parliamentarians, international organizations and civil society organizations in a global discussion to identify strategies for building an enabling environment to evaluate the SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens.
• A **technical seminar** to start the process of establishing a common framework to evaluate SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens. Elements include workshops addressing the relevance of the new metrics and agreed indicators, understanding the complexity of SDGs and the power of partnerships, discussing strategies to strengthen gender-responsive evaluation systems, and the demand for and use of evaluation with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens in policymaking.

• A **technical guidance** on evaluating SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens.

• A **resource material package** on evaluating SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens to be used in training and workshops.

This report summarizes the proceedings of the **high-level event** and the **technical seminar**, including thematic workshops, and inputs from the online dialogue. Summaries of the **four-week online consultation** are included in Annex 2.
The event held in New York in March 2016 started with the high-level panel, which was organized by the UN Women IEO, EvalGender+ and UNEG in collaboration with EvalPartners, Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation, IOCE, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNDP, Swiss Development Cooperation, CONEVAL Mexico, the Government of Sri Lanka and the Government of Tunisia.

The high-level panel was held at the Ford Foundation on 15 March and engaged ministers, parliamentarians, senior leaders from international organizations and civil society representatives. It addressed strategies for building an enabling environment to evaluate the SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens. The panel was moderated by Marco Segone, UNEG Chair, Director of UN Women IEO and Co-chair of EvalGender+. Opening remarks were made by HE Olivier Zehnder, Deputy Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations.

The panel was composed as follows:

- Thomas Gass, Assistant Secretary General, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
- HE Kabir Hashim, Minister of Public Enterprise Development, Sri Lanka; Chair, Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation
- Hon Susan Musyoka, Member of Parliament, Kenya; Africa Regional Representative to Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation Steering
Committee; Executive Member of the African Parliamentarian Network for Development Evaluation

- HE Ananda Pokharel, Minister of Tourism, Culture and Civil Aviation, Nepal; Chair, Nepali Parliamentarian Forum for Evaluation; South Asia Representative to Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation Steering Committee

- Ziad Moussa, President, IOCE; Co-chair, EvalPartners


Key take away messages from the discussions included:

- **New metrics for assessing SDGs should include a transformative lens to ensure the voices of women and the most vulnerable are included.** Evaluation is a tool to grasp power relations and uncover gender norms. Data disaggregation is not enough to ensure “No one is left behind”. Responsibility relies on joint work among statisticians (and statistics departments), evaluators, policymakers and parliamentarians.

- **The complexity of the SDGs showcases a new reality for evaluation.** To address this complexity, evaluation will need to look into boundaries, perspectives and interactions. This includes devising new roles for evaluators as facilitators, expanding the evidence universe, and making sure the voices of the most vulnerable are heard.

- **Parliamentarians have a very important role to play as promoters of gender-responsive evaluation for the SDGs.** They are able to build the demand for gender-responsive evaluation and link policymakers to evaluations in order to strengthen accountability.

Closing remarks were made by HE Rohan Perera, Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka to the United Nations.
TECHNICAL WORKSHOP

Thematic discussions

The technical workshop was held on 16 and 17 March at UNICEF and addressed technical aspects essential to take into consideration when evaluating the SDGs, including: the relevance of the new metrics and agreed indicators, the complexity of SDGs and the power of partnerships, strategies to strengthen gender-responsiveness of national evaluation systems, and the demand for and use of evaluation with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens in policymaking.

The first panel on “How to ensure the Sustainable Development Goals will be evaluated with a focus on leaving no one behind” was chaired by Dr. Colin Kirk, Director of the UNICEF Evaluation Office and Co-chair of EvalPartners. Keynote speakers were:

- Marco Segone, UNEG Chair; Director, UN Women Independent Evaluation Office; Co-chair, EvalGender+
- David Nabarro, UN Secretary General’s Adviser for the SDGs
- Maithree Wickramasinghe, Professor at the University of Kelaniya, Gender and Evaluation Advocate, Sri Lanka
- Hon. Olfa Cherif, Member of Parliament, Tunisia and Middle East and North Africa Representative to Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation Steering Committee

“Evaluation is an agent for change for the world we want!”
—Marco Segone

Segone presented on the importance of equitable development in the context of SDGs. There are two goals that directly ensure equality—Goal 5, Gender equality and Goal 10, Reduce inequities—although many other goals address equity aspects. These need a robust, effective, inclusive and transparent follow-up and review framework, operating at the national, regional and global levels.

Segone explained how equity is different from equality, using examples that affect equity in society. He also highlighted key principles of the SDGs, including:

- Voluntary and country-owned
- Open, inclusive and transparent, and support the participation of all people and all stakeholders
- Build on existing platforms and processes, avoid duplication, respond to national circumstances
- Rigorous and based on evidence; informed by data that is timely, reliable and disaggregated
- Capacity-building support to developing countries will be necessary

The stronger demand for evaluation is an opportunity, although capacity in equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation is a challenge. Segone also highlighted the paradigm shift of stronger evaluation leadership from global North to global South, as exemplified by the existence of more VOPEs and parliamentarians’ forums in the global South.

Wickramasinghe in her presentation framed examples of equity and equality in terms of: women as a uniform collective; economic activity and the field of higher education; discrimination as generalized and fixed; and women’s gender rights as coherent, independent and tangible. To be gender-responsive, one needs to acknowledge that women, like any other category, are not a homogenous group. While policymakers, practitioners and evaluators may choose to emphasize a collective or group identity, an individual may subscribe to multiple, intersecting identities or have identities imposed on him or her based on social
delineations, specific histories and the operation of socialization, ideologies and structures of power. It is vital to acknowledge that identities are layered and intersecting, contextual and time-bound, and can lead to substantially different life experiences. These will be significant in determining how an individual will respond to the challenges of inequality and inequity.

The second session was on “The relevance of ‘new metrics’ (measurement tools and indicators) for the evaluation of SDGs with a focus on leaving no one behind” chaired by Arild Hauge, Deputy Director, Independent Evaluation Office, UNDP. The keynote speaker was Stefan Schweinfest, Director of the UN Statistics Division.

Schweinfest discussed important aspects of data related to the SDGs. Poor indicators cannot help data visualization; technically sound indicators with strong data backing are needed to show clear evidence. There is also a strong need for strong national information systems (indicators, statistics, qualitative information, big data and geospatial data). A good indicator fulfills criteria including relevance, solidity, over-time and across-space comparability, and credibility. Regarding the Inter-agency Expert Group on SDGs implementation of a global indicator framework, the first important step will be the assessment of the status of the proposed indicators. The indicators will be classified into three tiers:

I. An established methodology exists and data are already widely available

II. A methodology has been established but for which data are not easily available

III. An internationally agreed methodology has not yet been developed

Therefore, ensuring quality of indicators and strengthening data gathering systems both nationally and globally would help to track progress of disaggregated data for measuring equity.

“Evaluation is not only rear view mirror, but also future oriented.”
—Stefan Schweinfest

IAEG (3): A “FRAMEWORK” OF INDICATORS?

Global indicators include:
- Key indicators (limited in number)
- Elements of disaggregation
- Different population groups
- Inequality issues

Thematic/sectorial indicators include:
- Additional indicators on each of the elements covered by the global indicators
- Indicators that are only relevant at the national level

National indicators include:
- Some of the thematic indicators?
- Some (all?) of the global indicators
- Different population groups

Sub-national indicators include:
- Some of the global indicators
- Some of the national indicators
- Different population groups
- Additional data sources (most innovative, more opportunities?)
Workshop 1.

The relevance of “new metrics” for the evaluation of SDGs: Data for development and indicators for equity and gender equality

**Key issues**

The workshop was organized around “new metrics” within three areas of interrelated work: evaluation, data (including data generation and data for development), and indicators. Six questions, listed below, framed the session, exploring the opportunities and challenges of new metrics to advance a gender-responsive and equity-focused evaluation of the SDGs.

The group discussed evaluation approaches to advance a gender-responsive and equity-focused evaluation. Highly participatory approaches (including, for example, **most significant change**) that were grounded in human rights principles and centrally featured women’s voices and experiences were touted as effective. Data collection methods were examined. Qualitative methods—involving the collection, analysis and interpretation of data that are not easily reduced to numbers—can often offer important insights into underlying power imbalances and ways to advance gender equality and women’s rights. The limitations of quantitative methods (sample size, low levels of disaggregation) for advancing gender-responsive and equity-focused evaluations were highlighted. It was also noted that quantitative data often does not capture or reflect issues of power, access, participation and voice—essential dimensions to advancing human rights and gender equality.

New sources of data were surfaced, with participants discussing opportunities and challenges associated with each. Challenges in populating indicators—including the availability of quality, disaggregated, comparable and timely data—were shared. Participants noted that indicators related to equity and equality, including gender equality, are more challenging to populate, requiring disaggregated data and data from remote areas and marginalized communities. When data is disaggregated by gender, disaggregation is often limited to vital demographic indicators such as sex ratios and literacy rates. This fails to capture the gendered manner in which power and access play out or the way in which gendered roles and expectations interact with and play out through public policy (for example, service provision in water and sanitation).

Participants listed key sources and repositories of data. National census and statistical departments were highlighted as traditional sources of important data. Ministries, development partners, private sector and civil society organizations were also mentioned as sources for data related to relevant thematic areas. Challenges, however, were noted in data collection (what data is collected) and disaggregation (critical for advancing equality); for many countries and in many contexts, collecting gender sensitive data is simply not a political priority. Participants underscored the importance of relevant, timely and comparable data for evidence based decision-making and underscored the challenges faced by policy-makers and programme implementers in accessing and using data for evidence based decision-making. Indeed, even if data is collected and disaggregated, limitations to use abound.
**Process and Summary**

The workshop was chaired by Andrea Cook, Director, Evaluation Office UNFPA. The panelists included:

- **Keynote Speaker**: Francesca Grum, Chief, Social and Housing Statistics Section, UN Statistics Division
- **Discussant**: Alexandra Pittman, Independent Expert (expertise on evaluation and gender)
- **Discussant**: Leyla Sharafi, Technical Specialist, UNFPA (expertise on gender)
- **Discussant**: Elena Bardasi, Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank (expertise on evaluation, gender and equity)

The panel was moderated by Alexandra Chambel of UNFPA.

**SDG Indicators**

The presentation by the Keynote Speaker, Francesca Grum, highlighted three main areas: SDG indicators relevant for gender analysis; current data sources and data gaps to assess the situation of women compared to men; and statistical challenges in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the way forward.

Following the panel’s presentation, breakout groups were formed where participants were asked to offer further thoughts and reflections on topics raised during the session. Participants raised the following points, organized by question:

1. **What are the most difficult issues to measure with respect to (a) social equity and (b) gender equality?**

   Regarding social equity, measuring multiple identities and issues of intersectionality is a serious challenge. This requires nuanced understanding of current and historical context, and an understanding of the population (their varied needs and differences). Regarding gender equality, measuring complex and sensitive issues (such as domestic violence) is often dependent on the cultural context (e.g., societies where there is a culture of shame requiring a more nuanced analysis). However, culture and context should not be used as an excuse to undermine rights (e.g., women’s right to say no to sex, women’s use of contraception). Measuring underlying transformative change (e.g., changes in empowerment, social norms, mindsets, behavior, power at the intra household level versus formal level change (e.g., change in laws and polices) is needed. It was also noted that the data is often not granular enough to comprehensively understand the needs and rights (and their violations) of individuals within communities. When operating in a patriarchal system to integrate feminist evaluation, we need approaches that extend beyond checklists and sex disaggregated data.

2. **Given the newly adopted SDG framework, what do you see as the new challenges for assessing gender equality?**

   Participants discussed the “tyranny of the aggregate”—when aggregation versus specific cases and the individual need to be balanced in data collection. The individual is important because this is “who is left behind”. Participants also discussed demand
generation for rights holders—“Leaving no one behind” requires agencies and governments to be fit for purpose, with efforts needed to build demand from the bottom up with rights holders, especially those left behind. Paradigms that are drawn on the lines of capitalism and patriarchy cannot drive gender equality, let alone measure it.

3. What is the potential for innovative approaches to evaluation to capture the perspectives and voices of women and marginalized groups in a more inclusive evaluation process?

A human-rights based approach to evaluation—although not innovative—is crucial to ensuring the voices and perspectives of women and marginalized groups in the evaluation process. New approaches, such as big data, should be used with caution and localized and contextualized for the following reasons:

• We do not know how representative or inclusive they are, particularly of the most marginalized

• Is big data really not leaving anybody behind (who is really using Twitter in Uganda, for example)?

There must be a focus on participatory evaluation methods. Vulnerable and marginalized groups must be part of the evaluation process from the onset.

4. What have proven to be some of the most effective methods for gender-responsive and equity-focused evaluations?

Critical principles and approaches to ensure gender-responsive and equity-focused evaluations include: inclusion of women’s voices, human-rights based learning approach, gender and age disaggregation of data, transparency and culturally relevant language. Effective methods to hear women’s voices in different cultural contexts include participatory methods that can lift women’s voices up (e.g., story-telling and drama). Indicators can then be created from this data, that is, from the ground up. National survey data is important, but contextualization and analysis is needed.

5. What are the limitations of current data collection methods and their implications with regard to developing gender-responsive and equity-focused evaluations of the SDGs?

Key concepts and analytical categories (such as equality, equity, gender and empowerment) should be clearly developed and defined for the evaluation and applied throughout all phases, including data collection. Data collected for evaluation should include: intra-household data (from surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.) and data from other members of households (i.e., not just the head of the household). As data is often not collected on children and youth for ethical principles, children and youth may be “left out”. Limitations to quantitative data collection methods include: low levels of disaggregation, small sample sizes, and an inability to capture issues of power, access, participation, etc. Evaluation protocols must be adapted to particular contexts (i.e., disasters, internally displaced people camps, informal housing settlements). There are currently low levels of capacity to ensure that data collection methods themselves are gender-responsive and equity focused.

6. How can developments in data offer new opportunities for evaluating the SDGs from a gender-responsive lens? What is the potential for new sources of data to capture the perspectives and voices of women and marginalized groups?

Social media as a new source of data should complement traditional sources (official statistics). Even if new sources of data exist, disaggregation is often not granular enough to capture variation within groups and among marginalized people. Availability of shadow data and raw data sets could offer new opportunities for evaluating the SDGs from a gender-responsive lens. Cross-tabulation of multiple data sets can offer new opportunities for evaluating the SDGs from a gender-responsive lens. Data generated from unstructured methods—such as a “walk and talk” approach and storytelling—can capture the perspectives and voices of women and marginalized groups.
Workshop 2.

Evaluation and complexity: Dealing with the increasing complexity of development ensuring “No one is left behind”

Key Issues

Complexity is a new dimension in the evaluation of the SDGs. Addressing complexity includes questioning about: How do evaluators identify boundaries, inter-relationships, policy environment, different segments of communities, etc., in a given situation? And most important, how do they ensure “No one is left behind” in any situation?

There are many areas that need to be addressed when taking complexity into consideration:

• Governance—Whose programme and programme theory is it? Are there different agendas? Are there emergent agendas?

• Focus—What are the intended outcomes and impacts in the programme theory? Are they different? Emergent?

• Causality—Necessity and sufficiency? Are there complicated causal packages involved in producing the impacts? Are the causal packages changing often?

• Consistency—Should the programme be the same everywhere? Should it be adapted in ways that can be identified and prescribed in advance? Or does it need to be adapted always to specific contexts?

• Change trajectory—is the trajectory of change readily predictable (we often assume a straight line)? Or predictable with expertise? Or unpredictable?

• Unintended outcomes—How can programme theory identify possible unintended outcomes? How can M&E stay alert to unanticipated and emergent unintended outcomes?

Process and summary

The workshop was chaired by Colin Kirk, Director, Evaluation Office, UNICEF. Panelists included:

• Speaker: Thomas A. Schwandt, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

• Speaker: Claudia Maldonado, Director, CLEAR Centre, Latin America

• Discussant: Dorothy Lucks, co-chair EVALSDGs

The workshop was facilitated by Tessie Catsambas, Encompass President.

Because the SDGs are interconnected, national policies and programmes to implement them will be complex. As programmes grow in size and scope, the number of partners and stakeholders and the kinds of social and behavioural changes they seek to produce become more complex—both in terms of how they are designed and implemented, and in terms of how they must be evaluated. Complexity is defined in terms of: (a) the nature of the programme, (b) the number of partners and stakeholders and the patterns of interaction among them (including the level of consensus or disagreement among them on the goals of the programmes), (c) the number of external (contextual) factors that influence how the programme is implemented and its outcomes, and (d) the complexity of the causal chains through which outcomes are to be achieved. A number of additional factors are particularly important for the evaluation of social equity and gender equality, including: (i) social and cultural constraints and pressures, (ii) the power relationships and social definition of gender relations and social equity, (iii) multiple influences on
processes of behavioural change, (iv) the role of social media, and (v) the long, non-linear causal chains through which changes are produced.

There need to be new ways of thinking, as complexity doesn’t work within linear theories of change. There is no linear relationship between cause and effect, and there is a false dichotomy between thinking and doing. In this situation, should evaluation look like more monitoring? What if communities own both the implementation and monitoring of SDGs? In this case, does evaluation need to be independent?

The workshop stressed the importance of being aware of boundaries, perspectives and interactions of complexity. Boundaries are created with every definition and decision, so it is important to be careful and reflective when setting boundaries. It is also important to recognize who decides on the boundaries and who is left out. Narrow boundaries might allow for deeper examination, but they may leave people out. Broad boundaries may be more inclusive, but they can lead to thin interventions. In addition, it is important to ask how theory of change is important in addressing complexity. Can theory of change address or capture complex situations?

Evaluators need to stay open to many different perspectives beyond scope boundaries, including being mindful of the power balance in evaluation: Who decides? Who participates? Who speaks? Whose measures are being used? Whose questions are being asked? Whose decisions are being made? The solution is to work through principles such as gender equality, human rights, ethics and equity.

In this context, policymakers also have an important role as policy is an “ongoing contract” and democratic accountability never finishes. Evaluation should be a partner to policy. Evaluators need to be clear for the audience and relevant to the discourse by getting support from advocacy experts. There is also a need to bring evaluators, policymakers and civil society together for collaborative learning.

Learning new ways of conducting evaluations is a must when facing the complexity of the SDGs. Evaluators may have to expand the evidence universe, not just rely on results-based management. Through evaluation, expectations of interventions can be challenged. Evaluation helps to find what is missing.

Be mindful of the power balance in evaluation:
Who decides? Who participates? Who speaks?
Whose measures? Whose questions? Whose decisions?

Workshop 3.
Demand for and use of evidence from evaluation: Understanding the political economy of equity-focused and gender-responsive evidence

**Key Issues**

One of the factors responsible for low use of evaluations is a misconception among policymakers that evaluation is another name for auditing. There is also a perception that evaluations are used to find faults and to go on a "witch hunt". Lack of appreciation of the value evaluations bring to the benefits from policies and programmes—and a belief that the costs involved in evaluations are avoidable opportunity costs—are also reasons for low demand. Lack of capacity to demand and use evaluations is also a serious handicap.

Low utilization is also due to the fact that evaluations are sometimes carried out by programme managers merely to fulfil donor requirements, resulting in a lack of strong convergence between the users of evaluation and evaluation ownership. While there are always multiple stakeholders in any development intervention, evaluation reports are often written with only one stakeholder (usually the donor) in mind. In addition, evaluation results are rarely disseminated widely to make them accessible to all concerned. This may be due to an organization’s lack of a communications team or a dissemination plan that includes the responsible parties.

There is considerable hesitation in either integrating equity and gender aspects into existing national evaluation policies or in establishing stand-alone guidelines. These issues are not adequately prioritized while planning, implementing and monitoring programmes.

**Process and Summary**

The workshop was conducted jointly by the Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation and the UNDP IEO. The workshop was moderated by Hon. Kabir Hashim, Minister of Public Enterprise Development, Sri Lanka and Chair of the Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation and held with a presentation from Arild Hauge, Deputy Director of UNDP IEO and two rounds of discussion with following attendees:

- Chair for round 1: Hon. Susan Musyoka, Member of Parliament, Kenya
- Chair for round 2: Hon. Samuel Hoyos, Member of Parliament, Colombia
- Panelist: Hon. Olfa Cherif, Member of Parliament, Tunisia
- Panelist: Hon. Natalia Nikitenko, Member of Parliament, Kyrgyzstan
- Panelist: Hon. Pol Ham, Member of National Assembly, Cambodia

Parliamentarians and policymakers can help ensure that national strategies and policies are in line with and include SDGs, particularly by making sure that SDGs are reflected in government and ministry reports to parliament and discussing them in parliamentary committees and commissions with an oversight function to provide accountability of the government and ministries. Parliamentarians can also facilitate

“In Kyrgyzstan, we have the M&E law (Law of the Kyrgyz Republic #35 of February 18, 2014), which introduced amendments to existing laws requiring monitoring and evaluation of legislation and programmes.”

—Natalia Nikitenko
collaboration with other stakeholders on accountabil-
ity on the SDGs.

Parliamentarians and policymakers also have a role to
promote M&E nationally. Parliamentarians work as a
conduit between the government and the people, and
are accountable to the people much as the govern-
ment is to parliament. Parliamentarians also have a
role to demand and support legislation on M&E and
national M&E policies (e.g., amendments on M&E
and gender-responsive budgeting), to facilitate capac-
ity building of M&E systems nationally. Parliaments
should empower oversight units (e.g., committees,
commissions and M&E units) to promote evaluation
reports to the decision makers. Parliamentarians at-
tending the workshop also raised practical concerns
including budgetary provisions for and independence
of M&E at the national level.

Parliamentarians also emphasized their role to
strengthen equity-focused and gender-responsive
evaluation for SDGs. This includes working with
VOPEs, civil society, evaluators and other stakeholders
on building capacity; developing gender-responsive
budgets (e.g., Colombia, Mexico, Tunisia); promoting
gender and human rights expertise in all amendments
in the parliament (e.g., Kyrgyzstan); promoting
oversight committees and commissions to demand

In some countries, parliamentarians are engaged in
promoting an evaluation culture. In Kenya, a parlia-
mentary caucus has been established to advocate to
the Parliament for evaluation. In Nepal, the National
Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation Policy has been
established with representation from many political
parties. Furthermore, evaluation is included in the
national constitution in Nepal due to advocacy by
several parliamentarian champions; the draft National
Evaluation Policy Act is ready to be submitted to the
Parliament. In Kyrgyzstan, the M&E Law (Law of the
Kyrgyz Republic #35) was passed in February 2014
and introduced amendments to existing laws requiring
M&E of legislation and programmes. A parliamentar-
ian champion and evaluation community leaders took
the lead in passing the law.

The Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation and
regional forums are encouraging parliamentarians
to help create and strengthen an enabling environ-
ment for evaluation, and in particular, equity-focused
and gender-responsive national evaluation policies
and systems.
CONCLUSIONS

New metrics for evaluation of SDGs

To advance responsive and equity-focused evaluations of the SDGs, new metrics—within evaluation, data and indicators—must be transformative. Towards that end, systematic, long-term and meaningful engagement with diverse actors—including community members, indigenous groups, and women’s rights groups and movements—is critical. Indeed, the experiences, opinions and expertise of those directly impacted by the implementation of the SDGs must shape the contours of new metrics and be engaged in the M&E of the programming.

Evaluation is a tool to better un-earth and visualize power relations and entrenched gender norms. Mixed methods—using qualitative and quantitative data and methods in evaluation—are important, but may be insufficient to ensure gender-responsive and equity-focused evaluations. The use of existing evaluation approaches particularly suited for capturing complex social change (such as outcome mapping and most significant change) as well as the development of new tools can contribute to greater gender-responsive and equity-focused evaluations. Such approaches and tools should be shared widely, with support for South-South cooperation and peer exchange and learning within and across countries.

Strengthening data systems

Data disaggregation is not enough to ensure “No one is left behind”. There is a need for statistics departments to work jointly with evaluators. Responsibility relies on joint work among statisticians, evaluators, policymakers and parliamentarians.

The challenges in reporting against indicators is collecting quality and timely data. Limitations to quantitative data collection methods include: low levels of disaggregation; sample sizes that are too small; and an inability to capture issues of power, access, participation, etc. Use of gender disaggregated data is often limited to vital demographic indicators, such as sex ratio and literacy rates, and does not really capture gender dimensions in critical aspects, such as the kind of negative gender roles fostered through non-availability of service provisions, such as water and sanitation. Identifying the factors that lead to social inequalities has been difficult to measure with respect to social equity. Qualitative methods involve the collection, analysis and interpretation of data that are not easily reduced to numbers.

Lack of data storage is another challenge that needs to be addressed. There is a need to institutionalize data management in order to eliminate poor and unmeasurable data. Key responsible government institutions, such as departments of census and statistics and ministries of health and education, need to have strong data storing systems and dissemination mechanisms.

In addition, evaluation needs to be owned by communities so that reliable disaggregated data can be collected from the community itself. Identification of marginalized groups and communities and use of participatory methods would help to gather intended data. This needs to be complemented by mixed methods in order to not only measure but also understand how social change and, therefore, gender change happens. Specifically, gender analysis tools and feminist methodologies are key to get relevant gender information and empower people.

Addressing complexity

The complexity of the SDGs showcases a new reality for evaluation. To address this complexity, evaluation will need to look into boundaries, perspectives and interactions. This includes devising new roles for evaluators as facilitators, expanding the evidence universe, and making sure the voices of the most vulnerable are heard.
The diversity of actors involved in an intervention in current contexts and their different interests—often conflicting—is one of the dimensions that needs more attention. This is especially true given the importance of “hearing all voices” and building a vision and agreement on the assessments made. Evaluation design needs to take into account in-depth understanding of local contexts. It also needs to be fully-customized and context specific. It is essential to understand local scenarios and how they interact with global processes, as this allows evaluators to understand how the “global” is manifested in the local. In addition, understanding the role of the environment in each process and its relationship with the population is key—especially for the most disadvantaged populations. Methods that advocate horizontal evaluation processes and encourage dialogues with various actors and reflection with the population are critical.

A multi-layer, multi-dimensional and multi-method approach is needed to address complexity of interventions. Monitoring has a privileged place in the context of interventions in complex environments. Monitoring requires one to pay attention to the story, patterns, events and simple numbers that are used to measure things. Participatory monitoring with different stakeholders is particularly important in evaluations of complex programmes.

Theory of change of localized SDGs will need to consider the complexity of programmes. However, theory of change may not capture all aspects. Therefore evaluation designs, evaluation methods and processes need to be concise to capture different dimensions of the programme and complexity.

National evaluation policies and systems

National M&E systems should focus on the SDGs as they cover all aspects of interventions. National evaluation policies are key in all countries. According to the Global Study on Mapping National Evaluation Policies, only 20 countries have formalized national evaluation policies. And of those existing policies, only a few include equity and/or gender equality provisions. For example, Kenya, Nepal and Zimbabwe include some gender equality aspects in their national evaluation policies and Afghanistan includes an equity-focused and gender-responsive section.

Countries such as Mexico, Chile, Colombia and South Africa have strong national evaluation systems and Malaysia has a strong results-based planning, budgeting and monitoring system. However, these systems need to strengthen equity-focused and gender-responsive aspects in evaluation. Currently, the main focus in many countries is on financial monitoring rather than results. The government capacity to plan, commission, disseminate and use evaluations needs to be increased. Moving beyond financial monitoring requires capacity to lobby evaluation, capacity to manage the evaluation process, capacity of individual evaluators to successfully conduct evaluations and capacity to use evaluations. Peer learning from successful national evaluation systems needs to be strengthened.

Localizing SDG indicators

All countries need to work on localized SDG indicators, monitoring data collection and evaluation of SDGs. The 230 global indicators cover all 169 SDG targets, which helps countries measure their own progress of indicators. The discussion on localizing indicators needs wider stakeholder consultation. It is also needed to identify targets, data needs, data sources and who is finally managing indicators at the national level.

Demand for and use of evidence from equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation to inform equitable development

Political will is key in any country in order to strengthen evaluation culture. Parliamentarians and political leaders need to demand high-quality evaluations in order to make policy decisions and allocate resources for development interventions. Evaluation reports can be key information sources for parliament debates, committee meetings and cabinet papers. For this,
parliamentarians need brief and concise evaluation reports with key findings and recommendations that are easy to read and reference.

There is also a need to bridge the gap between parliamentarians and the evaluation community. The evaluation community often complains that it is difficult to engage parliamentarians in evaluation. However, parliamentarians need evaluators to help them understand evaluation results and consider recommendations for decision making. Parliamentarians have a very important role to play as promoters of gender-responsive evaluation for the SDGs. They are able to build the demand for gender-responsive evaluation and link policymakers to evaluations in order to strengthen accountability.

Use of evaluation is key to the evaluation process. In particular, the management response to an evaluation could help the government use the evaluation findings to improve services and programme quality. There needs to be a close linkage between evaluation recommendations, planning and monitoring processes. M&E and programme teams need to synthesize lessons learned from evaluations from other countries, in addition to findings from their own organization and other organizations, in order to inform future programme plans.

Multi-stakeholder partnerships

Since evaluating SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens is a new area for many countries, cross-country learning is needed. Multi-stakeholder partnerships, such as EvalPartners, contribute to improving horizontal learning among countries. Even at the national level, partnerships among the evaluation community, the government, parliamentarians, development partners and other stakeholders allow for increased learning. VOPEs can play a vital role at the national level to bring stakeholders together.

National evaluation capacities

National evaluation capacities are critical for quality evaluations, particularly those related to the SDGs. Most important, many countries need capacity building on equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluations with concrete examples from successful countries. This includes creating an enabling environment for evaluation, technical expertise of evaluators, and availability of equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation guidelines.

Countries need to have national level equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation guidelines and codes of conduct developed in consultation with a wide group of stakeholders. There should be a systematic approach to strengthen the capacity of public officers who are managing evaluations and individual evaluators. The designated department responsible for M&E at the national level should have the authority to undertake capacity building on evaluation and coordinate with all the line ministries and departments. Most countries do not have technical capacity on management response or use of evaluations. This needs to be strengthened though government M&E departments and parliamentarians. Relevant organizations with technical expertise may coordinate efforts to develop resource materials, suggest guidelines, conduct training and provide technical support.
ANNEX 1.

Links to relevant presentations

How to ensure the SDGs will be evaluated with a focus on “No one left behind”

- PPT by Marco Segone, UNEG Chair; Director, UN Women Independent Evaluation Office; Co-chair, EvalGender+

- Keynote Speech by Maithree Wickramasinghe, Professor at the University of Kelaniya, Gender and Evaluation Advocate, Sri Lanka

The relevance of “new metrics” (measurement tools and indicators) for the evaluation of SDGs with a focus on “No one left behind”

- PPT by Stefan Schweinfest, Director, UN Statistics Division

Workshop 1. The relevance of “new metrics” for the evaluation of SDGs: Data for development and indicators for equity and gender equality

- PPT by Workshop Keynote Speaker: Francesca Grum, Chief, Social and Housing Statistics Section, United Nations Statistics Division

Workshop 2. Evaluation and complexity: Dealing with the increasing complexity of development ensuring “no one is left behind”

- PPT by Claudia Maldonado, Director, CLEAR Centre, Latin America

- PPT by Thomas A. Schwandt, PhD, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Workshop 3. Demand for and use of evidence from evaluation: Understanding the political economy of equity-focused and gender-responsive evidence

- PPT by Arild Hauge, Deputy Director, UNDP Independent Evaluation Office

- PPT by Ada Ocampo, Senior Evaluation Advisor, UNICEF Evaluation Office

Presentation of thematic workshops discussions: Key issues and suggestions for follow-up

- Summary Workshop 1 presented by Andrea Cook, Director Evaluation Office, UNFPA

- Summary Workshop 2 presented by Colin Kirk, Director Evaluation Office, UNICEF, Co-chair, EvalPartners

- Summary Workshop 3 presented by Natalia Nikitenko, Member of Parliament, Kyrgyzstan

Video recording

- High-Level Event video/ audio recording

- Technical Event video/ audio recording

Social media

Twitter compilation: https://storify.com/unwomenEval/new-york-high-level-event-leave-no-one-behind
ANNEX 2.

E-discussion: Evaluating SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens ("No one left behind")

A2.1 E-discussion announcement

Multi-stakeholder e-consultation:

No one left behind

Evaluating the SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens

Purpose of the consultation

Following the approval of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by the UN General Assembly and by the international development community in 2015, EvalPartners (including EvalGender+) and United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) members have begun to form working groups to strengthen monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems to assess these different goals. The purpose of the present consultations, organized by EvalGender+, UNEG and the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of UN Women, is to provide guidance to strengthen M&E systems to assess all SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens, in addition to Goal 5 (Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls) and Goal 10 (Reduce inequality within and among countries). The above mentioned agencies and network, in collaboration with other strategic stakeholders, are planning to prepare a Guidance Note that will assist both actors directly involved in social equity and gender equality, as well as all actors involved with the evaluation of the SDGs, in ensuring that social equity and gender equality are adequately addressed in all of the SDG evaluations. The SDG strategy is to work through, and to help strengthen existing M&E systems at the national and local levels and consequently the focus of the present consultations is on indicators and approaches that can be implemented through existing M&E structures—many of which may have limited experience and resources to address social equity and gender equality issues.

In addition to their importance as stand-alone SDGs, both of these are cross-cutting themes that must be integrated into the assessment of all of the other goals. For example, the achievement of Goal 2 (end hunger), Goal 3 (ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages), Goal 7 (ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable modern energy) and Goal 13 (take urgent action to combat climate change), to mention only four, all have important gender dimensions that affect the achievement of these goals. Similarly, there are social equity dimensions to all goals. To read more on SDGs visit the link “Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development” available at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld

The consultations identify four important themes that must be addressed in the M&E systems to assess SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-equality lens, in addition to goals 5 and 10:

- **Theme 1.** The relevance of “new metrics” (measurement tools and indicators) for the evaluation of SDGs from an equity-focused and gender-responsive perspective

- **Theme 2.** Evaluation and complexity: Dealing with the increasing complexity of development and interconnectedness of SDGs to ensure “no one is left behind”

- **Theme 3.** Towards equity-focused and gender-responsive national evaluation systems: Multi-stakeholder partnerships to strengthen national evaluation capacities
Theme 4. Demand for and use of evidence from equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation to inform equitable development

Each of these themes has different implications in different countries, regions and sectors, and according to the type of organization. Consequently we invite you to share your experiences and perspectives to assist the EvalGender+, UNEG and UN Women IEO teams in ensuring that the Guidance Note will reflect the diversity of experiences and perspectives in different countries, regions and types of organization.

Theme 1. The relevance of “new metrics” (measurement tools and indicators) for the evaluation of SDGs from an equity-focused and gender-responsive perspective

In recent years a number of “new metrics” have evolved that can potentially widen the range of indicators and measures available for the M&E of development results from equity and gender-responsive perspectives. These include:

- Data that can now be collected through mobile phones, tablets, internet, GPS mapping and other new information technologies
- “Big data” collected from satellites and drones, remote sensors, analysis of Twitter and social media, mobile phone records, digital electronic transfers (including purchase of mobile-phone air time and ATM withdrawals) and crowdsourcing
- Participatory consultations (e.g., Most Significant Change, Outcome Harvesting)
- Concept mapping
- Mixed methods evaluations
- Feminist research methods (e.g., oral history, feminist ethnography and content analysis, power relations, social justice and empowerment approaches)

Participants are invited to share their thoughts and experiences on the following questions (as well as others they propose) as they relate to equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation.

- In your experience, what are some of the limitations of current data collection methods and the kinds of indicators they produce?
- What are the most difficult issues to measure with respect to social equity? What about those with respect to gender equality?
- What are the new challenges for assessing sustainable social equity and gender equality?
- What have proved some of the most effective methods?
- In addition to those mentioned above, what other new metrics are you familiar with?
- Which of the new metrics show the greatest promise?

Theme 2. Evaluation and complexity: Dealing with the increasing complexity of development and interconnectedness of SDGs to ensure “no one is left behind”

As SDGs are interconnected, national policies and programmes to implement them will be complex. As programmes grow in size and scope, the number of partners and stakeholders, and in terms of the kinds of social and behavioral changes they seek to produce, they become more complex—not only in terms of how they are designed and implemented, but also in terms of how they must be evaluated. Complexity is defined in terms of: (a) the nature of the programme, (b) the number of partners and stakeholders and the patterns of interaction among them (including the level of consensus or disagreement among them on the goals of the programmes), (c) the number of external (contextual) factors that influence how the programme is implemented and its outcomes, and (d) the complexity of the causal chains through which outcomes are to be achieved. A number of additional factors are particularly important for the evaluation of social equity and gender equality, including: (a) social and cultural constraints and pressures, (b) the power relationships...
and social definition of gender relations and social equity, (c) multiple influences on processes of behavioral change, (d) the role of social media, and (e) the long, non-linear causal chains through which changes are produced.

Participants are invited to share their thoughts and experiences on the following questions (as well as others they propose) as they relate to equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation.

- Which dimensions of complexity are most important in your work on social equity and gender equality?

- How does complexity affect our understanding of the effectiveness of different interventions on the production of changes in social equity and gender equality?

- What methods and approaches have you found most effective for understanding the outcomes of complex programmes on social equity and gender equality?

- The processes of change are long, involving many actors and contextual factors. Also, the processes are not linear as advances on one front often involve set-backs on others. What kinds of evaluation strategies have you found most effective in these complex scenarios?

- What are the special challenges for understanding the impacts of different interventions on the most vulnerable populations? What evaluation methods are most effective for studying these very sensitive processes of change?

**Theme 3. Towards equity-focused and gender-responsive national evaluation systems: Multi-stakeholder partnerships to strengthen national evaluation capacities**

The SDGs pose challenges for national evaluation systems as the SDGs require the involvement of a broader range of stakeholders, a broadening of the range of indicators to be measured, and the methodological and organizational problems required to assess sustainability that requires collecting data over a much longer period of time. Many programmes are intended to produce benefits that continue over 5 or even 10 years, and the evaluation must (ideally) continue over all of this period. So instead of conventional evaluations that often only cover the three to five years of project implementation, the SDG evaluations may be required to continue for twice as long. The application of a social equity and gender equality lens will often present additional challenges for national evaluation systems, including the fact that the evaluation of gender outcomes and impacts is often the weakest part of many national evaluation systems and the methodologies for evaluating social equity are also not well developed in many countries (or in the evaluation literature in general). Given resource constraints of many evaluation agencies, it will often not be possible to consider specialized evaluations that focus exclusively on equity and gender, and it will be necessary to adapt standard M&E methodologies to address these issues. It will be important to consider the extent to which some of the multi-stakeholder partnerships can bring in agencies with expertise in these areas and with additional resources that may permit the selective application of gender and equity-focused data collection and analysis methodologies.

Participants are invited to share their thoughts and experiences on the following questions (as well as others they propose) as they relate to equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation.

- In your experience, what will be the main challenges that national evaluation systems will face when evaluating social equity and gender equality?

- In the countries with which you are familiar, how well established are the methodologies for evaluating these two areas?

- Which kinds of organizations have the most experience in the evaluation of these two areas? Are these organizations already part of the national evaluation systems? If not, what will be required to ensure their active involvement?

- What kinds of evaluation capacity development will be required to strengthen the capacity of the national evaluation systems to address these issues?
• What are examples of successful partnership in your country or in your area of work to strengthen M&E systems in general, and equity-focused and gender-responsive systems in particular?

• What are the opportunities and challenges for such partnerships?

Theme 4. Demand for and use of evidence from equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation to inform equitable development

Experience from all regions and sectors shows that one of the biggest challenges facing evaluation systems is the very low rate of utilization of evaluations. In many cases, evaluation findings do not reach many of the key organizations and groups (including community and women’s organizations). In other cases, they are not presented in a form that is easily accessible to some groups, particularly the most vulnerable. Even when evaluations are reviewed, action is often not taken on many of the recommendations. These challenges are likely to be even more serious for social equity and gender equality as these themes are less familiar to many organizations and the mechanisms to review and action on recommendations are often less developed.

Participants are invited to share their thoughts and experiences on the following questions (as well as others they propose) as they relate to equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation.

• In your experience, what are the factors affecting the demand for and use of evaluation?

• Are there additional factors affecting the demand and utilization of social equity and gender equality evaluations?

• How could the demand and utilization of these evaluations be increased?

• What types of evaluation presentations would you propose to make evaluation more accessible to stakeholders?

A2.2 E-discussion summary

Theme 1. The relevance of “new metrics” (measurement tools and indicators) for the evaluation of SDGs from an equity-focused and gender-responsive perspective

Prepared by Rituu B. Nanda, India (member EvalGender + Management Group)

In your experience what are some of the limitations of current data collection methods and the kinds of indicators they produce?

In terms of current data collection methods and the kinds of indicators they produce, the major limitation is with regard to institutional capacities—particularly, the civil society organizations, a systemic lack of M&E professionals, and adequate budget for M&E significantly hamper sound data collection. Different donor requirements for different programmes amongst civil society organizations/non-governmental organizations (NGOs) also creates confusion. Other issues that may need emphasis are promoting participation of stakeholders, especially through effective public-private partnership, and developing clear indicators. The lack of a common set of indicators to measure the impact of interventions on vulnerable populations itself is a major challenge that needs to be addressed. There is an urgent need to develop indicators that can be used across interventions and contexts that not only capture country or region-specific impact (general details) but also collect nuanced details regarding factors leading to discrimination and inequality (specific details).

Respondents noted that we should revisit some of the challenging indicators and targets like Goal 2, Goal 5 and Goal 10. For instance, an example is Goal 5 related to “end all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere”, which has proposed “Indicator 1: Whether or not legal frameworks are in place to promote equality and non-discrimination on the basis of sex”. We may have legal frameworks, but is there a conducive environment for the promotion of the same? What of the cultural and religious considerations, which
make women and girls feel subordinate to men and boys, and why is this accepted without questioning? Participants observed the need to have a set of global indicators as well as country-wide indicators. They added that gender must be included as a cross-cutting theme, such as SDGs 11 (11.2), 6 and 7.

Qualitative methods involve the collection, analysis and interpretation of data that are not easily reduced to numbers. These data relate to the various social world, concepts and behaviors of people and are not straightforward interventions, such as employment.

Another question was where to collect the data. Most cases should collect it from legal entities, such as institutions. Lack of data storage was another challenge that was highlighted. Use of sex disaggregated data is limited to vital demographic indicators, such as sex ratio and literacy rates and does not really capture gender dimensions in critical aspects, such as the kind of negative gender roles fostered through non-availability of service provisions such as water and sanitation. Conversely, these discussions exist in pro-poor development agendas, however they often fail to get mainstreamed in the formal discourse of urban development programmes, which have wider scope. Thus even when vision statements include social equity as a goal, this is not actually translated in the plan preparation process, proposals and outcome, as these do not use necessary indicators that can reflect status of social equity.

It will be critical to recognize the cross linkages between various programmes under different departments and ministries of national governments in light of the interconnected nature of the SDGs. This can facilitate bringing convergence in implementation.

What are the most difficult issues to measure with respect to gender equality?

One challenge is how to measure individual choices, for instance, the choice of medical treatments. Formulation and implementation of public policies for gender equality is a central issue. Therefore, the most difficult items to measure are the degree of efficiency and effectiveness of public policies geared towards gender equality.

Citing an example from Nigeria in finding out the ways women participate in politics across geopolitical zones, one respondent noted that even using mixed methods, the indicators do not capture all that needs to be captured. In measuring social equity, there is a need to take into consideration the background of each group and not to generalize and assume the same solutions to individual challenges.

The most difficult issues to measure are those that are related to the “why”: Why are (or aren’t) measures of equity changing? What is the context? Do changes in those measures have a meaningful impact on the lives of women and/or other marginalized groups? Another example is income equality. We may see gains in income equality in the years ahead. But why? Is it because women are working more hours, so their aggregate incomes are higher than men’s, even if men are working less? If a woman’s income goes up, is her quality of life also improving, or is getting worse/staying the same because of issues like long hours and/or control over family finances?

If we are looking at power relations, let us not forget those with other sexual identities like men who have sex with men and transgender.

What are the new challenges for assessing sustainable social equity and gender equality?

• It is difficult to measure sustainability because of polarized and changing situations. The challenge is to define smart basic process indicators managed by the country office planning, monitoring and evaluation system, which can be supported both technically and politically.

• Identifying the factors that lead to social inequalities has been difficult to measure with respect to social equity. The Joint Monitoring Programme background note on MDGs admits that though the
Joint Monitoring Programme has disaggregated quantitative data, “axes of difference such as race, ethnicity, religion, and gender, are often avenues of discrimination and understanding them better could help reveal the dynamics leading to differential outcomes in access to water and sanitation within and across countries.”

• Another problem is that sex/gender is only, to a certain extent, a variable that can be measured in quantitative terms. Often it is a construct or a process: doing gender + (intersectionality) in context that has to be studied concerning patterns of behaviour, organizational structures, gender contracts, etc.

• Members were concerned with the over-emphasis on “measurable” data to the neglect of observing small impacts, for example in intra-household power relations.

• Other difficult issues to measure with respect to social equity and gender equality relate to “governance” of the key programmes and their timely “qualitative and quantitative progress monitoring/tracking” against agreed outcomes, outputs, targets and indicators during implementation at various levels. Governance indicators allow focus on core elements of governance (e.g., accountability, transparency, participation in government decision making), and other issues of gender and social equity could be linked to these core elements.

• Respondents raised the issue of how evaluation can assess gendered perceptions of the implementing agents. Concepts of what counts as feminist “empowerment” vary significantly across contexts. The lack of a fit between the community-level concepts of empowerment and those of the implementing bodies can affect the kind of “impact” that a certain project can or cannot have.

• One of our biggest challenges will be in moving beyond the current “gender = women” framework and towards a framework that draws more on critical diversity studies, where gender (as in, judgements, norms and stereotypes related to femininity and masculinity, NOT men and women) is one of several intersecting hierarchies of disadvantage. Gender = women (being born with a vagina) is often understood as automatic entry into a state of disadvantage, ignoring class and/or caste, race and/or ethnicity and physical ability and other social hierarchies.

• Evaluations should start from a baseline of knowing if anything changed for those most excluded. If we are serious about addressing the SDGs, we need to accept that intersections of inequality matter. When it comes to gender-based violence, are we able to recognize that male children who are considered effeminate are often abused by both mothers and fathers?

• In measuring social equity, there is a need to take into consideration the background of each group and not to assume same solutions to individual challenges. Gender issues are sticky and sometimes—even with the best indicators and questions—it is not always possible to get factual data.

• It is difficult to scale poverty and wellbeing. Women and men from deprived families may have not sufficient nourishable foods due to of deprivation but do have social recognition.

• The new challenges for the evaluation of social equity and equality of the sustainable kind is the fact that some leaders and managers are not interested in equity issues and do not find interest in uncovering gender power disparities (between men and women, rich and poor, rulers and ruled, etc.)

What have proved some of the most effective methods?

Institutionalized data collection can help eliminate poor and unmeasurable data. All levels of government institutions (such as a department of census and statistics), NGOs, academic institutions and the private sectors (i.e., through chamber of commerce activist institutions in the health sector) should be involved.
**Oral histories and ethnographic tools** are effective in capturing power dynamics in society.

**Evaluation needs to be owned by the communities.** Governments could assist by focusing on inclusively organized neighbourhood groups, which could be a beginning for gender-responsive empowerment and governance participation. We should focus more on how communities can be a key stakeholder while planning an evaluation and give them the ownership to decide on the indicators and tools. We can seek community perception on what has changed over 15 years (SDG period) on gender and equity issues: What has improved, and what has not? For whom? Why?

Additionally, we need mixed methods if we want to not only measure but also understand how social change, and therefore, gender change, happens. Specifically, gender analysis tools and feminist methodologies are key to obtaining relevant gender information and empowering people. Good work in this field exists, and we need to disseminate it, train people on it, and engage them in the promotion of an evaluation culture and gender equality.

Another view was that mixed methods are good but sometimes are not sufficient. Gender issues are sticky, and even with the best indicators and questions, it is not always possible to get factual data. Some respondents noted that engaging community members can help in getting the right response. However, others noted that respondents still might refuse to provide the correct response. Compounding it, when there is gender imbalance, a man or woman may not reveal factual gender positions. Members shared solutions like development of facilitation skills amongst evaluators and use of a strength-based approach and/or community life competence approach to create an environment where stakeholders can share openly. Other tools include:

- UNDP tools for a participative process for gender budgeting
- Spatial mappings
- Gender profiling of public expenditures with impact assessment studies
- Gender appraisal of programmes and schemes
- Gender-based auditing
- Seasonal mobility mapping, work stress scaling, vulnerability mapping, linkage analysis
- A “life course approach tool” that can help identify factors underlying inequalities
- One example cited included a community mobilization approach developed by Raising Voices in Uganda called **SASA!** It was initially developed to combat domestic and gender-based violence but was found to have significantly broader successful applications. Instead of discussing or considering perpetrators and victims or models of behaviour, it tackled issues based on power, the theory being that everyone has felt more and less powerful at various times in their lives and so everyone can relate to it from both sides.

- Strong monitoring systems incorporating a gender and equity lens are critical for gender and equity-focused evaluation (example provided below from Anti-Slavery International)

- Lastly, a large number of respondents (at least 60 per cent) noted:

  - There should be a stress on participatory approaches to evaluation.

  - Evaluations have become a ritual that is feared, like auditing of accounts. There is so much tension surrounding them, that often the data collected might not reflect the true position of the situation.

**What new metrics are promising?**

- Sustainability post-project evaluation needs to be done to measure sustainability, particularly from a gender and equity lens.

- There is a need for facilitation skills in evaluation, e.g., while undertaking a study on reproductive health
issues of migrant workers, asking them directly what are reproductive issues yielded discouraging results. Therefore, the development of evaluator facilitation skills that can facilitate stakeholder conversations and practice deep listening are key.

• There should be participatory statistics through which communities can collect quantitative data.

• Approaches to redefine and redistribute power are also central to potential for progress. Constellation’s self-assessment framework is a way for communities to create a dream for themselves and also assess how far they have come on the path towards achieving that dream. It is a strengths-based approach that seeks to understand a community’s aspirations and also helps them recognize their achievements and potential.

Are we really open to listen to what is coming from the informants? What kind of mind and heart should we have in order to listen and understand?

Is it plausible to think that an open mind can determine an open discussion with no agenda (either from the evaluator or from the informants)? Can an open mind lead to discussions that are closer to solutions or that are themselves solutions? We need a lot of courage, as human beings to accept that changes are happening in the present moment. It doesn’t make any sense to reduce that moment to an “information gathering” process.

This strongly links the methodology and the evaluation process to the usefulness of the evaluation itself. Such a process has a direct usefulness. After a similar process, all participants (even the evaluators) are enriched, empowered.

The privilege of being evaluators and conducting field-level analysis should be systematically used to empower people, simply by listening to them with an open mind and an open heart and no judgement. This cannot be forgotten when we talk about tools, professionalization of the evaluation function (since we need to develop different skills), and usefulness of the evaluations.

Potential uses of technology:

• The Cloud: Data collection through the Cloud has been very efficient in handling large amounts of information, is easily accessible and is cheap.

• Facebook and Web pages can collect information about messages, documents, etc.

• Video helps visualize the experiences, messages, and practices of beneficiaries.

• Skype can be useful for interviews and meetings.

But from a gender perspective, it is critical how information technology is accessed and utilized. Data collected through technology has to be disaggregated in terms of social and physical cleavages and regions for analysis from an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens. Data from phones, tablets, the internet and big data could be useful for looking at gender advances and challenges. For this, we need to have data disaggregated by sex. However, the most important thing to consider is critical gender dimensions in the definition of our indicators. The most important gender dimensions are: sexual division of labor and different gender roles, participation of women and men in private and public spheres, the control of the use of women’s bodies, practical and strategic gender needs, different use of time by women and men, and the unequal access to and control over resources, benefits and services. You then need to pre-test to ensure that these tools do not introduce bias and would be unsuitable to gather with women, youth and vulnerable groups, etc.

In formulating the evaluation questions, it is important to ensure that we take care to target women and other vulnerable groups.

Experiential example:

A survey in 2014 in Sri Lanka for a government programme placed more focus on quantitative data. Police stations in the area noted 22 entries in the record book based on gender-based violence and rape cases.
Data based on 5 rape cases:

• 1 out of 5 rape cases was convicted in a court of law.

• 3 out of 5 are still under investigation, with no identification of the convict and no arrest taking place. Explanations as per the records: not enough credibility in the evidence from either side.

• 1 out of 5 (final) had no action taken at all and have remained an entry in the police stations.

Data based on 17 gender-based violence cases:

• 5 out of 17 cases were transferred to police family council unit; no arrests were made.

• 6 out of 17 cases had evidence (such as documentation of hospitalization of the victim) and arrests were made (according to the police) but cases were not taken to the courts. The accused were released on bail after the strong advice given by the police.

• 2 cases out of 17 complaints were withdrawn by the victim.

• 4 cases had no action taken by the police.

Self-assessment by communities (multiple countries)

Often communities are passive recipients. Constellation has used a community life competence process to stimulate communities to respond to issues and also conduct self-assessment to track progress of their response. This has been done on multiple issues like gender-based violence, HIV, etc. An example is available at: http://aidscompetence.ning.com/profiles/blogs/competency-assessment-on

Peru: Equity challenges

Despite its status as a middle-income country, there are important gaps between the rural and urban population, because of ethnicity origin, age, gender, language and others. The Gender Inequality Index in 2013 was 0.433 (INEI Peru: 2013). There is a lot of work to do in favour of women’s rights, for example there are important problems: illiteracy, low level of women participation in the economically active population, low level of women political participation, high percentage of violence based gender, poor conditions to facilitate the exercise of sexual and reproductive health rights, etc. Peru did not achieve the MDG 5; the rate of maternal mortality was reduced to 40 per cent but not to 75 per cent, which was planned (PAHO: May 2014). The government management of gender public policies has a lot of problems. Two of them are the lack of evaluation capacities and public expenses.

India: Neighbourhood-community based approach—the Kudumbashree programme

This is an example of a good evaluation strategy at the state level. They began using tools that could be handled by women themselves. Using the tools, women could identify who needed priority attention. Almost 260,000 territorially-organized neighbourhood groups and their federation at the levels of the ward and the local governance structures like panchayats (rural local bodies) and municipalities (urban local bodies) offered women forums for discussing issues that affected them and the opportunity to do something about them. This did a lot in terms of women empowerment, water management, sanitation and hygiene. The result: more women than men were elected at the panchayat elections and the elected were not merely namesakes for their husbands (as often happens).

International experience: Monitoring with a gender and equity lens

Anti-Slavery International is committed to equity and “the impartial fulfilment of each person’s human rights and dignity”. This commitment includes gender equity, which is proactively exercised through consideration of the differentiated experiences, perspectives
and needs of males and females, and tailored responses that are developed with these differences in mind. Collection of sex-disaggregated data is fundamental, so it is collected where relevant, such as in the Child Domestic Workers project in Peru, on bonded labour in India, and social development work with communities of slave descent in Niger. In other contexts, the target population may be exclusively male or female; the focus of Anti-Slavery International’s work in Senegal is school boys called *talibé* who are exploited after having been sent from their homes to residential schools. They also work with women who are no longer under the control of their former masters in Mauritania.

**India: Reflecting on data from the ground**

There was an engagement on implementation of the PWDV Act in Odisha. Status reports were developed and shared with the WCD department at the state and district levels. There was a request to develop an M&E tool on a quarterly basis. After a long engagement, an M&E framework was developed and the government machinery used it, reflecting data from the district level. Presenting the findings at right forum and a continuous involvement from shareholders has the potential to lead to a systematic M&E process.

**India: Voice of transgender and men who have sex with men**

When examining power relations, it is important not to forget those with other sexual identities. Last April 2014, the Supreme Court of India passed a judgement on issues of transgender, giving them the right to choose their gender identity and a range of development measures, including status under other class. The effects of this are still to be seen in some areas—sadly, a recent study in Punjab, India indicated that the school drop rate is still high in transgender children.

**Resources**


“Using Participatory Statistics to Examine the Impact of Interventions to Eradicate Slavery: Lessons from the Field”. http://www.ids.ac.uk/publication/using-participatory-statistics-to-


“Promoting Human Rights and Gender Sensitive Evaluations: Key Ideas for Evaluating Gender Equality Results”. https://www.academia.edu/5627223/_Promoting_Human_Rights_and_Gender...

“Power, Institutions and Gender Relations: Can Evaluations Transform them? (Part II)”. http://gendereval.ning.com/profiles/blogs/power-institutions-and-

“Gender Mainstreaming Under Kudumbashree: An Analysis”. http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/30547/14/14_chapt....

Theme 2. Evaluation and complexity: Dealing with the increasing complexity of development and interconnectedness of SDGs to ensure “no one is left behind”

Prepared by Rituu B. Nanda, India (member EvalGender+ Management Group)

As SDGs are interconnected, national policies and programmes to implement them will be complex. As programmes grow in size and scope, the number of partners and stakeholders, and in terms of the kinds of social and behavioural changes they seek to produce, they become more complex—not only in terms of how they are designed and implemented, but also in terms of how they must be evaluated. Complexity is defined in terms of: (a) the nature of the programme, (b) the number of partners and stakeholders and the patterns of interaction among them (including the level of consensus or disagreement among them on the goals of the programmes), (c) the number of external (contextual) factors that influence how the programme is implemented and its outcomes, and (d) the complexity of the causal chains through which outcomes are to be achieved. A number of additional factors are particularly important for the evaluation of social equity and gender equality, including: (a) social and cultural constraints and pressures, (b) the power relationships and social definition of gender relations and social equity, (c) multiple influences on processes of behavioural change, (d) the role of social media, and (e) the long, non-linear causal chains through which changes are produced.

Participants are invited to share their thoughts and experiences on the following questions (as well as others they propose) as they relate to equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation.

- Which dimensions of complexity are most important in your work on social equity and gender equality?

- How does complexity affect our understanding of the effectiveness of different interventions on the production of changes in social equity and gender equality?

- What methods and approaches have you found most effective for understanding the outcomes of complex programmes on social equity and gender equality?

- The processes of change are long, involving many actors and contextual factors. Also the processes are not linear as advances on one front often involve setbacks on others. What kinds of evaluation strategies have you found most effective in these complex scenarios?

- What are the special challenges for understanding the impacts of different interventions on the most vulnerable populations? What evaluation methods are most effective for studying these very sensitive processes of change?

We know that M&E can be relatively straightforward processes within simple projects or programmes, and there are well established procedures and methods that can be applied. M&E systems face other difficulties in order to be designed and implemented at the level of complex organizations and interventions—simple, disorganized and organized. Simple problems can be solved through appropriate action and its evaluation (such as building a park or playground). Disorganised complexity, for example, different kinds of service systems in a city that overlap and make it difficult to access relevant services, can be solved by partial reduction through statistics and by applying different perspectives that can then be evaluated. However, organized complexity (for example, administratively opposing decisions and implementation leading to chaos) cannot really be solved, only studied through methods like systemic action research, negotiations with M & E.

Challenges to incorporating complexity in evaluation processes

- Dynamics/diversity across India: social (caste, class), cultural, power dynamics. This means one cannot rely on a uniform framework (e.g., Jharkhand vs. Kerala). There is also exclusion of people on multiple levels such as disability, HIV/AIDS, etc.
• Environment is in-flux (dynamism) and constantly changing: this causes problems when it comes to developing a concept/logic model.

• Different stakeholder interests and agendas, which may not be covered—the stronger and more vocal stakeholders may try to influence the process and outcomes.

• Work on gender equality often faces a lot of resistance (organizational, social, operative). Gender equality is understood from a very diverse perspective.

Evaluation strategies found most effective in complex scenarios

• One risk to overcome is the thinking that complex situations are unpredictable and therefore a theory of change cannot be developed. On the contrary, it is quite important to capture a hypotheses of how we think we can get to the change we want. What is needed is a “complexity aware” theory of change! The traditional paradigms of formative and summative evaluations may not quite take into account the complex and emergent nature of social change. While it is possible to build a bridge (and then make a summative evaluation), it is not possible to “create” an equal society, as equal societies are emergent.

• Evaluation design is important. Participation is essential. Design should be participatory and have flexibility to proceed in an interactive way: who needs to be involved and at what stage, and what methods and tools must be used (informed from reviews of existing information from multiple sources).

• To promote transformative evaluation in terms of gender equality, one needs to examine:
  - How much does the programme take into account the three roles (productive, reproductive and community)?
  - Does it promote a well-balanced distribution of tasks between the sexes?
  - Is there a balanced participation of women and men in the intervention?
  - Are there activities designed and developed to cause a change in rules of participation of women and men?
  - Does the programme promote the idea that women should be the ones who make the decisions about their own bodies?
  - Are measures taken to increase the access to and control over resources, benefits and services by women?
  - Is a greater balance between sexes in this way promoted?
  - The diversity of actors involved in a process of intervention in current contexts and their different interests, often conflicting, is one of the dimensions that needs more attention given the importance of “hearing all voices” and to build a vision, agreements, and reflections representing each of the assessments made. Moreover, understanding the dynamics of power relations and how they operate requires great expertise and the exercise of professional, permanent alert to elucidate the meanings and processes taking place and to assess the merit of development programmes on issues of social equity and gender equality.

• Evaluation design needs to take into account an in-depth understanding of local contexts. It needs to be fully-customized and context specific. There is no cookie-cutter approach.

• It is essential to understand local scenarios and how they interact with global processes, as this allows us to understand how the global is manifested in the territories and what meanings local processes acquire at the global level.
• **Valuing the role of the environment in each process** and relationship with the population is key, especially for the most disadvantaged populations. Therefore, it is important to consider these dimensions and reflect on them together with the population effectively. Changes that are generated from within communities are the most valuable and endure. Methods advocating horizontal evaluation processes that allow dialogue and knowledge of various kinds and granting communities legitimacy are important.

• **Preliminary assessment** (qualitative-quant-qualitative). Qualitative: key informants, focus groups.

• A mixed method approach is important: **multi-layer, multi-dimension, multi-method approach**.

• **A systems approach** that identifies “interconnect-edness” (global-national-local) and stakeholder mapping is also important.

• **Monitoring** has a privileged place in the context of interventions in complex environments. Monitoring requires us to pay attention to story, patterns, finely grained events and simple numbers that are used to measure things rather than to be targets. Participatory monitoring with different stakeholders is particularly important in evaluations of complex programmes.

• **Use of strength-based approaches** like community life competence process, appreciative inquiry, etc. can create a space where different stakeholders can share openly and value each others’ perspectives and learn from each other.

• **Composition of the evaluation team** that is sensitive to gender and equity lens and has a good mix of thematic and evaluation experience is important.

• **Evaluators need to take on facilitation in some stages of evaluation** to create an environment to learn and ensure evaluation is not seen as an audit or fault-finding exercise.

• **Participatory statistics**—the community can be involved in collecting quantitative data, especially on sensitive issues.

• **Emergent methodologies could find their place**: developmental evaluation, social network analysis, human systems dynamics, realist evaluation, process tracing, and qualitative comparative analysis. All these approaches are intended to go beyond measuring impact, and actually lead to the “how” and the “why”, helping us understand what works in context, and highlighting the factors that are helping and hindering success. For instance, as these approaches are interested (with their different accents) to yield information that indicates how a particular intervention works (i.e., generative mechanism) and the conditions that are needed for a particular mechanism to work (i.e., specification of contexts), then they are more likely to be useful to policymakers than other types of evaluation that don’t pay attention to these issues. In sum, these evaluation approaches are interested in asking: what worked, under what conditions and with what approach?

**Experience**

**Participatory statistics**—This example came forth from Freedom Fund and Geneva Global slavery eradication programme in North India. IDS is the research partner and to overcome challenges of estimating changes in the magnitude of various forms of slavery introduced participatory statistics. The aim was to combine participatory approaches with statistical principles to generate robust data for assessing impact of slavery eradication.

**Resources**


“Dealing with Complexity in Development Evaluation, A Practical Approach” by Michael Bamberger, Jos Vaessen, Estelle Raimondo Editors. It is an excellent treatment of the various dimensions of complexity, and offers practical approaches and tools for evaluation. Developmental Evaluation (DE) was created for situations in which from the moment of planning there is high uncertainty about relationships of cause and effect that continues throughout implementation because of dynamic conditions for the project, programme or organisation. If that is what you mean by “complex”, then you may find the dozen case studies in “Developmental Evaluation Exemplars: Principles in Practice”, edited by Michael Quinn Patton PhD, Kate McKegg and Nan Wehipeihana to be useful.

Responding to evaluator and instructor demand, this book presents a diverse set of high-quality DE case studies. Twelve insightful examples illustrate how DE is used to evaluate innovative initiatives in complex, dynamic environments, including a range of fields and international settings. Written by leading practitioners, chapters offer a rare window into what it takes to do DE, what roles must be fulfilled, and what results can be expected. Each case opens with an incisive introduction by the editors. The book also addresses frequently asked questions about DE, synthesises key themes and lessons learned from the exemplars, and identifies eight essential principles of DE. See it at: http://www.amazon.com/Developmental-Evaluation-Exemplars-Principles-Practice/dp/1462522963/ref=mt_paperback?_encoding=UTF8&me=

IDS Bulletin from last year devoted to complexity and systems thinking in evaluation; http://www.ids.ac.uk/publication/towards-systemic-approaches-to-evaluation-and-impact

Sue Funnell and Patricia Rogers explored these issues, about how to respond to complexity, in the book on programme theory Purposeful Program Theory.

We found it useful to use the Glouberman and Zimmerman distinction between what is complicated (lots of elements) and what is complex (adaptive and emergent) and we explored the implications in terms of developing, representing and using programme theory. We identified 6 issues that could be important:

- Governance—Whose programme and programme theory is it? Are there different agendas? Are there emergent agendas?
- Focus—What are the intended outcomes and impacts in the programme theory? Are they different? Emergent?
- Causality—Necessariness and sufficiency? Are there complicated causal packages involved in producing the impacts? Are the causal packages changing often?
- Consistency—Should the programme be the same everywhere? Should it be adapted in ways that can be identified and prescribed in advance? Or does it need to be adapted always to specific contexts?
- Change trajectory—Is the trajectory of change readily predictable (we often assume a straight line)? Or predictable with expertise? Or unpredictable?
- Unintended outcomes—How can programme theory identify possible unintended outcomes (e.g., using Carol Weiss’ technique of negative programme theory)? How can M&E stay alert to unanticipated and emergent unintended outcomes?

There’s more detail on these in a conference presentation for GIZ in 2011 and in a recent publication for the Office of the Chief Economist in Australia’s Department of Industry, Innovation and Science “Choosing appropriate designs and methods for impact evaluation” (See Appendix 3).
Theme 3. Towards equity-focused and gender-responsive national evaluation systems: Multi-stakeholder partnerships to strengthen national evaluation capacities

Prepared by Awuor Ponge, Kenya (member EvalGender+ Management Group)

- In your experience, what will be the main challenges that national evaluation systems will face when evaluating social equity and gender equality? [Challenges]

- In the countries with which you are familiar, how well established are the methodologies for evaluating these two areas? [Methodologies]

- Which kinds of organizations have the most experience in the evaluation of these two areas? Are these organizations already part of the national evaluation systems? If not, what will be required to ensure their active involvement? [Organizations]

- What kinds of evaluation capacity development will be required to strengthen the capacity of the national evaluation systems to address these issues? [Requirements]

- What are examples of successful partnership in your country or in your area of work to strengthen M&E systems in general, and equity-focused and gender-responsive systems in particular? [Examples]

- What are the opportunities and challenges for such partnerships? [Opportunities]

Preamble

- In national evaluation systems, there will be a lot of resistance if there aren’t gender champions, gender experts, as well as funds and time to include gender and equity issues in the evaluation. Both issues are marginal issues nowadays.
• Equity and gender need to be embedded in policy and programmes with decision makers, civil society organizations and researchers arguing for better and more data to support the rights that addressing equity and gender implicitly suggest.

• If a country doesn’t have a properly established national evaluation system, how can we further discuss evaluating in a gender-responsive manner? Having a sound national evaluation system will be critical issue.

Challenges

• **Focus and locus problem:** It is a challenge, especially with most developing countries that do not have a department responsible for M&E. Also, there is need to sensitize the various players at local levels; this also includes the gender context of that country.

• **Structure and financial obligations:** M&E structuring in the government and the civil society organizations in many countries is either missing or very minimal. When there is one, it is heavily focused on financial monitoring by government agencies.

• **Indicator development:** For example, the challenge of documenting transgender people in the context of disaster. It is also problematic developing gender-responsive indicators.

• **Government structural weaknesses:** Various governments and their weakness in embracing gender-responsive programmes and their understanding of gender indicators, baselines and targets.

• **VOPE policy influence challenge:** VOPEs decision-making influence is very limited, as they don’t have the power of influencing decision making in the government.

• **Lack of political will:** There is very low will of decision makers and project managers to move towards budgeting for gender sensitive issues. Just conducting training won’t be effective if there is no political will or an enabling environment to carry out gender-responsive evaluation, such as government policies, circulars, guidelines, systems, officer willingness, knowledge, etc.

• **Conceptualization challenge:** There is a problem of mastery of concepts and therefore ownership. It is a lack of training on these issues. In many situations, the perception of gender concepts and assessment seems not to be controlled. Projects are not developed in a logic of gender equality, so that they lack indicators for the objective assessment of the results of the changes observed in assessment missions.

Methodologies

• **Systematic training:** There seem to be only few appropriate methods, lacking evaluation capacity and willingness, too little systematic training and scant resources for this type of endeavour.

• **Reliable measurements:** There is a need to focus on reliable methods of measurement of social inclusion and human development with a further focus also on the girl child. In order to do this, we need to continue to work for national production of more diversified and disaggregated data and improved and relevant indicators.

• **Socio-cultural contexts:** The kind of evaluation capacity development needed would be shaped by: socio-cultural beliefs and practices, methodological appropriateness and strategies used, power differentials—entrenched vested interest due to status quo, and would capture non-discrimination.

• **Appropriate indicators:** There need to be specific indicators that will show whether or not progress is being made towards targets. We need to ask ourselves: what do we intend to achieve through gender-responsive and equity-focused national evaluation systems? What targets do we set for ourselves over time? What are the indicators that will show us that we are on the right track? Of particular importance, what will be the beacon to show us that we have finally attained our goal of a gender-responsive and equity-focused national evaluation system?
What needs to be done?

• **Institutional memory:** Ensure capacity becomes a part of institutional memory—the capacity to evaluate progress towards gender equality stays within the system and does influence policy formation.

• **Capacity building:** All stakeholders need capacity building to build a common understanding on the concept, indicators, and tools of analysis. In many cases, it is often only UN agencies that have the knowledge and capacity on equity-focused and gender-responsive topics. Work needs to be done with VOPEs to make government aware of the value of having a sound national evaluation system. One also needs to provide technical knowledge on different aspects of evaluation. It is important that a training be set up that ensures evaluations are done in the future at country levels as the SDG indicators are very broad. There also needs to be capacity building on the formulation of results targets and indicators and training on the concept of equality of opportunity and its impact on development kind.

• **Multiple stakeholders:** For national evaluation capacities to work, there is a need for multiple stakeholders (non-state actors and state actors) and individual and group actors. How does change happen and how can one achieve effective and sustained development? Documenting perspectives of different stakeholders is a critical step in this process. What about different stakeholders reflecting jointly on the data? One can establish a pool of instructors/trainers in gender/national evaluation and develop and disseminate simple tools on gender and evaluation systems. These tools can be disseminated through training the various actors involved with the administration projects in project management. VOPEs contribute to promoting an evaluation culture (e.g., SLEVA) within the country through capacity building programmes, networking and coordination.

• **Disaggregated data collection:** Improve collection and coding of data on social inclusion within official development assistance programmes. Use the SDGs (including targets and indicators) and develop coding and tracking mechanisms for analysing inclusion within donor portfolios.

• **Management of information systems:** It would be great to work with interested governments to help them to process the backlog of projects in their aid information management systems to be coded using our schema. There is a need to build gender-denominated information systems and indicators into national statistics apparatus, not necessarily specific to the SDGs alone. These can also be incorporated into the questionnaire for the national sample surveys that are periodically conducted in rounds by national statistics agencies.

• **Standard and policy:** There should be an effort to work towards an international standard that could be incorporated either from the perspective of aid reporting (e.g., OECD, IATI) or national statistics (e.g., national statistical commissions and/or the UN Statistics Division). If equity-focused and gender-responsive lens is in the evaluation policy itself, it would be easier to include it in evaluations.

• **Built-in frameworks:** Most of the goals in the SDGs are covered in the statistical data constructed through surveys and census. This would ensure a permanent, built in framework for assessing gender-related impact of SDGs or any other goals and programmes formulated or committed to in future. There is a need to strengthen the capacity of the national evaluation systems to address issues including: designing gender-responsive projects and programmes, monitoring in a gender-responsive manner, context-specific training on different tools and analysis (on-the-job training would be most effective) and managing gender-responsive evaluation.

**Example 1: Tanzania**

**Weak national evaluation system not supported by policy**

The main challenge in Tanzania, is the weak National Evaluation System that is not supported by policy. The M&E is not well developed although it appears in the Organogram. At the national level, there are structures
but down the stream of local government authorities and villages the system is not operational. The MKUKUTA, for example, is well developed to monitor the SDGs, however downstream tracking and reporting is weak. Capacity building of the structures and knowledge in the local government authorities and villages is highly needed for the SDGs.

Example 2: Nepal

Inadequate implementation mechanisms

For more than a decade, gender inequity and social exclusion have been high in the state agenda, including new constitution making, overall development plans and all sectoral development plans. For instance, in an example of disaster recovery response strategies and planning processes, the gender-responsive evaluation system in place remained weak. In most cases, the number of women counted is considered gender-responsive; this is not enough. Even with a highly gender-responsive policy document, gender is almost nowhere in the implementation processes to be followed.

Example 3: Uganda

Fragmented information management systems

The major problem faced by Uganda is that both information management and decision making is focused on the administrative process of expenditures and activities rather than on the poverty outcomes, impacts and goals that are being pursued. Planning, budgeting and incentives are geared towards tracking inputs, activities and immediate outputs. Recurrent and development expenditures are reviewed separately, rather than for their combined impact in achieving overall goals. M&E remain overly centred on compliance with government requirements and regulations rather than end-results of policy, programme and project efforts and more particularly tracking results/impact on social equity and gender equality. M&E in Uganda is fragmented, with multiple government and donor planning and progress reporting formats. Policy formulation, work planning and budgeting are undertaken as separate exercises at the sector and district levels.

With a proliferation of different funding arrangements, officials are burdened with a large volume of reporting but have little systematic information about effectiveness of actual public service delivery.

Example 4: Chile

Monetary incentives and compliance

Chile has implemented a gender lens in the context of the measures implemented after the modernization. The “Programme Management Improvement Genero” programme has positioned the indicators on gender and a corresponding decrease in gaps in the apparatus governmental. The measure is associated with a monetary incentive if compliance is achieved; therefore there is an extra motivation to achieve (which can often result in distortion). The truth is that the “Programme Management Improvement Genero” programme has permeated public institutions (if not culture) and has “moved” lines of practices, generating more inclusive spaces, at least in installments. All public institutions have the obligation to incorporate such measures, giving the content that each agency can afford according to their capacities and levels of development. Surely that is interesting to observe, and how the role of the National Women’s Service, has played a key role in its positioning, implementation and monitoring.

Resources


UN Women has developed a Training Manual “Building Gender-responsive and Transformative National Evaluation Capacity”. The Training Manual can be found here: http://gendereval.ning.com/forum/topics/un-women-training-manual-building-gender-responsive-and
Theme 4. Demand for and use of evidence from equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation to inform equitable development

Prepared by Dr. Rashmi Agrawal, India (member EvalGender+ Management Group)

The four specific issues raised under this theme were:

• Factors affecting the demand for and use of evaluations in general

• Additional factors affecting the demand and utilization of social equity and gender equality evaluations

• How can the demand and utilization of these evaluations be increased?

• Types of evaluation presentations that would make evaluation more accessible to stakeholders

A total of 15 persons addressed the above questions

1. One of the factors responsible for low use of evaluations is a misconception among policymakers that evaluation is another name for auditing. There is also a perception that evaluations are used to find faults and to go witch-hunting. Lack of appreciation of the value evaluations bring to the benefits from policies and programmes and a view that the costs involved in evaluations are avoidable opportunity costs are also reasons for low demand. Lack of capacity to demand and use evaluations is also a serious handicap.

There is a need to demystify the concept of evaluation to policymakers. They should be made to realize that evaluations can help them in achieving the development goals by throwing light on which programmes work and which do not. Sustained capacity building for both producers and users of evaluation should help. Evaluations should be able to answer the questions more quickly, in a simple language, and the reports should not be too long.

Low utilization is also due to the fact that evaluations are often carried out by programme managers merely to fulfil donor requirements. Again, there is lack of strong convergence between the users of evaluation and evaluation ownership. While there are always multiple stakeholders in any development intervention, evaluation reports are often written with only one stakeholder, usually the donor, in mind. Evaluation results are rarely disseminated widely to make them accessible to all concerned. The critical issue here is if organizations have communication teams or dissemination plans and who is responsible for dissemination.

There needs to be close linkage between evaluation recommendations, planning and monitoring processes. The M&E teams and programme teams need to be upfront in synthesizing lessons from evaluations from other countries that can inform the next relevant programme plans. It would be strategic for each M&E team and programme team to bring to the table evaluation findings from their own organization and other organizations on how the findings and recommendations will inform their programme design.

2. There is considerable hesitation in either integrating equity and gender aspects into the existing national evaluation policies or in establishing stand-alone guidelines. These issues are not adequately prioritized while planning, implementing and monitoring of programmes. Another factor affecting the demand and utilization of social equity and gender equality evaluations is the limited dissemination of evaluation findings and lessons. There seems to be failure to have a dissemination and marketing strategy that is appropriate to specific stakeholders. Evaluation users are not aware of websites where evaluation findings are posted, such as the UN Women. In addition, these websites are accessible only to limited users who can access the internet. Appropriate media for dissemination is, therefore, critical. In addition, allocation of resources for evaluation seems to end with the production of the report, so limited resources are available for dissemination.
The complexity of how to measure social equity and
gender equality makes many without the technical
know-how shy away from conducting these evalua-
tions. Social and gender issues cut across all sectors
and yet sectors are divided; this somehow causes so-
cial and gender issues to be swept under the carpet.

3. **The current global initiatives to integrate gender and equity into M&E of progress towards the SDGs could also motivate a change of thinking at the national level.** The national evaluation policies should emphasize the need to take into account the intersection of gender with other social and demo-
graphic factors or there should at least be national guidelines emphasizing such need. In Canada, for
example, there is a national requirement (though not explicitly included in the national evaluation policy) that all planning, implementation, and evaluation of national legislation, policies, and programmes must be subjected to analysis from the point of view of gender and the intersection of gender with other identity factors. Continued brain-
storming and advocacy is necessary to ensure that the process of integration of gender and equity into national development evaluations is sustained.

Results of formative evaluations are likely to utilized
more in government programmes than those of summative evaluations as the authorities are more ready to make changes before commencing the programme than later.

Other institutional mechanisms to track action on recommendations emerging from evaluations will also be useful.

**There is need for meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the evaluation process so as to increase ownership, help determine the intended use of the evaluation findings, review interim findings and contribute to recommendations.** Experience has shown that people are more inclined to support initiatives that they participated in.

Civil society organizations also can play an important part in promoting demand for and use of evaluations with a gender and equity focus. Legislators also have a role to play in this process. Though their representative function can cause the citizenry to demand for accountability reports, performance reports and follow-up on recommendations, increased education and awareness creation on the importance of evaluation is necessary. The media, if trained on how to package and disseminate findings could play a key role in linking government, civil society organizations and the population. This approach should dwell more on positive case studies to try to counter the negative attitude policy actors have that evaluation is a means to witch-hunt others.

4. **It is difficult to prescribe general types of presenta-
tions needed to promote utilization of evaluation results, because each organization comes with its format.** The converging point that might be useful is **an action-oriented report that relates to each of the stakeholders and suits the interests of a particular target audience.** For example, women would be more interested in how the distance to a water-
point changed their lives while men in a pastoral community would be more interested on how their livestock benefited and the government will be interested in what additional policies to put in place.

5. **There is a need for capacity building for both produc-
ers of evaluations as well as users.** Lack of capacities lead to lack of appreciation of evaluations and their utilization. Some experiments on short trainings generated interest and introduced colleagues to the basics of evaluation, the importance of evaluation in policy and how evaluation findings can be disseminated. More importantly, by training senior staff and members of parliament, it raised awareness about their role as demanders and users of evaluation in the policy cycle—given the parliamentary mandate as an oversight institution. Certain issues relating to demand and supply were raised during the 2013 Evaluation Week held in Kampala and brought out **inter alia** that there is a need to change the basic mind set towards evaluations to have a positive atti-
dtude, resource allocation and evaluation culture.

6. The assumption that social equity and gender equal-
ity are generally taken into consideration within the poverty indicators makes the specific demand and supply for them difficult.
7. **Creation of regulatory and institutional frameworks is important.** In Uganda for instance, there is a National M&E Policy and a focal office charged with its mandate. In addition, all respective ministries and agencies are mandated by law. What is lacking is strong enforcement. Parliament can play a key role to enhance the increased demand for and supply of evaluation through its oversight mandate and budgetary function. It can also cause increase in evaluation utilization.

8. Gender equality and social equality is not key in the political agenda in most of the countries including the developed ones.

9. Belief that a women’s issue applies to programmes whose objectives population are women is a problem; **gender issues are relevant to general development programmes as well.** At the heart of the matter, these processes respond to the entrenched dominant patriarchal system and from which, even unconsciously, reflections are made in the context of development processes. While it is important to recognize that structural processes can be extremely slow to change to the current times, it is important to be permanently decoding information appropriately and learning to transform those structures.

10. **Within the government, a number of factors affect demand for evaluation including lack of incentives, complacency, high staff turnover (leading to change in focus and lack of incentive), and above all, a lack of understanding about the intention and technique of evaluation.** These concerns can be addressed by providing performance and career incentives, providing understanding on values of evaluation, and on improving performance of the project (such that learnings/best practices of a project can be replicated).
ANNEX 3.

Agenda

NO ONE LEFT BEHIND.

EVALUATING SDGS WITH AN EQUITY-FOCUSED AND GENDER-RESPONSIVE LENS

DATE: 15 MARCH - 17 MARCH 2016

High-level event: Tuesday, 15 March, 3-5pm followed by reception

Technical workshop: 16-17 March

Location: New York, USA

High-level Panel

Date: 15 March 2016, 15:00 – 17:00, followed by reception at 17:00

Location: Ford Foundation, New York

Introduction: Marco Segone, UNEG Chair; Director, UN Women Independent Evaluation Office; Co-chair, EvalGender+

Opening remarks: HE Olivier Zehnder, Deputy Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations

Panelists:

• Thomas Gass, Assistant Secretary General, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs

• HE Kabir Hashim, Minister of Public Enterprise Development, Sri Lanka; Chair, Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation

• Hon Susan Musyoka, Member of Parliament, Kenya; Africa regional representative to Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation Steering Committee; Executive Member of the African Parliamentarian Network for Development Evaluation

• HE Ananda Pokharel, Minister of Tourism, Culture and Civil Aviation, Nepal; Chair, Nepali Parliamentarian Forum for Evaluation; South Asia representative to Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation Steering Committee

• Ziad Moussa, President, IOCE; Co-chair, EvalPartners

• Nick York, Director, Human Development and Economic Management, Independent Evaluation Group, The World Bank Group
Questions and answers

Closing remarks: HE Rohan Perera, Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka to the United Nations

17:00 – 18:00: Reception

Each speaker will be given approximately seven minutes to share his/her perspective on the following questions:

1. Should SDGs be evaluated with an approach ensuring “no one is left behind”? If so, why?

2. What are the challenges and opportunities to strengthen national capacities to evaluate the SDGs with a focus on “no one left behind”, including gender equality?

3. What should be done to overcome the challenges and leverage the opportunities?

An open, interactive and engaging discussion session will follow. The event will be live webcast and video-taped.
Technical seminar:

“TOWARDS AN EQUITY-FOCUSED AND GENDER-RESPONSIVE FRAMEWORK TO EVALUATE THE SDGS”

DATE: 16-17 MARCH 2016

Location: UNICEF Headquarters, New York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY, 16 MARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:00</td>
<td>Registration and welcome coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:10</td>
<td>Welcome by Colin Kirk, Director, Evaluation Office, UNICEF; Co-chair, EvalPartners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:10-10:30 | **How to ensure the Sustainable Development Goals will be evaluated with a focus on “leaving no one behind”?**  
Chair: Colin Kirk, Director, Evaluation Office, UNICEF; Co-chair, EvalPartners  
Keynote speakers:  
• Marco Segone, UNEG Chair; Director, UN Women Independent Evaluation Office; Co-chair, EvalGender+  
• David Nabarro, UN Secretary General Adviser for the SDG  
• Maithree Wickramasinghe, Professor at the University of Kelaniya, Gender and Evaluation Advocate, Sri Lanka  
• Hon. Olfa Cherif, Member of Parliament, Tunisia; Middle East and North Africa Representative to Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation Steering Committee |
| 10:30-11:00| Coffee break                                                                      |
| 11:00-12:30| **The relevance of “new metrics” (measurement tools and indicators) for the evaluation of SDGs with a focus on “leaving no one behind”**  
Chair: Arild Hauge, Deputy Director, Independent Evaluation Office, UNDP  
Keynote speaker:  
• Stefan Schweinfest, Director, United Nations Statistics Division  
Introductions by Chairs of Thematic Workshops: Setting the scene  
1. **The relevance of “new metrics” for the evaluation of SDGs: Data for development and indicators for equity and gender equality** Chair: Andrea Cook, Director Evaluation Office, UNFPA  
2. **Evaluation and complexity: Dealing with the increasing complexity of development ensuring “no one is left behind”** Chair: Colin Kirk, Director Evaluation Office, UNICEF; Co-Chair EvalPartners  
3. **Demand for and use of evidence from evaluation: Understanding the political economy of equity-focused and gender-responsive evidence**. Chair: Kabir Hashim, Minister of Public Enterprise Development, Sri Lanka and Chair of the Global Parliamentarian Forum for Evaluation |
| 12:30-14:00| Lunch                                                                             |
### WEDNESDAY, 16 MARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 17:30</td>
<td>Thematic workshop parallel breakout session – Moderated by thematic workshops chairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workshop 1.**
The relevance of “new metrics” for the evaluation of SDGs: Data for development and indicators for equity and gender equality

**Workshop 2.**
Evaluation and complexity: Dealing with the increasing complexity of development ensuring “no one is left behind”

**Workshop 3.**
Demand for and use of evidence from evaluation: Understanding the political economy of equity-focused and gender-responsive evidence

SEE AGENDA IN THE ANNEX BELOW

### THURSDAY, 17 MARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9:00–11:00    | Presentation of thematic workshops discussions: Key issues and suggestions for follow-up Questions and answers among chairs and participants Chair: Ziad Moussa, IOCE President; Co-chair, EvalPartners  
- Andrea Cook, Director Evaluation Office, UNFPA  
- Colin Kirk, Director Evaluation Office, UNICEF; Co-chair, EvalPartners  
- Kabir Hashim, Minister of Public Enterprise Development, Sri Lanka; Chair of the Global Parliamentarian Forum for Evaluation  
- Oscar Garcia, Director, International Fund for Agricultural Development Evaluation Office (to share outcome of workshop on evaluability of SDG2 organized by Rome-based UN agencies) |
| 11:00 – 11:30 | Coffee break                                                          |
| 11:30 – 13:00 | What have we learned? Key elements necessary for establishing a framework to evaluate SDGs with an equity-focused and gender-responsive lens Chair: Andrea Cook, Director, Evaluation Office, UNFPA Key speakers:  
- Maria Bustelo, Rector’s Delegate for Equality, Universidad Complutense de Madrid; former President, European Evaluation Society  
- Michael Bamberger, Independent Consultant and former senior evaluator, World Bank  
- Florence Etta, founder and former Chair, African Gender and Development Evaluators Network  
- Rosario Cárdenas, Council Member, CONEVAL, Mexico  
- Thomas Schwandt, Professor, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign |
| 13:00 – 13:30 | Concluding remarks by Marco Segone, UNEG Chair; Director, UN Women Independent Evaluation Office; Co-chair, EvalGender+ |
WORKSHOP 1.
The relevance of “new metrics” for the evaluation of SDGs: Data for development and indicators for equity and gender equality

Organizer: UNFPA Evaluation Office
Session Chair: Andrea Cook, Director, Evaluation Office, UNFPA

Panelists:
- Workshop Keynote Speaker: Francesca Grum, Chief, Social and Housing Statistics Section, United Nations Statistics Division
- Discussant: Alexandra Pittman, Independent Expert (expertise on evaluation and gender)
- Discussant: Bruce Campbell, Director, UNFPA (expertise on population data and big data)
- Discussant: Elena Bardasi, Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank (expertise on evaluation, gender and equity)
- Chair: Andrea Cook, Director Evaluation Office, UNFPA

Moderator: Alexandra Chambel, UNFPA

Session:

Time: 14:00 – 15:30 Panel presentations

1. Introduction of panel members (5 minutes)

2. Presentation by the Keynote Speaker, Francesca Grum, representative from UN Statistics Division (30 minutes):
   a. Setting the scene on the SDG gender and equity indicators
   b. Data sources
   c. Monitoring the indicators (global and national levels)
   d. Challenges (technical vs. political expectations)

   Question: Is the global indicator framework for the SDGs gender sensitive? If so, in what ways?

3. Discussants reflections on the following issues:
   a. Alexandra Pittman (10 minutes)
   b. Elena Bardasi (10 minutes)
   c. Bruce Campbell (10 minutes)

   Questions: Is the SDG framework gender sensitive and equity responsive? If so, how are gender and equity issues reflected across the SDGs framework? What are the challenges to an equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation of the SDGs?
Questions: How can developments in data offer opportunities for evaluating the SDGs from a gender-responsive and equity-focused lens? How can data (including new sources of data) better capture and contribute the views and voices of women and marginalized groups into a more participatory evaluation process?

Questions from floor and answers by panel members directed by Chair (20 minutes)

4. Concluding remarks by Chair (5 minutes)

Time: 15:30 – 16:00 Coffee break

Time: 16:00 – 17:30 Group work

Reflection and further discussion by participants on topics raised during the session.

Theme 1. The relevance of “new metrics” for the evaluation of SDGs: Data for development and indicators for equity and gender equality

In recent years a number of “new metrics” have evolved that can potentially widen the range of indicators and measures available for the M&E of development results from equity and gender-responsive perspectives. These include:

• Data that can now be collected through mobile phones, tablets, the Internet, GPS mapping and other new information technologies
• “Big data” collected from satellites and drones, remote sensors, analysis of Twitter and social media, mobile phone records, digital electronic transfers including purchase of mobile-phone air time and ATM withdrawals, and crowdsourcing
• Participatory consultations (e.g., Most Significant Change and Outcome Harvesting)
• Concept mapping
• Mixed methods evaluations
• Feminist research methods (e.g., oral history, feminist ethnography and content analysis, power relations, social justice and empowerment approaches)

Participants are invited to share their thoughts and experiences on the following questions (as well as others they propose) as they relate to equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation:

1. What are the most difficult issues to measure with respect to social equity? And with respect to gender equality?
2. What are the new challenges for assessing sustainable social equity and gender equality?
3. What is the potential for new metrics/data to capture the perspectives and voices of women and marginalized groups into a more inclusive evaluation process?
4. In your experience, what are some of the limitations of current data collection methods and the kinds of indicators they produce?
5. What have proven to be some of the most effective methods for gender-responsive and equity-focused evaluation? Which of the new metrics show the greatest promise?
6. How can developments in data offer opportunities for evaluating the SDGs from a gender-responsive and equity-focused lens?
WORKSHOP 2.

Evaluation and complexity: Dealing with the increasing complexity of development ensuring “No one is left behind”

Organizer: UNICEF

Session Chair: Colin Kirk, Director, Evaluation Office, UNICEF

Panelists:

• Thomas A. Schwandt, PhD, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

• Claudia Maldonado, Director, CLEAR Centre, Latin America

• Dorothy Lucks, co-chair EVALSDGs

Moderator: Tessie Catsambas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, 16 March 2016: Evaluation and complexity: Dealing with the increasing complexity of development ensuring “No one is left behind”. Chair: Colin Kirk, Director Evaluation Office, UNICEF</td>
<td>Welcome and purpose – Colin&lt;br&gt;Complexity exercise icebreaker</td>
<td>Transition to the topic&lt;br&gt;Kinaesthetic conceptualization to the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14h00-14h30 Welcome, introductions and expectations</td>
<td>Speakers – Claudia Maldonado (using complexity thinking to understand field realities and challenges)&lt;br&gt;Thomas Schwandt (integrating complexity thinking into evaluative thinking)</td>
<td>Challenge the group with provocative questions regarding complexity&lt;br&gt;Seed ideas to be discussed&lt;br&gt;Link methodology to field reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14h30 – 15h30 Dimensions of complexity</td>
<td>Introduce small group discussions around three dimensions of complexity: boundaries, perspectives and interactions&lt;br&gt;Small groups are assigned one topic from above, and discuss the following questions:&lt;br&gt;1. What kinds of insights can we get from thinking along this dimension? What is revealed?&lt;br&gt;2. What issues does the dimension explore regarding the SDGs and equity in particular?</td>
<td>Exploring aspects of complexity thinking and initiating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda item</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15h30-16h00 Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16h00 – 16h30 Dimensions of complexity (cont.)</td>
<td>Sharing highlights from group discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16h30-17h00 Implications of complexity aware thinking</td>
<td>Three groups discuss the following questions (one each): 1. What advice do we have for evaluators from the complexity discussion to make sure no one is left behind? 2. What advice do we have for implementers of development activities from the complexity discussion to make sure no one is left behind? 3. What advice do we have for policymakers from the complexity discussion to make sure no one is left behind?</td>
<td>Explore the implications of complexity aware thinking for different stakeholders and functions in the development partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17h00-17h30 Implications (cont) | Groups report out on their advice for the three different SDG stakeholder groups  
Appreciation and thanks (Colin) | |
WORKSHOP 3.

Demand for and use of evidence from evaluation: Understanding the political economy of equity-focused and gender-responsive evidence

Organizer: Global Parliamentarian Forum for Evaluation and UNDP Independent Evaluation Office

Method: Talk show

Panelists:

- Chair for round 1: Hon. Susan Musyoka, Member of Parliament, Kenya
- Chair for round 2: Hon. Samuel Hoyos, Member of Parliament, Colombia
- Panelist and speaker: Arild Hauge, Deputy Director, Independent Evaluation Office, UNDP
- Panelist: Hon. Pol Ham, Member of National Assembly, Cambodia
- Panelist: Hon. Natalia Nikitenko, Member of Parliament, Kyrgyzstan
- Panelist: Hon. Ananda Pokharel, Minister of Tourism, Culture and Civil Aviation, Nepal
- Panelist: Hon. Olfa Cherif, Member of Parliament, Tunisia


Session: 90 minutes

1. Introduction of panel members
   - Self-introductions, beginning with the Chair: 5 minutes

2. Challenges and opportunities of national evaluation capacity development for the SDGs
   - Arild Hauge: 10 minutes

3. History of Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation, snapshot of the topic of the panel
   - Ada Ocampo: 5 minutes

4. First round: Talk show
   - Questions posed and answers by panel members
   - Moderated by Chair: 20 minutes

5. Q & A
   - Questions from the floor and answers by panel members
   - Directed by Chair: 15 minutes
6. Second round: Talk show  
   Questions posed and answers by panel members  
   Moderated by Chair: 15 minutes

7. Q & A  
   Questions from floor and answers by panel members  
   Directed by Chair: 10 minutes

8. Wrap up, concluding remarks and key take away messages  
   Ada Ocampo: 5 minutes

**Proposed questions:**

1. How can parliamentarians/parliaments support governments to demonstrate accountability on the SDGs?  
   What are the key messages to governments and fellow parliamentarians?

2. What is the role of parliamentarians to strengthen equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation for SDGs?

**Time: 15:30 – 16:00 Coffee break**

**Time: 16:00 – 17:30 Group work**

Reflection and further discussion by participants on topics raised during the session.
## ANNEX 4.

### List of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rashmi</td>
<td>Agrawal</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>National Institute of Labour Economics Research and Development (NILERD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farzana</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Lead Evaluation Specialist</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullia</td>
<td>Aiazzi</td>
<td>Evaluation Expert</td>
<td>Freelance consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneha</td>
<td>Aidasani</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>Columbia University Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oluymensi</td>
<td>Alatise</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>International Inner Wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliya</td>
<td>Allen-Valley</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>McGill University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Senior Research Associate</td>
<td>JBS International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabiola</td>
<td>Amariles</td>
<td>Member Board of Directors</td>
<td>Red de Mujeres Latinoamericanas en Management EvalGender+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Director Learning for Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rituu</td>
<td>B Nanda</td>
<td>CoP Facilitator</td>
<td>Institute of Social Studies Trust EvalGender+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Bamberger</td>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td>Freelance consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>Bardasi</td>
<td>Senior Economist</td>
<td>World Bank Group - Independent Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian</td>
<td>Bartlett</td>
<td>General Secretary</td>
<td>Public Services International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Belohlav’</td>
<td>Policy Analyst</td>
<td>Population Reference Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Borden</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>A’lani Kailani Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitlyn</td>
<td>Bowman</td>
<td>President &amp; CEO</td>
<td>IRSAM Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Bustelo</td>
<td>Rector’s Delegate for Equality, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, and former President, European Evaluation Society</td>
<td>Complutense University of Madrid</td>
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