Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality into UNAIDS Evaluations

GUIDANCE DOCUMENT

Table of Contents

Boxes

Tables

Acronyms

AGYW   Adolescent girls and young women

AIDS   Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome

GBV   Gender-based violence

GE   Gender equality

HIV   Human immunodeficiency virus

HR   Human rights

HRBA   Human rights-based approach

HR & GE   Human rights and gender equality

IPV   Intimate partner violence

MSM   Men who have sex with men

M&E   Monitoring and evaluation

PWID   People who inject drugs

SDGs   Sustainable Development Goals

SRHR   Sexual and reproductive health and Rights

UN   United Nations

UNAIDS   Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS

UNDG   United Nations Development Group

UNEG   United Nations Evaluation Group

UN Women   United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women

Purpose and Content of the *Guidance*

This guidance was developed in response to United Nations (UN) system-wide mandates to integrate human rights and gender equality in all areas of UN agency work, including evaluation. It complements the UNAIDS evaluation policy [*ref. evaluation policy*] and draws on the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidance for integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation, following the main stages of evaluation planning and implementation in the specific context of human rights and gender equality (UNEG, 2011).

The specific objective of this guidance is to conceptualize the two dimensions and foster a systematic approach for human rights and gender equality responsive evaluations. Through the provision of guidelines to better plan and implement evaluations that are mindful and sensitive to human rights and gender equality dimensions, the UNAIDS Joint Programme will be better able to learn lessons, hold key stakeholders accountable for results, and in turn improve policies and programming, which will contribute to the realization of human rights and gender equality and making progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (UNEG, 2011).

This document is not a step-by-step operational guide on how to conduct evaluations, rather it is meant to ensure that evaluations are conducted in a human rights and gender equality sensitive manner. The guidance includes basic definitions and concepts related to human rights and gender equality sensitive evaluation, explaining its rationale and role, in addition to describing how to prepare the terms of reference (ToR) for human rights and gender equality responsive evaluation and how to implement an evaluation that is human rights and gender equality responsive.

This guidance is particularly useful for evaluation of efforts not specifically focused on either human rights or gender equality. As such, it facilitates human rights and gender equality considerations in all steps of *any* evaluation, involving assessment for evaluability, preparation of related terms of reference, and implementation of the evaluation.

Tables and checklists are included to support and guide different steps of the evaluation process in addition to providing detailed recommendations on how to integrate human rights and gender equality dimensions into the evaluation process.

Intended users of the *Guidance*

This guidance is primarily tailored for use by professionals within UNAIDS Secretariat (and/or in partnership with UNAIDS Cosponsors), and/or external evaluators who are conducting evaluations for UNAIDS.

Introduction

Human rights and gender equality responsive evaluation is a powerful tool that can contribute to the socio-cultural and economic change process that is at the centre of development programming by identifying and analysing inequities, inequalities and unequal power relations (UNEG, 2011, p. 3). Disregarding human rights and gender equality elements may deprive the UN system of evidence about who benefits (and does not) from its programmes, risks reinforcing discriminatory intervention practices, and gives opportunity for oversight in demonstrating how effective interventions are carried out (UNEG, 2011, p. 3).

Definition and Purpose of Human Rights and Gender Equality Responsive Evaluation within UNAIDS

This guidance integrates the two concepts of **human rights** and **gender equality** to take advantage of the interactions and overlap between these mutually reinforcing concepts while also understanding that gender equality is both a human right and also a dimension of development in its own right. Also, human rights issues are inclusive of, but not limited to, gender and gender identities (UNEG, 2011, p. 11).

Human Rights

Evaluation at UNAIDS (ref. evaluation policy) is guided by the people-centred approach of UNAIDS, which enhances capabilities, choices, and rights for all people with full respect for diversity. The promotion and protection of, and respect for, the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all, including the right to development, which are universal, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated is a central principle to the mandate of the UN to address underlying causes of human rights violations. This is why human rights issues should be mainstreamed into all HIV and AIDS policies and programmes (UNEG, 2011, p. 11; United Nations General Assembly, 2016).

Human rights barriers — including stigma and discrimination, violence and other abuses, negative social attitudes and legal obstacles—contribute to vulnerability to HIV among key populations and women and girls, and limit their access to HIV prevention, testing, treatment and care services. As recognized by all UN Member States in the General Assembly resolutions on HIV, the realization of human rights, including sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) is an essential element of the HIV response. Yet for too long, legal, policy and human rights issues have been seen by some policy-makers, programme implementers and service providers as disconnected from (and at best parallel to) efforts to implement HIV prevention, testing or treatment programmes. Changing this situation and using a human rights-based approach (described in *Box 1*) is a priority for UNAIDS to Fast-Track the HIV response and end the AIDS epidemic by 2030, as proposed in the 2016 United Nations Political Declaration on Ending AIDS, the UNAIDS 2016-2021 Strategy and the Unified Budget, Results, and Accountability Framework (UBRAF). Furthermore, human rights are linked to a specific

UNAIDS Strategy Result Area (SRA) 6 that calls to 'Eliminate HIV-related stigma and discrimination, including against people living with HIV and key populations, and to prevent and challenge violations of human rights' (UNAIDS, 2017; UNAIDS, 2015; UNAIDS, 2015).

Box 1: What is a Human Rights-Based Approach?

A human rights-based approach is a conceptual framework for the HIV response that is grounded in international human rights norms and principles, both in terms of process (e.g. right to participation, equality and accountability) and outcome (e.g. rights to health, life and scientific progress). HRBA addresses discriminatory practices and unjust distributions of power that impede progress in the HIV response by strengthening the capacities of rights-holders to claim their rights and the ability of duty-bearers to meet their obligations.

(UNAIDS, 2015)

Gender Equality

Gender equality refers to equal rights and responsibilities of women and men and girls and boys. Gender equality recognizes that women's and men's rights should not depend on being born male or female and recognizes the diversity of different groups of women and men in their needs, interests, and priorities. As gender equality is not solely a "women's issue," it requires engagement from men and boys as well as women and girls (UNEG, 2011, p. 13). In particular with relation to HIV/AIDS and the work of UNAIDS, globally, women and girls are still the most affected by the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and they bear a disproportionate share of the caregiving burden. Progress towards gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls has been unacceptably slow, and the ability of women and girls to protect themselves from HIV continues to be compromised by physiological factors, gender inequalities, including unequal power relations in society between women and men and boys and girls, and unequal legal, economic and social status, insufficient access to health-care services, including sexual and reproductive health, and all forms of discrimination and violence in the public and private spheres, including trafficking in persons, sexual violence, exploitation and harmful practices (United Nations General Assembly, 2016). Women's political empowerment and equal access to leadership positions at all levels are also fundamental to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and a more equal world (UN Women, documents on gender equality).

Gender equality is an integral component to the HIV response as gender inequality continues to undermine efforts to address HIV and other aspects of sexual and reproductive health among women and girls around the world (UNAIDS, 2017). Globally, women account for 51% of all adults living with HIV, and they represent 59% of all people living with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa. Additionally, persistent gender inequalities and gender-based violence contribute to women's HIV risk and vulnerability. In some settings women who experience intimate partner violence are 50% more likely to acquire HIV compared to those who do not experience such violence (WHO, 2013). Violence against women is one of the more extreme forms of discrimination; it is estimated that nearly 30% of women globally experience physical

or sexual violence by an intimate partner at least once in their lifetime (WHO, 2013). Such violence can affect women's ability to insist on safer sex or use HIV prevention, testing and treatment interventions[1]. In some regions, women who experience intimate partner violence are 1.5 times more likely to acquire HIV than women who have not experienced such violence.

Achieving gender equality, advancing women's empowerment and fulfilling the sexual and reproductive health and rights of women and girls are crucial to reaching the Sustainable Development Goals and achieving the targets set in the 2016 United Nations Political Declaration on Ending AIDS (United Nations General Assembly, 2016). The UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2021 and UBRAF mainstream gender equality and the empowerment of women across strategic result areas. The Strategy and UBRAF indicators are disaggregated by age and sex, where relevant; furthermore, gender equality is linked to a specific Strategy Result Area (SRA 5), which calls to 'Eliminate gender inequalities and gender-based abuse and violence and increase the capacity of women and girls to protect themselves from HIV' (UNAIDS, 2015; UNAIDS, 2015).

Human Rights and Gender Responsive Evaluation

Human rights and gender equality responsive evaluation can enhance gender equality by assessing how far these elements have been addressed in policies, advocacy, and programmes (ref. evaluation policy). Human rights and gender equality responsive evaluation process is grounded in principles and approaches related to human rights and gender equality and, in some cases, can empower involved stakeholders, thus playing a part in preventing further discrimination and exclusion (UN Women Independent Evaluation Office, 2015, p. 4).

Human rights and gender equality responsive evaluation consists of two key components.

(i) ***What the evaluation examines*** – it assesses the degree of barriers related to human rights and gender equality, which give rise to inequities, discrimination, and unfair power relationships (UNAIDS, 2017).

(ii) ***How the evaluation is undertaken*** – human rights and gender equality responsive evaluation assesses how an action or programme incites change by using a process that is inclusive, participatory, and respectful of all involved stakeholders.

Furthermore, human rights and gender equality responsive evaluation promotes accountability to commitments to both dimensions by providing data on how actions and

---

[1] Gari S, Malungo JR, Martin-Hilber A et al. HIV testing and tolerance to gender based violence: a cross-sectional study in Zambia. PLoS One. 2013;8(8):e71922
Mohammed BH, Johnston JM, Harwell JI et al. Intimate partner violence and utilization of maternal health care services in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. BMC Health Serv Res. 2017;17(1):178
Maxwell L, Devries K, Zionts D et al. Estimating the effect of intimate partner violence on women's use of contraception: a systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS One. 2015;10(2):e0118234

programmes promote and protect universal human rights and gender equality and using this information towards achievement of human rights and gender equality commitments.

How to integrate Human Rights and Gender Equality into Evaluation

The principles for addressing human rights and gender equality issues in evaluation are, as follows (UNEG, 2011, p. 14):

Inclusion

When evaluating for human rights and gender equality, close attention should be paid to which groups benefit and which groups contribute to the action or programme. Programmes need to be tailored to needs or focused on key population groups (if relevant), including but not limited to sex workers, people who inject drugs, transgender people, prisoners and gay men and other men who have sex with men (MSM), as well as women and girls (UNAIDS, 2016). Furthermore, related programmatic data should be disaggregated by sex, age, sexual orientation, and/or gender identity (UNAIDS, 2016). The concept of inclusion must be assessed beyond advantage, meaning by acknowledging not only individuals who are positively affected by the program but also those who are negatively affected by it, including not only women and girls but also men and boys.

Participation

Human rights and gender equality responsive evaluation is participatory, meaning that key stakeholders have the right to be consulted and participate in decisions about what is evaluated and how it is evaluated and should be included in evaluative work. As such this participatory process should be accounted for in the design, implementation and monitoring of the action or programme. Furthermore, when putting together the evaluation team, a level of expertise is needed among the evaluation team on gender equality and human rights. The evaluation team should also be gender balanced and culturally diverse (UNEG, 2011).

Partnerships and ownership

UNAIDS evaluations must be planned and conducted in partnership with national and international stakeholders and partners, addressing issues relevant to priorities and results at the country, regional or global levels with particular attention being paid to the inclusion of women in all its diversity, and individuals/groups infected or affected by HIV, who are marginalized and/or discriminated against (ref. to evaluation policy) (UNEG, 2011). This is to ensure coordination of interventions among stakeholders, national and international, and ownership by national stakeholders. UNAIDS supports national agendas to ensure that the HIV response is strong and guided by science, evidence, human rights and gender equality. Evaluations and assessments do not happen in a vacuum but are conducted to inform national processes such as National Strategic Plans development and revisions or grant applications to reprogramming (GFATM funding cycles).

Guidance for Human Rights and Gender Equality Responsive Evaluations of Programmes

STEP 1. PREPARING FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENDER EQUALITY RESPONSIVE EVALUATION

This section will introduce and inform the evaluability of human rights and gender equality dimensions in a programme.

Task 1.1: Determining the Evaluability of Human Rights and Gender Equality Dimensions of a Programme

An evaluability assessment for human rights and gender equality is an exercise that helps to identify whether an action or programme can be evaluated, if the evaluation is justified, feasible and likely to provide useful information (UNEG, 2011, p. 16).

In order to determine the evaluability of human rights and gender equality dimensions of a programme, it is important to consider three possible levels of evaluability of human rights and gender equality (low, medium, and high), as well as the information on the characteristics of programmes and possible approaches to challenges. The key charactistics of a programme in determining evaluability are addressed, as follows:

- **HIGH**: Human rights and gender equality issues have been clearly defined and considered, meaning human rights and gender equality are clearly reflected in the programme design, data has been collected in a disaggregated manner (i.e. by sex, gender identity and age) reflecting diversity of stakeholders.

- **MEDIUM**: Human rights and gender equality issues have been considered to a certain extent (i.e. intended or mentioned, but not clearly articulated on how to address them in practice; limited to only a few disaggregated indicators; the intervention design benefited from limited human rights and gender equality analyses).

- **LOW:** Human rights and gender equality dimensions have failed to have been considered in designing, implementation, and monitoring of the programme; stakeholder human rights and gender equality analyses were not conducted adequately or not existent at all; data on human rights and gender equality and/or disaggregated data are not available.

Possible approaches to address evaluability challenges are detailed in *Table 1*.

Table 1: Evaluability Assessment for Human Rights and Gender Equality (HR & GE)

EVALUABILITY FOR HR & GE	POSSIBLE APPROACHES TO ADDRESS EVALUABILITY CHALLENGES
HIGH: HR & GE issues have been clearly defined and considered, meaning HR & GE are clearly reflected in the programme design, data has been collected in a disaggregated manner (i.e. by sex, gender, gender identity and age) reflecting diversity of stakeholders	• Address any possible weaknesses and recommend steps to improve evaluability, if necessary • Include methods and tools in the evaluation that can capture new data or strengthen the existing one on HR & GE (e.g. information on new groups of people, changes in context, etc.) • Make sure that the HR & GE issues captured in this programme are also well reflected in the evaluation report • Include in the evaluation process an exercise
MEDIUM: HR & GE issues have been considered to a certain extent (i.e. intended or mentioned, but not clearly articulated on how to address them in practice; limited to only a few disaggregated indicators; the intervention design benefited from limited HR & GE analyses)	• Highlight the evaluability limitation in the evaluation ToR • Include in the evaluation process an exercise to strengthen the existing HR & GE analyses • Include data on HR & GE in the evaluation report, address limitations and provide recommendations for improvement
LOW: HR & GE dimensions have failed to have been considered in designing, implementation, and monitoring of the programme; stakeholder HR & GE analyses were not conducted adequately or not existent at all; data on HR & GE and/or disaggregated data are not available.	• Include, in the evaluation design, tools and methods that may help generate information on HR & GE. Include tools and methods to enhance stakeholder participation • Pay special attention to the stakeholder analysis in the evaluation process, and who should be involved. • Include preparation of HR & GE analyses in the evaluation process • During the evaluation process, seek partners and documents that may have useful information on HR & GE • During the data analysis process, pay special attention to the question whether the intervention had a negative effect on particular stakeholders. Consider and consult stakeholders on how this situation could be improved • Highlight the challenges of addressing HR & GE in the evaluation report, also specifically in the evaluation section.

(UNEG, 2011, pp. 18-20)

STEP 2. PREPARING THE EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

This section of the guidance proposes human rights and gender equality responsive elements for inclusion in the evaluation terms of reference (UNEG, 2011, p. 21).

Task 2.1: Identifying Evaluation Stakeholders and Their Roles in Human Rights and Gender Equality

Involving stakeholders in the design, planning and implementation of evaluation is a fundamental principle of human rights and gender equality issues. According to UN mandates, ensuring stakeholder participation is an obligation of the UN, and it is the right of every beneficiary to be informed and have a say on the processes and interventions that affect their lives (UNEG, 2011, p. 21).

The degree and level of stakeholder participation in the evaluation process varies, as the content/objective of evaluation, institutional, budgetary and time challenges need to be taken into consideration. However, stakeholder's participation strengthens accountability, builds trust in the evaluation process and generates credibility for the evaluation process, by being informed by lived experiences and realities. Stakeholder's participation also strengthens ownership over evaluation conclusions.

A stakeholder analysis is the most effective tool to help identify who the different groups in an action or programme are, their roles and identifying how, when and why they should be included in the evaluation process. A stakeholder analysis for human rights and gender equality would use disaggregated information that would understand and acknowledge that different groups exist and are affected by the programme in different ways. Examples of disaggregation are sex, gender and identity, age, income level, education level, and sexual orientation.

Box 2: Benefits of Stakeholder Participation in Human Rights and Gender Equality Responsive Evaluation

Contributions: Different perspectives will enrich the evaluation design and approach, including: identifying human rights and gender equality issues and implications that may not have been explicit in the programme design and implementation; identifying and collectively finding solutions for evaluation constraints and challenges; facilitating and guiding the conduct of the evaluation; and bringing realistic, on-the-ground insights to the review and assessment of evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Use and Usefulness: The ultimate definition of evaluation success is the extent to which it is used and useful. Participatory approaches to evaluation have demonstrated increased credibility of evaluation results and thus use.

Capacity Building: Being involved in the evaluation process is itself a learning experience and can serve to build the capacity of stakeholders through increased exposure to gender equality and human rights issues and gender-responsive evaluation approaches. It can help draw explicit connections between programmes and the larger objectives of social change; encourage good practice in tracking and measuring gender equality and human rights; and can be one step in helping duty-bearers (i.e., government officials or authorities) to become committed to gender equality and human rights obligations.

Task 2.2: Evaluation criteria to assess human rights and gender equality

Developing evaluation criteria to assess human rights and gender equality provides a framework to define the evaluation questions. It is the evaluator's task to integrate human rights and gender equality dimensions into the evaluation criteria of the evaluation. The UN commonly uses and adapts the evaluation criteria of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) to evaluate its interventions (UNEG, 2011, p. 25). However, OECD-DAC criteria are neutral in the terms of addressing human rights and gender equality, and therefore, the UNEG developed guidance on how to integrate human rights and gender equality dimensions into this criteria as seen in *Table 2* (UNEG, 2011, p. 26)**.**

Table 2: DAC Evaluation Criteria and Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality (HR & GE)	
DAC CRITERIA AND DEFINITION	**INTEGRATING HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENDER EQUALITY**
RELEVANCE: Extent to which the objectives of a development program are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country-needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies	Assessing the HR & GE relevance of an intervention entails examining how the intervention is designed and implemented to align and contribute to HR & GE, as defined by international and regional conventions; and national policies and strategies; and the needs of rights holders and duty bearers both women and men, targeted by an intervention). Results of the intervention should also be relevant to the realization of HR & GE. Some examples of areas to assess include the: • Extent to which the program is aligned with and contributes to national policies and strategies on HR & GE; • Extent to which the program is informed by substantive and tailored HR & GE analyses that identify underlying causes and barriers; • Extent to which the program is informed by needs and interests of diverse groups of stakeholders through in- depth consultation; .
EFFECTIVENESS: Extent to which the development program's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Effectiveness assesses the outcome level, intended as an uptake or result of an output	Analysis of an program's effectiveness involves assessing the way in which results were defined, monitored and achieved (or not) on HR & GE and that the processes that led to these results were aligned with HR & GE principles (e.g. inclusion, non- discrimination, accountability, etc.). In cases where HR & GE results were not explicitly stated in the planning document or results framework, assessing effectiveness in terms of HR & GE is still possible and necessary as all UN interventions will have some effect on HR & GE and should aim to contribute to their realization. Some issues to consider include the: • Extent to which the Theory of Change and results framework of the intervention integrated HR &GE; • Extent to which a human rights based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy were incorporated in the design and implementation of the intervention; • Presence of key results on HR & GE.
EFFICIENCY: Measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. It is most commonly applied to the input-output link in the causal chain of a program	The HR & GE dimensions of efficiency require a broader analysis of the benefits and related costs of integrating HR & GE in programs. A key aspect that needs to be considered is that HR & GE involve long-term and complex change processes that require sustained support. While a direct relationship between resource investment and long term results should be carefully established, the assessment of efficiency should also consider short term process achievements (participation and inclusiveness, etc.) and medium term results (developing an enabling environment, building capacity, etc.). Some aspects to consider include the: • Provision of adequate resources for integrating HR & GE in the program as an investment in short-, medium-, and long- term benefits; • Costs of not providing resources for integrating HR & GE (e.g. enhanced benefits that could have been achieved for modest investment); • Extent to which the allocation of resources to targeted groups takes into account the need to prioritize those most marginalized.
SUSTAINABILITY: Continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major	To assess the sustainability of results and impacts on HR & GE the extent to which an intervention has advanced key factors that need to be in place for the long-term realization of HR & GE should be studied.

development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long- term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time	Some examples include: • Developing an enabling or adaptable environment for real change on HR & GE; • Institutional change conducive to systematically addressing HR & GE concerns; • Permanent and real attitudinal and behavioral change conducive to HR & GE; • Accountability mechanisms operating on HR & GE; • Capacity development of targeted rights holders (to demand) and duty-bearers (to fulfill) rights;
IMPACT: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended	Positive HR & GE impact can be defined as the actual and long-lasting realization and enjoyment of HR & GE by rights holders and capacity of duty-bearers to respect, protect and fulfill HR & GE . Impact can be positive or negative, intended or unintended, primary or secondary. For a number of reasons (e.g. multi- causality, timeframe to observe impact, etc.), the assessment and measurement of impact that can be attributed to an intervention, or to which an intervention has contributed, is a complex endeavor; however, it is essential to do so for learning on what works and what does not in terms of advancing HR & GE. For interventions that are not primarily focused on HR & GE, it may also lead to identifying if interventions are reinforcing existing discrimination and power structures that are contrary to HR & GE. Some aspects that should be considered in such an assessment include: • Real change in gender relations, e.g. access to and use of resources, decision- making power, etc.; • Empowerment of targeted groups and influence outside of the intervention's targeted group; • Unintended effects on any groups that were not adequately considered in the intervention design;

(UNEG, 2011, pp. 26-28)

Task 2.3: Framing the Evaluation Questions

Evaluation criteria and questions should be interlinked and seek information on how human rights and gender equality have been integrated into the design and planning, implementation, and results achieved of the programme (UNEG, 2011, p. 29). These questions need to be considered in the context of the programme and evaluation being conducted. Evaluation questions must also stem from the programme's *Theory of Change*.

Some examples of questions that could be used to assess human rights and gender equality in an evaluation include:

- Does the programme have human rights and gender equality specific quantitative and qualitative indicators?
- Does the programme systematically collect and use sex-disaggregated data?
- Are programme activities and results specifically geared towards human rights and gender equality, and in what proportion?
- Is the differentiated impact of the work on women and men considered?

Table 3 (UNEG, 2011, p. 30) presents additional examples of questions that could be used to assess human rights and gender equality in an evaluation.

Box 3 : *Human Rights and Gender Equality Responsive Theory of Change*

A theory of change is a method that explains how a given intervention, or set of interventions, is expected to lead to specific development change, drawing on a causal analysis based on available evidence. (UNDAF, 2017, p. 4). Often human rights and gender equality are absent in a Theory of Change, or expressed in a way that does not lead to concomitant action (UNEG, 2011, p. 29). For example, projects or programmes might note that adolescent girls and young women are disproportionately more affected by HIV than their male counterparts but include no activities designed to address this inequality, such as patriarchal notions of society, which can lead to increased rates of intimate partner violence (IPV) and riskier sexual behaviour.

By articulating the causes of a development challenge/challenge in the response to AIDS, making assumptions explicit on how the proposed strategy is expected to yield results, and testing these assumptions against evidence—including what has worked well, or not, in the past—the theory of change helps ensure a sound logic for achieving change

(UNDAF, 2017, p. 4).

Table 3. Framing the Evaluation Questions to Assess Design and Planning, Implementation and Results - Examples

CRITERIA	ASSESSING DESIGN AND PLANNING	ASSESSING IMPLEMENTATION	ASSESSING RESULTS
RELEVANCE	• Was the programme formulated according to international norms and agreements on HR and GE, and to national and local strategies to advance HR & GE? • Was the programme formulated according to the needs and interests of all targeted stakeholder groups? How were these needs and interests assessed? • Were HR & GE analyses conducted at the design stage?	• Did the activities undertaken meet the needs of the various groups of stakeholders, including those who are most likely to have their rights violated? • Did the activities address the underlying causes of inequality and discrimination?	• Are programmatic results contributing to the realization of international HR and GE norms and agreements, as well as to national and local strategies to advance HR & GE? • Do the programme results respond to the needs of all stakeholders, as identified at the design stage?
EFFECTIVENESS	• Did the programme's theory of change incorporate the HR & GE dimensions? • Are HR & GE objectives clearly stated in the results framework? • Is the responsibility for ensuring adherence to HR & GE objectives well-articulated? • Does the programme have specific quantitative and qualitative indicators and baselines to measure progress on HR & GE?	• During implementation, were there systematic and appropriate efforts to include various groups of stakeholders, including those who are most likely to have their rights violated? • Did programme implementation maximize efforts to build the capacity of duty bears and rights holders? • Was monitoring data collected and disaggregated according to relevant criteria (gender, age, etc.)? • Was sufficient information collected on specific indicators to measure progress on HR & GE? • How was monitoring data on HR & GE used to improve the programme?	• What were the main results achieved by the intervention towards the realization of HR & GE? • To what degree were the results achieved equitably distributed among the targeted stakeholder groups? • Do programmatic results contribute to changing attitudes and behaviors towards HR & GE? • Do the programmatic results contribute to reducing the underlying causes of inequality and discrimination? • Did the programme contribute to the empowerment of women and/or other relevant population groups?
EFFICIENCY	• Are there sufficient resources (financial, time, people) allocated to integrate HR & GE in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the programme?	• Were the programme resources used in an efficient way to address HR & GE in the implementation (e.g. participation of targeted stakeholders, collection of disaggregated data, etc.)?	• Was the use of programme resources to address HR & GE in line with the corresponding results achieved? • Would a modest increase in resources to

	• What are the costs of not addressing HR & GE adequately from the design stage?	• Were there any constraints (e.g. political, practical, bureaucratic) to addressing HR & GE efficiently during implementation?	address HR & GE in the intervention have made possible a substantive increase in corresponding results (e.g. allocation of staff time to look at HR & GE aspects of programme activities)?
SUSTAINABILITY	• Did the programme design include an appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting national/local ownership, use of local capacity, etc.) to support positive changes in HR & GE after the end of the programme? To what extent were stakeholders involved in the preparation of the strategy? • Did the planning framework considered the institutional and organizational context and its is conduciveness to the advancement of HR & GE?	• To what extent were national and local organizations involved in different aspects of the programme implementation? • Did the programmatic activities aim at promoting sustainable changes in attitudes, behaviors and power relations between the different stakeholder groups?	• To what extent do stakeholders have confidence that they will be able to build on the HR & GE changes promoted by the programme? • To what degree did participating organizations change their policies or practices to improve HR & GE fulfillment (e.g. new services, greater responsiveness, resource re-allocation, improved quality etc.)?
IMPACT	• Did the programme envisage any specific impact on HR & GE? Is it clearly articulated in the results framework? • Did the programme design consider how impact on HR and GE could be assessed at a later stage? • To what extent were the potential unintended impacts on the various stakeholder groups identified during the design stage?	• How did the programmatic activities relate to the intended long-term results on HR & GE? • Did the programme monitoring systems capture progress towards long-term results on HR & GE? • Were there any positive or negative unintended effects on HR & GE identified during implementation? How were they addressed?	• Did the programme clearly lead to the realization of targeted HR & GE norms for the stakeholders identified? • Were there any unintended results on HR & GE in the programme? • Did the programmatic activities and results in HR & GE influence the work of other organizations and programmes?

(UNEG, 2011)

Task 2.4: Working with Human Rights and Gender Equality Indicators

Indicators are one of the most critical tools for a good quality evaluation. They describe how intended results are measured (i.e. whether rights and equality are being promoted) and illustrate the changes to which an action or programme contributes. In terms of measuring human rights and gender equality dimensions, they help evaluators assess, for example, whether the action or programme has been successful in promoting empowerment at legal, political, economic and social levels. They can also help address stakeholder diversity since, through measuring disaggregated indicators, a programme can obtain information on whether it is affecting different groups of people. By comparing the progress on the indicators with baseline information, it is possible to establish changes over a period of time (UNEG, 2011, p. 33). Examples of such human rights and gender equality specific indicators include:

- Percentage of planned and actual expenditure related to HIV/AIDS that contributes to human rights and gender equality results (Gender Equality Marker rating of 2 or 3) (UNDG, 2013).
- Number of new HIV infections per 1000 uninfected population, disaggregated by age and sex or key population group (i.e. women and girls, AGYW, MSM, sex workers) (The H6 Partnership, 2016).
- Proportion of women and men living with HIV who report experiencing stigma and discrimination related to disability and/or HIV status, disaggregated by age and gender (Bloom & Negroustoueva, 2013, p. 18).

The evaluability assessment that is done in the preparation stage of an evaluation can identify whether the programme has an adequate set of indicators (and information on their progress) to support the assessment of human rights and gender equality during the evaluation process. If such indicators do not exist, they could be created during the planning stage of the evaluation (while also revising the ToR) and assessed during the evaluation process (UNEG, 2011). In doing so, it is important to refer to the standards set out in the following guidance documents for key sets of gender-specific indicators:

- *Indicator Standards: Operational Guidelines for Selecting Indicators for the HIV Response* (UNAIDS Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group, 2015);
- *Global AIDS Monitoring (GAM) 2018: Indicators for monitoring the 2016 United Nations Political Declaration on Ending AIDS* (UNAIDS, 2017); and
- *Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework (UBRAF) 2016-2021: Indicator Guidance* (UNAIDS, 2016).

Additional tips on creating human rights and gender equality indicators are also provided in *Box 4* if necessary. An example of evaluation of Human Rights, Community Engagement and Gender Equality tool, is included in the Global Validation of EMTCT of HIV and Shypilis: http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/rtis/9789241505888/en/

STEP 3. IMPLEMENTING THE EVALUATION

This section provides guidance on using appropriate evaluation methods to ensure that human rights and gender equality dimensions of the action or programme are identified and analyzed during the evaluation process. It also outlines the process of writing the evaluation report (UNEG, 2011, p. 37)

Task 3.1 Selecting the appropriate evaluation methodology

Determining the evaluation method is the first part of implementing a successful evaluation process. A mixed methods approach (qualitative and quantitative), while including different stakeholders, will offer differing perspectives that will produce a more reliable picture of reality. *Table 4 o*ffers guidance on selecting evaluation methodology to address human rights and gender equality (UNEG, 2011, p. 38).

Examples of gender-responsive evaluation methods are, as follows: methods that are appropriate and relevant to both women and men (and other population groups as relevant), inclusive, participatory, ensure collection of disaggregated data, understand the constraints and challenges of informants, explore gender roles and power relations, are context and culturally sensitive, and emphasize mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative) (UN Women Independent Evaluation Office, 2015, p. 59)**.**

Table 4. Key Elements of an Appropriate Evaluation Methodology to Address Human Righs and Gender Equality	
SELECTING THE APPROPRIATE EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	
MIXED- METHODS	An appropriate mix of qualitative and quantitative methods is used to gather and analyze data, in order to offer diverse perspectives to the evaluation, and to promote participation of different groups of stakeholders. Common evaluation tools that can be used in a mixed- method approach include (but are not limited to) desk reviews, interviews, focus groups, surveys, etc.
STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION	The full range of stakeholder groups are interviewed to avoid biases including gender bias, distance bias (favoring the more accessible), power bias (are interviewees able to speak freely because privacy and confidentiality concerns have been addressed?). In addition, the choice of field sites to be visited should have an explicit rationale (differing conditions, random selection, etc.).
INCLUSION OF THE MOST VULNERABLE	Identify and include those most likely to have their rights violated in the data gathering and analysis process. Explore alternatives to address the participation barriers these groups may face.
ADEQUATE RESOURCES	Funds, time and human capacity within the evaluation are specifically allocated for stakeholder consultation and HR & GE data gathering.
DATA DISAGGREGATION	Data gathering instruments and methods are developed such that HR & GE related data can be disaggregated.
TAKING ADVANTAGE OF EXISTING DATA SETS	Evaluators can make good use of existing national or international data sets (such as AIDSInfo and NCPI) to compare and confirm or refute programme findings. It may be useful and efficient to test findings with a diverse panel of experts, who can corroborate or suggest other interpretations.
VALIDATION OF FINDINGS	When evaluators have gathered their information and prepared tentative findings, it is good practice to validate these findings through workshops with different groups, to increase their accuracy and reliability. The design may include report- backs of key findings to mixed groups of beneficiaries, to programme implementers, and to external experts. The information can be presented for validation, for deepening the analysis, and for eliciting potential conclusions and recommendations.
ADEQUATE SAMPLE	If the amount of information reviewed/data collected is too limited, the findings may be questioned. If budget concerns or time constraints limit the number of respondents, or if the number in some categories is very small (for example, only a few people can spare the time to speak with evaluators) the findings need to be validated by a larger group, or through triangulation. The sampling strategy also needs to address the inclusion of women and men and other population groups of interest in diverse stakeholder groups.
TRIANGULATION	Wherever possible, data should come from more than one source. For example, if population groups of interest report increased success in negotiating their needs or representing their interests, this may be confirmed through records of decisions, or asking stakeholders if they have noticed any changes in the negotiation process with population groups. If women report increased empowerment, they can be asked how this has impacted their sexual and reproductive health and rights, as well as their decision-making role in the household – both of which may be confirmed by observation. In addition, legislation in that country can be examined to see whether a national strategy or policy exists addressing gender-based violence (GBV) and violence against women that includes HIV.

(UNEG, 2011)

Task 3.2 Collecting and Analyzing Data

In the data collection stage of evaluation, evaluation tools should be tailored to address human rights and gender equality dimensions and challenges. There are multiple dimensions to analyzing data when addressing human rights and gender equality issues. Firstly, data should be produced and offered by various stakeholders (including the most vulnerable), treated with respect and valued equally. Secondly, data analysis should understand the context of human rights and gender equality issues that apply to stakeholders and using this understanding to inform the interpretations of their opinions. Lastly, there needs to be special attention paid to data that specifically address human rights and gender equality issues in a programme. When conducting qualitative data collecting and analysis, researchers should commit to conducting research within the participants' cultural context.

Task 3.3 Preparing the Evaluation Report and Alternative Forms of Reporting

When preparing the evaluation report, it is good practice to share evaluation findings with stakeholders. This can be done in the form of a final workshop, where participants are selected in reference to the stakeholder analysis (with special attention given to the most vulnerable groups). In order to address human rights and gender equality, the workshop needs to be inclusive and create a space for reflective and active, free and meaningful participation (UNEG, 2011, p. 41)

A good evaluation report will need to make sure that the information provided by participants during the evaluation process, including the final workshop, is duly captured with balanced perspectives and fair representation of different points of view. Findings and recommendations need to be formulated in detail, identifying to whom the recommendations are addressed and proposing concrete action points. The evaluation report is the most important resource for the evaluator to reassert the importance of adequately addressing human rights and gender equality. *Table 5* presents some guidance on how to formulate an evaluation report that adequately addresses human rights and gender equality (UNEG, 2011, p. 42).

Table 5. Preparing the Evaluation Report	
KEY ELEMENTS OF ELECTIVE EVALUATION REPORT	
COVERAGE OF HR & GE INFORMATION	The report should correspond with the requirements in the ToR for information and findings on HR & GE. Are the conclusions adequately supported by the findings?
STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION	The report should acknowledge how inclusive stakeholder participation was ensured during the evaluation process.
RECOMMENDATIONS ON HR & GE	Do the conclusions warrant recommendations, and are they appropriately targeted and specific, and likely to lead to appropriate action? If not, can they be made more relevant? Will it be possible to follow up on the recommendation to see if it has been implemented?
CHALLENGES	Challenges to obtaining HR & GE information or to addressing the issues appropriately should be included. Indicate the implications of not having data available, if this is the case: if data were available, what would have been different in the evaluation? What would have been the gains in the process?
LESSONS	Include lessons on HR & GE, both related to the intervention itself, and also on how to integrate these dimensions into the evaluation process.

(UNEG, 2011)

Summary Checklist

A summary checklist for the human rights and gender equality evaluation process is provided in *Table 6* (UNEG, 2011, p. 44). This checklist is organized by the various steps of an human rights and gender equality responsive evaluation that should be taken throughout the process. The checklist should help evaluators to keep in mind the key elements of human rights and gender equality when doing their evaluations.

Table 6. Checklist for Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality Dimensions into the Evaluation Process	
EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT	Was an assessment to determine the evaluability level of HR & GE in the intervention performed?
	How will HR & GE evaluability challenges be addressed during the evaluation, based on the results of the evaluability assessment?
STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS	Was a HR & GE stakeholder analysis performed?
	Was a diverse group of stakeholders identified from the stakeholder analysis, including women and men, as well as those who are most affected by rights violations and groups who are not directly involved in the program?
	How will the evaluation team reach out to stakeholders to be engaged in the evaluation?
CRITERIA	Were evaluation criteria defined which specifically address HR & GE?
	Were additional criteria specific to the context of the program to be evaluated identified?
QUESTIONS	Were evaluation questions that specifically address HR & GE framed?
INDICATORS	Are there indicators already defined by the program with available disaggregated data?
	Were additional indicators identified for the evaluation of the program, specifically addressing HR & GE?
	Were plans made on how to collect data to inform the additional indicators?
TEAM	Was an evaluation team with knowledge of and commitment to HR & GE selected?
	Is the evaluation team diverse, in terms of gender, types of expertise, age, geographical origin, etc.?
	Is the team ethically responsible and balanced with equitable power relations, in line with the concepts of HR & GE?
METHODOLOGY	Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed methods approach, appropriate to addressing HR & GE?
	Does the evaluation methodology favour stakeholders' right to participation, including those most vulnerable?
	Does the evaluation methodology favour triangulation of the information obtained?
COLLECTING AND ANALYZING DATA	Were all stakeholder groups identified in the stakeholder analysis consulted during the evaluation?
	Were all stakeholder groups consulted at the end of the data collection stage to discuss findings and hear their views on the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation?
REPORT AND REPORTING	Does the evaluation report address HR & GE issues, including in the recommendations section?
	How will the recommendations in the report affect the different stakeholders of the programme?
	Are there plans to disseminate the evaluation report to a wide group, in particular stakeholder groups who have an interest in and/or are affected by HR & GE issues?
	Was a management response prepared which considers the HR & GE issues raised in the report?
	Did the preparation of the management response and discussion of action points involve a diverse group of stakeholders, including those who have an interest in and/or are affected by HR & GE?

(UNEG, 2011)

References

Bloom, S., & Negroustoueva, S. (2013). *Compendium of Gender Equality and HIV Indicators.* Measure Evaluation.

Canadian International Development Agency. (1997). *Guide to Gender-Sensitive Indicators.* CIDA.

The H6 Partnership. (2016). *Annual Report 2016: Harnessing the collective strengths of the UN system to improve the health of women, children and adolescents everywhere.*

UN Women Independent Evaluation Office. (2015). *How to Manage Gender-Responsive Evaluation.* United Nations.

UNAIDS. (2015). *On the Fast-Track to end AIDS: UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2021.*

UNAIDS. (2015). *UNAIDS Terminology Guidelines.*

UNAIDS. (2015). *Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework 2016-2021.* Geneva.

UNAIDS. (2016). " Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework (UBRAF) 2016-2021: Indicator Guidance.

UNAIDS. (2016). *Prevention Gap Report.*

UNAIDS. (2016). *Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework (UBRAF) 2016-2021: Indicator Guidance.*

UNAIDS. (2017). *Fast-Track and Human Rights: Advancing human rights in efforts to accelerate the response to HIV.*

UNAIDS. (2017). *Global AIDS Monitoring 2018: Indicators for monitoring the 2016 United Nations Political Declaration on Ending AIDS.*

UNAIDS Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group. (2015). *Indicator Standards: Operational Guidelines for Selecting Indicators for the HIV Response.* Retrieved from AIDS MERG: http://aidsmerg.org/

UNDAF. (2017). *Theory of Change- UNDAF Companion Guidance.* United Nations Development Group. United Nations.

UNDG. (2013). *Gender Equality Marker - Guidance Note.* United Nations.

UNEG. (2011). *Integrating Human RIghts and Gender Equality in Evaluation- Towards UNEG Guidance.* United Nations.

United Nations General Assembly. (2016). *Political Declaration on HIV and AIDS: On the Fast Track to Accelerating the Fight against HIV and Ending the AIDS Epidemic by 2030.*

WHO, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, South African Medical Research Council. (2013). Global and regional estimates of violence against women: Prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence. Geneva: World Health Organization.