**UNEG**
United Nations Evaluation Group

Guidance
Document

# UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note

## (reviewed in August 2014)

# Oversight

In Resolution E/2014/L.12 the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) requests the United Nations system, including its agencies, funds and programmes, within their respective organizational mandates, to continue working collaboratively to enhance and accelerate gender mainstreaming within the United Nations system, including by fully implementing the United Nations System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP)[1]. The UN-SWAP is composed of 15 performance indicators for tracking 6 main elements on gender mainstreaming: accountability, results based management, oversight, human and financial resources, capacity, and knowledge exchange and networking. All UN entities are to self-assess and report on their implementation of the plan. The oversight element of the UN-SWAP includes three performance indicators, including one dedicated to evaluation that is linked to meeting the gender-related UNEG Norms & Standards and demonstrating effective use of the UNEG guidance on integrating gender in evaluation.

As a means to guide UN entities, the UN-SWAP framework is accompanied by a set of Technical Notes on each Performance Indicator that provides the indicator, the mandate on which it was based, guidance on how to complete the rating for that particular indicator, and current practice examples. While the UN-UN-SWAP Performance Indicators approved by the CEB are set in stone, the Technical Notes are considered live documents that can be enhanced.

The categories below "*not applicable*", "*missing*", "*approaches requirements*", "*meets requirements*" and "*exceeds requirements*" are common to all the 15 UN-SWAP Performance Indicators, including the Evaluation Performance Indicator.

| 5. Evaluation Performance Indicator | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Applicable | Missing | Approaches requirements | Meets requirements | Exceeds requirements |
| 5a. Performance indicator is not relevant to a UN entity | 5b. None of the UNEG gender-related norms and standards are met | 5c. Meets some of the UNEG gender-related norms and standards | 5d. Meets the UNEG gender-related norms and standards | 5ei. Meets the UNEG gender-related norms and standards and<br><br>5eii. Demonstrates effective use of the UNEG guidance on evaluating from a human rights and gender equality perspective |

---

[1] For more information on the UN SWAP and the full introduction to performance indicators and technical notes please consult: http://www.unwomen.org/2012/04/un-women-welcomes-a-landmark-action-plan-to-measure-gender-equality-across-the-un-system/

**How to distinguish between the 'Non Applicable' and 'Missing' categories when reporting against SWAP?**

**Non-applicable**: can pertain to highly technical areas of the UN work where integrating gender considerations may not be possible. For instance, due to the nature of its highly technical work, it is not always possible to integrate gender implications in all of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) areas of work, such as: (i) the introduction of international standards related to the transport of dangerous goods by air or (ii) the production of guidance on the application of market-based measures aimed at reducing the environmental impact of aircraft engine emissions to name only a few (the complete response from ICAO on how the applicability of the scorecard can be found in Annex 3)

**Missing**: applies to a situation where most of the criterion has not been met. This may partly be because the institutional guidance, tools or systems to support the integration of gender equality are not yet in place. The entity should score the criteria as missing and note the need to develop these to improve performance.

Before a UN entity considers the UN SWAP Evaluation performance indicator as non-applicable, it should question whether this is due to operational/procedural matters or whether it is truly not relevant to the type of evaluation it conducts.  If it is a matter of guidance, tools, systems, processes or prioritization not being in place the 'missing' rating would apply whereas if it is a question of not being relevant to the particular work of a given UN entity, the 'non applicable' rating would apply, as in the example of ICAO above.

# I.    Introduction: UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator and the mandate to integrate Gender Equality in evaluation:

This note is meant to support the Evaluation Offices of UN entities to comply with the annual reporting process against the CEB-endorsed UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator. The reporting process for evaluation includes UN-SWAP Evaluation Scorecard (see Section V) and Online Reporting System and qualitative feedback (see Section VI). The note also aims to support more systematic and harmonized reporting through the use of a common tool that also allows for improved comparability across UN entities.

The technical note and its related Scorecard for UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator were piloted in 2013. During the UNEG 2014 AGM, it was decided that a Task Force under UNEG Strategic Objective 3 would be composed in order to undertake the review process of the technical note and Scorecard. Both the technical note and the Scorecard were then reviewed in 2014 after the second UN-SWAP reporting cycle, to incorporate feedback from UN entities on their experiences and revise the technical note and Scorecard accordingly. The elements reviewed in this updated version are based on the feedback provided by UN entities after the piloting year and based on the results of survey to all UN-SWAP Evaluation Focal Points on their experiences.

UN entities are expected to meet all UN-SWAP performance standards by 2017, with an extended timeframe to 2019 for those entities with a mainly technical focus. Furthermore, the recent Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review Resolution (A/RES/67/226) adopted by the General Assembly in December 2012 requests 'the Joint Inspection Unit to undertake a system-wide evaluation of the effectiveness, value added and impact of the System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the

Empowerment of Women as a tool for performance monitoring and accountability for submission to the General Assembly following its full implementation.' Accordingly, this requires that systems to report against this performance indicator are developed and in place so that progress can be shown by UN entities and as an input to the JIU evaluation.

The ultimate goal is that all UN system entities "meet requirements" related to this Performance Indicator in terms of integrating gender equality and empowerment of women (GEEW) in their respective evaluations. However, achieving this is only considered a starting point to fully integrating gender dimensions in evaluation processes, rather than an end in itself. UN entities should continually strive to "exceed requirements" if the UN system is to truly benefit from gender responsive evaluation practice.

Nevertheless, integrating gender dimensions in evaluation is still a relatively new area of practice in evaluation. Institutional and methodological challenges exist and a shift in the way evaluations are conducted is required. The development and testing of new gender responsive approaches and methods must also be undertaken and fully implemented. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that UN entities may not be in a position of 'meeting requirements' for this indicator immediately, and a 3-5 year period is more realistic.

It is expected that the act of monitoring and reporting against this indicator will provide constructive momentum for reviewing progress made and reflecting on continuing challenges so as to improve performance over time, at both the level of the individual entity and the UN system.

---

**ECOSOC Resolution 2007/33**[1] requests the United Nations system, including United Nations agencies, funds and programmes within their organizational mandates, to strengthen institutional accountability mechanisms, including through a more effective monitoring and evaluation framework for gender mainstreaming based on common United Nations evaluation standards.

**Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review Resolution** A/RES/67/226[1] *notes* the development of the **norms and standards** for evaluation by the **United Nations Evaluation Group** as a professional network, and encourages the use of these norms and standards in the evaluation functions of United Nations funds, programmes and specialized agencies, as well as in system-wide evaluations of operational activities for development; *encourages* the United Nations development system to institute greater accountability for gender equality in evaluations conducted by country teams by including gender perspectives in such evaluations; and *welcomes* the development of the United Nations System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women, under the leadership of UN-Women, as an accountability framework to be fully implemented by the United Nations development system.

## II.  What are the UNEG gender-related Norms, Standards and Guidance?

The UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation[2] were developed in response to General Assembly resolution A/RES/59/250[3]. While the UNEG Norms seek to facilitate system-wide collaboration on evaluation by ensuring that evaluation entities within the UN follow basic principles, the UNEG Standards are intended to guide the establishment of the institutional framework, management of the evaluation function and the conduct and use of evaluations. The following box outlines the specific UNEG gender-related norms and standards for evaluation.

---

**UNEG Gender Related Norms and Standards**

Competencies (Standard 2.4) – Evaluators need to have technical knowledge of, and be familiar with, the methodology or approach that will be needed for the specific evaluation to be undertaken, as well as certain managerial and personal skills.

Specialized experience and/or methodological/technical knowledge, including some specific data collection and analytical skills, may be particularly useful in the following areas:

'Understanding of gender considerations'.

Ethics (Norm 11 and Standard 2.5)
> ➢ Norm 11: In light of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender inequality.
> ➢ Standard 2.5: Evaluators should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relationships with all stakeholders:
> 'Evaluators should be aware of differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction and gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, and be mindful of the potential implications of these differences when planning, carrying out and reporting on evaluations.'

Design (Standard 3.7)  - Evaluation methodologies should be sufficiently rigorous to assess the subject of evaluation and ensure a complete, fair and unbiased assessment:

'… Methodology should explicitly address issues of gender and under-represented groups.'

Design (Standard 3.9) – The evaluation design should, when relevant, include considerations as to what extent the UN system's commitment to the human-rights based approach has been incorporated in the design of the undertaking to be evaluated with specific consideration of gender issues.

Selection of Team (Standard 3.14) – the composition of evaluation teams should be gender balanced, geographically diverse and include professionals from the countries or regions concerned.

Implementation (Standard 3.15) – Evaluations should be conducted in a professional and ethical manner.

---

[2]  For link to full list of UNEG Norms and Standards, please download at: http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp
[3] Document A/C.2/59/L.63 of 17 December, paragraph 69.

> 'Evaluations must be gender and culturally sensitive and respect the confidentiality, protection of source and dignity of those interviewed'.
>
> Report (Standard 4.8) – The evaluation report should indicate the extent to which gender issues and considerations were incorporated where applicable.
> - ➢ How gender issues were implemented as a cross-cutting theme in programming, and if the subject being evaluated gave sufficient attention to promote gender equality and gender sensitivity
>
> The report should include an analysis of gender and how the design and implementation of the subject being evaluated addressed the gaps.

In addition to establishing evaluation norms and standards for the UN system, UNEG has developed a number of guidance documents that further elaborate on the specific gender-related norms and standards outlined above. *These documents define gender equality responsive evaluation as one that incorporates the gender equality mainstreaming principles into evaluation such as equality, inclusion and non-discrimination. By doing so, such evaluations contribute to the social and economic change process that is central to most development programming by identifying and analyzing gender inequalities, discriminatory practices and unjust power relations that are central to development problems. Conducting gender responsive evaluation can lead to more effective interventions and better and more sustainable results*.

It is important to note that existing UNEG guidance covers the integration of both human rights and gender equality (HR & GE) dimensions in evaluation. This is due to the fact that both dimensions are closely interlinked, with women's rights and gender equality an integral part of the human rights framework and the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA). Therefore, gender equality responsive evaluation also calls for attention to the women's rights dimension of the HRBA. The key UNEG guidance documents covering integration of gender equality in evaluation are:

- ➢ [UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations](#).
  Approved by the UNEG AGM in 2013, this work was developed in parallel to, and elaborates on the UNEG Handbook and provides the United Nations system with an even more detailed resource on evaluation approaches methods for a technical audience to ensure human rights and gender responsive evaluations….

- ➢ [Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation – Towards UNEG Guidance](#)
  Approved by the UNEG AGM in 2011, this handbook is a practical, user-friendly guidebook on how to include human rights and gender equality in evaluations. It offers tools and resources to include gender equality in evaluations by providing guidance throughout all phases of an evaluation.

- ➢ [UNEG Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR) and Inception Report](#)
  Approved at the UNEG AGM 2010, this quality checklist serves as a guideline in the design and conduct of evaluations. The use and application of section 9 of this document provides criteria for assessing the integration of gender equality into TOR and inception reports.

- ➢ [UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports](#)

Approved at the UNEG AGM 2010, this quality checklist for evaluation reports serves as a guideline in the preparation and assessment of an evaluation report. The use and application of section 8 of this document provides criteria for assessing the integration of gender equality into evaluation reports.

➢ [UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#) and the [UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation](#) Approved in 2008, these guidelines are based on commonly-held and internationally recognized professional ideals for the conduct of evaluation. The Guidelines and Code include requirements for considering gender roles in cultural context, experience and competency with gender issues, and gender balance among evaluators.

The Scorecard criteria have been drawn from the above UNEG references and modified based on feedback from UN entities. In addition, some UN entities have also incorporated the UNEG gender-related norms, standards and accompanying guidance into their own evaluation guidance and tools (e.g. generic TOR, evaluation report outline, internal guidance notes, etc.) and these provide a more customised reference for assessing performance against this indicator for those entities.[4]

## III. Implementing and reporting against the UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator

To report on progress against the UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator, UN entities will need to conduct a meta-analysis of a portion of the evaluations that they have managed and/or conducted during a one-year period that assesses the level of integration of gender dimensions in their evaluations.

The use of the UN-SWAP Evaluation Scorecard (see Annex 1 and Section V for further detail) provides a basis for harmonising the meta-analysis conducted by different entities by assigning an overall aggregate score for reporting against the UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator's scaled rating system: *missing, approaching requirements, meeting requirements, or exceeding requirements*. Every effort has been taken to ensure the applicability of the Scorecard criteria to all types of UN entity. It is advised that:

- UN entities that have already established meta-review/evaluation processes (conducted internally or externally) should seek to incorporate all elements of the guidance provided in this note and the Scorecard into their existing processes so as to institutionalize the review of these elements and avoid parallel or duplicate reporting processes.

- Those UN entities that have no such processes in place should use the Scorecard to report against this performance indicator on an annual basis.

It is important that Evaluation Offices conduct an annual meta-analysis in order to report on their performance by the UN-SWAP reporting deadline. Respective evaluation units should assess whether they have the capacity to undertake the meta-analysis internally or whether there is a need to utilize external resources to undertake the exercise.

---

[4] For example, ILO has produced a guidance note to [Integrating Gender Equality in Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects](#) which succinctly sets out the main steps that should be taken through the evaluation cycle and which is applicable to most UN System organizations.

# IV. What should be included in the UN-SWAP meta-review/evaluation?

For the purpose of reporting against this indicator, UN entities should include in their UN-SWAP meta-review/evaluation only those reports that meet the UNEG definition for evaluation:

> An evaluation is 'an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area, institutional performance etc. It focuses on expected and achieved accomplishments, examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors an causality, in order to understand achievements or the lack thereof. It aims at determining the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the interventions and contributions of the organizations of the UN system. An evaluation should provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lesions into the decision-making processes of the organizations of the UN system and its members'.

There are other forms of assessments being conducted in the UN system that vary in purpose and level of analysis, and may have some overlapping elements. Evaluation is to be differentiated from the following: self-assessments, appraisals, monitoring exercises, reviews, inspections, investigations, audit, research and internal management consulting. While useful in their own right, these assessments should not be included in the meta-review/evaluation.

Both evaluations conducted or managed by central evaluation offices and decentralized evaluations undertaken by entities should be included in the meta-review/evaluation.

- For UN entities with a *high number of evaluations*, a <u>minimum</u> of 30 evaluations carried out by the entity for the year should be included in the meta-review/evaluation.
- For UN entities with *less than 30 evaluations* managed and/or conducted for the year under review, a 100% of evaluations should be included in the meta-review/evaluation.
- Those entities with *established meta-review/evaluation processes* in place should try to include a 100% of evaluations for the year under review when feasible.

Those entities selecting a sample of evaluations for meta-review/evaluation should aim to select a representative sample so as to minimize sample bias. Selection criteria should include:

- ➤ Evaluation managed/conducted by both central evaluation offices and decentralized evaluations;
- ➤ Balance in terms of mid-term versus final evaluations;
- ➤ A mix of evaluation types: project, programme, policy, outcome, impact, evaluation of normative work, strategic, etc.;
- ➤ A balanced mix of topics, themes and sectors;
- ➤ Widespread geographical coverage;
- ➤ Interventions[5] where gender equality is the primary focus of the interventions and where gender is not the primary focus but mainstreamed throughout the intervention.

---

[5] The term 'interventions' can be substituted by 'policies' or 'strategies' depending on the type of evaluation conducted to better reflect the nature and focus of institutional evaluations. Since the reporting tool is organized around standard evaluation practice it is in principle adaptable to different evaluation typologies (e.g. evaluation of normative work, policy, institutional evaluations, etc),

# V.  UN-SWAP Evaluation Scorecard

The UN-SWAP Evaluation Scorecard (Annex 1) is a reporting tool organized around 4 scoring criteria that capture the overall elements related to mainstreaming gender equality as reflected in the evaluation reports conducted by the entities in a given year.[6] The basic data source and the unit of analysis for scoring are the actual evaluation reports. Due to practical feasibility, and the lack of capacity of several entities to undertake a more complex analysis, the criteria included in the Scorecard are those that can be assessed by reviewing the evaluation reports.

The 4 scoring criteria included in the Scorecard are:

➢ *GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis and Evaluation Indicators are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected*

➢ *GEEW is integrated in Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.*

➢ *A gender-responsive Methodology, Methods and Tools, and Data Analysis Techniques are selected.*

➢ *The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation reflect a gender analysis.*

Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).

UN entities that have more detailed systems in place and that are able to undertake a more comprehensive analysis could also include design documents, evaluability assessments, TOR, inception reports as sources of reference for their assessment. Some entities may also include phone interviews in view of collecting data from evaluation managers and evaluation teams to help with completing the Scorecard.

## 1.  How to score each evaluation criterion

UN entities will use the Scorecard to assess each evaluation report using a four point scale rating system for each criterion. Each of the scoring levels below corresponds to a numbered score:

➢ 0 = Not at all integrated. Applies when none of the elements under a criterion are met.

➢ 1 = Partially integrated. Applies when some minimal elements are met but further progress is needed and remedial action to meet the standard is required.

➢ 2 = Satisfactorily integrated. Applies when a satisfactory level has been reached and many of the elements are met but still improvement could be done.

---

[6] It has been developed from the principles outlined in the UNEG gender-responsive norms and standards, guidance, existing UNEG checklists, ethical code, etc.

➢ 3 = Fully integrated. Applies when all of the elements under a criterion are met, used and fully integrated in the evaluation and no remedial action is required.

It is important to note that <u>no decimals should be provided in the scoring of criteria, only whole numbers</u>.

During the piloting of the previous version of this technical note it has been reported that there is room for subjectivity in the assessment of the different criteria. This implicit subjectivity, which is inherent to any type of assessment of this kind, particularly when self-assessing the reports of our own organizations, is acknowledged. It is therefore highly desirable that the meta-review/evaluation for the assessment of the UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator is integrated in the corporate meta-evaluation system when those exist or otherwise conducted externally, when possible.

The Scorecard includes references to the UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations; and UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation. Entities are encouraged to review those guidance documents and take the reference and the examples provided there when undertaking the analysis. This technical note is not intended to repeat information already included there. Annex 1 Individual Scoring Tool includes detailed references to both the guidance and the handbook. One of the limitations faced by the UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations is the limitation of existing examples in the UN system. UN-SWAP reporting against the Evaluation Performance Indicator is a promising system that will eventually allow collecting examples of best practices and challenges in integrating gender in evaluations in the UN system, by analysing the qualitative feedback provided by the entities during each reporting cycle.

## 2. How to score individual evaluation report

Since each evaluation report is assessed against 4 criteria the maximum possible number of points that a report can obtain is 12 (by obtaining 3 points in each of the 4 criteria).

Entities will use the Scorecard to assess each evaluation report by determining the rating for each criterion as outlined above. To calculate the overall individual evaluation score the total number of points for each criterion will be added up and the overall evaluation rating will be given using the scoring system below:

➢ 0-3 points = Missing requirements

➢ 4-7 points = Approaches requirements

➢ 8-10= Meets requirements

➢ 11-12 = Exceeds Requirements

For example, if the evaluation score is 11 or above the rating for the evaluation would be 'Exceeds Requirements' while an aggregate value of 10 would be 'Meeting Requirements'.

## How to calculate the meta-review/evaluation score

The scoring system above used to score individual evaluation reports will also inspire the aggregate overall rating for the UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator. To calculate the meta-review/evaluation score to be reported against the Evaluation Performance Indicator, the average score for

each evaluation under review is added and then divided by the total number of evaluations to obtain an aggregate average.

The aggregate meta-evaluation scoring system used to report against the evaluation performance indicator is very similar to the scoring system for individual reports:

- ➢ 0-3,5 points = Missing requirements
- ➢ 3,51-7,5 points = Approaches requirements
- ➢ 7,51-10,5 points= Meets requirements
- ➢ 10,51-12 = Exceeds Requirements

For example, if there are three evaluations in the meta-review/evaluation that have individual scores of 10, 8, and 12 respectively, the sum of the three scores would be 30, which divided by 3 (the number of evaluations under review) would give an average of 10. This would give a meta-review/evaluation rating of "*Meets Requirements*". If there are three evaluations in the meta-review/evaluation that have individual scores of 9, 8, and 12 respectively, the sum of the three scores would be 29, which divided by 3 (the number of evaluations under review) would give an average of 9.66. This would also give a meta-review/evaluation rating of "*Meets Requirements*".

*Examples of completed Scorecards on how to report against this performance indicator can be found in Annex 1 and 2.*

# VI.   Online Reporting System and qualitative feedback

During annual UN-SWAP reporting, Evaluation Offices are responsible for conducting and sharing their meta-reviews/evaluations and/or completed Scorecards with their organizational UN-SWAP Focal Point[7], who is responsible for uploading these on the web-based reporting system. Evaluation Offices are also encouraged to include examples of evaluations that demonstrate how entities are approaching, meeting or exceeding requirements for this indicator overall or for specific dimensions for upload to the web-based system.

Beyond the provision of the actual Scorecard and the final aggregated scoring UN entities are encouraged to provide also qualitative analysis that outlines challenges, barriers and factors supporting implementation Evaluation Office staff are encouraged to liase with their UN-SWAP Focal Point and ensure that they are familiar with the web-based reporting system section for the evaluation indicator and familiarize themselves with the different areas for input which include the following[8]:

---

[7] All UN entities have designated UN-SWAP Focal Points who do consolidate reporting against all UN-SWAP performance indicators and that enter the data in the online reporting system on behalf of their respective organizations. These colleagues are generally staff of the Gender Units/Gender Divisions of the entities.

[8] These are common areas of input that apply to all UN-SWAP indicators and are not restricted to the Evaluation Performance Indicator.

- **Entity name**
- **Rating of the Performance Indicator:** The entity will need to input the final aggregated number obtained
- **Scoring**: The entity will input the scoring obtained which related to the rating obtained (Missing requirement; Approaching requirements; Meeting requirements; Exceeds Requirements)
- **Timeline**: The entity will indicate here the timeline to meet requirements of this particular indicator.
- **Responsibility to follow up**: The entity will indicate the responsible unit/department to follow up on this particular indicator.
- **Resources needed**: The entity will indicate whether resources are needed to meet standards on this particular indicator.
- **Comments by reporting entity**: This area provides the space to provide qualitative inputs beyond the actual scoring of the indicator.

UN entities are encouraged to include qualitative analysis of their assessment of the UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator. There are elements which are very important in the evaluation process, beyond the analysis of the actual evaluation report, including the integration of gender related considerations in the preparatory and follow up phase of an evaluation process. While due to practical feasibility the assessment of those elements are not included in the UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Scorecard, entities that have the capacity of doing so should provide qualitative feedback on the integration of gender during the different stages of the evaluation process. This includes:

**Evaluability** of the GEEW aspects of the intervention is assessed and steps/measures are taken to maximize the evaluability of GEEW aspects. Guidance on determining the evaluability of GEEW dimensions of an intervention in the evaluation is provided on p. 56-60 in the UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations; on p.17-21 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.

A gender-responsive **Stakeholder Analysis** is undertaken. Guidance on conducting a gender-responsive Stakeholder Analysis is provided on p. 60-65 in the UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations; on p.22-25 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.

**Evaluation Team** recruited that has the capacity to conduct gender-responsive evaluation. Guidance on evaluation teams is provided on p. 89-91 in the UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations; on p.36-37 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.

The **Management Response** to the evaluation addresses the GEEW issues raised in the report and is developed in consultation with a diverse group of stakeholders who have an interest in and/or are affected by GEEW issues. Guidance on Management Responses is provided on p. 118-121 in the UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations; on p.44 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation as well as the UNEG Good Practice Guidelines for Follow Up to Evaluations[9].

---

[9] http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=610

The **Evaluation Dissemination Strategy** is gender responsive. Guidance on evaluation dissemination is provided on p. 121-125 in the UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations; on p.44 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.

In addition to the elements of the evaluation process outlined above, the qualitative inputs provided should also include a reflection on the efforts undertaken by the entities to strengthen gender related issues in their evaluation functions, including development of internal capacities, development of guidance,etc.

# ANNEX 1: UN-SWAP - Individual Evaluation Scoring Tool

| Scoring Criteria | Annotations | Scoring per Criteria (0-3) only whole numbers no decimals | Comment on Scoring (Explanation of why rating has been given) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1.** GEEW is integrated in the **Evaluation Scope of analysis and Indicators** are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected | If GE responsive, the evaluation will analyze how GEEW objectives and GEEW mainstreaming principles were included in the intervention design and how GEEW results have been achieved. Gender responsive evaluation requires and assessment of the extent to which an intervention being evaluated has been guided by organizational and system-wide objectives on GEEW. Indicators for the evaluation of the intervention should include GEEW dimensions and/or additional indicators are identified specifically addressing GEEW; mixed indicators (including quantitative and qualitative indicators) are preferred. *Further guidance on gender-responsive indicators is provided on p. 45-55 in the UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations; and on p.33-35 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.* | 0=Not at all integrated. 1=Partially integrated. 2=Satisfactorily integrated. 3=Fully integrated. | |
| **2.** **Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions** specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved. | GEEW dimensions are integrated into all Evaluation Criteria and questions as appropriate and/or criteria derived directly from GEEW principles are used (e.g. equality, participation, social transformation, inclusiveness, empowerment, etc.). *Further guidance on integrating GEEW consideration into OECD-DAC criteria and evaluation questions is provided on p. 76-88 in the UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation; p.25-32 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.* | 0=Not at all integrated. 1=Slightly integrated. 2=Satisfactory integrated. 3=Fully integrated. | |
| **3.** A gender-responsive **Evaluation Methodology, Methods and tools, and Data Analysis Techniques** are selected. | Triangulation of data is done to ensure that the voices of both women, men, boys and girls are heard and used; additional time or resources (time, staff, funds) to implement a gender-responsive approach is considered and planned for, etc. mixed-method approach are preferred to make visible diverse perspectives and promotes participation of both women and men, boys and girls from different stakeholder groups Data collection methods including, desk reviews, focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc. are identified and accompanying tools, e.g. questionnaires, observational tools, interview guides etc. developed integrating GEEW considerations (e.g. interview guides ensure that women and men are interviewed in ways that avoid gender biases or the reinforcement of gender discrimination and unequal power relations, etc.). During data screening and data analysis, special attention is paid to data and information that specifically refer to GEEW | 0=Not at all integrated. 1=Slightly integrated. 2=Satisfactory integrated. 3=Fully integrated. | |

| | issue in the intervention, and making the best possible use of these in the overall assessment of the intervention.<br><br>*Further guidance on key elements of an appropriate GEEW responsive evaluation methodology, methods, tools and data analysis techniques is provided on p. 91-110 in the UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations, and on p. 37-41 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.* | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **4. The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation** *reflect a gender analysis* | The evaluation report's findings, conclusion and recommendations should reflect a gender analysis. The evaluation report should also provide lessons/challenges/recommendations for conducting gender-responsive evaluation based on the experience of that particular evaluation<br><br>*Further guidance on gender-responsive data analysis is provided on p. 110-114 in the UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations p.42 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.* | 0=Not at all integrated.<br>1=Slightly integrated.<br>2=Satisfactory integrated.<br>3=Fully integrated. | |
| *Individual evaluation score* | | 0-3 points = Missing requirements<br><br>4-7 points = Approaches requirements<br><br>8-10 = Meets requirements<br><br>11-12 = Exceeds Requirements | |

# Annex 2. UN-SWAP – Meta-analysis Tool Example

| Number of Individual Evaluations in Meta-review/evaluation (3 is only given as an example: please adjust columns accordingly, with the relevant number of evaluation reports to be assessed ) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Scoring Criteria** | **Evaluation n 1: Scoring (0-3)** | **Evaluation n 2: Scoring (0-3)** | **Evaluation n 3: Scoring (0-3)** |
| 1. *Evaluation Scope of Analysis and Indicators* are design in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 2. GEEW is integrated in *Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions* specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved. | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 3. A gender-responsive *Methodology, Methods and Tools, and Data Analysis Techniques* are selected. | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 4. *The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation* reflect a gender analysis | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| *Individual evaluation score* | 6 | 11 | 6 |
| **Meta review-evaluation Score (average of individual evaluation scores)** | | | 7,66= meets requirements |

# Annex 3: Example of Non-Applicable of UN-SWAP Evaluation Scorecard Evaluability Criterion

*The UN System Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment: Provision of Feedback by ICAO's Evaluation and Internal Audit Office (EAO)*

As part of the UN System Wide Action Plan to the Chief Executives Board (CEB) Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (CEB2006/2), seven female aviation professionals were interviewed at ICAO with the objective to provide concrete examples that illustrate how a criteria or dimension in the UN-SWAP scoring tool may not always be applicable to all UN areas of work, in this case, that of the technical work of ICAO. Nonetheless, some useful insights on the gender dimension drawn from the experience of the female aviation professionals at ICAO is reported here to provide a gender perspective in civil aviation at ICAO and at the global level.

The following are some concrete examples of ICAO's work programmes provided by the female aviation professionals, which they view as non-applicable in terms of evaluability of gender equality/empowerment aspects.

- Dangerous Goods Section, Air Navigation Bureau: ICAO facilitates the adoption of national legislation by Member States that introduces international standards related to the transport of dangerous goods by air (Dr. Katherine Rooney, Chief, Dangerous Goods Section, http://www.icao.int/safety/DangerousGoods/Pages/background.aspx)
- Market-based Measures: ICAO produces guidance material on the application of market-based measures aimed at reducing or limiting the environmental impact of aircraft engine emissions, particularly with respect to mitigating the impact of aviation on climate change. Market-based measures include: emissions trading, emission related levies - charges and taxes, and emissions offsetting (Sam Brand, Environment Officer (Market-based Measures), Environment Section, http://www.icao.int/environmental-protection/Pages/market-based-measures.aspx)
- Aviation Safety Management – Significant Safety Concerns: ICAO monitors and facilitates the resolution of Significant Safety Concerns by coordinating and providing direct assistance to ensure air safety in Member States and regions (Jimena Blumenkron, Technical Officer, Safety Management and Monitoring, Air Navigation Bureau)
- Aviation Safety Management – Runway Safety Seminars: ICAO regularly conducts runway safety seminars in all ICAO regions to mitigate current aviation safety management issues. The key expected outcome of these seminars is the formation of inter-disciplinary alliances and collaboration between various disciplines (e.g. air traffic controllers, maintenance engineers, pilots etc.) to ensure more effective mitigation and resolution of air safety management issues (Gnehm Elizabeth, M.Sc., Technical Officer, Integrated Safety Management Section, Air Navigation Bureau)

The "Next Generation of Aviation Professionals" initiative was identified by two interviewees as potentially suitable to have a gender strategy and target in the future. The rationale for the initiative is ICAO's estimation that there will be a global shortage of pilots, air traffic controllers and engineers by 2030. The objective is to increase the recruitment of young professionals in the civil aviation profession to mitigate the risk of such a shortage. Although it is no longer novel to see young female interns pursuing a technical aviation profession, gender representation in the technical profession continues to be

predominantly male, and therefore there is a strong rationale for which the programme could and should pursue a gender-based strategy and targeting.

While all female aviation professionals interviewed concurred that the evaluability of gender equality and empowerment of women (GEEW) issues is non-applicable in their technical areas of work, they acknowledged the relevance of gender balance measures in HR management, particularly recruitment, to which ICAO is accountable and reports to the Council.

Reflecting on their experience, the majority of interviewees made reference to stakeholder participation and representation in the profession being largely gender unbalanced. The following are some specific observations, many of which go beyond ICAO's work programmes and reflect the state of gender equality of Member State stakeholders and beneficiaries with whom they interact.

- Unbalanced gender participation and representation: Males are more represented in ICAO technical meetings, the governing body of ICAO; in interviews for technical positions (particularly as candidates coming from Civil Aviation Authorities), all of which may reflect the relatively low participation and visibility of women in civil aviation governance, management and the technical profession globally. Only three out of 36 members of the ICAO Council currently are female.
- The civil aviation profession is traditionally male dominated but this is slowly changing: According to some of the female civil aviation professionals at ICAO, there is an increased presence of women in traditionally male occupied positions. A female aviation professional at ICAO is no longer perceived as "novelty", as she may have been twenty years ago. Few visible and highly technical, senior-level positions at ICAO are represented by female professionals (e.g. the Director of the Air Navigation Bureau, the Chief of the Dangerous Goods Section).
- Discrimination towards women who have a technical position in civil aviation: Based on the experience of a female aviation professional from ICAO who visits airports on-site and interacts with aviation inspectors, in some cultures it has proven to be difficult to conduct her work due to the reluctance on behalf of the male counterparts to interact with a female technical officer. As a result, she frequently delegates visits to certain countries to male colleagues.
- ICAO has published security guidelines for women in 2006 as a result of specific requests from women staff members who wanted to have tips on dealing with security issues as they relate to women in the work environment, including when travelling to conduct on-site airport visits.
- ICAO has been involved in formal and informal gender-related outreach activities: Anecdotally, some formal (through the gender focal point) and informal gender-targeted outreach activities have been conducted in the recent past. Examples include "Women in Aviation" thematic events and International Day of Women celebrations highlighting women in aviation. The retired focal point used the Air Navigation Conference registration information to reach out to female participant and establish networks.
- The current gender focal point is the Chief of Policy, Organizational and Staff Development Section in the Human Resources Department. The HR Department is pursuing additional gender outreach activities through: i) the Young Aviation Professional Programme, which is a collaboration between IATA and ACI (Airports Council International) ii) an improved employment website to include testimonials of women in aviation, iii) talent pool management with a gender focus whereby female applicants who were found suitable for ICAO posts will be

kept on a roster for future reference, iv) offering internships in collaboration with The International Aviation Women's Association (IAWA); and v) offering fellowships to female applicants