

**EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE NGO FRAMEWORK**  
**PROGRAM OF CARE AUSTRIA**

**1980-02/2013: Claiming rights – promoting gender equality:  
Women’s Empowerment and male engagement for gender  
transformation in post-conflict and chronically food-insecure  
settings (Ethiopia, Nepal & Uganda): 2013-2015.**

***FINAL REVIEW REPORT***

***Submitted by EVA team, 8 October 2015***

***Authors: Meena Shivdas & Laura Maritano***

## Table of Contents

Acronyms	3
Executive summary	4
1) INTRODUCTION	7
• Methodology	8
• Description of Framework and summary of conclusions	9
2) FINDINGS	13
• Theory of Change and Logical Framework Analysis	13
• Added Value of Holistic Approach	22
• Added Value of Research and Learning Agenda	26
• Impact and Effectiveness	28
• Relevance	34
• Sustainability	35
• Efficiency	37
• Planning and Implementation	40
• Monitoring	41
• Research and Learning Agenda	45
3) CONCLUSION	50
ANNEXES	54

## ACRONYMS

ADA	Austrian Development Agency
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
DSDC	Dalit Social Development Center (Nepal)
EMB	Engaging with Men and Boys
FGM	Female Genital Mutilation
FP	Framework Programme
GBV	Gender based Violence
LF	Logical Framework
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MSC	Most Significant Change
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development
PSNP	Productive Safety Net Program
PSS	Psycho-Social Support
R&LA	Research and Learning Agenda
REFLECT/Reflect	<b>Re</b> generated <b>Freirean</b> <b>L</b> iteracy through <b>E</b> mpowering <b>C</b> ommunity <b>T</b> echniques
RWSC	Rural Women Service Centre
SAA	Social Analysis and Action
TAs	Technical Advisors
TOR	Terms of Reference
ToC	Theory of Change
UNSCR 1325	United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325
VDC	Village Development Committee
VIDC	Vienna Institute for International Dialogue and Diplomacy
VSLA	Village Savings and Loans Association
WEP	Women's Empowerment Programme

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This External review of CARE Austria's three year Framework Program (FP) III, "Claiming Rights - Promoting Gender Equality: Women's Empowerment and male engagement for gender transformation in post-conflict and chronically food-insecure settings (Ethiopia, Nepal and Uganda)" 2013-2015, was conducted by EVA team with two evaluators between April and August 2015.

The review assessed the implementation of FPIII for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the program which consists of interactive interventions with a common strategic and development objective and a learning component. FPIII, funded mainly by the Austrian Development Agency (ADA), is implemented in Nepal, Uganda and Ethiopia with key advocacy interventions in Austria as well as at the international level.

The main purpose of the review was to gain insights and knowledge from the implementation of FPIII to contribute to planning and steering of the ongoing and eventually future programs. Therefore the review covered planning and implementation modalities of FPIII. The objective of the review was to revise results and assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the program.

The review process entailed an initial desk review of documents and submission of a framework for analysis prior to an inception meeting, a comprehensive desk review of all relevant documents, individual interviews with CARE Austria program staff, CARE Country Office staff in Ethiopia and Uganda, implementing partners in Uganda and Nepal, and an online survey administered to staff and partners in all three countries.

The overall objective of FPIII is *'To contribute to increased effectiveness in development program quality in conflict and post conflict, as well as in food insecure situations through an holistic approach to women's empowerment and gender equality and evidence based research, learning and sharing of best practice'*. The specific/context related objective is that by 2015, 40,703 women and 15,019 men, either affected by conflict Uganda (34,062 direct beneficiaries, 23,843 women and 10,219 men) and Nepal (9,160 women and 1,500 men; total of 10,660) or by food insecurity in Ethiopia (11,000 households – with 7,700 woman and 3,300 men), are able to exercise gender equality by addressing agency/individual, institutional/structural and relational aspects of their empowerment.

The basis for the program approach employed by FPIII is a theory of change (ToC) which conceptualises women's empowerment along agency/individual, institutional/structural and relational aspects and envisages socio-economic and political/leadership change in their lives through addressing specific inequalities and inequities and consequent violations. Accordingly, three program results relate to the individual, structural and relational dimensions of women's empowerment with the fourth result on research and learning focusing on provision of technical support to countries, coordination of cross-country research and learning activities and international advocacy.

The review has assessed FPIII as a complex program in terms of formulation, operation, funding and coordination, implementation and Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) which has an impact on program implementation and the M&E system. Despite this complexity, FP III is rated as overall relevant, effective and aiming for sustainability given that the design, planning and implementation of various phases of the FP have been participatory with active engagement of CARE Country office staff and implementing partner organisations' whose capacities have been strengthened for facilitating women's empowerment. FPIII is also found to be relevant to all three country contexts wherein women are located in resource poor settings and face gender-based vulnerabilities and violations.

In terms of the design and logic coherence of program and program intervention, it can be said that the program results are formulated clearly and built around three important areas of change in relation to women's empowerment – agency, relations, and structure. However there are harmonization gaps in the way the program objectives are formulated across CARE Austria as well as the program countries. It is

recommended that due conceptual clarity is brought to the design process and in particular the logic of change is used to think through the design for the research and learning agenda.

Both the holistic approach and the research and learning agenda are found to definitely constitute an added value to the program as women's empowerment is achieved through a multiplicity of approaches and across different levels with the realisation of women's agency addressed along socio-economic and political dimensions.

The holistic approach is coherently conceptualized in various program documents and there seems to be a fair understanding of the various levels of empowerment presented in the holistic approach model. The review findings show that the employment of a holistic approach on the realization of women's rights has resulted in incremental, and in certain instances significant changes in women's economic empowerment, with progress made on enabling women to change unequal gender equations at a personal/relational level as well as access leadership opportunities with strengthened capabilities. The main recommendation is to improve the actual monitoring of the impact of the holistic approach which would lead to working more efficiently towards systematization of learning on the holistic approach itself.

The research and learning agenda has provided the vehicle for adaptation of resources on the program approach and facilitated a platform for learning through monitoring activities and enabled cross-country sharing of information. The learning agenda can be further strengthened through facilitating learning between impact groups at local/national levels to make it more meaningful, wherever this not already done (especially Uganda). In addition, supporting country offices on monitoring would ensure that learning outcomes can inform future programing. The international advocacy undertaken is rated to be of strategic value by partners with due acknowledgement given to CARE Austria's efforts. In order to make the learning experience on advocacy more meaningful for stakeholders, efforts should continue to strengthen links between implementing partners and international partners. Another important consideration would be strengthening knowledge management for the learning agenda through aiming for consolidation of existing resource material to enhance learning outcomes.

The review found that economic empowerment of women has been largely effective in terms of more income but has not yet significantly resulted in equal income or opportunities for women given entrenched structural, systemic and cultural barriers. More efforts need to be continued to address household decision-making and addressing social inequalities that shape women's ability to make life choices so that increased transformation in gender relations can be achieved. In all three countries it is observed that the structural aspects of women's empowerment are being successfully addressed and their assertion in the public arena through leadership positions is becoming evident.

The main recommendation is to continue the focus on strengthening women's voice and capacity to enable them to overcome gender asymmetries in households and attain economic empowerment. Given that changing the mind-sets of gatekeepers in institutions is critical for enabling women's empowerment, particularly the realisation of women's meaningful representation and participation, there should be increased focus on addressing systems, practices and procedures that perpetuate gender inequality through specific interventions at country level. In other words, interventions that specifically target socio-cultural and systemic barriers over a sustained period would enable structural/institutional changes.

In relation to program sustainability, information from stakeholders at country level indicates that they are already pursuing pathways for sustainability, therefore continued focus on capacity strengthening of structures and institutions, collaboration with governance structures and processes and promoting ownership of the program among the community is likely to result in increased institutional and social sustainability. It would be strategic for CARE Austria if the learning outcomes are consolidated in a way that is accessible for all countries and partners and can contribute to sustainability.

In terms of planning and coordination, the review found that CARE Austria has fared well in maintaining efforts on coordinating a complex program with multiple stakeholders operating at different levels. The review also found that the participatory planning modalities have value for stakeholders and contribute to a sense of ownership towards the various aspects of the program approach.

With regard to monitoring, the monitoring and reporting systems are largely focusing on activities and outputs and less systematically on ‘changes’ (Results/Outcomes), however, the Outcome Indicators of the women’s empowerment component are monitored and documented by CARE and partners through other tools such as the MSC (most significant change) technique, baseline and endline studies, and outcome studies. The main recommendation is that monitoring and reporting systems for next FP should be formulated in harmony with its ToC and LF. Tools should be better integrated in the M&E and reporting system with a simplified and more focused version of the M&E and reporting system which could provide a number of benefits both in terms of efficiency and effectiveness.

In conclusion, we can say that the program approach to women’s empowerment achieved through a multiplicity of interventions across different levels for the realisation of women’s agency addressed along socio-economic and structural dimensions has been largely effective. The benefits accruing to the targeted women through FP III are enabling them to gradually overcome socio-cultural barriers and realize their capacity to change inequalities in their personal lives, as well as gain a level of economic independence and access the public arena.

## 1) INTRODUCTION

This report responds to the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the consultancy from CARE Austria for an external review of the three year Framework Program (FP) III, “Claiming Rights - Promoting Gender Equality: Women’s Empowerment and male engagement for gender transformation in post-conflict and chronically food-insecure settings (Ethiopia, Nepal and Uganda)” – 2013-2015. EVA team was commissioned to review the implementation of FP III to revise results and assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the program. (See **ANNEX 1 –EXTERNAL REVIEW Terms of Reference - TOR**).

FP III, mainly funded by the Austrian Development Agency (ADA), is a three-year development program of CARE Austria, CARE Nepal, CARE Uganda, CARE Ethiopia and a number of implementing partner organisations. Implementation commenced on 1<sup>st</sup> of January 2013 and will run until 31<sup>st</sup> of December 2015. The program, builds upon previous phases that ran from 2007-2009 and 2010-2012. The program has a common strategic and development objective and a learning component:

Overall objective

*To contribute to increased effectiveness in development program quality in conflict and post conflict, as well as in food insecure situations through an holistic approach to women’s empowerment and gender equality and evidence based research, learning and sharing of best practice*

Specific and contextual objective

*By 2015, 40,703 women and 15,019 men, either affected by **conflict Uganda (34,062 direct beneficiaries, 23,843 women and 10,219 men)** and **Nepal (9,160 women and 1,500 men; total of 10,660)** or by **food insecurity in Ethiopia (11,000 households – with 7,700 woman and 3,300 men)**, are able to exercise gender equality by addressing agency/ individual, institutional/ structural and relational aspects of their empowerment*

Three expected results areas are common to all countries with the fourth results area on “Research and Learning” specific to each country:

*ER 1 – “Agency”: Women have equitable access and control over production assets to ensure their livelihood security*

*ER 2 – “Relations”: Transforming key socio-cultural norms, relations, attitudes of women, men, girls and boys for gender equality*

*ER 3 - “Structure”: Meaningful representation & Participation of women at all levels*

In line with the above, the four program interventions are:

1. WEP III (Uganda): This program intervention is a continuation of two previous phases of framework program funding. The program complements programming funded by CARE Norway and NORAD, and implemented by six partner organisations in 2013, which has now reduced to two partner organisations.
2. Sakcham III (Nepal): This program intervention is a continuation of two previous phases of framework program funding. The program has been designed with increased focus on institutionalization of project gains and learning, and increased sustainability.
3. Berchi (Ethiopia): This program intervention is the first phase of framework program funding. It has been designed to complement the CARE Canada and CIDA funded Food Security for Farmers program. It is implemented by CARE staff as well as Ethiopian government staff as part of that country’s PSNP safety net program.
4. Research and Learning Agenda (coordinated by CARE Austria): This program component is for coordination of the Framework Program and ensuring synergies between the program interventions. It also includes technical support (in gender, psychosocial and climate change) to

the program interventions in the 3 targeted countries, a cross-country research and learning, and advocacy activities in Austria and internationally.

## **Review: purpose, objective & scope, and method**

The review is intended to contribute to:

- Learning: insights and knowledge gained through the review will contribute to planning and steering of the ongoing and eventually future programme
- Exchange of best practices between stakeholders
- Improvement of policies of the implementing organisations, processes and methods of ongoing and eventually the future programme
- Accountability towards the stakeholders
- Recommendations for Austrian NGO and local partner/s as well as ADA concerning future framework programmes and cooperation

The main objective of the review is to revise results (output, outcome) and assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programme. The review was to be based on qualitative analyses of available documents and interviews with partners in order to understand strengths and weaknesses in FPIII implementation, identify areas for improving program approaches on women's socio-economic and empowerment in resource poor, post conflict and food insecure contexts, and make recommendations.

EVA team conducted a rapid desk review and submitted a working document containing initial analysis of information and subsequent preliminary understanding for discussion at the inception meeting in Vienna on 7<sup>th</sup> May 2015. Further extensive document review informed the formulation of supplementary questions to the TOR questions to enable focused analyses. The review used a mainly qualitative approach to gather and analyse the data to answer all the TOR questions and in addition quantitative analysis was used for the cost benefit analysis. Information from CARE Austria, CARE Country Offices and partners was gathered through interviews, online survey and communication by email.

In keeping with the TOR questions, this report examines the program approaches and the range of activities undertaken to achieve women's empowerment to situate the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the program implementation and assesses the M&E approaches employed to reach conclusions and make recommendations.

## **Methodology**

The main review questions formulated in the TOR and discussed with CARE Austria are:

- |  |
|--|
| <b>1) Assess the design and logic coherence of program and program intervention including the design of the logframe and theory of change</b>                                      |
| <b>2) Assess the added value of the holistic approach adopted in the program and of the Learning and Research component</b>  |
| <b>3) Assess the relevance, impact, effectiveness and efficiency and sustainability of the program</b>   |
| <b>4) Highlight strengths and weaknesses of the framework program in terms of planning, implementing and monitoring (internal systems)</b>   |
| <b>5) Highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the Research and Learning Agenda (coordinated by CARE Austria) specifically in terms of planning, implementing and monitoring.</b> |

Sub-questions were also formulated in the TOR. For all questions and sub-questions asked and answered in this review, please see **ANNEX 2 – REVIEW QUESTIONS**.

Given the foregoing, this report draws on:

- a) The extensive documentation available at CARE Austria which cover annual reports, core program design documents, workshop reports, monitoring reports including reports on stories covering ‘most significant change’ (MSC), program reviews and evaluations already undertaken including 3 baselines (Ethiopia, Nepal and Uganda) and the one available endline (Uganda)- (see **ANNEX 3 – LIST OF CONSULTED DOCUMENTS**)
- b) Information was gathered from 31 people through:
  - 16 interviews: 5 face to face interviews, 1 telephone interview, 10 Skype interviews.
  - 11 responses from completed online Survey Monkey questionnaires.
  - 4 email responses- See **ANNEX 4 - LIST OF INFORMANTS, CONTACTED PEOPLE; ANNEX 5 - INTERVIEW QUESTIONS; ANNEX 6 - SURVEYMONKEY QUESTIONS**.

### **Limitations of the Review**

Accessing data from documents was not an easy task as the Assessment Team (AT) had to categorise the extensive documents received before embarking on analysis (files were sent in big folders per year and all the files needed to be opened and categorized as done in Annex 3). Not all informants contacted were able to speak to the AT and in addition there was limited response to the online survey despite follow up.

Another key limitation was the lack of endline data which would allow identification of outcome level changes. The endlines are not available for Sakcham III (Nepal) and Berchi (Ethiopia). The Roco Kwo (Uganda) endline although available, covers only up to the middle of the FP III period. As this review was commissioned to inform the design of next program, not all endlines were available. Furthermore, field visits might have provided the opportunity to gain more first-hand insights but this was not built into the review budget.

### **Description of the Framework Program III and summary of the main findings**

The Framework Program III is complex in terms of formulation, operation, funding and coordination, implementation and M&E for CARE Austria, CARE country offices and partners. This complexity has also constituted a challenge for the evaluators, both in terms of orienting themselves with the program and the very large amount of program documents and in terms of assessing the various components and evaluation themes. It is worthwhile therefore to examine this complexity in more detail.

#### **a) Coordination and funding complexity**

The Framework Program, funded 80% by ADA and 20% by CARE Austria, is actually a set of projects (Ethiopia – BERCHI; Nepal – SACKHAM III; Uganda – WEPIII: names as reflected in the Framework Program) with similar activities and unified theory of change/program hypothesis. A fourth component includes bilateral technical support from CARE Austria to each of the projects, as well as cross country learning and international advocacy. Each of the three projects in the three programming countries contributes to and complements three different wider country programs (funded by different donors). In two of the three countries (Uganda and Ethiopia) the funds are bundled together with other donor funds (DFAT, CARE Canada, NORAD, CARE Norway etc.) which are supporting activities in the same regions and with the same impact groups.

The program budget allocation for the different components was as follows:

AUT902 - Learning Component III	583.365,67
ETH915 - BERCHI	847.333,48
NPL945 - Sakcham III	847.169,20
UGA912 - WEP III	847.131,97
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.125.000,32</b>
80% ADA	2.500.000,25
20% CARE Österreich	625.000,06

ADA funds 80% of the FPIII, covering thus some of the activities contributing to the wider country programs and the Learning component. In some cases CARE Austria has contributed to activities from its separate unrestricted funding (i.e. over and beyond the 20% match).

FPIII is thus implemented by CARE Austria, in loose coordination with CARE Norway, CARE Canada, and in close coordination with three different CARE country offices and partners in Nepal, Uganda and Ethiopia in settings which are at various stages of post-conflict and food-insecure situations. CARE Austria staff note that the lack of clear protocols for coordination in contexts where funding is bundled actually contributes to operational complexity.

CARE Austria has mainly a role of coordination and reporting to ADA, various CARE affiliates and country offices; it channels funding to the country offices, provides technical input and capacity-building & coaching to country offices' staff (from discussions with CARE Austria staff, the technical input via the learning agenda we note is quite limited from other CARE affiliates), and also feed into policy papers at international level. CARE Austria also facilitates cross-country learning by facilitating discussions and learning. In other words, CARE Austria is meant to support on Result 4, and to support capacity building that would help implementing partner staff to better achieve results 1-3.

The country offices' role is one of implementation through receiving funds, working with partners who are the main implementers on the ground and the beneficiaries on planned activities to realize results and outputs. Accordingly, Country Offices are responsible for the attainment of Results 1-3 of the logframe. The Country Offices are also responsible for capacity building of partners, institutional development of partners in some cases, financial reporting and oversight of partners, M&E of the projects they are implementing, and in some cases facilitating research and evaluations.

There is an added layer of complexity in terms of working with partners as CARE Austria works with other entities of the CARE International (CI) family such as the CI Gender Network (who put out strategic documents – with the CI ToC on women's empowerment drawn on/developed further by CARE Austria and Country offices for the FPIII), CARE UK (on raising awareness about women, peace and security through knowledge sharing and facilitating participation of grassroots women at international fora), CARE Nederland (for the development of several CARE impact studies -- GBV), case studies and policy papers (on UNSCR 1325), and policy papers (on 1325), as well as local institutions such as VIDC (Vienna Institute for International Dialogue and Cooperation) with whom CARE Austria collaborated on the Beijing + 20 event in Vienna (CARE Austria brought partners from FPIII implementation countries to share experiences and raise awareness).

While commending CARE Austria for its efforts in working with local partners and providing opportunities to beneficiaries/impact group members to network and present their stories at international levels, CARE Austria's coordination mechanisms came in for criticism by partners themselves. It was pointed out that support/finance systems were not as effective as they could be, and that as there was less flexibility in approach given donor condition/restrictions, CARE Austria is not able to respond as and when needs arise on the ground during implementation. It was also observed that staff was sometimes overwhelmed by the various tasks at hand given the multiple roles played by one person.

## b) Formulation complexity

The program's core activities aim at **Women's empowerment** and this is integrated with a **Research and Learning Agenda (R&LA)**, which is an important component of the program. However it is unclear since Phase II how these two aspects are integrated within the FP.

In fact, FP Phase II (2010-2012) was designed by situating/placing increased quality and effectiveness **at the centre of the Overall Objective**, while the Learning Agenda was expressed as a core activity:

*“To contribute to increased effectiveness in development program quality in conflict and post conflict, as well as in food insecure situations, **through an holistic approach to women's empowerment and gender equality and evidence based research, learning and sharing of best practice**”.*

This **formulation** – which puts the R&LA at the centre, together with the women empowerment agenda - was **maintained within the FPIII** (2013-2015) –and actually 20% of the Program budget was allocated to it (see table above).

In the **FP III 2013-2015 programmatic text**, it is further pointed out that:

*“**Continuous research, participatory learning** (=reflective practice) **and questioning** of the used methodologies and interventions leads to a continuous enhancement of the quality of programming and to the deduction of best practices, clarity of do-no-harm and a set of model interventions which can be used for piloting women's empowerment also in other post-conflict settings (in an adopted way, depending on the specific environment), or food-insecure settings. The knowledge is continuously fed back into the Programming Cycles and will be shared with other stakeholders.”*

Nevertheless, as we will discuss in this report, **the role of the learning agenda is neither reflected in the Theory of Change (ToC) nor in the Logical Framework (LF)**, producing a certain ambiguity on the relationship between the R&LA and the women's empowerment component. These problematic aspects of the integration of the R&LA in ToC and LF, were actually signalled in the final evaluation of FPII together with the recommendation to better 'operationalize' the R&LA at the various level of the LF. However the review was finalized after the design of FP III had already been completed. During program implementation, the recommendation has been partly followed-up by CARE Austria.

This has led to a discussions between CARE Austria, CARE Nepal, CARE Ethiopia and CARE Uganda staff on the content of the cross-country research and learning agenda (including the identification of a shared research and learning question as per the Phase II evaluation recommendation), on the needs of the various offices and to the design of a basic 'stand-alone' set of outputs and activities for the cross-country research and learning agenda. Each Country Office has its own research and learning agenda that is part of its own Result 4 with CARE Austria staff coordinating the cross country aspects of the R&L agenda and where needed possibly offer support to the country office for its Result 4 .The project and the overall LF remained however formulated as before the evaluation, with the learning component at the core of the objectives of the program, contributing to and not resolving the ambiguity in the formulation of how the learning agenda is integrated within the program.

## c) Implementation complexity

The FPIII is also quite complex in terms of implementation – the **holistic approach** adopted for implementation views **women's empowerment** through pathways for economic independence, meaningful representation of women at all levels and changing gender norms.

The pathways for economic empowerment are founded on a slew of activities, for e.g., setting up of village savings and loans association (VSLA) groups; training for increased market and financial access; advocacy on women's land and property rights, and improved skills-set for agricultural and other types of artisanal production given climate change adaptation and gender roles in farming.

In terms of political representation and participation, psychosocial support (PSS) and capacity building for impact group members is offered to scale up women's empowerment and increased roles in decision-making in the public domain.

With regards to changing social norms, awareness raising and *Reflect/REFLECT*<sup>1</sup> methods including SAA (Social Analysis and Action), as well as the offer of psycho-social support (PSS) are employed to change gender asymmetries at household and community levels and achieve gender transformation.

The added layer of the **R&LA** then adds to this implementation complexity. The research and learning agenda is a mix of bilateral technical support (on gender equality & transformation, PSS, and climate change and adaptation), coordination of cross-country learning including research using M&E data, and limited advocacy. Cross-country exchange of information with a view to improving program implementation through shared learning and innovation and feeding national level advocacy initiatives on UNSCR (United Nations Security Council Resolution) 1325, Beijing +20, and climate change agenda in Austria, regional and international levels are also carried out.

This implementation complexity, as it will be better described in this report, impacted especially on the amount of work expected by fewer than two full-time CARE Austria's Technical Advisors, who found themselves juggling with coordination, technical assistance, research, learning and M&E tasks.

#### **d) M&E (Monitoring and Evaluation) complexity**

The complexity in design, coordination, funding and implementation, produces a certain complexity also in the M&E systems. The M&E system in CARE is complex – the program's baseline and endline on the country level has to go along with the country office level program baselines and endlines (due to efficient use of resources and respecting partners' time limitations and tasks, which include as well other indicators apart from the "pure" CARE Austria program ones). While respecting individual country and program's M&E systems, CARE also needs to identify common shared indicators for the FP III cross-country activities.

The tension between these different M&E levels and reporting concerns and duties towards different donors and programs, has made the process of harmonization of M&E system quite complex and time-consuming. Thanks to CARE Austria Technical Advisors, harmonized Results and Indicators were identified for the Women Empowerment component. Furthermore, one common learning question – not proper shared indicators of change – were identified for the shared Learning component. In fact, during FP III, each Country Office has a different country specific learning agenda and therefore slightly different formulation of Result 4.

Furthermore, the existence of different programs and M&E systems has also resulted in a huge production of M&E documentation and learning material, difficult to consolidate into 'accessible' and 'user friendly' learning.

### **Conclusion: Main Review Findings**

In this evaluation we point out how this complexity impacts program implementation and M&E system. In the final evaluation for FP II it was suggested that **'less is more'**. **In this report we will re-iterate this suggestion, but we will also try to better qualify this comment.** Especially we will point out the need for: a) clarification of the objective of the FP IV in relation to the **R&LA**; b) if objectives and outcomes will be about **Learning** – as it seems from our conversations with CARE Austria's staff - this should be reflected in the ToC and LF (including appropriate outcomes and outcome indicators; see the suggested 'Kirkpatrick Model'); c) simplification and harmonization of the **M&E system**; d) simplification of the **reporting system** and strengthening of its focus on 'outcomes' for the impact group (including **intermediate outcomes**).

---

<sup>1</sup> *Reflect* - **Regenerated Freirean Literacy through Empowering Community Techniques** is an innovative approach to adult learning and social change, which fuses the theories of Brazilian educator Paulo Freire with participatory methodologies.

The complexity of the program furthermore has an impact in terms of **'implementation'**. Coordination is carried out by the CARE Austria Technical Advisors with a high number of various level – from local to international – actors, providing technical capacity building, advocacy inputs, managing the project and monitoring it. This necessitates reflection by CARE Austria on the role of the Technical Advisors and their workload, and a need to think about an improved management system with clearly distinctive role for Technical Support, Coordination and M&E and Learning.

**Despite its complexity in terms of formulation, implementation and M&E, the FP III is overall relevant, effective and aiming for sustainability** given that not only are CARE Country office staff engaged actively in the design, planning and implementation of various phases of the FP, but also that implementing partner organisations' capacities have been strengthened for facilitating women's empowerment. Moreover, the modalities for economic empowerment are also self-sustaining, particularly the operationalisation of VSLAs including the scaling up of linkages with banks so that women beneficiaries have increased access to credit.

In this context, both the **R&LA** and the **Holistic Approach** definitely constitute an added value to the program as women's empowerment is achieved through a multiplicity of approaches and across different levels with the realisation of women's agency addressed along socio-economic and political dimensions.

## 2) FINDINGS

### *1) Assess the design and logic coherence of program and program intervention including the design of the logframe and theory of change*

#### **1.1) ToC and LF analysis**

*The ToC and LF will be analysed for internal and external validity. For internal validity the following questions will be asked: Is the project's Theory of Change clear? Are there 'logical' gaps in it? Is the ToC correctly represented in the Log Frame? Are Outcomes and Objectives correctly formulated in terms of desired change? Are the Outcome and Output Indicators coherent with what they intend to measure? Are the Means of Verification coherent with the Indicators?*

#### **Examined documents**

- 1.3\_2012\_ADA\_Uganda\_Nepal\_External Review phase II.pdf
- 1.4\_20140107 COAFP\_Management Response Eval.docx
- 2.1\_Framework Program Overall FINAL 2013-2015.pdf
- 2.6\_CARE FP Annual Report 2013.pdf
- 2.8\_Annexes Annual Report 2013
- Annex 1 - Section 4 Table Baseline Results.pdf
- 2.10\_Required Participant Survey on the Symposium and LC.docx
- 2.11\_Research Learning Question(s).docx
- 4.1\_20141031 REPORT RV Annual Planning Meeting\_ENG.docx
- 6.1\_AUT901ProgramDocument.pdf
- 6.2\_LogframeAUR902LearningProject.docx
- 7.1.1\_20150209 LiteratureReview\_draft.docx
- All Log Frames Table – consolidated by Care Austria
- FP II Log Frame

#### **Findings**

Before starting this chapter it is important to clarify that ToC and LF analysis are mainly about gaps in the **'formulation'** of the ToC and LF, also in relation to the concrete reality of the program, and thus on the impact that this formulation has on the M&E and reporting system of the program. It is thus not about 'what was actually done' but about the way it was formulated in view of what was done.

## Theory of Change (ToC)

Based on examination of documents, this review finds that the Learning Agenda is not clearly incorporated in the program ToC, mainly due the complexity of the program formulation and a certain confusion on how to integrate the Learning Agenda in the program. While the ToC of the overall program is well formulated and coherent with the holistic approach as far as the **women's empowerment component is concerned**, at the same time **it does not mention the Learning component at all**.

### ***Theory of Change***

*Women's agency in and after conflict or in food insecure situations is strengthened through enhanced psychosocial wellbeing and active integration into Solidarity Groups (with a special emphasis on economic empowerment through VSLA) along with an array of other locally determined psychosocial activities. Women's strengthened agency & solidarity (social connectedness) and human rights awareness raising through training, and the linkage of grass-roots women's voices and needs to national and international level advocacy initiatives, enables them over time to negotiate (=relational aspect of empowerment) the structures (legal and cultural aspects) around them and speak out for themselves and to meaningfully participate in decision-making on different levels. Thus sustainable women's empowerment for grass-roots women in either post-conflict or chronically food-insecure settings can be reached through specifically addressing in a holistic way agency, structure and relational aspects and by mainstreaming the strategic engagement of men. (CARE Austria Program hypothesis).*

Furthermore, neither the FPIII ToC, nor the LF indicate **what kind of change/s** CARE and partners want to obtain **from the Learning Agenda**, mainly in terms of changes in the staff, in the practices of the staff, in the culture of CARE and of the partner organizations, and thus in the work with the beneficiaries and in the effectiveness of the program. The Learning Agenda, in fact, remains expressed within individual LF mainly in terms of Outputs and not of Results (see below).

In terms of **women's empowerment**, however, the ToC draws on the holistic approach by first considering and then incorporating the analytical categories of women's agency, the social relations that shape the way women realise their agency/capabilities and the enabling structures or environment in which women realise their agency/capabilities.

The ToC then systematically links the **pathways to women's empowerment** outlined in the holistic approach by broadly mapping key areas for intervention which would result in realisation of women's agency, gender relations transformation in households and institutions, and strengthened international advocacy on women's rights. Intervention areas include training/capacity building on individual rights (economic, social and political realms), meaningful participation and advocacy in all 3 realms, and strategic engagement with men, family and community.

The individual ToCs of the country programs are also in consonance with women's empowerment as elaborated by the holistic approach.

## **LF: Objectives**

As we have mentioned above, the complexity of the program in terms of funding and coordination, and thus the need for integrating different country projects funded by different donors, has strong implications also on the design of the Log Frame and of the Monitoring system

In order to analyse the relation between overall and individual country program LFs we have prepared a table to allow comparison:

**LOG FRAMES – COMPARISON MATRIX - OBJECTIVES and OBJECTIVES INDICATORS** (based on document named 'All logframes AUT901.docx')

Overall Program LF	Uganda Program LF	Ethiopia Program LF	Nepal Program LF
<p><b>Main Objective:</b> To contribute to increased effectiveness in development program quality in conflict and post conflict, as well as in food insecure situations through an holistic approach to women's empowerment and gender equality and evidence based research, learning and sharing of best practice</p> <p>INDICATORS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge-management System in place</li> <li>• Lessons Learned shared</li> <li>• Gender Equality Modules developed</li> <li>• Evidence Based advocacy Events realized/ Papers elaborated &amp; shared</li> <li>• Tools used and implemented</li> </ul>	<p><b>Overall Program Objective (Nepal Uganda, Ethiopia, Austria):</b> Promote women's empowerment and gender equality</p> <p>NO INDICATORS</p>	<p><b>Overall Program Objective (Nepal Uganda, Ethiopia, Austria):</b> Promote women's empowerment and gender equality</p> <p>NO INDICATORS</p>	<p><b>Overall Program Objective (Nepal Uganda, Ethiopia, Austria):</b> Promote women's empowerment and gender equality</p> <p>NO INDICATORS</p>
<p><b>Program Objective:</b> By 2015, 57.251, women and 30.317 men, either affected by conflict Uganda (34,062 direct beneficiaries, 23.843 women and 10.219 men) and Nepal (9,160 women and 1,500 men; total of 10,660) or by food insecurity in Ethiopia (42,846 households – with 18,748 woman + 5,500 women heads of household, and 18, 598 men), are able to exercise gender equality by addressing agency/individual, institutional/structural and relational aspects of their empowerment.</p> <p>INDICATORS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Men Engage Module” developed and implemented</li> <li>• Lessons learned shared with ADA and other development practitioners</li> <li>• Most significant change training done and country Office reports received and shared</li> <li>• Evidence based advocacy materials developed &amp; shared throughout the program with a special emphasis on 2015 (eg. 15 years of UNSCR 1325, MDG +15, etc)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Goal: (Uganda):</b> To contribute toward the realization of NUWEP's goal of a peaceful society where women and men are equally empowered to enjoy their human rights.</p> <p>NO INDICATORS</p>	<p><b>Goal: (Ethiopia):</b> Chronically food insecure women are empowered and have achieved sustainable livelihood security.</p> <p>INDICATORS</p> <p>Proportional change in Women's Empowerment (using the WE in Agricultural index)</p>	<p><b>Goal: (Nepal):</b> To contribute towards gender equality for equitable and just society.</p> <p>NO INDICATORS</p>
	<p><b>Uganda - Program Intervention Objective:</b> To contribute toward gender equality and empowerment of women and girls affected by conflict to secure their livelihoods and fulfilment of rights</p> <p>INDICATORS</p> <p>1.% of women and men economically secured and reporting income level above poverty level 2.Proportion of women and men directly engaging and participating in decision making on fulfilment and respect for human rights</p>	<p><b>Ethiopia - Program Intervention Objective:</b> To contribute towards social transformation that supports gender equality and women's empowerment in Amhara and Oromia regions</p> <p>INDICATORS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women demonstrate increased ability and confidence to enact a variety of valued livelihood strategies</li> <li>• Increased rate in uptake of family planning</li> </ul>	<p><b>Nepal - Program Intervention Objective:</b> To empower women; enabling them politically, socially, culturally and economically to exercise and enjoy their rights</p> <p>INDICATORS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. % of women and men having changed attitudes towards women in position of leadership</li> <li>2. % of women participated in elections - as candidates and voters</li> <li>3. % of women and men reporting meaningful participation in decision making (at HH and community)</li> <li>4. % of women reporting improved self-esteem.</li> <li>5. % of women reporting enhance social connectedness</li> </ol>

Overall Program LF	Uganda Program LF	Ethiopia Program LF	Nepal Program LF
			6. % of women reporting able to make decision on their sexual and reproductive health rights 7. %of women reported improved healing environment at household. 8. Proportion of women reporting access to services and public resources. 9. % of women reported their control over their properties and earning

From this table it is possible to make the following observations:

### Program Objectives' formulation

- First of all, we can notice **an excess in the number of 'Objectives'**, partly overlapping and partly differentiated per context. This is definitely due to the fact that there is the need to show the connections between FPIII and to the CARE country offices' programs, nevertheless this generates a certain amount of confusion.  
In this regard, in a Skype interview some level of concern was expressed by an M&E staff at a Country office on the **conceptual difficulties** experienced with **grappling** with this process. The staff quoted, '... it is almost like retro-fitting a program so a perfect fit never happens', i.e., although there is some degree of independence in designing the program, there is also some conditionality. This type of a reaction may have to do with the fact that country offices are expected to align their programs with the overall FPIII program design.  
The **R&LA** is at the core of the **Main Objective of the overall program**, where improved knowledge is seen as the basis of program contribution to increased effectiveness and quality of programming in food insecure and post-conflict areas.
- Nevertheless the **R&LA does not appear in the country LFs** at the level of the **Main Objectives, which are in fact** about women's empowerment.
- The R&LA also appears in the **Indicators of the Main Objective of the overall program**, where, nevertheless, we found listed a group of **'output indicators'** of the R&LA (*Knowledge-management System in place, Lessons Learned shared, Gender Equality Modules developed, Evidence Based advocacy Events realized/ Papers elaborated & shared, Tools used and implemented*) **rather than** indicators expressing the impact of learning– the change produced by the learning component - on program effectiveness.
- **Also, the R&LA does not appear in the overall program and country LFs** at the level of the **Program Objectives, which again are about** women's empowerment.
- The **Indicators chosen for the Program Objective (in the overall program LF)**, have nothing to do with the 'change' in women's lives that they intend to measure, but are simply a list of **'output' indicators related to the R&LA** .
- The **Program Objective** of each country is expressed differently for each country and also differently from the way it is expressed in the overall program LF.
- Furthermore, **Indicators** for country program Objectives **differ from each other** and from the Indicators of the Overall Program.

In other words, this produces lack of clarity in the program's formulation, especially concerning **the learning agenda** and **its incorporation in a program about women's empowerment**. It also denotes some problems in the **definition of Indicators** for the Objectives of the program, as these are **not sufficiently formulated in terms of the 'change'** they intend to achieve. Therefore, rather than being formulated in terms of 'outcomes' these indicators are formulated in terms of 'outputs'. Finally, overall and country **Indicators are different from each other**, possibly hampering the comparison of results.

The comparability of results - coherence in terms of changes that the program intends to achieve – is especially important as all country programs contribute to CARE Austria program, and because comparison of results allows for cross-country learning on efficacy of different approaches as well.

It is evident that this poses huge challenges to the clarity of the program and to the possibility of monitoring and evaluating it (see section on M&E). This is definitely something to be modified in future projects as the **Program Objective defines - together with the Results (see next section) - the most important achievements (changes) expected from the Program, and should thus be clearly identifiable and measurable through appropriate Indicators (and MoVs).**

### Program Results' formulation

The **Expected Results** are however **formulated** much more clearly than the Objectives, and are built around three important areas of change in relation to **women's empowerment, according to the Human Rights Based Approach and the Women's Empowerment Framework used by CARE International**. This framework/approach, envisages 3 main areas of change, which when brought together, support women's full enjoyment of rights. According to such a framework/approach, these changes can be created through holistic strategic actions affecting different levels of women's lives (See Section 2 on Holistic Approach for more details). The three areas of change through which the FP III is built are:

***ER 1 – “AGENCY”:** Women have equitable access and control over production assets to ensure their livelihood security*

***ER 2 - "RELATIONS”:** Transforming key socio-cultural norms, relations, attitudes of women, men, girls and boys for gender equality*

***ER 3: “STRUCTURE”:** Meaningful representation & Participation of women at all levels*

**Indicators**

### RESULTS RELATED TO WOMEN EMPOWERMENT (HOLISTIC APPROACH) Please note that shared indicators are highlighted in blue.

Overall Program LF	Uganda Program LF	Ethiopia Program LF	Nepal Program LF
<b>ER1: Women have equitable access and control over productive assets to ensure their livelihood security</b>			
1.1. Proportion of women and men reporting women having <b>access and control over productive assets</b> 1.2. Proportion of women reporting <b>access to a services and public resources</b> C-Ug+Npl: % of women with <b>capacity to cope with economy shocks</b>	<b>1.1.</b> Proportion of women and men reporting women having <b>access and control over productive assets</b> <b>1.2.</b> Proportion of women reporting <b>access to services and public resources</b> (access to financial services from formal and informal institutions, extension services, judicial services, quality education and health services, etc) <b>1.3.</b> Proportion of women reporting <b>resilience to socioeconomic shocks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of women and men reporting women having <b>access and control over productive assets</b></li> <li>• Proportion of women reporting <b>access to services and public resources</b></li> <li>• % of women with <b>capacity to adapt to environmental and economic shocks</b></li> <li>• % change in women's income compared with men's</li> <li>• % increase in women's joint decision making on household assets</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proportion of women and men reporting women having <b>access and control over productive assets</b></li> <li>2. Proportion of women reporting <b>access to services and public resources</b></li> <li>3. Proportion of women reporting <b>resilience to socioeconomic shocks</b>.</li> <li>4. # of women and men informed about women property rights.</li> <li>5. # of women supported for entrepreneurship/business initiative through revolving fund.</li> <li>6. # of women provided skills based and entrepreneurship training.</li> <li>7. # of advocacy activities organized to ensure women right on land</li> </ol>

Overall Program LF	Uganda Program LF	Ethiopia Program LF	Nepal Program LF
			<p>8. # information centre established and supported to subscribe for publications on technologies and daily commodity price list display mechanism</p> <p>9. # of family provided emergency supports (disaster, fire, flood etc)</p>
<b>ER2 Transform key institutional and socio-cultural norms, relations and attitudes for gender equality</b>			
<p>2.1. Women and men reporting <b>changes in attitudes towards GBV</b> <i>Optional:</i></p> <p>2.2. % of men and women reporting changes in <b>gender roles and norms</b></p> <p>2.3. Women reporting <b>enhanced self-esteem and confidence</b></p> <p>2.4. % women reporting improved social <b>connectedness</b></p> <p>2.5. Proportion of women reporting <b>control over decisions affecting their lives</b></p>	<p>3.1. Women and men reporting changes in <b>attitudes towards GBV</b></p> <p>3.2. Increase of proportion (or %) of men and women reporting (positive or pro-GE/WE) changes in <b>gender roles and norms</b></p> <p>3.3. Increase of proportion (or %) of Women reporting and <b>enhanced self-esteem, confidence and social connectedness.</b></p> <p>3.4. Increase of proportion (or %) of women and men <b>venturing into social roles and activities traditionally preserved for men and/or women</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % change in societal perspective of values/rights of women among leaders; among men &amp; boys; among women &amp; girls</li> <li>• % of Women and men reporting changes in <b>attitudes towards GBV</b></li> <li>• % of men and women reporting changes in <b>gender roles and norms</b></li> <li>• Proportion of women reporting <b>control over decisions affecting SRHR</b> (ET,NPL)</li> <li>• Increased evidence of service giving institutions such as agri-extension, MFI, health services and police demonstrating accountability &amp; responsiveness to women's priorities</li> <li>• Improved couples conversations to explore and challenge partners for healthy life</li> <li>• Women reporting <b>enhanced self-esteem and confidence</b></li> <li>• % women reporting improved <b>social connectedness</b></li> <li>• % of women who reporting free mobility</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. % of women and men reporting <b>changes in attitudes towards GBV.</b></li> <li>2. % of men and women reporting <b>changes in gender roles and norms.</b></li> <li>3. % of women reporting <b>improved self-esteem.</b></li> <li>4. % of women reporting <b>enhance social connectedness</b></li> <li>5. # of women, men, girls and boys involved in local and national level hearing on transformation of key socio cultural norms, relation and attitudes.</li> <li>6. # village leaders (women and men) sensitized on key social issues (GBV, human rights violence and discriminatory socio-cultural norms) and their impacts on family and communities</li> <li>7. # of men and women role model identified and mobilized for transformation of socio culture norms, relation and attitudes.</li> <li>8. # of family and group provided psycho-education by trained CBSW on PSS.</li> <li>9. # of woman received psychosocial supports by # of CBSW trained on PSS or by Community Psychosocial Committee</li> <li>10. functioning coordination group and referral system</li> <li>11. # of Faith Healers, Priest and Imam sensitized to transform patriarchy values, norms and systems</li> <li>12. # of men campaigner trained and mobilized for men engagement to empower women</li> </ol>
<b>ER3: Meaningful representation and participation of women at all levels</b>			
<p>3.1. % of women and men reporting <b>women's meaningful participation in decision making</b> across HH, community and national levels</p> <p>3.2. Women reporting <b>improved</b></p>	<p>2.1. Increase of % of women and men reporting women's <b>meaningful participation</b> in decision making across HH, community and national levels</p> <p>2.2. Increase of % of women in key decision making bodies (structures and institutions) in the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of Women reporting improved <b>responsiveness of institutions</b> towards women</li> <li>• % increase in number of women and men reporting women's <b>meaningful participation</b> in decision making across</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. % women reporting improved <b>responsiveness of institutions</b> towards women</li> <li>2. % of women and men reporting <b>meaningful participation in decision making</b> (at HH and community)</li> <li>3. # of quality decisions influenced/made by women leader</li> <li>4. # of women and men well</li> </ol>

Overall Program LF	Uganda Program LF	Ethiopia Program LF	Nepal Program LF
responsiveness of institutions towards women	program region at LC I, II, III, IV and V including Cultural Institutions (those traditionally preserved for men) 2.3. # of contributions of the program to pro-GE/WE legislations and policies enacted and operationalized	<p>HH, <a href="#">community decision making</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% of men and women who believe that women in leadership position can perform as much as men</li> <li>Increased evidence of partnership/solidarity for women priorities between women leaders at all level</li> </ul>	<p>informed on national and international instruments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of issues related to gender equality and women empowerment advocated</li> <li># events (workshops, training and policy dialogues) completed for the implementation and monitoring for the NAP implementation (UNSCR 1325 and 1820)</li> <li># of NAP activities implemented and successful steps identified and shared at district and national level in coordination with NAP DCC and MOPR</li> <li># of monitoring events conducted by # of “NAP implementation watch dog group” comprising # of women groups”</li> <li># of districts prepared an alternative monitoring report for the UN Secretary General as a part of the Anniversary of the UNSCR 1325.</li> <li># of women leaders capacitated to advocate for women rights and bridge the gap in constitution, government policy and practice in peace, security and development including UNSCR 1325 and 1820.</li> </ol>

In relation to these areas of change, the ‘women’s empowerment’ **Results and Indicators** are in general well formulated and coherent with the ToC. In particular, we would like to point out that:

- The formulation of the expected Results is maintained the same in all LFs;
- In most cases the Indicators suggested in the LF for the overall program are expressed in terms of ‘change’ rather than of Output Indicators (as, instead, it is for the Learning agenda – see below);
- Furthermore, in most cases, the Indicators suggested for the country LFs are the same as the Indicators suggested for the Overall Program, which allows the different actual results to be compared.
- The planned changes also reflect the Holistic Approach adopted in the program (see below in this report), which envisages changes at psycho-social, socio-cultural, economic and institutional level.

In addition to the above areas of change, the FPIII (as FPPI) envisaged a **fourth area of change** concerning the **R&LA**.

**RESULTS RELATED TO LEARNING** [Please note that shared Results are highlighted in blue.](#)

Overall Program LF	Uganda Program LF	Ethiopia Program LF	Nepal Program LF
<b>ER 4: Promote key Learning and Impact Measurement for women’s empowerment</b>			
ER 4: Promote key Learning and Impact Measurement for women’s empowerment	<p>Uganda</p> <p><a href="#">ER 4: Promote key Learning and Impact Measurement for women’s empowerment</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsive, institutionalized impact measurement system developed and evidence</li> </ul>	<p>Ethiopia</p> <p><a href="#">ER 4: Promote key Learning and Impact Measurement for women’s empowerment</a></p> <p><a href="#">ER 4.1: Key good practices and learning for women’s empowerment captured and shared</a></p>	<p>Nepal</p> <p><a href="#">ER 4: Learning and Impact Measurement to leverage impact on women’s empowerment</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of hypothesis and assumption (eg. how psychosocial programming contribute to WE) of WE framework tested and</li> </ul>

	<p>of effectiveness informing programming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of influence of research on policy and practice/programming</li> <li>• Evidence of learning outcomes from learning and cross-country fertilisation on women and human rights advancement milestones</li> <li>• Evidence based advocacy for GE and WE based on Learning and M&amp;E</li> </ul>	<p><u>ER 4.2: Key research questions contributing to women's empowerment answered</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenges and opportunities learned related to women's progress towards empowerment</li> <li>• Government food security programs have increased investment in women's empowerment initiatives</li> <li>• Impact measurement system established and generating evidence</li> <li>• Theory of Change for CFIRW Program tested</li> </ul>	<p>validated, respectively</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference value of women empowerment indicators established and shared</li> <li>• Best practice and learning from CARE Nepal's Projects relevant to women empowerment documented and disseminated.</li> <li>• Synthesis of case stories/events on women empowerment published.</li> <li>• Prepared activities implementation guidelines, indicator matrix, M&amp;E plan and periodic work plan</li> <li>• Completed inception review, outcome monitoring, midterm review and final evaluation.</li> <li>• # of success stories and issues showcased through mobilizing media for policy influence</li> <li>• # of implementing partners' executive members and staff trained on M&amp;E and social audit.</li> <li>• # of implementing partners organized social audit.</li> </ul> <p><u>ER 5. Institutionalization of achievements (e.g. Support mechanisms) related to structure and relations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of PECs linked to VDC and district level women networks/alliances</li> <li>• # of saving and credit groups converted to / linked with cooperatives</li> <li>• Community psychosocial support system (committees) institutionalized by VDC for women empowerment</li> <li>• # VDC/DDC women empowerment strategic plan developed and adapted</li> <li>• # of VDC/DDC conducted gender budget audit</li> <li>• # of VDCs declared "Domestic Violence Free" VDCs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ # VDCs/DDCs included GBV prevention activities and support provision for GBV survivor in their plans.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>ER 6. Mainstreaming gender and social inclusion in CARE Nepal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff oriented/refreshed on Gender and Social Inclusion and SEA policy</li> <li>• Institutionalized Accountability Mechanisms by establishing a GESI Mainstreaming Committee</li> </ul>
--	---	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of GESIM Tools, Checklists, Guidelines, GESI Scoreboard etc.</li> <li>• Established / operationalized SEA reporting and investigating mechanism</li> <li>• Finalized Staff GESI induction package</li> <li>• Number of women and men staff participated in retreat / manhood / womanhood celebration organized by women forum of CARE Nepal</li> <li>• GESI organizational gap analysis conducted</li> <li>• Established baby care centre in CARE Nepal Offices</li> <li>• CARE Nepal men engagement strategy developed and adapted</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

The R&L aspects of the program, are specified in the specific **ER 4** of the **individual country programs’ Log Frames**. Even if one common Result is identified in the LF, this as the other Results (which differ across countries), are expressed mainly in terms of ‘**activities/outputs**’ (**Promote..., Share..., Answer...**). As a consequence, the related Indicators are different for the different countries and are expressed mainly in terms of ‘**output**’ indicators, rather than in terms of ‘**changes**’ created in the staff, in the organizations and in their practices through learning and research.

Finally, in the **program LF**, the **definition of % and whole numbers of beneficiaries of each Indicator**, as left to be defined in the country LFs. However, as we can see from the attached table, this has not really happened in the country programs’ LFs either.

**In other words, the country LFs articulate results and indicators on women’s empowerment more accurately/better** (see also Chapter 2 on Holistic Approach) **than those on the learning and research component**. Even if, the understanding that learning is aimed at improving quality and effectiveness of programming, **is present in the narrative of the main program documents, this is not explicitly spelt out in the ToC and in the LF, making the link between learning and research activities, and program quality effectiveness very tenuous, and providing no space for measuring it.**

The **problematic aspects related to ToC and LF** have emerged also from the interviews/Survey Monkey with CARE country offices and from some program documents. In particular, it was pointed out that a unitary monitoring framework for the **cross-country learning agenda** was lacking and there was difficulty in identifying common denominators in the changes desired from the learning component in the different countries.

To all this, we need to add that a certain lack of clarity about the place of the research agenda within FPIII emerged also from conversations with CARE Austria’s staff. Some of them, clarified that the research agenda was central to the program. We could add that this was covered by 20% of the budget and that CARE Austria’s staff was hired through that money. Some others, repeatedly highlighted the fact the FPIII was actually about women empowerment and that the Learning component was actually just a small component of the program, and this was reason why it became marginal within LF and ToC, while at the same time the huge amount of work that this required was highlighted, next to the coordinating tasks of the program itself.

**Recommendations**

From what has emerged in the above analysis, we would like to suggest **the following recommendations**:

- a) First of all, there should be conceptual **clarity in defining the actual Objectives of the program**. What is the objective? ‘Women’s empowerment’? ‘Increased learning’? Or the more ambitious ‘learning to increase women’s empowerment’? The design of the ToC and LF will depend on the answer to these questions. In this case there was instead a certain lack of clarity about the Objective, or better, a gap between its formulation in the proposal text, and its actual formulation within the Log Frame and other program documents, plus the contradictory understanding by CARE Austria’s staff.
- b) Secondly, depending on the **clarified Objective, the ToC and LF**, including Objectives, Results and Indicators should be formulated accordingly. For the future, in case the program were simply about **women empowerment**, we would suggest to simply better harmonize the existing LF at the level of the Results and to formulate a more coherent objective. If instead, as it seems, the next FP will be mainly about Learning, we suggest to use the ‘Kirkpatrick Model’ to think about the ‘logic of change’ in a learning program (see **ANNEX 7 – THE KIRKPATRICK MODEL TO LEARNING**).
- c) Third, Objectives, Results and related Indicators should always be expressed in terms of ‘**change**’ / ‘**outcomes**’, and never in terms of ‘outputs’. This would support cross-country **comparability as, while** activities might differ across countries, these will however aim at creating **the same types of change** in the targeted groups (knowledge, attitudes, behaviours, PSS well-being, economic empowerment, control over assets and resources, political participation etc.);
- d) Fourth, Indicators should be **specific to the ‘change’** they intend to measure (no R&LA Indicators, if we are talking about a result about women empowerment –as it was in the LF at the Objective level) and should be quantified (absolute numbers/%) and ‘qualified’ (in terms of knowledge, attitudes, behaviours, PSS well-being, economic empowerment, control over assets and resources, political participation etc.) depending on the changes that the intervention intends to produce.

In the **Section 4.2 on Monitoring** we will present some findings and recommendations on the **implications that ToC and LF formulation**, in the current and in the next Framework Program, had and can have on the **Monitoring and on the Reporting systems**.

## **2) Assess the added value of the Holistic Approach adopted in the program and of the Learning and Research component**

### **2.1) Added Value of Holistic approach**

- *What difference did it make in this third phase of the Framework Program to not have **women’s psychosocial wellbeing** as a separate result area, but rather as a cross cutting approach?*
- *How were **climate change related issues embedded** in the design and structure of the program and how did this impact on outcomes?*
- *What, if any, **value was added** to the program through the **combination of programming in food insecurity context and post-conflict contexts**?*

### **Examined documents**

- 2.1\_Framework Program Overall FINAL 2013-2015.pdf
- 2.2.1\_20131107\_FGD Summary Report With Partner Staff\_longer version.docx
- 2.6\_CARE FP Annual Report 2013.pdf
- 20141015 Holistic Model/AUT902 Holistic Model 2014
- 5.6.8\_Learning Conference - 20150202 FP Learning Conference Report\_draft.docx

Documents provided post Vienna meeting:  
5.1.2 Women's Empowerment Overview Brief 2009  
Design Workshop Phase III/ADA learning and Design Workshop 2012, Uganda  
20140328\_concept note\_BK  
EOI Phase IV  
Further Scenario Development Final

## Findings

The **Holistic Approach** is central to the work of **CARE Austria** and to the **FPIII**. According to the words of CARE Austria staff, FPIII is the 'testing ground' for the holistic approach to women's empowerment that is being mainstreamed within CARE programming (Women's Empowerment Overview Brief 2009.pdf). The Holistic **approach** does not only inform the **program methodology**, but it is also the **focus** of the **Learning component** of FPIII (see Section 1 and Section 2.2).

In addition, the **learning** about the **effectiveness of the Holistic Approach** is intended to be of **value** for **CARE, ADA** and the **general development community** in terms of **strategic thinking**. In particular, **ADA seems satisfied** with CARE Austria's **holistic approach** to the FP including in the way **international development commitments** have been **taken on board** in the implementation. For all these reasons, in this section we analyse how the Holistic Approach has been conceptualized and operationalized within FPIII and we provide recommendations on possible areas of improvement.

The **holistic approach** adopted by the FP Phase III draws on CARE International's Strategic Impact Inquiry (Women's Empowerment Overview Brief 2009.pdf), which **conceptualises women's empowerment** along three interlinked analytical axes/categories:

- **Agency**: a woman's own aspirations and capabilities
- **Structure**: the environment that surrounds and conditions her choices
- **Relations**: the power relations through which she must negotiate her path

**Operating** on these **different levels** at the **same time**, implies the **adoption of diversified interventions** focusing on the **different areas of women lives** – socio-economic, political and personal.

From review of the documents cited, it is evident that at the level of **individual agency**, the holistic approach **focuses on psychosocial well-being** and individual rights to overcome violence experienced and counter issues of low self-esteem and confidence to result in **women's increased resilience and strengthened capabilities** to lead lives with dignity<sup>2</sup>, in particular, focusing on economic and political empowerment. In fact, psychosocial wellbeing is seen as a precondition for political empowerment by Country office staff<sup>3</sup>. Skype interviews with partners (Uganda and Nepal) also revealed that psychosocial wellbeing is seen as a precondition for political empowerment. As asserted by a partner in Uganda, '...after more than 20 years of conflict, women lost property, husbands, got HIV, many were maimed and suffered trauma. They had to become healthy human beings again to realise their potential in economic opportunities, step outside their homes and strive for political leadership'. This perception could also be related to the contextual reality of conflict and its aftermath in both Uganda and Nepal. However, we also found that, in Ethiopia (from Skype interviews with Country office staff), psycho-social well-being is seen as an important factor requiring consideration in women's empowerment.

The holistic approach then addresses women's empowerment along the remaining two analytical axes – **structure** by focusing on political rights and subsequent empowerment and leadership at various levels<sup>4</sup>; and **relations** by focusing on social empowerment through changing gender dynamics within households

---

<sup>2</sup> Having the capacity to access socio-economic and political rights, draw on resources, and have control over one's body and reproductive choices, own assets and make meaningful decisions on one's life.

<sup>3</sup> See 2.2.1\_20131107\_FGD Summary Report With Partner Staff\_longer version.docx.

<sup>4</sup> VLSAs, district social committees for water use, health uptake etc., political office through representation on councils and development committees etc.,

and in communities and transforming participation in important household decision making regarding ownership of assets, children's futures etc.,

The approach emphasises the consideration of **contextual issues** such as poverty, food security, and community resilience against shocks which affect the lives of women and their families. Efforts are also made to make the holistic approach strategic by **harmonising interventions with recommendations made through international and national commitments** on UNSCR 1325 & 1880, Climate Change, CEDAW, and regional declarations and agreements on women's rights and gender equality.

In other words, the Holistic Approach is **coherently conceptualized** in various program documents, Theory of Change and Log Frame (see also Section 1). As conveyed by a staff from the Uganda Country Office, there is recognition that the conceptual framework for the holistic approach is about **related domains for change** – **individual** (*Self-esteem, Self-image, Bodily integrity and reproductive choice, Capacity for accessing education, employment & livelihoods, Skills, Asset ownership and control of assets, and Knowledge of rights*), **structural** (*Marriage, Market, Local Government, Provincial Government, and Justice System, women's meaningful representation in decision making areas*), and **relational** (*Community, Family, Marital relations, Joint decision-making, Joint ownership of marital property*) which are all interlinked.

The visual presentation of the **Holistic Approach model** for women's empowerment (20141015 Holistic Model/AUT902 Holistic Model 2014 - developed upon request of Country Office staff to describe in terms of activities the work that they do - , is a very detailed mapping of the **activities to be implemented at the level of agency** (individual and household), **relations** (household, CBOs and CSOs and community) and **structure** (local, regional, national level) in order to achieve **women's empowerment** in terms of **psycho-social well-being, access and control of resources and participation in decision making**

Based on the information received in Skype interviews with Country Offices and partners there seems to be a fair understanding of the various levels of empowerment presented in the holistic approach model, however the following responses on Survey Monkey reveal that there are a few concerns about programme implementation using the approach as well as gaps in knowledge:

- '...holistic approach is important for empowerment ... these components (food security, economic empowerment, psycho-social care, engagement with men) are very important provided there is adequate resource and well woven program activities. But some of the activities such as climate change were included at a every later stage ... so, with limited intervention it was like a kind of add on?'
- '...holistic approach is a nice frame for addressing multiple factors that determine poverty reduction at large and women empowerment in particular. However, the context in intervening in different aspects of the model need to be tailored to the situation in a particular area.'
- '...the holistic approach is **preventing targeted actions/activities and monitoring** given the **complexity of the approach** (economic and social empowerment of women, PSS, climate change and food security);'
- '... **not very easy to measure program impact** on the Impact Group using Holistic approach, hence **no added value in the holistic approach**';
- 'Using Holistic approach may **compromise on the quality of deliverables**'.

There are no further details to these statements emerging from the online survey.

It could be **valuable for CARE Austria** to take note of these observations and work with Country offices and partners on how best to convey the pathways and themes identified for each aspect of women's empowerment (individual, structural, relational) and the change that is intended/aimed at for at different levels. In addition, providing more information about prioritising or ranking elements of the approach to suit the purposes of a certain activity may be helpful to dispel the notion that using the approach prevents focus given the range of analytical categories and thematic issues it encompasses.

Furthermore there is also a general impression – for the moment not supported by concrete data – **that interventions implemented through a holistic approach are actually more effective than those implemented without it** (see Section 4.2 on Monitoring). One consultant has been commissioned by CARE Austria to analyse the **effectiveness of the Holistic approach, by comparing groups of beneficiaries with** whom work was carried through a holistic approach, with groups of beneficiaries to whom the holistic approach was not applied (a sort of comparison group, not a ‘proper ‘control group’ as it was neither identified on the basis of the same characteristics of the experimental group, nor baselined at the start of the program in paralleled to the FP/III beneficiaries). This is being currently carried out by using data gathered in 2014 for Nepal (Sakcham II endline) and for Uganda (Roco Kwo endline). Because data available is not of very high quality, it is difficult to draw very precise conclusions; nevertheless, from our conversation with the consultant, it appears that programs with a holistic approach are more effective than programs implemented without a holistic approach.

The same impression was confirmed by country offices, and especially with regard to the PSS component. The **added value of PSS as part of the holistic approach** was pointed out not only in post-conflict program sites (Nepal and Uganda) but also in Ethiopia in a context of food insecurity where it is being used as a learning outcome as PSS aspects have been added to the VSLA curriculum and applied with one group to see how it works and what difference it makes compared to groups where PSS is not used as an approach/strategy in VSLA interventions.

In terms of **value in combining programing in food insecurity context and post-conflict contexts**, what has emerged from the findings based on Skype interviews with Country office staff and implementing partners is that resources such as the PSS material used in post-conflict settings (Uganda and Nepal) are drawn on and adapted for use in food insecurity settings (Ethiopia), and lessons learnt from CARE Ethiopia on food security issues have been incorporated in activities to promote women’s livelihoods in Gulu, Uganda. Therefore the added value has been **facilitation of thinking through program approaches through different lenses**.

On the question about what difference was made in not having PSS as a separate result area for phase III, the Uganda Country office staff indicated in a Skype interview that ‘... although PSS is not reflected as a separate result, we see it as important for interventions because when guns are silent there is still no peace’, - an indication that PSS is seen as a cross cutting issue. The staff also asserted that as governments perceive PSS as secondary given the priority placed on livelihoods strategies for allocation of resources which is seen as the resolution for problems faced by women, it was important to use the holistic approach to identify key issues with the communities and use a ranking exercise to hone in on where PSS is needed for example in addressing domestic violence or defilement of girls as well as decision making by bringing in elements of social protection in communities.

The **added value of the climate change** component has received less of an uptake -- taking on board climate change has been more of a fit for Ethiopia given the larger food security program in which the FP is embedded. However, the Uganda Country office indicated through Skype interviews that even though climate change is not recognised as an issue affecting them by impact groups and they are silent on it, CARE Uganda and partners are raising it as part of awareness about food security as it will benefit impacts groups. Feedback from the online survey reveals that for staff/partners working on interventions such as ‘engaging men’, the relevance of climate change is not an overriding concern. This may be because the links between climate change and livelihoods is not clearly established. If the climate change agenda is to be integrated into the holistic approach, more efforts need to be made to bring in the issue of climate change in the context of fragility in rural livelihoods and appropriate technical assistance and resources have to be provided.

The review findings also show that the **holistic approach** on the realization of women’s rights has resulted in incremental, and in certain instances significant changes in women’s **economic empowerment** - for example in the VSLA experiences in Uganda where women are able to build micro enterprise, enter decision making positions and become change agents in communities. In Nepal and Ethiopia too, the results on economic empowerment have enabled women to lift themselves out of poverty.

**All three countries** report that progress in **women's economic empowerment** is an enabling factor in facilitating women's entry into public/political office at the local/district levels. While smaller changes are evident in **women's political empowerment**, these are no less significant given that women are often excluded from decision making on public policy and administration and lack the skills for engaging with political processes and structures. Issues of governance and accountability are more complex for women to influence in the short term. If, as envisaged the 4<sup>th</sup> phase is implemented, results on political empowerment are more likely to be realized.

Further feedback from ADA received through Skype interview is that while the holistic approach is appreciated as it addresses individual level, structural level and relational level aspects of women's empowerment, the structural level dimensions are very important – social and cultural barriers – and need to be addressed systematically as structural level changes will have more impact and is key to sustainability.

To conclude we have two final remarks/observations: a) while we believe that the **Holistic Approach** is clearly **defined** and **represented** in the **ToC** and at **LF** level, **problems** remain in the actual **monitoring** and **evaluation** of it (see Section 4.2 on Monitoring); b) the **learning** about the **Holistic Approach**, which is the focus of the Learning and Research Agenda, could be slightly **more focused and systematized** across countries (see section on Learning).

## Recommendations

The main recommendation we would like to put forward is that within the **Holistic Approach model**, intermediate changes at the different level (individual, community, institutions) created by the implemented activities, could be selected and pointed out and incorporated, to **facilitate thinking in terms of change**. Furthermore, **simplification of the visual** for the Holistic Approach Model, should be provided in order for clearer understanding of the approach by Country offices and partners. Finally, we strongly recommend improving the **actual monitoring of the impact of the Holistic Approach** (see Section on Monitoring) and thus to more efficiently work on the **systematization of the learning on the Holistic Approach** itself (see Section on Learning).

### 2.2) Added Value of Research and Learning Agenda

*What, if any, is the value added for the impact group of the trainings and technical input from a learning project?*

## Examined documents

### 3.1\_GENDER

3.1.2\_20140124 Gender Security Discussion.docx

3.1.3\_20140126 Gender in Projects Survey Results.pptx

3.1.5\_Program Staff Survey.pptx

3.1.6\_Gender Audit.pptx

3.2.1\_20140310 Training of staff on Engaging Men and Boys\_draft.docx

3.3.1\_201308 PECCN ACRES discussion paper summary INTERNAL.pdf

3.3.2\_201308 PECCN ACRES discussion paper INTERNAL.pdf

3.4\_MSC\_CCRLA Kick Off Workshop Report.pdf

2.5\_Country level reports 2013

2.5.1.4 UGANDA WEP III 2013 Annual Report.docx

2.5.2.1\_Annual Report (Jan-Dec) 2013.doc

2.5.3.3\_Progress\_report\_Berchi\_2013 final.docx

5.6.8\_Learning Conference 20150202 FP Learning Conference Report\_draft.docx

## Findings

Following Phase II evaluation recommendation on the need to identify a shared research and learning question for all implementing countries, there have been discussions between CARE Austria, CARE Nepal, CARE Ethiopia and CARE Uganda staff on the content of the cross-country research and learning agenda. One question identified during the kick-off workshop, as joint research and learning question for cross-country learning, was about the effectiveness of the holistic approach, which is interesting, and relevant to CARE offices at all levels.

Currently, effectiveness of the holistic approach is being monitored through a commissioned regression study where 6 questions are asked on the efficacy of Holistic Approach. This Regression Study is carried out solely for Nepal (Phase II, i.e. before this programming period) and Uganda, is based on endline studies and is at the moment at the draft stage. Qualitative data is also gathered on this in all three countries. Also from this study, it would seem to emerge that in order to have **meaningful results** on the **effectiveness of learning** from the **R&LA**, a better **M&E system** should be introduced from the start of the program (important for FP IV). In this regard, ADA's feedback on the R&L which was received through a Skype interview, is that it is ambitious and complex and a bit over-demanding for everyone involved. Furthermore, ADA sees the need for the **R&LA** to be refined with more **reflection** on what aspects of the **holistic approach** should be focused on for the learning agenda.

**R&LA** is seen by **CARE Austria** as an important driver for training and technical inputs for program implementation as it enables:

1. The channelling of **technical/specialist support** on women's empowerment and gender equality, VAW and psychosocial approach to Country Office program staff and partners;
2. Overall **inputs** to be provided on the **holistic approach** including climate change adaptation;
3. Cross-country **exchange of lessons** learnt which would **benefit impact groups** across three different settings;
4. **Lessons** learnt from the **ground up** in the three countries to strategically **inform international advocacy** on gender equality, women's rights, women, peace and security, and combatting violence against women.

**At the level of country offices**, each country office has its own R&LA with activities ranging from consideration and further **adaptation of key training/capacity building resources on the holistic approach covering the main themes** of Psychosocial support, Gender Based Violence, Engaging Men & Boys and other information on gender equality and climate change to **engaging in monitoring activities** and **gleaning lessons from the exercises to share with colleagues across the three countries**. The **R&LA arenas** are accessed both through the learning conferences convened by CARE Austria and through online learning and sharing platforms facilitated and steered by CARE Austria technical advisors.

**At the level of international networking and partnerships**, the **R&LA** provides the **basis of sharing and informing strategic advocacy** on not just **international development agendas** but also on **innovations in program approaches** such as Engaging Men & Boys, applying **Psychosocial support in VSLA contexts** and strengthening **women's political leadership** through active **community level engagement** with **local governance** structures, processes and systems. **ADA** is particularly supportive of the R&LA and as indicated in a Skype interview an official said, 'ADA expects **CARE Austria** to bring **lessons learnt from the field** to **inform the policy level**. It is important for example on the issue of climate change that the impact on women is brought into the public debate in Austria. The Technical Advisors (TAs) are funded by ADA, we value their input and would like to see a more **strategic positioning** of their **advocacy messages** in the **Austrian policy making arena**'. Whether this is the direction in which CARE Austria wants to go in terms of program strategy, should be a matter of in-depth discussion between Care and ADA.

This review indicates that **R&LA** is perceived to be of **value** although the **experiences** in each country has been **varied**. In **Ethiopia**, PSS has been adopted as an approach for the BERCHI implementation

with VSLAs taking on board the lessons learnt in the two other countries. However, it is pointed out that PSS took time to be defined and customised for their context but learning did occur and that outcomes are yet to be seen. Program staff also asserted that PSS needs were not that easy to discern (given that the situation is not a conflict/post conflict) and stakeholders had to go through layers of analysis before they could apply PSS to the intervention.

A key aspect of the training provided in Ethiopia under the R&LA shows that learning outcomes for staff have occurred. Program staff view the **holistic approach – particularly PSS – as providing the space for changing women’s lives**. Given that the PSS has been applied to VSLAs where it is seen as a **platform for creating support mechanisms**, staff realise that **women’s empowerment is not about economic and political empowerment alone** and that **women have faced silent violence** over the years. Clearly, program staff appreciate the value of the R&LA. However the **value of the R&LA for impact groups will only be seen** when the commissioned **qualitative and quantitative endline study is completed** together with the **finalisation of collection of stories** reflecting most **significant change**.

In **Uganda**, drawing on **CARE Austria’s TAs’ expertise**, being part of **international conferences** (UNSCR 1325 etc) and **gaining inputs from research**, particularly endlines, were flagged. However, an observation made by a staff during Skype interview is that during **FP I & II, CARE country offices** were more **involved** with the **learning agendas** and could draw on funds allocated, but for FP III, the **learning agenda and budget** is seen to be **limited to staff and partner participation in outside activities** i.e., regional/international fora convened by CARE Austria and CARE International. Furthermore, it was also pointed out there were budget constraints which limited **sharing of local successes and experiences** between **impact groups** so that they benefit from the learning. The allocation of funding for ensuring that learning also occurs between impact group members may need to be discussed and considered by ADA, CARE Austria, Country Offices and partners.

In **Nepal**, all 5 online survey responses indicate that the R&LA has been valuable, and that it promoted sharing of lessons between partners. One partner organisation pointed out that the organization applied the learning from SAKCHAM on eradication of child marriage and dowry system to the work being done on gender equality with men and boys.

It is also noted that **R&LA does not seem to consider actual capacity of organisations**. For example, one online response from Ethiopia reveals that under the **R&LA** it is specifically **required** that the **impact of psychosocial intervention on economic empowerment be assessed** given that the Country program consciously adopted the **PSS strategy and applied it to VSLAs**, but capacity for monitoring at the field level was lacking. Two online responses from partners also noted that while the R&LA adds value for purposes of sharing experience and new learning, it has not been based on capacity assessment of their organization.

From the foregoing, we can say that if **learning at country level** is strengthened through facilitating **learning between Impact groups at local/national levels**, the R&LA will become more meaningful as lessons learned from the ground can inform future program planning. **Country offices** may also require technical support for **monitoring R&LA** and **implementing partners** may benefit from **technical support** for carrying out **monitoring through and for learning outcomes** in order to make the **R&LA more meaningful**. In other words to fulfil the rationale for the R&LA which is seen as a *channel for both ground up and top down learning*, the **strengthening of capacity and capability** at the **ground up** level is **critical** as this would also enable partner organisations to build on achievements and sustain the impact of their interventions.

In conclusion, it is important, as pointed out in **1.1 ToC and LF analysis**, to have a **proper LF** and a **monitoring system** for the **R&LA** which would make the **implementation and management of the R&LA** more **efficient and effective**.

## Recommendations

Given the foregoing information on findings, and in line with streamlining efforts to strengthen the added value of the R&LA, the following recommendations are made:

1. It would be **beneficial** if in **Phase IV**, facilitation of **learning between impact groups** at the **country level** is considered and partners are **supported** through technical and financial assistance.
2. In terms of enabling partners to sustain the impact of their interventions, it would be helpful if the **R&LA** is specifically **embedded in monitoring processes of implementing partner organisations** and facilitation of **networking for partners** is continued in parallel with enhancement of **strategic advocacy** based on **lessons learnt** from the field.

## 3) Assess the relevance, impact, effectiveness and efficiency and sustainability of the program

### 3.1) Impact and Effectiveness

*Assess to what extent the program objectives and results have been achieved*

*The ToC and LF will be analysed for internal and external validity For external validity the questions to be asked will be: **Are the interventions actually producing the desired changes (Effectiveness)?***

## Examined documents

2.3.1\_EndlineSakchamIIBaselineSakchamIII.doc  
4.3.1\_20140730 GA Sakcham Project Debrief.docx  
7.1.5\_INTERNAL REPORT revised BH 151214.docx  
2.2.1\_20131107\_FGD Summary Report With Partner Staff\_longer version.docx  
2.5.3.1\_Berchi Baseline Exercise Summary Report FINAL.pdf  
2.8\_Annexes Annual Report 2013  
Annex 1 - Section 4 Table Baseline Results.pdf  
Baseline Survey for ROCO KWO Program  
Roco Kwo Mid-Term Review  
Endline Uganda (ID 14893)-PT.docx (draft)  
Qualitative report Uganda DRAFT for comments.docx  
5.6.7\_EMB Global Learning – CARE EMB Project Report Two Wheels

## Findings

As indicated in the foregoing sections, the **ToC concerning the women empowerment component** is well articulated and the LFs at CARE Austria and Country office levels reflect the intent and aims of the ToC. At the outset it must be stated that baseline and endline are not available for all of the countries<sup>5</sup> although it has been possible to gather a good idea about the impact and effectiveness of the FP from a **multiplicity of country documents**. As we discuss in the section on M&E, in fact, Annual Reports

<sup>5</sup> Baseline & draft endline for Roco Kwo; endline SAKCHAM II which serves as the baseline for SAKCHAM III; and baseline only for BERCHI.

focus mainly on Outputs rather than Outcomes, and thus it is not possible to clearly gather information about ‘change’.

This section assesses **the impact and effectiveness of interventions** designed to achieve the **three defined results** in terms of **women’s empowerment** in the **three different targeted countries**.

### ***Impact & Effectiveness of Results on Women’s Empowerment***

In terms of effectiveness of results, from review of documents cited above, economic empowerment is perceived as easier to grasp and measure, while psychosocial support and the transformation of gender roles is seen as essential preconditions for economic and political empowerment of women. This perception is also evident in Skype interviews with partners in Uganda and Nepal. In Uganda, at a FGD held with implementing partners in 2013 which focussed on synergies between the different interventions and the related changes observed, it was pointed out that the **biggest changes are observed in economic empowerment** and the **smallest changes in political empowerment**.

From examination of **ER 1 – “AGENCY”**: *Women have equitable access and control over production assets to ensure their livelihood security* implementation, the following observations can be made.

**Economic empowerment** of women has been largely effective in terms of more income but has not resulted in equal income or opportunities for women given structural, systemic and cultural barriers. Economic gains for women have been made through facilitation of memberships in VSLAs, capacity building in skills including for farming, bee-keeping, and craft production with parallel training in functional financial literacy and increased access to credit and markets.

In **Nepal**, findings from regression analysis of SAKCHAM II reveals that participation in CARE-led activities (solidarity group meetings, trainings for income generation, PSS activities to build self-esteem and confidence) has resulted in not only higher incomes for impact group women beneficiaries but also led to their increased bargaining power with patriarchy at the household and community levels. A correlation has also been established between women’s increased economic empowerment and their capacity to make joint decisions in the household with regards to land/asset acquisition or sale as well as their negotiating capability within households. Furthermore it is observed that impact group members’ increased authority at the household has contributed to their assertion in the public arena – at the VDC level. These findings also echo the views of staff who responded to the online survey. Furthermore, SAKCHAM III implementation reveals that EMB (engaging men and boys for gender equality) was used as a program strategy to promote women’s agency by underscoring and drawing on men’s involvement in bringing about social transformation.

For **Uganda**, the **RocoKwo endline** indicates that while impact group members report higher incomes through diverse range of income generating activities (VSLA membership, petty trade, brewing alcohol, bee keeping etc), they do not have enough incomes or savings to draw on for health emergencies or major life events.

In **BERCHI-Ethiopia**, we can establish from information provided by CARE staff that VSLAs have offered vulnerable women a viable pathway for income generation and by adapting the tool/resource on PSS for a setting on food insecurity, women’s agency in the context of operating VSLAs within a large government program is addressed in a holistic manner. The outcomes from the approach can only be discerned when the endline is completed but interviews with country office staff<sup>6</sup> indicate that women are benefiting from the interventions.

However **attention needs to be paid to** particular aspects of **economic empowerment which would have implications for gender relations** as well as **inadvertent outcomes for vulnerable women because of the way certain program approaches** are operated, and the way **powerful social**

---

<sup>6</sup> There was no response from partners in Ethiopia – the online questionnaire as well as request for interview were sent with a follow up mail.

**actors/cultural custodians are not always mindful of land laws and remain mired in customs that are inimical to women's rights.**

**Uganda** endline findings indicate that while membership and participation in VSLAs empower women both economically and socially, peer pressure from expectations on accumulating savings may result in serious consequences for women. There were a small number of cases of women who had sold their assets without consulting husbands which not only resulted in domestic violence but which also eroded their precarious assets base. Another concern flagged are the methods relied on for loan repayments which could be in arrears and which may lead to asset grabbing for loan recovery by VSLA groups. The endline in Uganda also shows that alcohol brewing has increased by 10% among women beneficiaries since the baseline and makes the link between increased alcohol brewing among women and higher reports of domestic violence as men have access to alcohol. Research based on endline and baseline data, carried out by the external consultant for Nepal and Uganda, might however shed further light on these issues.

In addition to provision of skills training for food production, making markets and credit available for sale of produce is critical for women beneficiaries. Access to and ownership of land is also particularly important in all three countries given that not only are impact group women extremely vulnerable because of poverty, they also experience cultural constraints that make land access and ownership quite fraught as they have to overcome social barriers (e.g., widows in **Uganda**, low caste women in **Nepal**, early marriage in **Nepal** and **Ethiopia** and female genital mutilation – FGM - in **Ethiopia**) and economic constraints (high rates of illiteracy, lack of bankable skills, poor knowledge of markets etc.,).

In terms of **Income Generating Activities (IGAs)**, while results are encouraging in all three countries, attention needs to be given to **engaging women more in small enterprise/business** in a way that links them to **increased access to credit and markets** which would also lessen the reliance of resorting to generating income in the more grey areas of the informal sector such as alcohol brewing. In this regard, the work of an implementing partner organization in Uganda is encouraging as indicated in a Skype interview, ‘...our application of the holistic approach has progressed – we are now engaged in facilitating/setting up bank linkages for beneficiaries and providing market access to them.’

On implementation of **ER 2 - "RELATIONS"**: *Transforming key socio-cultural norms, relations, attitudes of women, men, girls and boys for gender equality*, it is recognised that **social transformation through changing norms, relations, attitudes is less likely to be evident within a relatively short timeframe** of the three phases of FP in Uganda and Nepal and the first phase in Ethiopia. Nevertheless, we can say that Nepal and Uganda have registered incremental change in social relations which have had positive outcomes for women's increased participation in public life.

Data from **Nepal** reveals that women benefiting from PSS training, REFLECT centre meetings including solidarity group activities have more influence in household decision-making indicating a shift in gender relations that has taken place. Responses from the online survey of staff also reveal that women beneficiaries have changed their attitudes towards girls' education and practises such as early marriage. The engagement with men and boys has been fairly successful in the three districts where men's groups/activities for male members has contributed to change in male attitudes – reflected by the fact that male members' wives have more of say at public meetings and household decision-making. An assessment of the EMB program strategy has pointed out that the key value of the work is the promotion of gender equality through a rights-based approach that focuses on inclusion and social mobilisation. The assessment also pointed out that EMB is based on recommendations made by women beneficiaries and through working with supportive men/allies identified by women members of REFLECT Centres in order to gradually build a critical mass of supportive men. While changes at the personal level between couples can be discerned, for significant change in social transformation to occur in the cultural context of Nepal, upper caste leaders and cultural custodians have to be engaged in meaningful dialogues.

In **Uganda**, women engaged in advocacy forums have not only influenced local service delivery (for health services, water and sanitation etc.,) but also made gains in the area of girls' education. But, and significantly, 18.5% of women at endline still agree that a wife should tolerate being beaten by her

husband or partner in order to keep the family together indicating that cultural barriers and social conditioning still need to be combatted (See page 63 of Endline Uganda (ID 14893)-PT.docx (draft)). In terms of changes in men's attitude towards women's empowerment, the program strategy of 'role model men', working with men to address GBV and capacity building for male state officials (police, local council leaders) have had an impact on women's role in local politics and women's enhanced negotiating capacity. However, according to responses on the online survey, staff have also pointed out that women beneficiaries have felt marginalised by program approaches meant solely for men. In other words, beneficiary women have expressed to staff that the focus on men in activities for engaging men and boys has taken away the focus from women's own needs and concerns.

In **Ethiopia**, interview with staff indicate that specifically targeting different tiers of 'gate keepers' whether at the community or school administration is helping to address culturally sensitive issues such as early marriage and FGM. In terms of engaging with men for social transformation, under the role model men approach, training male champions for change has successfully called attention to household nutrition levels and gender biased distribution of food. Concurrently addressing the institutional level through a task force on food security would also have positive policy outcomes. However changing of mind-sets of gatekeepers in institutions including cultural structures is a long term outcome and less likely to yield results in a three year timeframe.

From the review above, we can say that **all three countries** have made progress in the area of **engagement with men** by incrementally developing a critical mass of supportive men/allies for the achievement of social transformation.

The concluding observation is that any pathways for women's empowerment should counter men's perceived threats to the existent gender equations in the social fabric because generally **efforts for social transformation are often resisted by men** based on perceived threats to existing male dominance or social status quo (i.e., men feel they will lose their power if women become economically empowered and therefore resist interventions). At the same time, when **interventions address men** as well, there is a **need to address women's perceived fears of losing out on participation in program activities** as they have hitherto been sole recipients of participation in economic and social activities (as a large focus of the interventions are on women). This aspect of program intervention was raised both in Survey Monkey results as well Skype interview with the Uganda Country Office.

Therefore, for any **meaningful social transformation** to occur, **impact group** women's **perceptions** about **program exclusion** has to be acknowledged and **addressed** and **gate keepers/custodians**, who may tend to perpetuate unequal gender equations or ascribe to cultural gender asymmetries to suit themselves/the power structures, need to be **brought on board**.

On **ER 3: "STRUCTURE"**: *Meaningful representation & Participation of women at all levels*, interventions in Nepal and Uganda have registered a level of success. In Ethiopia, the focus has been mainly on women's meaningful representation in VSLAs.

SAKCHAM II in **Nepal** has shown that membership in VSLAs has encouraged women beneficiaries' political participation on social, development and resource allocation matters at the Village Development Committee (VDC) level demanding services from the VDC. As a consequence, women beneficiaries who have become politically active in local governance processes are engaging with male leadership and authority. In addition, interventions on EMB have also contributed to women's foray into the public arena given that men involved in EMB activities are gradually supporting women's involvement outside the home. Furthermore, the online survey responses also indicate that the social mobilisation of women through networks, solidarity groups etc., has resulted in increased awareness among women for the need to participate in community decision making and influence resource allocations.

However, the regression analysis on SAKCHAM II indicated that women did not vote in an assembly election. This aspect of women needing to pro-actively vote in assembly elections should continue to be addressed in SAKCHAM III given that women beneficiaries' active engagement with leadership/local

governance processes will contribute to social transformation. At another level, Nepal has low literacy levels among women and in order to build women's capacity for leadership, at a minimum, functional literacy including financial literacy also needs to be addressed.

In **Uganda**, staff assert that 70% of the VSLA leadership is women and that a safe space is provided for impact group members to develop their leadership skills before they can occupy positions on social committees for water use and health provision. These positions are seen as a preparation ground for occupying political spaces at the district level – elected councils etc., Sometimes when impact group members are unable to gain public office, there have been instances where the local male leader offers them other leadership positions thereby providing opportunities for the women to interact with male leaders and traditional authority and influence social change. The endline notes that a higher proportion of women are in leadership committees in community based organisations. The endline has flagged the need to increase women's membership of these community based organisations which would form the foundation for any aspirations for leadership levels.

Although Uganda has quota system (30-35% reserved seats at district bodies), given the post conflict situation in Gulu, women are unable to take up these positions as they are unable to meet the basic criteria on education (literacy level). In fact the endline has identified high illiteracy levels of the impact and target groups as a gap that has affected the program and which is likely to have implications for future programming.

In **Ethiopia**, where meaningful representation of women was limited to women's representation in VSLAs, the implementation has been effective in terms of reaching 6,346 women with credit access and IGA training. CARE Annual Report 2014 highlights that beneficiaries have reported making profits and are able to repay their loans on time, increase their savings, and cover home and school expenditures for their children and family member. In a Skype interview with staff it emerged that women's management and decision making capabilities are addressed through the mechanism of VSLAs.

Staff also recounted that to facilitate women's access/control of resources and entry into decision making levels, the programme was working with government structures and processes. In particular to sustain efforts to build women's leadership, BERCHI was using the mechanism of VSLAs (getting women into management positions) and SAAs (building community awareness) and addressing community level barriers by targeting cultural custodians who are often gatekeepers who may stymie efforts for social transformation.

**Meaningful participation and representation of women** at all political levels can only be **achieved if women's agency (voice and capacity) is strengthened and inequality of outcomes in the socio-economic fabric is addressed, in tandem. Engagement with male leadership (political and cultural) is critical** to this result area as women have to deal with male opposition as well as overcome social barriers when they acquire the capacity and become capable of holding political office/and or decision-making positions. In this regard, all three countries have addressed the question of engagement with male leadership and traditional authority to varying extents.

## **Recommendations**

### ***Women's Empowerment Results***

Given that the ToC identifies specific **pathways for women's empowerment**, it is clear that programme interventions in each country **recognise that vulnerable women** who are the priority impact group members become **empowered at their own pace depending on their particular circumstances**. It is therefore important to continue the emphasis on enabling the women to make choices on the **pathways they seek to take towards gender equality** and recognise that an adaptable approach in designing empowerment pathways would respond to any changes in needs that may arise.

For example, in Uganda, a woman may **opt to brew alcohol** for income generation while at the **same time**, as a **change agent**, she may advocate with other impact group members on the need for health services for women, but at a personal level she may be among the 18% who still believe that husbands have a right to beat their wives. In other words, because her **personal transformation** is occurring **gradually** given the social-cultural factors shaping her life-decisions and she is becoming **empowered to varying levels** in the social, economic and political dimensions of her life, she may choose which areas of her **life she can change** depending on her **circumstances** and her **capability**. Therefore, as asserted in the Uganda endline, there should be a degree of flexibility in the way the various empowerment pathways are designed for adoption by women.

As pointed out strengthening **women's agency (voice and capacity)** and addressing **inequality of outcomes in the socio-economic fabric** will contribute to effective implementation. In order to continue **achieving impact** in the three result areas, the following recommendations are made:

- **Continued focus on strengthening women's voice and capacity** to enable them to overcome gender asymmetries in households and attain economic empowerment.
- As **changing of mind-sets of gatekeepers** in institutions is critical for enabling women's empowerment, particularly the realisation of women's meaningful representation and participation, there should be **increased focus** on addressing **systems, practices and procedures** that **perpetuate gender inequality** through context specific programme strategies at Country level.

### **3.2) Relevance of the Program**

*The ToC and LF will be analysed for internal and external validity For external validity the questions to be asked will be: **is the Program meaningful to the context** of the three different targeted countries (**Relevance**)?*

#### **Examined documents**

5.1.2 Women's Empowerment Overview Brief 2009

5.6.8\_Learning Conference

2nd MenEngage Workshop Evaluation Summary\_qualitative.docx

2nd MenEngage Workshop Evaluation Summary\_quantitative.docx

20150202 FP Learning Conference Report\_draft.docx

All report sheets.docx

Annex 11 - Austria (Global Learning EMB and CCRLA).pptx

Annex 12 - Ethiopia (Berchi progress update).pptx

Annex 13 - Nepal (Engaging Men in Sakcham).pptx

Annex 14 - Uganda (Male Engage Initiative).ppt

Changed attitudes and assumptions.docx

Learning Conf Eval Form\_Results.docx

MenEngage\_brief.docx

#### **Findings**

In this section the program is reviewed for relevance in terms of how meaningful it is for country contexts.

As the realisation of **women's agency, gender relations transformation in households and institutions, and strengthened international advocacy on women's rights** comprise the core of the ToC, the approaches adopted by FP III are in consonance with women's empowerment as elaborated by the holistic approach. All **three country offices** have asserted that they have been **actively involved in designing FP III ToC** which forms the basis for their respective ToCs. We have found that individual ToCs of the country programs are specific to their context and in keeping with the overall women's empowerment framework espoused by CARE Austria.

In terms of relevance of the FP III for **Ethiopia** – the program is meaningful to the national context given that the targeted women are located in resource poor settings and the Country Office has identified equitable access and control of resources, development of women's leadership and social capability and sensitisation of institutions to women's empowerment and gender equality as priority areas of focus. FP III enables the situating of these priorities on women's empowerment and gender equality within the larger programme on food security with the provision of financial and technical resources. In addition, the added value of the learning agenda has facilitated application of PSS to a context where the main program mechanism for women's leadership is through VSLAs. As asserted by the Country office staff, 'women's empowerment is a good program as BERCHI is part of the government's safety net program for the poorest groups, and we are graduating the women with skills and market access for micro level business. Our next step is to lift them out of poverty'.

In **Uganda**, given that the program is attempting to bring about change in three domains - addressing women's needs post conflict (information sharing; skills and knowledge transfer; functional literacy; livelihoods and VLSA; ownership of and rights to land/assets); building an environment of peace through focus on resilience and UNSCR 1325 (provision of PSS; dialogue with traditional chiefs); and strengthening inclusive governance with focus on capacity building for women leaders (grassroots awareness; skills for auditing local government accountability) – FP III is meaningful as it builds on the achievements of the two previous phases on women's empowerment in a post conflict context.

CARE Uganda Country office staff assert that the process of designing the FP III ToC and LF has been inclusive and a useful learning exercise. The learning agenda in particular had been useful and relevant -- for example, lessons learnt from CARE Ethiopia on food security issues have been incorporated in activities to promote women's livelihoods in Gulu. Although CARE Uganda is considered a centre of excellence for VSLA, program strategies used by CARE Burundi on how to engage men, helped avoid backlash in a post conflict situation where 70% focus was on building women's resilience and 30% focus was on men. The idea of having an approach of inclusive PSS which targeted minorities was adopted from the experience in CARE Nepal.

In **Nepal**, FP III is meaningful as it builds on the achievements of the two previous phases on women's empowerment in a post conflict context. Building on the CARE Austria ToC and the holistic approach, the strategies for women's empowerment and social transformation, particularly with regard to engagement with men and boys and a focus on gender relations at the household and community levels have been particularly relevant given the cultural context of the country. Insights gained from a Skype interview with a staff from an implementing partner organisation revealed that the provision of PSS services and activities and consequent popularising of national action plan (NAP) 1325 were particularly relevant in a post conflict setting. Furthermore, it was asserted in the same Skype interview that the men engagement component is successful and relevant as it has resulted in social change. The SAKCHAM approach was singled out by the partner organization as being unique because of the components on meaningful participation of women and EMB which contributed to changing gender relations at the household level.

Given the foregoing, the **FP III** is found to be **not only relevant to country contexts** but also through the **mechanism of the R&LA**, lessons learnt from Country offices also engaged in **FP implementation are effectively shared to refine strategies/activities deployed for effective implementation.**

## Recommendations

Given that **FPIII is relevant and meaningful** to the context of all three targeted countries and that **the mechanism of R&LA** has proved particularly useful, it is recommended that this aspect of the **program is continued for the next phase**, in particular sharing of lessons learned to refine strategies for effective implementation and due institutionalisation of successful processes to contribute to sustainability.

### 3.3) Sustainability

*Analysis of a) financial sustainability; b) social sustainability; c) cultural sustainability; d) institutional sustainability*

#### Examined documents

2.3.1\_EndlineSakchamIIBaselineSakchamIII.doc  
4.3.1\_20140730 GA Sakcham Project Debrief.docx  
7.1.5\_INTERNAL REPORT revised BH 151214.docx  
2.5.3.1\_Berchi Baseline Exercise Summary Report FINAL.pdf  
2.8\_Annexes Annual Report 2013  
Annex 1 - Section 4 Table Baseline Results.pdf  
Baseline Survey for ROCO KWO Program  
Roco Kwo Mid-Term Review  
Endline Uganda (ID 14893)-PT.docx (draft)  
Qualitative report Uganda DRAFT for comments.docx

## Findings

The project has been assessed **highly sustainable** – or at least strongly aiming at guaranteeing sustainability - by the staff of the CARE country offices, both in relation to the women empowerment component and the R&LA.

As described in sections 3.2 and 5, and as confirmed by program staff in the three countries, the **Learning Agenda** is considered useful and an important element for the **institutional sustainability** of the program. An improved M&E system for the R&LA is also suggested at country level. At the same time, consideration of facilitating learning between impact groups (see 2.2) would also contribute to sustainability of impact at the local level.

In this evaluation, it has also emerged that the **participatory processes** employed in carrying out the Learning agenda, in program and M&E design, also contribute to staff's ownership for the adopted approaches and thus also contribute to the program's **institutional sustainability**.

In terms of **women's empowerment**, different elements corresponding to the different – holistic - approaches adopted in the three countries are considered guarantee of **economic, social and cultural sustainability**. In **Uganda**, different elements identified as key to economic, social and cultural sustainability of the action on the ground include the expansion of the VLSA approach which facilitates savings and growth; the men engagement and role model men becoming part of the community structure; advocacy forum members becoming part of the community structure; impact group women benefiting

from government programs, structures and organizations to access services include funding; expansion of participation and forging of partnerships.

In **Nepal**, emphasis has been placed on strengthening and formation of women's groups with parallel mobilisation of women's networks at VDC and district levels. In particular, efforts have been made to link women's credit and savings group with VDC budgetary processes as well increasing knowledge of savings and credit groups on the importance of asset creation which would result in women's increased ownership of assets. In terms of sustaining the work with engagement with men, capacity building, formation of men's support groups at VDC level and linkages with national level alliance is seen to be important. With regard to sustaining links with government structures and processes, working relationship with government and stakeholders at VDC and district levels are being strengthened. Sustainability at this level will be augmented by the community structures created during the program period.

In **Ethiopia**, as the program is embedded within government structure and processes, the impact group women are also beneficiaries of government programs. The following factors are therefore identified by staff as contributing to institutional and social sustainability:

- Capacity strengthening of structure and institutions
- Collaborative partnership with government
- Participatory nature of the interventions
- High sense of ownership of the program among the community

## Recommendations

Given the foregoing, in terms of **sustainability**, it is clear that the Country offices are already pursuing **approaches** which **enable building on structures and processes** already in place, however, it would be strategic for CARE Austria if the **learning outcomes are consolidated** in a way that is **accessible** for all countries and partners and can contribute to sustainability.

### **3.4) Efficiency / Cost/Benefit analysis**

*Using available budgets, financial reports and administrative data on project participants, as well as in-country project evaluations, what is the approximate cost of the program for each participant and indirect beneficiary, and what is the "benefit" that the participant receives?*

## Examined documents

6.1\_AUT901ProgramDocument.pdf  
2.5.1.4 UGANDA WEP III 2013 Annual Report.docx  
2.5.1.5 WEP III Audit report 2013.pdf  
2.5.2.1\_Annual Report (Jan-Dec) 2013.doc  
2.5.2.6\_SAKCHAM Audit Report Dec'13.pdf  
2.5.3.3\_Progress\_report\_Berchi\_2013 final.docx  
2.7\_CARE RV financial report 2013.xls  
CARE Overall Annual FPIII Report 2014  
4.5.1.2\_WEPIII Audit report 2014.pdf.pdf  
4.5.2.4\_Audit Report Dec'14.pdf (Nepal)  
AUT910Summary.doc  
CARE-FP Annual Report 2014

## Findings

**Number of beneficiaries:** First of all it is necessary to say that it has been quite difficult to retrieve clear full data about beneficiaries. A consolidated table of actual beneficiaries per country and per activities is not available among all the FPIII documents. This has meant that we had to try to retrieve the number from the narrative reports. We have consulted the 2013 Country Reports (as the Overall Annual Report for 2013 draws on these ones) and the Overall Annual Report for 2014. We have found that the figures for each result area are not uniform across the three countries i.e., sometimes it is a narrative with no figures and other times, quite importantly, and figures are not always aggregated by sex. At times figures relate to the year in question, other times they are cumulative of the whole FPIII, or include other FP as well. In one case, only percentages are reported with no clarity on the absolute reference figures. No figures are available for the learning component. Furthermore, CARE Austria and partners produced other contrasting figures during the last feedback to this report (see list row in the table below). All this makes it very difficult to understand the exact number of actual beneficiaries that have been targeted by the project.

Nevertheless, we have tried to elaborate this table:

NUMBER OF BENEFICIARIES	OVERALL	UGANDA	NEPAL	ETHIOPIA
<b>PLANNED (PROPOSAL)</b>	57.251, women and 30.317 men	<b>34,062</b> (23.843 women and 10.219 men)	<b>10,660</b> (9,160 women and 1,500 men )	<b>11,000</b> households (7,700 woman and 3,300 men)*
<b>ACTUAL 2103 (from consulted project reports)</b>		<b>14,700</b>	<b>15.173</b>	<b>3.636</b>
<b>ACTUAL 2014 (from consulted project reports)</b>		<b>76.247</b> (75.861 VSLA since 2009) (60 women; 76.187 not specified)	<b>12.929</b> (10.083 since start of FPPIII) (7.697 women, 1.495 men, 3.737 not specified)	<b>14.842</b> (Reflect 9.000) (13.677 women; 1.165 men)
<b>Other data from other CARE sources</b>		<b>2013:</b> 14700 women, 220 Role model men, 240 cultural leaders, 180 local council and women leaders = <b>15340</b> <b>2014:</b> 12600 women, 4500 role mode men, 240 cultural leaders and 180 LCs= <b>17520</b>	<b>2013+2014 according to admin data 09/2015: 17081</b>	<b>2013:</b> 130 VSLAs, 2366 members (1349 women) = <b>2366</b> <b>2014:</b> 395 VSLAs, 7717 members (4998 women); 120 SAAs, 3217 members. = <b>10934</b>
<b>Roughly over 2 years:</b>		<b>32,000</b>	<b>17,000</b>	<b>13,000</b>

\* In the original proposal this figure was actually higher: 42,846 households (18,748 woman + 5,500 women heads of households + 18, 598 men).

As it is possible to see, there are noticeable discrepancies in the way data are reported through different documents. **We could nevertheless roughly say that it seems that the number of beneficiaries**

**targeted at the start of the program has been reached.**

No data is available on indirect beneficiaries.

No data is available about the beneficiaries' Learning component.

**Expenditure:** Data on expenditure has been gathered from Audit Reports (not available for Ethiopia 2014) and Care Overall Financial Report 2013

	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2013 (EURO)	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2014 (EURO)	TOTAL 2013-2014
UGANDA	291476	179303	470779
NEPAL	213.075	279909	492984
ETHIOPIA	53.996	238808	292804

No data is available broken down per activity. We could however roughly say that Uganda and Nepal are approximately spending what is expected by them.

**Cost per beneficiary:** As it is neither really possible to say what is the exact number of beneficiaries nor do we have full information about actual expenditure, it is impossible to make even a very basic calculation of the cost per beneficiary.

Nevertheless, taking into account that it seems that targeted beneficiaries have actually been reached (even one year before than expected), and having some figures about actual expenditure we can proceed with the following calculation:

	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2013 (EURO)	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2014 (EURO)	TOTAL 2013-2014	BENEFICIARIES (PLANNED BY 2015 AND ROUGHLY REACHED BY 2014)	COST PER BENEFICIARY
UGANDA	291476	179303	470779	32	14,5
NEPAL	213.075	279909	492984	32	29
ETHIOPIA	53.996	238808	292804	32	22,5

Overall we could say that the program has cost so far – over 2 years – around 15-30 Euro per beneficiary, depending on the country.

**Cost /Benefit:** If we look at the relation cost/benefit, we could say that an expenditure of 15-30 Euro per beneficiary over 2 years for the benefits received by the beneficiaries, is actually well spent.

In the section on **Effectiveness**, we have highlighted the benefits that impact group members seem to get from the FPIII and especially from its holistic approach. In Nepal, women have received higher incomes leading to their increased bargaining power with patriarchy at the household and community levels as well their assertion in the public arena through leadership positions. In Uganda, impact group

members report higher incomes through diverse range of income generating activities, overcome the aftermath of trauma caused by conflict to occupy public office as well as influence local service delivery (for health services, water and sanitation etc.). In Ethiopia, with access to credit and training, beneficiaries have reported making profits and are able to repay their loans on time, increase their savings, and cover home and school expenditures for their children and family members.

CARE Austria further provided additional information on funds which were raised to support activities under the R&LA when core budget was not available. 100,000EUR raised was allocated as a 'special fund' to support activities that were either gaps in the country programs or gaps in the cross-country research, learning and advocacy work. This flexible funding enabled CARE Austria to support opportunities that often arise and which were not budgeted for or costs that originally was thought would be supported by other CARE members/projects.

In conclusion we can say that that the **benefits** accruing to impact groups/beneficiaries through the program are not only **cost effective** but also enabling them to overcome socio-cultural barriers and **realize their capacity to change inequalities** in their personal lives and access the public arena -- which goes beyond quantification.

## Recommendations

If realistic data has to be gathered about the **actual beneficiaries** of the program – which thing is recommended – properly updated country program database should be held (where it is not already done) and then data should be **consolidated** in accessible tables, broken down per activity, and – very important – also per sex.

It would also be particularly important to keep concrete data about the **beneficiaries of the learning component** (see chapter on ToC and LF and chapter on Monitoring; see also **ANNEX 7** – The Kirkpatrick model to learning).

Ideally, **budget and expenditure** should also be broken down per Activity (but we know that this depends also very much on the financial systems of individual organizations and might be difficult to implement).

Overall, however, the program seems to have good benefits for the beneficiaries at a very low expenditure rate.

## 4) Highlight strengths and weaknesses of the framework program in terms of planning, implementing and monitoring (internal systems)

### 4.1) Planning and Implementation

- *Assess if there is a value added in the linkage with other CARE members in the framework program interventions*
- *Examining action plans, and processes staff's appropriation mechanism ie., ownership and participation in planning, design and implementation of project, beneficiaries' participation, coordination with other projects, organizations and stakeholders,*

## Examined documents

- 1.3\_2012\_ADA\_Uganda\_Nepal\_External Review phase II.pdf
- 1.4\_20140107 COAFP Management Response Eval.docx
- 2.1\_Framework Program Overall FINAL 2013-2015.pdf

2.6\_CARE FP Annual Report 2013.pdf  
4.6\_20141204 Internal Mid-term review meeting.docx  
4.7\_20150119 TA reports 2014.xlsx  
4.8\_2015 Planning Mtg Flip Charts Write Ups.docx  
7.1.1\_20150209 LiteratureReview\_draft.docx  
7.1.2\_20150220 LiteratureResearch\_final.docx  
7.1.5\_INTERNAL REPORT revised BH 151214.docx

## Findings

As we have seen in the introductory part of this report, but also in other sections, **coordination** is among the main tasks of CARE Austria's Technical Advisors and is an element of the FP III implementation complexity. The TAs are the coordination hub – for program management, technical support, advocacy input and M&E - with the three CARE country offices, CARE Canada and Norway, CARE International, ADA and other international national coordination bodies.

This work is considered valuable by all the bodies that are part of this network – country offices appreciate the technical support received, the learning and the occasions/platforms for exchange; CARE offices at international level, value the advocacy and learning inputs and the coordination effort; ADA commends the role that CARE Austria covers at national and international levels.

In this coordination effort, what is evident is that a lot of synergy seem to be required for harmonizing CARE Austria's work with work of international donors and CARE affiliates, as this would have an impact to an extent on program design and delivery (because of common priorities on international commitments).

**Staff's appropriation mechanism i.e., ownership and participation in planning, design and implementation of project:** by staff in CARE Austria and CARE offices is acknowledged and integrated into the work. Coordination efforts and technical assistance to country offices has also meant an increased number of learning and planning occasions for both the teams. Workshops and joint meetings were carried out on a variety of themes: design and harmonization of Indicators; design of basic LF for R&LA; Holistic approach; Gender Mainstreaming; Engaging Men and Boys; PSS Approach; Climate Change and gender; Most Significant Change technique; Women Peace and Security; GBV; etc. This has definitely increased within the various teams the sense of ownership for the approach adopted and the learning acquired within the program. (See also section 3.2 Relevance).

**Beneficiaries' participation** was granted at country level by CARE country offices and local partners also as part of the programs for which the FP III constitutes the 'connective' umbrella. They have been involved in country assessments, evaluations, surveys etc., thereby contributing to a sense of ownership.

**Action plans and workload.** As was pointed in the introduction and elsewhere, while CARE Austria retains control of the overall coordination of the FP III, of the L&R agenda, and of M&E - including budget for these activities - the Country offices work towards the same results by focusing on women's empowerment activities implemented within the framework of other programs. This has a consequence - the staff allocated by CARE Austria to these activities – one Gender Advisor (100%) also responsible for coordination, Psychosocial Advisor (60%) and Climate Change Advisor (30%) – seem overstretched. The Gender Advisor and Psychosocial Advisor have been more actively involved with providing technical assistance for program implementation at the Country office level as well responsible for the R&LA resulting in work overload. There is also a certain level of ambiguity and lack of clarity on how much is expected of these Advisors at various levels i.e., knowledge management, and networking with country office level, national level in Austria and at international level with CI and other CARE affiliates; provision of technical advice, with training and consolidating research and learning at country office level and in Austria. Additionally, given critical M&E responsibilities, and the lack of dedicated time for this, monitoring of FP III has suffered.

## Recommendations

It is recommended that CARE Austria continue this downward/upward coordination effort as it is recognized of value by all the stakeholders involved and definitely contributes to a sense of ownership towards the various aspects of the program approach. At the same, to make possible this double effort without detracting energy and focus from the targeted countries and important dimensions such as the R&LA – including technical support – and M&E, a better distribution of tasks, responsibilities and roles – maybe also the inclusion of a separate coordinator position - should be envisaged at CARE Austria level and discussed with donors.

### 4.2) Monitoring

*In addition to ToC/LF review, analysis of data collection, data analysis, reporting and sharing, timing, tasks and responsibilities, formats etc.,*

## Examined documents

1.3\_2012\_ADA\_Uganda\_Nepal\_External Review phase II.pdf  
1.4\_20140107 COAFP Management Response Eval.docx  
2.5.1.4 UGANDA WEP III 2013 Annual Report.docx  
2.5.2.1\_Annual Report (Jan-Dec) 2013.doc (Nepal)  
2.5.2.4\_Annex-3 case stories.docx  
2.5.3.1\_Berchi Baseline Exercise Summary Report FINAL.pdf  
2.5.3.3\_Progress\_report\_Berchi\_2013 final.docx  
2.6\_CARE FP Annual Report 2013.pdf  
2.8\_Annexes Annual Report 2013  
Annex 1 - Section 4 Table Baseline Results.pdf  
2.9\_20140801\_Cross Country MSC Selection Report.docx  
3.4\_MSC\_CCRLA Kick Off Workshop Report.pdf  
4.5.1.1\_1\_WEP III UGANDA 2014 Annual\_report draft.docx  
4.5.2.1\_Annual Report (Jan-Dec) 2014.docx (Nepal)  
4.5.3.2\_2014 Annual Report-BERCHI.doc  
4.6\_20141204 Internal Mid-term review meeting.docx  
4.7\_20150119 TA reports 2014.xlsx  
Annex 1 - Section 4 Table Baseline Results.pdf  
Baseline Survey for ROCO KWO Program  
Roco Kwo Mid-Term Review  
Endline Uganda (ID 14893)-PT.docx (draft)  
Qualitative report Uganda DRAFT for comments.docx

## Findings

In **Section 1** we have discussed the positive and problematic aspects existing in the formulation of the **ToC** and of the **LF** for the FPIII, and pointed out how they have **implications for the Monitoring and Reporting systems**. In this section, we examine those implications in more detail.

Overall we could say, that even as if in the case of the empowerment component (but not for the R&LA) ToC and LF are correctly formulated in terms of outcomes, the **Monitoring and Reporting systems** are largely **focusing on activities and outputs and less systematically on the ‘changes’** (Results / Outcomes) that these activities create in the targeted groups, whether these are the beneficiaries of the

Holistic Approach (empowered women) or those of the Learning and Research Agenda (CARE and partners' staff).

If we look at the **overall program and country Annual Reports, which are the main documents in which intermediate yearly changes should be reported**, we notice that:

- **Results and Result Indicators** related to the **women's empowerment** – which were correctly formulated in the LF - are not monitored and reported according to their formulation (in terms of change) but purely in terms of activities and outputs;
- **Results and Result Indicators** for the **learning component** – which were wrongly formulated in terms of Outputs – are reported in terms of Outputs, but the Outputs are different from those planned in the LF;
- nothing is reported in relation to getting closer to the achievement of the **Program (and Main) Objective**;
- Furthermore, there are some small **discrepancies** between data reported in the overall program report and data presented in the country reports, probably due to the difficulty of condensing and summarizing data from 3 countries in one complete report.;
- Finally, because of the above reasons, it is also **quite difficult even to determine the number of beneficiaries** benefiting from the program: a consolidated table of the actual program beneficiaries is actually not available and the AT need to recover it from the narrative reports in order to be able to do the rough cost-benefit analysis presented above.

In other words the 'changes' created by the project are not actually reported in overall and country **Annual Reports**: a) no 'changes' are monitored in relation to the **R&LA**, also because not appropriate Outcome Indicators have been identified for it; b) changes in relation to the **women's empowerment component** are also mainly reported in terms of outputs in the annual reports, even if actually they have proper Outcome Indicators (see section on ToC and LF).

**Nevertheless, Outcome Indicators of the women's empowerment component**, are monitored and documented by CARE and partner through other tools. These are: a) the stories collected through the **Most Significant Change technique**; b) **Baseline and Endline Studies, but also c) Outcome studies** in Nepal, SEE\_PET discussions, score card processes in various countries, case studies in at least Nepal and Uganda, systematization in Nepal et.,

The **Most Significant Change** technique has been appropriately chosen (and staff has been properly trained and followed-up) for identifying relevant – positive and negative - changes created by the program. Nevertheless, also to CARE staff, it is not always clear how this can be effectively integrated as an M&E tool for the program. In some cases, it has been reported that resources for monitoring have been limited and this kind of monitoring is extremely time-consuming and quite complex to carry out. Discussions at the design workshop in 2012 in Uganda also identified that ADA guidelines of allocating 3-5% resources for M&E may not be sufficient<sup>7</sup>. In addition, the workshop also flagged the issue about M&E not being evident in every job description.

Three different **Baseline studies** were commissioned at the start of the program, and one **Endline Study** is available at the moment, for Uganda, with a second one underway for Ethiopia.

From what we can see from the table summarizing the **Baseline findings** (2.8\_Annexes Annual Report 2013 - Annex 1 - Section 4 Table Baseline Results.pdf) these are not fully comparable. This is definitely due to the fact that in two of the three countries (Ethiopia and Uganda) - as per aid effectiveness agenda around harmonization, the baselines and endlines are joint baselines and endlines with other projects running in the same area, with other CARE members funding. Therefore, even if the indicators are the same across all three countries, the survey questions are adapted by in-country consultants based upon the local realities.

---

<sup>7</sup> ADA learning and design workshop phase III report, Uganda, 2012

Nevertheless, all these interesting **tools and research work aimed at assessing effectiveness of the program of the adopted holistic approach** are somehow a bit *'dispersed'* and do not feed into a coherent and structured M&E and reporting system which is at the moment not 'user friendly'.

## Recommendations

**Monitoring and Reporting systems** for next FP should be formulated in harmony with its ToC and LF. If the Program will be formulated mainly in terms of **women's empowerment**, monitoring and reporting should be focused on the Indicators formulated for this component in the current FP (see Section 1). Alternatively, if the Program will be formulated mainly in terms of **learning**, monitoring and reporting should be focusing on the Outcome Indicators identified by the **Kirkpatrick Model (ANNEX 7)**.

In both cases, **monitoring tools** (Means of Verification) should be able to capture the expected change for the impact groups (staff, women etc.) however these will be identified (and not simply the outputs from the activities). **Reporting** should also be focusing on the changes for the Impact group (in terms of empowerment for women and learning for R&LA stakeholders) according to a specific format common to all the three countries.

Within this logic, the **Most Significant Change technique** and **Baseline and Endline Surveys** are very appropriate tools. Baseline and Endline should however measure common sets of Indicators, focusing on 'changes' that can be common to all the projects and that focus, depending on the type of program that will be implemented, either on the Holistic Model to women's empowerment, or on the Kirkpatrick Model to learning, and should be well planned and defined since the program's start.

**Midline Studies**, based on qualitative methodology – interviews, FGDs and short and simple Surveys - and the MSC technique could also be incorporated. Differences between countries will be reflected, if necessary, within the individual tools utilized in each individual country. For example, the same Indicator could be measured through a Survey question that would suit all countries, but eventual specificities, could be reported only in the individual questionnaires.

**EXAMPLE FOR WOMEN EMPOWERMENT COMPONENT.** The approach presented here is already used for the women empowerment component in the FP III, but we report the example for completeness.

**Outcome indicator common to all countries:** Increased % of women who report access and control over productive assets and in the household decision making (thanks to the activities of the project), at endline compared with baseline.

**Survey questions for all countries (based on specificities highlighted in the Baseline Study):**

1) Please indicate for the following assets, the type of ownership (you are the owner / your husband or other male members of the household are the owners / you jointly own it):

- land
- livestock
- home
- **other (can be specified if different for different countries)**

2) Please indicate, in relation to the following issues, who has the last word in making the decisions (you have the last word/ your husband other male household members have the last word/ you decide together):

- buying land
- selling land
- selling home
- buying home
- selling livestock
- buying livestock
- **other (can be specified if different for different countries)**

**Outcome indicator common to all countries:** Increased % of women who report social connectedness (thanks to the activities of the project), at endline compared with baseline.

**Survey questions for all countries (based on FPIII Baseline Study):**

Please, say how much you agree (Lickert scale) with the following statements:

- I feel isolated within my community
- When I have problems I talk to members of my household
- When I have problems I have at least one good friend I can talk to
- I am member of a community group (specify for different contexts)
- I take part into community groups (**specify type of groups – VSLA etc, – depending on contexts**)
- Community groups (**specify per context**) are for me very good place to go
- I am able to go to community leaders (**specify depending on context**) to talk when I have problems
- I am able to get help from religious leaders (**specify per context**) if I need to talk

The same should be done for **monitoring an evaluating the Learning agenda**, independently from the different activities that the Learning Agenda incorporates in the different countries. This approach was not utilized during FPIII implementation, but we recommend that it should be used in future FPs especially if focusing on Learning.

**EXAMPLE FOR LEARNING COMPONENT. Based on the Kirkpatrick model, as suggested in this report.**

**Outcome Indicator:** % of field staff who has introduced in his/her work i at least two of the three good learning he/she had planned to implement at the moment of finishing the training (specify) measure at endline and compared to baseline

We could assume that the three different countries will carry out different learning activities. For example, one will focus on PSS, the other one Men Engagement and the other on gender and Climate Change. Our objective will remain that of focusing in the Learning program/component is working or not, so it won't matter if beneficiaries will learn different things, what matters is that through learning they will improve their work and program quality and effectiveness.

**Possible questions at Baseline:**

What are the main three learnings you take away from this training?

How do you plan to utilize it in your work?

Possible questions at Midline:

**Possible questions at Midline:**

Have you started utilizing what you learn at the training XY?

If yes, what? Please, mention at least two practices you have introduced in your work.

If no, why?

**Possible questions at Endline:**

Have you utilized in your work any of the things you what you learn at the training XY?

If no, why?

If yes, what? Please, mention all the new practices you have introduced in your work.

Were you satisfied with the results?

All these tools should be **better integrated, in the M&E and reporting system**. A **simplified and more focused version of the M&E and reporting system**, could be providing a number of benefits both in terms of efficiency (clearer and easier system to follow for the field staff, easier reporting) and effectiveness (easier data consolidation and analysis, clearer reporting, comparability of data and thus of the approaches adopted in different contexts, clearer learning outcomes).

Appropriate **staff and funding** should be assigned to M&E as we have already mentioned the CARE Austria's Technical Advisors seem to be overstretched with tasks such as coordination, technical advising, and R&LA.

## 5) Research and Learning Agenda

### Research and Learning

- *Assess value added from additional collaboration with CARE –international- wide learning and advocacy initiatives*
- *Assess how the framework program is embedded into the general portfolio and organizational structure of CARE Österreich*
- *Assess what has been achieved regarding advocacy work (local, national, international level, and the synergies, if any, generated between countries and regions)*
- *Assess relevance and utility of Technical Advisory support to the program interventions*
- *Did the psychosocial wellbeing study carried out in Phase II add any value to programming for M&E in Phase III? How was it followed up upon and did this add any value to the programming?*
- *What changes could be seen by attempting to focus the Research and Learning Agenda on one research and learning question?*
- *What value added did the impact analysis research bring? What if any was the strategic usefulness?*
- *What are the results of the initial exploratory attempts to integrate psychosocial wellbeing approach into a development context (non-emergency and not post-conflict)*
- *What advances, if any, were made in this phase regarding knowledge management, for example, is there clarity on the cost, value and purpose of documentation? Is the time spent on documentation appropriate for its expected purpose? What are the obstacles to better knowledge management?*
- *What results and synergies are created, if any, from cross-country and regional learning experiences created by the program?*
- *Assess the added value of the program for CARE Österreich as an organization, comparing this phase to previous phases*
- *How, if at all, have Austrian as well as Ugandan, Ethiopian and Nepali stakeholders benefited from learning, exchange or knowledge management generated by the Framework Program?*

### Examined documents

- 1.3\_2012\_ADA\_Uganda\_Nepal\_External Review phase II.pdf
- 1.4\_20140107 COAFP Management Response Eval.docx
- 2.1\_Framework Program Overall FINAL 2013-2015.pdf
- 2.6\_CARE FP Annual Report 2013.pdf
- 4.2.2\_ASC MEconsultative meeting UGA Report 2014.docx
- 4.3.6\_Report of Pss Outcome study 2014.doc
- 4.6\_20141204 Internal Mid-term review meeting.docx
- 4.7\_20150119 TA reports 2014.xlsx
- 4.8\_2015 Planning Mtg Flip Charts Write Ups.docx
- 5.6.8\_Learning Conference 20150202 FP Learning Conference Report\_draft.docx

### Findings

- *Assess value added from additional collaboration with CARE –international- wide learning and advocacy initiatives*

The FP III seeks to achieve **women's empowerment** also through the **Research and Learning Agenda (R&LA)**, the **effectiveness of R&LA** is also achieved at **two levels** – **gender equality advocacy**

through the **CARE Austria/CARE International channel** and **gender equality & UNSCR 1325** and other **development commitments** through **ADA/European partners' platform**, and the **cross country exchange between Nepal, Uganda and Ethiopia** facilitated by CARE Austria.

As the **R&LA** has been **designed to draw on lessons learned** at **cross-country** and **CARE International levels**, it provides a platform for **strategic advocacy** for **gender equality** and **international development commitments** and **program adaptation/innovation**, which are two key strengths of the approach.

**CARE Austria's knowledge and analysis of gender issues** and **lessons learned** from the FP focussing on **Engagement with Men and Boys** and **Gender-Based Violence** are acknowledged to be of **significant value** to the **CARE International Gender Network**.

In particular, the work has informed current efforts for compiling guidance to advance the current CARE International Program Strategy on gender equality and women's empowerment as well as to shape the direction and efforts for the 2020 Program Strategy. More importantly, CARE International considers **CARE Austria expertise on gender and psycho-social issues** as **strategic** for its own external positioning as an expert in these areas. For example, CARE International perceives the collaboration on EMB learning initiative as successful to the plans for development of policy/advocacy briefs to showcase how CARE works on engaging men and boys. The work from Nepal is seen as fundamental to this work and substantively informed the development of the manual on using EMB for gender equality as part of learning and knowledge generation.

- *Assess how the framework program is embedded into the general portfolio and organizational structure of CARE Österreich*

From the information gathered through interviews with CARE Austria staff, it is evident that the FPIII is unique in its approach as compared to other programmes run by CARE Austria given that FPIII works closely with target countries as well as international partners at the **substantive level with provision of technical inputs** as well at a **coordinating level with administration** of funds and overall **program management**.

In terms of 'embedding', it can be said that the FPIII is drawing on in-house expertise on issues such as climate change as evidenced by the involvement of the Climate Change Advisor, as well as general programme management and development expertise with the advice of the Programme Director. A positive aspect of the way the program functions is having a dedicated team for the program who are able to call upon other colleagues in the organization for their expertise and advice, while at the same time offer their expertise to the organization at large. From a learning perspective, this is of value as **lessons learnt** in one area can **inform programs** in other areas being implemented by the organization.

- *Assess what has been achieved regarding advocacy work (local, national, international level, and the synergies, if any, generated between countries and regions)*

**CARE Nederland** has been cooperating closely with CARE Austria in both the CIGN Program Working group as well as the WPS (Women, peace and security) group and recognises the way **CARE Austria** links its programs and **invests both in programs and advocacy** in the **FPIII targeted countries** which makes the **advocacy effective**. According to **CARE UK**, CARE Austria's **programs and partnerships** with civil society in countries affected by conflict have proven a highly **valuable** resource in CARE's advocacy on WPS both at the country, regional and global levels.

At a **strategic level**, CARE Austria's **efforts to engage with partners and grassroots activists in a sustained way** to test different approaches to addressing gender equality, women's empowerment and related themes like GBV and developing context-appropriate strategies, have **enhanced understanding** of the realities of **implementing UNSCR 1325**.

- *Assess relevance and utility of Technical Advisory support to the program interventions*

**CARE Austria's Advisors' efforts** to substantively inform strategic policy papers on gender equality and UNSCR 1325 for CARE International and ADA respectively have been noted by partners for **effectiveness**. Under the R&LA, the advocacy component is commended and gender equality work is particularly appreciated by ADA. Staffs' technical capacity for program implementation and the gender equality advocacy within Austria are seen to be effective. Staff efforts in highlighting the holistic approach on women's empowerment through sharing lessons learned from the R&LA in ADA-organised seminars/workshops for development partners are seen as an example of impact of CARE Austria's work.

At the level of donor coordination & support, **ADA** has given the focus on **R&L its unequivocal backing** through recognising that **lessons learned** from **FP implementation** in the three countries has **value for national level advocacy in Austria** and for **advancing international development commitments on women's rights, Beijing commitments and UNSCR 1325**.

However, there is **need to negotiate priorities** between the **international level** and **country level** commitments with **necessary budget** and **staff adjustments** given that the two **Technical Advisers** (Gender & PSS) seem **overstretched** with:

1. Undertaking **routine grant administration** and support services to country offices as well as being actively engaged in **strategic advocacy on gender equality and UNSCR 1325** in Austria and internationally;
2. Being responsible for **technical outputs** (papers, briefs, inputs to manuals/tools, commissioning reports/reviews/evaluations) and overseeing **R&L agenda**;
3. Supporting the **M&E** process of what is a complex program spanning multi-sited implementation with layered knowledge management and coordination of a range of partners. Coordinating research based on M&E data as well as facilitating cross country learning.

- *Did the psychosocial wellbeing study carried out in Phase II add any value to programming for M&E in Phase III? How was it followed up upon and did this add any value to the programming?*

The psychosocial well-being study carried out in phase II seems to have added value to programming for M&E in Phase III particularly as detailed in 4.2 Monitoring, there have been outcome studies, for e.g., in Nepal -- SEE\_PET discussions, score card processes in various countries – as well as case studies in at least Nepal and Uganda. Moreover, as evidenced by reports in Uganda and Nepal, there seems to be increased awareness of the need to consider cultural diversity and contextual realities in programing. The follow up as also flagged in 4.2 Monitoring seems to have led to systemization of compiling information on monitoring.

- *What changes could be seen by attempting to focus the Research and Learning Agenda on one research and learning question?*

From the review of documents as well as analysis of information received through Skype interviews with Country offices and partners we can say that the formulation of a single research and learning question in consultation with country offices has helped to consolidate the learning. CARE Austria staff recognised that the question chosen by consensus method was quite complex to answer needing additional time and technical support and took steps to address the issue. A case in point is the efforts made for the compilation of stories on MSC. The process followed for gathering information on MSC has enabled exchange of ideas and more importantly, helped staff to reflect on monitoring.

- *What value added did the impact analysis research bring? What if any was the strategic usefulness?*

The cross country research and learning question which is on overall impact has added value as evidenced by the way information on the implementation of the holistic approach has been generated across the three countries – i.e., each country has been able to identify what aspect of the holistic approach (women’s empowerment, engaging with men and boys etc.,) required more information for monitoring and has been able to reflect on such tracking leading to contributions to online discussions and learning conferences.

At another level, an example of specific impact analysis research has been on PSS in Nepal which has added value to the work of implementing partners and CARE Country office staff as indicated in a Skype interview and in one online survey. Information from the study informed national level research on UNSCR 1325 and 1828.

- *What are the results of the initial exploratory attempts to integrate psychosocial wellbeing approach into a development context (non-emergency and not post-conflict)*

See Sections 2.1) Added Value of Holistic approach and 2.2 Added Value of Research and Learning Agenda, where the relevant information has been provided.

As pointed out in 2.1, there was added value of integrating psychosocial wellbeing into a development context – as in a context of food insecurity in Ethiopia where it is being used as a learning outcome given that PSS aspects have been added to the VSLA curriculum and applied with one group to see how it works and what difference it makes compared to groups where PSS is not used as an approach/strategy in VSLA interventions.

- *What advances, if any, were made in this phase regarding knowledge management, for example, is there clarity on the cost, value and purpose of documentation? Is the time spent on documentation appropriate for its expected purpose? What are the obstacles to better knowledge management?*

The knowledge management aspect of the program in terms of sharing key information on technical issues including resources on program approaches, material on monitoring including relevant tools which are all channelled under the R&L agenda have been fairly well disseminated with Country office staff and partners finding them to be of value. In terms of adapting material for the different country contexts, Country office staff have reported that they value the inputs provided by CARE Austria TAs. Therefore, it can be said that the time spent on documentation under the R&L agenda for helping implementation is appropriate.

The time allocated by CARE Austria staff to compilation of documents could be complemented by also allocating time and efforts to consolidate the available material under each thematic cluster in a way that the main lessons learnt and insights gathered from implementation are made available to a wider audience. The main obstacle to better knowledge management would be demands on TAs time for administrative and coordination matters in addition to technical work. In this regard, the lack of staff to manage the knowledge system for the program is also noted.

- *What results and synergies are created, if any, from cross-country and regional learning experiences created by the program?*

In terms of **learning across the countries and regions**, three overall **observations** can be made based on document review, online survey and transcripts of interviews with country office staff:

1. **Learning through sharing of resources and approaches** has been particularly effective and led to **adaptation of manuals/tools** at country office level taking into account local FP contexts and cultural specificities or nuances. However, it was also felt that **more systemised sharing on a regular basis** was needed and a **coordinator** and **increased budgetary support** from CARE Austria and other CARE affiliates would **enhance the learning**.
2. CARE Austria initiated **online discussion, information collection and monitoring on the basis R&LA**, specifically the MSC approach, has not only enabled country office staff to assess FP effectiveness in terms of targets achieved but also assisted them to **draw links between the various activities for impact group women and the effects these have had on gender relations and social transformation**.
3. The **R&LA has enabled** the analysis of what has been effective for women's empowerment in terms of approaches, evidence from the field, and advocacy based on evidence.

- *Assess the added value of the program for CARE Österreich as an organization, comparing this phase to previous phases*

From the review findings, in general, we can say that for CARE Austria the **consolidation of learning on approaches** to addressing **women's empowerment** in post-conflict and food insecurity from **FP III** would be of strategic value in **informing advocacy on gender equality** in international development in the era of **SDGs** (sustainable development goals).

- *How, if at all, have Austrian as well as Ugandan, Ethiopian and Nepali stakeholders benefited from learning, exchange or knowledge management generated by the Framework Program?*

In terms of *Austrian as well as Ugandan, Ethiopian and Nepali* stakeholders benefiting from the learning agenda, VIDC (Vienna Institute for International Dialogue and Cooperation) has shared that CARE Austria contributed significantly to advocate for “Beijing +20” in Austria as it participated in the conference on the occasion of Beijing+20 in Vienna from June 9-10, 2015 and invited three speakers from FP III to contribute with their experiences in implementing Beijing.

Implementing partners benefited from the learning agenda, Skype interview with a Ugandan stakeholder revealed that being invited to Vienna to present on UNSCR 1325 and network was valuable. In addition, as mentioned in the Section 2.2 on the research & learning agenda, cross country learning has been facilitated and partners and staff in Country Offices have appreciated the learning, in particular Ethiopia where the Framework Program is new. Results from the online survey also show that stakeholders at the country level have benefited from the knowledge generated by FP III.

## Recommendations

Based on the observations made, the following recommendations are put forward:

1. The R&LA **continue with the efforts** made on making the **learning experience** for stakeholders **meaningful** including through **strengthening links** between **implementing partners** and **international partners**.
2. The **budget and staff allocations** are duly **reviewed** for the **R&L** to ensure that country offices, implementing partner organisation and ultimately the **women beneficiaries benefit** from the **R&L outcomes**.
3. A **job evaluation** of **Technical Advisors' positions** is done to **maximise available technical capacity** on **R&L** while also mindful of commitments to **strategic advocacy at international levels** and **capacity building for sustainability at country and program-site levels**.

## 3) CONCLUSION – summary of observations and recommendations

For **Table of Recommendations** see **ANNEX 8**.

Given the substantive analysis presented in this review with the TOR questions being answered on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the program and details of findings as well as specific recommendations made, this concluding section summarises the main observations and recommendations.

As highlighted, **Framework Program III** is **complex** in terms of formulation, operation, funding and coordination, implementation and M&E with CARE Austria working in close coordination with three different CARE country offices at various stages of post-conflict and food-insecure situations – Nepal, Uganda and Ethiopia, and in loose coordination with CARE Norway and CARE Canada. In addition, advocacy work is carried out with other CARE affiliates and key organizations in Austria.

This **complexity** has had an **impact on implementation** because Country offices have their own programs, as well as on monitoring given the harmonization required across the different M&E systems of country offices and partners and the reporting expectations of different donors.

**Despite or perhaps because of (at least in terms of implementation)** its **complexity** in terms of formulation, implementation and M&E, the **FP III** is **overall relevant, effective** and **aiming for sustainability**. The **program approach** employed is found to be **relevant** and **meaningful** to the **context** of all three **targeted countries**.

### Assessment of design and logic coherence of program and program intervention:

From the analysis of the ToC and LF where a comparison was made on the Program Objectives across CARE Austria as well as the program countries, it was pointed out that there was a lack of congruence between the overall Program Objectives and Country Program Objectives which produced a lack of clarity in the program's formulation, especially concerning the learning agenda and its incorporation in a program about women's empowerment. Some problems in the definition of Indicators for the Objectives of the program were observed as these are not sufficiently formulated in terms of the 'change' they intend to achieve. However, the Expected Results are formulated much more clearly than the Objectives, and are built around three important areas of change in relation to women's empowerment – agency, relations, and structure. Finally, as overall and country Indicators are different from each other comparison of results become hampered. It is therefore recommended that there should be conceptual

clarity in defining the actual Objectives of the program and the use of the 'Kirkpatrick Model' to think about the 'logic of change' in a learning program is suggested.

**Assessment of the added value of the Holistic Approach adopted in the program and of the Research and Learning component:**

The Holistic Approach is coherently conceptualized in various program documents, Theory of Change and Log Frame and there seems to be a fair understanding of the various levels of empowerment presented in the holistic approach model. The review findings show that the employment of a holistic approach on the realization of women's rights has resulted in incremental, and in certain instances significant changes in women's economic empowerment, progress has been made on enabling women to change unequal gender equations at a personal/relational level and providing them with the capacity to take on leadership roles. The added value of PSS as part of the holistic approach was flagged not only in post-conflict program sites (Nepal and Uganda) but also in Ethiopia in a context of food insecurity where it is being used as a learning outcome. In terms of incorporating climate change issues, the review found that the issue was more of fit for Ethiopia given the program's main focus is on food security. The review found that there was value in combining programming in food insecurity context and post-conflict contexts given gender asymmetries in fragile settings and the set of similar gender-based vulnerabilities that emerge in terms of access to resources and services. Therefore the added value of the Holistic Approach has been facilitation of thinking through program approaches using different lenses and adapting resource materials accordingly.

The main recommendation is to improve the actual monitoring of the impact of the Holistic Approach and thus to more efficiently work on the systematization of the learning on the Holistic Approach itself. In addition it is recommended that within the Holistic Approach model, intermediate changes at the different level (individual, community, institutions) created by the implemented activities, could be selected and pointed out and incorporated, to facilitate thinking in terms of change.

This review showed that R&LA is perceived to be of value although the experiences in each country has been varied which includes adaptation of resources on the holistic approach and engaging in learning through monitoring activities for sharing with colleagues across the three countries. The R&LA can be strengthened through facilitating learning between Impact groups at local/national levels to make it more meaningful. In addition, supporting Country offices on monitoring R&LA would ensure that learning outcomes can inform future programming. In terms of enabling partners to sustain the impact of their interventions, it would be helpful if the R&LA is specifically embedded in monitoring processes of implementing partner organisations and facilitation of networking for partners is continued in parallel with enhancement of strategic advocacy based on lessons learnt from the field.

**Assessment of the relevance, impact, effectiveness and efficiency and sustainability of the program:**

The review found that economic empowerment of women has been largely effective in terms of more income for example, for VSLA members, but has not resulted in equal income or opportunities for women given structural, systemic and cultural barriers. Although economic gains for women have been made through facilitation of memberships in VSLAs, capacity building in skills including for farming, bee-keeping, and craft production with parallel training in functional financial literacy and increased access to credit and markets, more efforts need to be made to address household decision-making and addressing social inequalities that shape women's ability to make life choices so that transformation in gender relations can be achieved.

In all three countries it is observed that the structural aspects of women's empowerment are being successfully addressed and their assertion in the public arena through leadership positions is evident - in Uganda, impact group members have overcome the aftermath of trauma caused by conflict to occupy public office as well as influence local service delivery; in Ethiopia, beneficiaries have taken on management and leadership responsibilities in VSLAs; and in Nepal, women have entered local

government structures and influenced community decisions on resource-use. However, as pointed out in the review, meaningful participation and representation of women at all levels can only be fully achieved if women's agency (voice and capacity) is strengthened in tandem with addressing inequality of outcomes in the socio-economic fabric. In this regard, all three countries have addressed the question of engagement with male leadership and traditional authority with EMB strategy used successfully.

The main recommendation is to continue the focus on strengthening women's voice and capacity to enable them to overcome gender asymmetries in households and attain economic empowerment. Given that changing the mind-sets of gatekeepers in institutions is critical for enabling women's empowerment, particularly the realisation of women's meaningful representation and participation, there should be increased focus on addressing systems, practices and procedures that perpetuate gender inequality through context specific program strategies at Country level.

FPIII is found to be relevant to country contexts wherein women are located in resource poor settings and face gender-based vulnerabilities and violations. The holistic approach with focus on agency, relations and structure has enabled the program to hone in on specific interventions on economic and social empowerment and meaningful participation and leadership. In addition the mechanism of the R&LA wherein lessons learnt from Country offices also engaged in FP implementation are effectively shared are found to be helpful to refine strategies/activities deployed for effective implementation.

Stakeholders identified a number of pathways for sustainability which they are already pursuing including a) expansion of the VLSA approach which facilitates savings and growth; b) the men engagement and role model men becoming part of the community structure; c) advocacy forum members becoming part of the community structure; d) impact group women benefiting from government programs, structures and organizations to access services including funding; and e) expansion of participation and forging of partnerships. The review found that the Learning Agenda is considered useful and an important element for the institutional sustainability of the program. Given the foregoing, continued focus on capacity strengthening of structures and institutions, collaboration with governance structures and processes and promoting ownership of the program among the community is likely to result in increased institutional and social sustainability. It would be strategic for CARE Austria if the learning outcomes are consolidated in a way that is accessible for all countries and partners and can contribute to sustainability.

In terms of cost benefit analysis of the program, the review found that overall, the program seems to have good benefits for the beneficiaries at a very low expenditure rate. If we look at the relation cost/benefit, we could say that an expenditure of 15/30 Euro per beneficiary over 2 years for the benefits received by the beneficiaries, is actually well spent. In particular, as highlighted in the section on Effectiveness, in Nepal, women have received higher incomes leading to their increased bargaining power with patriarchy at the household and community levels as well their assertion in the public arena through leadership positions. In Uganda, impact group members report higher incomes through diverse range of income generating activities, overcome the aftermath of trauma caused by conflict to occupy public office as well as influence local service delivery (for health services, water and sanitation etc.). In Ethiopia, with access to credit and training, beneficiaries have reported making profits and are able to repay their loans on time, increase their savings, and cover home and school expenditures for their children and family members. Nevertheless, it must be noted that it was difficult to retrieve full data on beneficiaries given that calculations for number of beneficiaries are not uniform across the countries. It is recommended that data on beneficiaries be consolidated and data on those benefiting from the Learning Agenda component are delineated to enable a clearer understanding of the cost benefit of the program.

#### **Highlighting strengths and weaknesses of the framework program in terms of planning, implementing and monitoring (internal systems)**

In terms of planning and coordination, the review found that CARE Austria has fared well in maintaining efforts on coordinating a complex program with multiple stakeholders operating at different levels. The

review also found that the participatory planning modalities have value for stakeholders and contributes to a sense of ownership towards the various aspects of the program approach. In order to maximise these efforts without detracting energy and focus from the targeted countries and important dimensions such as the R&LA – including technical support – and M&E, a better distribution of tasks, responsibilities and roles – maybe also the inclusion of a separate coordinator position - should be envisaged at CARE Austria level and discussed with donors.

With regard to monitoring, the monitoring and reporting systems are largely focusing on activities and outputs and less systematically on the ‘changes’ (Results / Outcomes) that these activities create in the targeted groups, whether these are the beneficiaries of the Holistic Approach (empowered women) or those of the Learning and Research Agenda (CARE and partners’ staff). Similarly no ‘changes’ are monitored in relation to the R&LA, because of a lack of identified appropriate Outcome Indicators. The review found too that changes in relation to women’s empowerment component are also mainly reported in terms of outputs despite the existence of Outcome Indicators. However, the Outcome Indicators of the women’s empowerment component, are monitored and documented by CARE and partners through other tools such as the MSC technique, baseline and endline studies, and outcome studies.

The main recommendation is that monitoring and reporting systems for next FP should be formulated in harmony with its ToC and LF. Given that the R&L is an important focus of the program, monitoring and reporting should focus on the Outcome Indicators identified by the Kirkpatrick Model (ANNEX 7). Tools should be better integrated, in the M&E and reporting system. A simplified and more focused version of the M&E and reporting system, could be provide a number of benefits both in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. Appropriate staff and funding should be assigned to M&E in view of the review findings on the various tasks of coordination and R&LA assigned to CARE Austria’s TAs.

#### **Highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the Research and Learning Agenda (coordinated by CARE Austria) specifically in terms of planning, implementing and monitoring.**

The review found that the R&LA provides a platform for strategic advocacy for gender equality and international development commitments and program adaptation/innovation, which are two key strengths of the approach. CARE Austria's knowledge and analysis of gender issues and lessons learned from the FP focussing on Engagement with Men and Boys and Gender-Based Violence are acknowledged to be of significant value. At a strategic level, international partners recognise CARE Austria’s efforts to engage with national partners and grassroots activists in a sustained way to test different approaches to addressing gender equality and women’s empowerment and developing context-appropriate strategies to inform policy frameworks. In particular CARE Austria expertise on gender and psycho-social issues are considered to be strategic as they inform international networking for global advocacy.

CARE Austria’s efforts to substantively inform strategic policy papers on gender equality and UNSCR 1325 based on learning from FPIII have been rated by partners as effective. In order to make the learning experience for stakeholders more meaningful, the R&LA should continue with the efforts made on strengthening links between implementing partners and international partners. Therefore the budget and staff allocations for the R&LA should also be duly reviewed to ensure that country offices, implementing partner organisations and ultimately the women beneficiaries benefit from R&L outcomes. In terms of monitoring, there is need to negotiate priorities between the international level and country level commitments with necessary budget and staff deployment/adjustments.

The concluding comment is that the benefits accruing to the targeted women through FPIII program are enabling them to gradually overcome socio-cultural barriers and realize their capacity to change inequalities in their personal lives, as well as gain a level of economic independence and access the public arena.

## ANNEXES

- Annex 1 – TOR
- Annex 2 – Review Questions
- Annex 3 – List of consulted documents
- Annex 4 – List of people contacted for the review
- Annex 5 – Interview questions
- Annex 6- Survey Monkey questions
- Annex 7 – The Kirkpatrick Model to learning
- Annex 8 – Table of recommendations



## CALL FOR APPLICATIONS - TERMS OF REFERENCE

EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE NGO FRAMEWORK PROGRAM –  
**1980-02/2013: Claiming rights – promoting gender equality: Women’s Empowerment and male engagement for gender transformation in post-conflict and chronically food-insecure settings (Ethiopia, Nepal, Uganda): 2013-2015.**

### 1. Introduction

The CARE Österreich-ADA Framework Program “Claiming Rights - Promoting Gender Equality: Women’s Empowerment and male engagement in post-conflict and chronically food-insecure settings (Ethiopia, Nepal, Uganda) is a three-year development program of CARE Österreich, CARE Nepal, CARE Uganda, CARE Ethiopia and a number of implementing partner organizations detailed in section two.

The framework program, which is 80 % financed by the Austrian Development Agency (ADA), began implementation on the 1<sup>st</sup> of January 2013 and runs until 31<sup>st</sup> of December 2015. It is the third phase and builds upon previous framework programs that ran from 2007-2009 and 2010-2012.

“Claiming Rights - Promoting Gender Equality: Women’s Empowerment and male engagement for gender transformation in post-conflict and chronically food-insecure settings (Ethiopia, Nepal, Uganda)” consists of interactive program interventions with a common strategic and development objective and a learning component as described below:

#### **Overall objective**

*To contribute to increased effectiveness in development program quality in conflict and post conflict, as well as in food insecure situations through an holistic approach to women’s empowerment and gender equality and evidence based research, learning and sharing of best practice*

#### **Specific (context related) objective**

***By 2015, 40,703 women and 15.019 men, either affected by conflict Uganda (34,062 direct beneficiaries, 23,843 women and 10,219 men) and Nepal (9,160 women and 1,500 men; total of 10,660) or by food insecurity in Ethiopia (11,000 households – with 7,700 woman and 3,300 men), are able to exercise gender equality by addressing agency/individual, institutional/structural and relational aspects of their empowerment***

The program operates under the following theory of change:

*Women’s agency in and after conflict or in food insecure situations is strengthened through enhanced psychosocial wellbeing and active integration into Solidarity Groups (with a special emphasis on economic empowerment through VSLA) along with an array of other locally determined psychosocial activities. Women’s strengthened agency & solidarity (social connectedness) and human rights awareness raising through training, and the linkage of grassroots women’s voices and needs to national and international level advocacy initiatives, enables them over time to negotiate (=relational aspect of empowerment) the structures (legal and cultural aspects) around them and speak out for themselves and to meaningfully participate in decision-making on different levels. Thus sustainable women’s*

*empowerment for grass-roots women in either post-conflict or chronically food-insecure settings can be reached through specifically addressing in a holistic way agency, structure and relational aspects and by mainstreaming the strategic engagement of men. (CARE Austria Program hypothesis).*

In order to reach this goal, CARE has developed, together with the CARE program staff from the three Country Offices, three expected result areas, relevant within each of the contexts, in order to work for gender equality. The expected result areas are in line with the CARE Women's Empowerment Model, as well as with each Country Offices Women's Empowerment Program. The areas identified are considered major stepping stones for contributing to gender equality. In line with the Theory of Change mentioned above, the following **expected result areas ("domains of change")** have been agreed on as minimum expected result areas for all the three program interventions:

**ER 1 – Agency: Women have equitable access and control over production assets to ensure their livelihood security**

At the end of the program, 40,703 women and 15,019 men are participating in Solidarity Groups and XX %<sup>8</sup> of women perceive increased access and control over productive assets, XX % of women of increase of access to services and productive resources.

**ER 2 - "RELATIONS": Transforming key socio-cultural norms, relations, attitudes of women, men, girls and boys for gender equality**

Out of the 40,703 women and 15,019 men directly benefitting from the program interventions, at least XX % (disaggregated by sex) report changes in attitudes towards GBV and other harmful traditional practices<sup>9</sup>.

**ER 3: "STRUCTURE": Meaningful representation & Participation of women at all levels**

Out of the 40,703 women and 15,019 men participating in the solidarity Groups, XX %<sup>10</sup> report women's meaningful participation in decision-making on HH/community/national levels; and XX% of increase of reported improvement of responsiveness of relevant institutions toward women.

**The Program Interventions**

Four program interventions have been formalized to achieve the framework program objectives and results mentioned above.

5. WEP III (Uganda): This program intervention is a continuation of two previous phases of framework program funding. The program has been designed to go hand-in-hand with programming funded by CARE Norway and Norad. It was implemented by six partner organizations during 2013, and is now implemented by two partner organizations.
6. Sakcham III (Nepal): This program intervention is a continuation of two previous phases of framework program funding. The program has been designed with increased focus on institutionalization of project gains and learning, and increased sustainability.
7. Berchi (Ethiopia): This program intervention is the first phase of framework program funding. It has been designed to complement the CARE Canada and Cida funded Food Security for Farmers program. It is implemented by CARE staff as well as Ethiopian government staff as part of that country's PSNP safety net program.

---

<sup>8</sup> context relevant indicators will be defined in the Baseline study and measured at country level

<sup>9</sup> to be defined on program initiative level, relevant for the context

<sup>10</sup> S.a., will be defined in the Baseline study and measured at the country level

More detailed information on the first three interventions can be obtained in the individual program intervention documents. Each program intervention in each country was also free to define further result areas that contributed to learning or overall women's empowerment.

8. Research and Learning Agenda (coordinated by CARE Österreich): This program component is, on the one hand, responsible for the overall coordination of the Framework Program and ensuring synergies between the program interventions. It also includes technical support (in gender, psychosocial and climate change) to the three program interventions mentioned above, as well as a cross-country learning and research agenda, and advocacy activities in Austria and internationally.

## 2. The partners

- a) CARE Österreich  
[www.care.at](http://www.care.at)

Since 1986 CARE Österreich has been successfully supporting and implementing development and humanitarian assistance projects/programs on all continents, particularly in Southern and East Africa and the Great Lakes Regions, South and South East Asia, the Middle East and South/East Europe and the CIS. Up to now CARE Österreich has secured funds for more than 360 projects, implemented in 50 countries, benefiting millions of vulnerable people.

Since 1995 CARE Österreich is effectively managing more than 90 EuropeAid and ECHO grants & service contracts. In 2007 CARE Österreich has managed a total of 53 projects in 22 countries worldwide with annual expenses of more than EUR 11.2 million of which 65 % were funded by the European Commission and 13 % by the Austrian public institutions and 21 % of private fund-raising. CARE Österreich is a valued partner of the European Commission Development Aid EuropeAid and the EC Humanitarian Aid ECHO, the Austrian Development Agency, various UN organizations and other development actors recognized for effective project cycle and contract management as well as high quality assurance.

- b) The Austrian Development Agency  
[www.ada.gv.at](http://www.ada.gv.at)

The Austrian Development Agency (ADA) is the Operational Unit of the Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC). It is in charge of implementing all bilateral programs and projects in ADC's partner countries and administers the budget earmarked for this. Another focus of ADA's operations is education and information in Austria to convey the issue of development cooperation to a broader public.

Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC) pursues its goals of reducing global poverty, ensuring peace and human security and preserving the environment in an international framework. The policies and program parameters are agreed on with the European Union and in international committees. Two policy pillars of bilateral and multilateral development cooperation are the Millennium Development Goals and the Paris Declaration. The ADC also works to implement the Three Year Program on Austrian Development Policy (2013-2015.)

The Austrian Development Agency cooperates with a variety of development actors, including non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and combines official development assistance with numerous civil-society initiatives. This way, government and civil society make a joint contribution to poverty reduction and improving the conditions of life in developing countries.

The framework program for Austrian NGOs is one of the various co-financing instruments in the collaboration with NGOs. The programs are based on the NGO's own initiatives and are directed at meeting the actual needs of the target groups in developing countries. Per definition, an ADA framework

program consists of coherent and interactive program interventions with a common strategic and development objective.

### c) The implementing partners

CARE Österreich implements the program in cooperation with CARE Burundi, CARE Nepal and CARE Uganda. Each of the CARE Country offices has a structure of local partner organizations with which the program interventions are implemented & also strategic partner organizations in the field of advocacy.

**Ethiopia:** Food Security Task Force, at woreda, zone and regional level; Women and Children's Affairs Offices

**Nepal:** Grassroots-level - Rural Women Service Centre (RWSC), Kalika Community Women Development Centre (KCWDC) and Dalit Social Development Centre (DSDC); national level: Saathi, National Forum of Women's Rights Concern (NFOWRC)

**Uganda:** Grassroots-level: KIWEPI, VISO, WORUDET, FOKAPAWA, DNU; ARLPI; GWED-G; National level: Isis Wicce, UWOPA, UWONET, Raising Voices, CEDOVIP, Cewigo, Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development; CECORE

## 3. Purpose

The review is intended to contribute to:

- **Learning:** insights and knowledge gained through the review will contribute to planning and steering of the ongoing and eventually future program
- **Exchange** of best practices between stakeholders
- **Improvement** of policies of the implementing organisations, processes and methods of ongoing and eventually the future program
- **Accountability** towards the stakeholders
- **Recommendations** for Austrian NGO and local partner/s as well as the ADA concerning future framework programs and cooperation

## 4. Objective of the Review

The main objective of the review is to revise results (output, outcome) and assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the program. The review should present results, conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations with regard to the program and the implementation of the program approach.

## 5. Specific focus of the review:

The review is in part, a review of the entire Framework Program, with specific emphasis on the fourth intervention. Review of the first three interventions will also build upon a mix of baselines, mid-terms reviews and final evaluations from the three interventions (see Annex list below.) However, given that the purpose of the review is to inform future programming, it will be carried out before the end of the three-year period, and not all end evaluations from each of the three interventions will have been completed during this overall review. Meanwhile, the fourth intervention has an internal mid-term review which was conducted.

The overall questions (questions "a" through "e") should be assessed, with some specific attention paid to the numbered questions within the assessment of overall questions

- a) Assess the design and logic coherence of program and program intervention including the design of the logframe and theory of change
  1. What difference did it make in this third phase of the Framework Program to not have women's psychosocial wellbeing as a separate result area, but rather as a cross cutting approach?
  2. How were climate change related issues embedded in the design and structure of the program and how did this impact on outcomes?
  3. What, if any, value was added to the program through the combination of programming in food insecurity context and post-conflict contexts?
  
- b) Analyse, to what extent the program objectives and results have been achieved
  1. What, if any, is the value added for the impact group of the trainings and technical input from a learning project?
  
- c) Assess the relevance, impact, effectiveness and efficiency and sustainability of the program
  1. Using available budgets, financial reports and administrative data on project participants, as well as in-country project evaluations, what is the approximate cost of the program for each participant and indirect beneficiary, and what is the "benefit" that the participant receives?
  
- d) Highlight strengths and weaknesses of the framework program in terms of planning, implementing and monitoring (internal systems)
  1. Assess if there is a value added in the linkage with other CARE members in the framework program interventions
  
- e) Highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the Research and Learning Agenda (coordinated by CARE Österreich) specifically in terms of planning, implementing and monitoring
  1. Assess value added from additional collaboration with CARE –international- wide learning and advocacy initiatives
  2. Assess how the framework program is embedded into the general portfolio and organizational structure of CARE Österreich
  3. Assess what has been achieved regarding advocacy work (local, national, international level, and the synergies, if any, generated between countries and regions)
  4. Assess relevance and utility of Technical Advisory support to the program interventions
  5. Did the psychosocial wellbeing study carried out in Phase II add any value to programming for M&E in Phase III? How was it followed up upon and did this add any value to the programming?
  6. What changes could be seen by attempting to focus the Research and Learning Agenda on one research and learning question?
  7. What value added did the impact analysis research bring? What if any was the strategic usefulness?
  8. What are the results of the initial exploratory attempts to integrate psychosocial wellbeing approach into a development context (non-emergency and not post-conflict)
  9. What advances, if any, were made in this phase regarding knowledge management, for example, is there clarity on the cost, value and purpose of documentation? Is the time spent on documentation appropriate for its expected purpose? What are the obstacles to better knowledge management?
  10. What results and synergies are created, if any, from cross-country and regional learning experiences created by the program?
  11. Assess the added value of the program for CARE Österreich as an organization, comparing this phase to previous phases

12. How, if at all, have Austrian as well as Ugandan, Ethiopian and Nepali stakeholders benefited from learning, exchange or knowledge management generated by the Framework Program?

To each question, highlight strengths and weaknesses, lessons learned and suggest areas of improvement for the future

## 6. Review approach, methods and process

### a) Methodology

The review will be based on the review of available documents and interviews with partners. It is up to the consultant to suggest the preferred methodology and action plan as part of the bid. In particular, the consultant shall briefly state how s/he will address each if the listed tasks above.

Some suggestions are:

- Review of the available documentation and reports (compare Annex 1)
- Inception meeting (in person or by Skype) with CARE Österreich staff
- Interviews with key program-staff (in person or by Skype) such as
  - The responsible overall coordinating person of the content of the Framework Program (Gender Advisor of CARE Österreich), the Psychosocial Technical Advisor, the Climate Change Advisor, the Advocacy Officer, and the financially responsible person), as well as the desk officers of the program interventions in Vienna.
  - CARE Country Office Program Intervention staff (phone/skype interviews)
  - Program implementing partners of the program in Ethiopia, Uganda and Nepal (telephone interview/questionnaire)
- Interviews with the NGO-desk of the Austrian Development Agency and relevant coordination office of the ADA
- Interviews (as far as possible per skype & or telephone) with relevant key stakeholders in Ethiopia/Nepal/Uganda/Austria such as
  - Assistant Program Directors (CARE Ethiopia, CARE Nepal, CARE Uganda)
  - Strategic Partner Organization staff
  - Government ministries staff

### b) Bid Format

Bids will be accepted until 11:59pm (CET) April 6th 2015 and should include the company, organization or consultants' profile, experience and references. The bid should be in EURO, showing all taxes (Mwst/VAT). Bids should also include the estimated cost to the lead evaluator for two trips to Vienna for the initial meeting as well as presentation and discussion of draft results (to be discussed with consultants if this is necessary). Bids should include a suggestion of the methodology, time and action plan and if necessary, suggestions and recommendations to the Terms of References.

### c) Suggested Time-frame

Action	Responsible	Timing
Submission of bids (electronically)	To <a href="mailto:elizabeth.brezovich@care.at">elizabeth.brezovich@care.at</a> (Gender Advisor)	By April 6
Contract signed and documents	Contract signed between CARE	By April 14 <sup>th</sup>

handed over	Österreich and consultant / company	
Framework Program Review (documents, first interviews with CARE Österreich staff)	Consultant	By May 1 <sup>st</sup>
Submission of an inception report	Consultant	Within 7 days of first interviews with CARE Österreich staff
Further interviews with stakeholders and staff	Consultant	By April 25
Presentation and discussion of draft report	Consultant	By June 1 <sup>st</sup>
Submission of final review (hard copy and electronic copy) to ADA and CARE Österreich	Consultant	By June 31 <sup>st</sup>
Provide one to two days of support to integrate findings of review into future program design	Consultant	By July 31 <sup>st</sup>

#### **d) Budget**

The consultants/ company shall elaborate a working plan with the number of estimated working days to fulfil the contract of services and the daily fee. Other proposed costs shall also be included in the proposed budget. Upon preliminary selection of one bid the price will be negotiated between the consultant and CARE Österreich.

#### **e) Support services**

CARE Österreich and the Austrian Development Agency will provide support (information/interviews; providing relevant documents, feedback to draft of review, participation at presentation of draft findings). The interviews will be arranged and supported after agreeing on the action and time plan.

### **7. The review Team**

The review team will consist of at least two members who should have experience in the programmatic as well as evaluation aspects of programming similar to that of the Framework Program.

Key Qualification Factors to be considered along with the technical proposal and the bid:

- Experience in evaluating women's empowerment and gender equality programming
- Experience in evaluating multi-country programs
- Experience implementing women's empowerment and gender equality programming
- Experience in evaluating learning, research, and advocacy programs
- Experience evaluating programs remotely
- Experience in cost-benefit analyses
- Experience in knowledge management

### **8. The Review Report Format:**

The consultants will submit **an inception report** following the inception phase, a **final draft review report**, and the **final review report**. The format for the final review report can be found under annex 2.

## **Annex 1: Available documents**

### **Framework Program Documents**

- Framework Program Application / Contract (2013-2015)
- Framework Program Annual Report 2013
- Framework Program Annual Report 2014 (forthcoming)
- Final Report of ADA Framework Program (2010-2012)
- (Semi-Annual and annual) reports of program interventions

### **M&E related documentation:**

Nepal – Sakcham III:

- Baseline
- Mid-term review
- Endline (forthcoming, potentially available during review)

Uganda- WEP III

- Paul Bukuluki (PhD) and James Mugisha BASELINE SURVEY FOR ROCO KWO PROGRAM; Makerere University, Faculty of Social Sciences CARE International (Uganda); July 2010.
- CARE International in Uganda (Janani Luwum , Rose Amulen, Godfrey Otobi, Steve Power): Roco Kwo Mid-Term Review (Uganda, April 2012)
- Roco Kwo final evaluation and endline report

Ethiopia- Berchi:

- “Baseline Exercise Summary Report: The Food Sufficiency for Farmers (FSF) Mebkat Project & The Berchi - Be Strong! Project” (Mike de Vries)
- “Baseline Exercise Annexes - Methodology, Tools and Data Summaries: : The Food Sufficiency for Farmers (FSF) Mebkat Project & The Berchi - Be Strong! Project” (Mike de Vries)
- Qualitative review report (forthcoming)

### **Internal documents, manuals, and other work (some generated in collaboration with another intervention)**

#### **Berchi (Ethiopia)**

1. “Social Analysis and Action for Food Security Programs” (CARE training manual)
2. “Workshop Report: Preparation for Berchi launch with CARE staff” (CARE)
3. “Workshop Report: Berchi Psychosocial Training” (CARE)
4. “Berchi Concept Note: VSLA and SAA groups formation and activities” (CARE)
5. “Workshop Report: TOT psychosocial support”

#### **WEP III (Uganda)**

6. “Conflict Affected Women’s Perceptions of Psychosocial Well-being in the Acholi Sub-Region of Northern Uganda” (CARE)
7. “Northern Uganda Women Empowerment Program – NUWEP Engaging Men Initiative (EMI) Mid - term Review 2013”

8. "Value Chain Analysis Report of selected enterprises in the Acholi and Lango Sub Region (Gulu, Amuru, Kitgum, Pader, Oyam, Lira, and Otuke districts)" (FIT)
9. "The Great Lakes Advocacy Initiative (GLAI) Final Evaluation" (WayFair Associates for CARE Norway)
10. "Analysis of Causes and Drivers of Conflict for Conflict-Sensitive Recovery and Development Intervention in Northern Uganda" (CARE internal study)
11. "Trip report of CARE Austria PS TA - including report on psychosocial study launch in Gulu, Northern Uganda" (CARE)

### **Sakcham III (Nepal)**

12. Engaging Men as Allies in Women's Empowerment (CARE Explanatory Leaflet)
13. Report on Constitutional Assembly Election (CARE internal report)
14. Case stories from Nepal (CARE internal stories)
15. Constituent Assembly Election 2013 Gender Monitoring Report (in Nepali)
16. 1325 Localization study
17. Engaging Men and Boys video and discussion question guide
18. Psychosocial outcome study report
19. Psychosocial training reports and documents

### **Program Intervention 4: Research and Learning Component (many of below documents were generated in coordination with the other program interventions.)**

20. Table: Baseline Results of Key Indicators" (For Section 4 of 2013 annual report)
21. "Kick-Off Workshop for the Learning and Research Component of the program, including Training on Most Significant Change" (CARE)
22. "What Does a Holistic Approach to Women's Empowerment Really Mean?" Graphic model of Framework Program Activities (CARE)
23. "Focus Group Discussion Summary with Implementing Partner Staff" Exploratory research on cross-country research and learning question (CARE)
24. "UNSCR 1325 in Europe: 20 case studies of implementation" (European Peacebuilding Liaison Office)
25. "Gender Equity and Diversity Module 501: Engaging Men and Boys for Gender Equality,, Facilitator Manual" (CARE)
26. "To be well at heart – Conflict-Affected Women's Perception of Psychosocial Well-Being: A Participatory Study in Burundi, Nepal and Northern Uganda" (2013)
27. "Conflict-Affected Women's Perception of Psychosocial Well-Being in the Acholi Sub-Region of Northern Uganda" (2013)
28. "Conflict affected Women's Perception of Psychosocial Well-Being in Mawkanpur, Chitwan and Kapilvastu Districts of Nepal" (2013)
29. "Kumererwa-neza: To Be Well in Your Heart; Conflict-Affected Women's Perception of Psychosocial Well-Being in Burundi" (2013)
30. "The SEE\_PET for Women - A Participatory Method for Developing and Measuring the Effectiveness of Psychosocial Programs for Women" (2013)
31. "To be well at heart: women's perceptions of psychosocial wellbeing in three conflict affected countries." Article in Interventions, April 2014
32. "Nationaler Aktionsplan zur Umsetzung von Resolution 1325 (2000) des Sicherheitsrates der Vereinten Nationen. Fünfter Umsetzungsbericht" (BMeiA)
33. "Gender-Based Violence Issue Brief: March 2013" (CARE)
34. "Was wird aus den Millenniums-Entwicklungszielen? - Der Weg in Richtung 2015 und der 'Vienna Policy Dialogue on Gender Equality'" (Kühhas, Barbara: *Frauensolidarität: 123/2013* page 30-31)
35. "Adaptive Capacity for Resilience and Equity for Smallholders (ACRES)" (CARE International position paper)
36. "Smallholder Agriculture in a Changing Climate" (CARE International program brief)

37. “No excuse for inaction – CARE International’s demands for the 2013 UN climate talks in Warsaw”(CARE International)
38. “Berücksichtigung des Nationalen Aktionsplans zu UN Resolution 1325 (Frauen, Frieden, Sicherheit) in der Österreichischen Sicherheitsstrategie” (Brief der Friends of 1325 Gruppe an Bundeskanzler Werner Faymann)
39. Learning Conference Report (MenEngage Global Symposium and Framework Program Learning Conference)
40. Engaging Men and Boys Global Learning Project, Sakcham Systematization Report (forthcoming)
41. Engaging Men and Boys Global Learning Project Consultancy report
42. Engaging Men and Boys Brief 1 and Brief 2
43. Engaging Men and Boys Training Report (Uganda) (forthcoming)
44. CARE Austria 1325 Position Paper, November 2014
45. Impact Analysis Report Sakcham (forthcoming)
46. VLSA Discussion Manual for Berchi project
47. Training report from VLSA Discussion Manual ToT
48. CARE International GBV Strategy
49. CARE International GBV Impact Report
50. Various CARE International advocacy papers

### **Documents of the Austrian Development Agency**

- NGO Framework Program Guidelines (**Förderrichtlinien** der Rahmenprogramm)
- ADA Evaluation Guidelines

### **Annex 2 Review Report Format**

The report should contain a maximum length of 30 pages. Data should be collected and interpreted if possible in a sex-disaggregated manner. OECD DAC Evaluation Quality Standards are to be applied and the compliance of the latter needs to be comprehensible in the review.

The Review Report should follow the format below:

- a) Title Page  
(Name of the program, name of the review company/consultant, name of the author, date of the review, etc.)
- b) Table of contents
- c) Executive summary
- d) Introduction (Description of the review objectives, the process and the methodologies applied)
- e) Content of the review (short program description and context to the Austrian Development Agency)
- f) Review results including conclusion and recommendation per section
- g) Overall lessons learnt, conclusion and recommendations for organizational learning and similar future program interventions
- h) Annexes  
(TOR, list of persons interviewed, documents reviewed, sites visited, etc.)

## ANNEX 2 – REVIEW QUESTIONS

In this table are summarized the ToR questions and sub-questions (ToR sub-questions have been slightly re-organized), and the questions and methodological notes formulated by the Assessment Team.

ToR Questions	ToR sub-questions	Further questions formulated by the AT
<p><b>1) Assess the design and logic coherence of programme and programme intervention including the design of the logframe and theory of change</b></p>		<p><b>1.1) ToC and LF coherence</b></p> <p>The ToC and LF will be analysed for internal validity. <u>For internal validity</u> the following questions are asked: Is the project's Theory of Change clear? Are there 'logical' gaps in it? Is the ToC correctly represented in the Log Frame? Are Outcomes and Objectives correctly formulated in terms of desired change? Are the Outcome and Output Indicators coherent with what they intend to measure? Are the Means of Verification coherent with the Indicators?</p>
	<p>What difference did it make in this third phase of the Framework Program to not have women's psychosocial wellbeing as a separate result area, but rather as a cross cutting approach?</p> <p>How were climate change related issues embedded in the design and structure of the program and how did this impact on outcomes?</p> <p>What, if any, value was added to the program through the combination of programming in food insecurity context and post-conflict contexts?</p> <p>What, if any, is the value added for the impact group of the trainings and technical input from a learning project?</p>	<p><b>2) Assess the added value of the holistic approach adopted in the programme and of the Learning and Research component</b></p>
<p><b>2) Assess the relevance, impact, effectiveness and efficiency and sustainability of the programme</b></p>	<p><b>Impact and Effectiveness</b></p> <p>Assess to what extent the programme objectives and results have been achieved</p>	<p><b>3.1) Impact and Effectiveness</b></p> <p>The ToC and LF will be analysed for external validity. <u>For external validity</u> the questions to be asked will be: Are the interventions actually producing the desired changes (Effectiveness)?</p> <p>The achievement of</p>

	<p><b>Efficiency</b></p> <p>Using available budgets, financial reports and administrative data on project participants, as well as in-country project evaluations, what is the approximate cost of the program for each participant and indirect beneficiary, and what is the “benefit” that the participant receives?</p>	<p>the Specific Objective and of the Expected Results will be verified according to the specific indicators set in the programme for each country. The analysis will take into account the specificity of these different contexts and the specific design of the project in each country. It will also take into consideration eventual unintended outcomes.</p> <p>The analysis of Impact and Effectiveness will be carried out by looking mainly at the Baseline and Endline Surveys and other M&amp;E documentation available for the three different countries.</p> <p><b>3.2) Relevance of the Programme</b></p> <p>The ToC and LF will be analysed for external validity <u>For external validity</u> the questions to be asked will be: is the ToC meaningful to the context of the three different targeted countries (Relevance)?</p> <p>Analysis based on:</p> <p>a) documentation on the consequences of food insecurity and conflict on women’s empowerment in the three countries;</p> <p>b) actual improvements but also gaps in the achievement and unintended outcomes (Impact/Effectiveness) created by the programme in terms of women’s empowerment;</p> <p>c) ToC (external validity) – is the Programme ToC actually relevant to</p>
--	--	--

		<p>the context? Are there gaps, not considered dimensions, that are negatively impacting on the achievement of the desired results?</p> <p><b>3.3) Sustainability</b></p> <p>Analysis of a) financial sustainability; b) social sustainability; c) cultural sustainability; d) institutional sustainability</p> <p><b>3.4) Efficiency / Cost/Benefit analysis</b></p> <p>Cost/Benefit analysis:</p> <p>a) calculating the approximate cost of delivering the programme for each participant and indirect beneficiary (based on budgets, financial reports and administrative documents and number of targeted beneficiaries), and comparing it to the “benefit” that the participant receives.</p> <p>b) identifying both ‘tangible’ and ‘intangible’ benefits received by the beneficiaries to capture perceived benefits that are non-monetary in terms of perceptions of well-being and experience of life-changes including changed gender dynamics at the household level which beneficiaries</p>
--	--	--

		<p>may attribute as a result of their participation in the project.</p> <p>Finally we will be comparing the findings on what could have been the situation in terms of cost/benefit if the programme had not been implemented and/or if other programmes had been implemented.</p>
		<p><b>4) Highlight strengths and weaknesses of the framework programme in terms of planning, implementing and monitoring (internal systems)</b></p> <p><b>4.1) Planning and Implementation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess if there is a value added in the linkage with other CARE members in the framework program interventions</li> <li>• Examining action plans, and processes staff's appropriation mechanism ie., ownership and participation in planning, design and implementation of project, beneficiaries' participation, coordination with other projects, organizations and stakeholders,</li> </ul> <p><b>4.2) Monitoring</b></p> <p>In addition to ToC/LF</p>

		<p>review, analysis of data collection, data analysis, reporting and sharing, timing, tasks and responsibilities, formats etc.,</p> <p>Analysis of M&amp;E process implementation will cover the actual schedule for data collection and analysis, the formats utilized, databases, data consolidation and analysis reports, data sharing among the three different contexts, use of data for implementation and learning etc.</p>
<p><b>5) Highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the Research and Learning Agenda (coordinated by CARE Austria) specifically in terms of planning, implementing and monitoring.</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assess value added from additional collaboration with CARE – international- wide learning and advocacy initiatives</li> <li>2. Assess how the framework programme is embedded into the general portfolio and organizational structure of CARE Österreich</li> <li>3. Assess what has been achieved regarding advocacy work (local, national, international level, and the synergies, if any, generated between countries and regions)</li> <li>4. Assess relevance and utility of Technical Advisory support to the program interventions</li> <li>5. Did the psychosocial wellbeing study carried out in Phase II add any value to programming for M&amp;E in Phase III? How was it followed up upon and did this add any value to the programming?</li> <li>6. What changes could be seen by attempting to focus the Research and Learning Agenda on one research and learning question?</li> <li>7. What value added did the impact analysis research bring? What if any was the strategic usefulness?</li> <li>8. What are the results of the initial exploratory attempts to integrate psychosocial wellbeing approach into a development context (non-emergency and not post-conflict)</li> <li>9. What advances, if any, were made in this phase regarding knowledge management, for example, is there clarity on the cost, value and purpose of documentation? Is the time spent on documentation appropriate for its expected purpose? What are the obstacles to better knowledge management?</li> <li>10. What results and synergies are created, if any, from cross-country and regional learning experiences created by the program?</li> <li>11. Assess the added value of the programme for CARE Österreich as an organization, comparing this phase to previous phases</li> <li>12. How, if at all, have Austrian as well as Ugandan, Ethiopian and Nepali stakeholders benefited from learning, exchange or knowledge management generated by the Framework Program?</li> </ol>	<p><b>5.1) Research and Learning</b></p> <p>This component will be addressed through the review questions and through focusing mainly on the quality of the research and advocacy documents produced, the mechanisms of research sharing and dissemination and advocacy, and on the way learning has been incorporated within the programme in terms of planning and implementation, and how this has been absorbed by policy-makers.</p>

### ANNEX 3 - LIST OF CONSULTED DOCUMENTS

<b>A) DOCS SENT BY CARE - REORGANIZED BY EVAteam</b>
<b>1_2009-2013_PROGRAM</b>
1.1_2009_Psychosocial assessment Sakcham II.pdf
1.2_2010_Uganda baseline report-final.doc
1.3_2012_ADA_Uganda_Nepal_External Review phase II.pdf
1.4_20140107 COAFP_Management Response Eval.docx
<b>6_OVERALL Phase III Program Project documents</b>
6.1_AUT901ProgramDocument.pdf
6.2_LogframeAUR902LearningProject.docx
6.3_AUT901_All_OriginalBudget.xlsx
6.4_Aut902_LearningProjectBudget_current.xlsx
<b>6.5_UGANDA</b>

6.5.1_20120914_narrative_UGA_CARE.pdf
6.5.2_20141210_UGA912_budget_current incl 2nd amendment.xls
<b>6.6_NEPAL</b>
6.6.1_20120914_narrative_NPL_CARE.pdf
6.6.2_20120914_NPL_Annex A+B_CARE.pdf
6.6.3_NPL945_Original Budget as submitted.xlsx
<b>6.7_ETHIOPIA</b>
6.7.1_Berchi Umwidmung 2 ADA WEP 20130906 final.doc
<b>6.7.2_PSS TOT Ethiopia</b>
Approaches and techniques for Training of Adults.pptx
BERCHI MHPSS TOT EVALUATION.docx
BERCHI MSPSS TOT PROGRAM.docx
MHPSS Concepts.pptx
psychological_first_aid.ppt
Psychosocial Intervention.pptx
PsychosocialTrainingEthiopia2015Draft.doc
SEE-PET BERCHI.pptx
6.7.3_Berchi Budget Revision 3 20141215 final.xlsx
<b>2_2013_PROGRAM</b>
2.1_Framework Program Overall FINAL 2013-2015.pdf
<b>2.2_UGANDA</b>
2.2.1_20131107_FGD Summary Report With Partner Staff_longer version.docx
2.2.2_20131108 Engaging Men and Boys Training Uganda.docx
2.2.3_20131113 GA Notes Trip report Uganda.docx
<b>2.3_NEPAL</b>
2.3.1_EndlineSakchamIIBaselineSakchamIII.doc
<b>2.4_ETHIOPIA</b>
2.4.1_2013_Berchi Launch Workshop Report.docx
2.4.2_2013 TRIP REPORT Gender Advisor.docx
<b>2.5_Country level reports 2013</b>
<b>2.5.1_Uganda</b>
2.5.1.1_WEP 1 to 3 Launch Uga 2013 Rose A Presentation.ppt
2.5.1.2 WEP Uga Launch August2013 Janine Presentation.pptx
2.5.1.3 PS Study Launch Uga 2013 Taaka Presentation.pptx
2.5.1.4 UGANDA WEP III 2013 Annual Report.docx
2.5.1.5 WEP III Audit report 2013.pdf
<b>2.5.2_Nepal</b>
2.5.2.1_Annual Report (Jan-Dec) 2013.doc
2.5.2.2_Annex-1 Men Engagement Leaflet.pdf
2.5.2.3 Annex-2 CA election Report.docx
2.5.2.4_Annex-3 case stories.docx
2.5.2.5_GBVTraining2013Nepal.doc
2.5.2.6_SAKCHAM Audit Report Dec'13.pdf

<b>2.5.3_Ethiopia</b>
2.5.3.1_Berchi Baseline Exercise Summary Report FINAL.pdf
2.5.3.2_Draft concept note VSLA and SAA 28 august.docx
2.5.3.3_Progress_report_Berchi_2013 final.docx
2.6_CARE FP Annual Report 2013.pdf
2.7_CARE RV financial report 2013.xls
<b>2.8_Annexes Annual Report 2013</b>
5_Umsetzungsbericht_NAP_1325.pdf
ACRES Position Paper.pdf
Berchi Baseline Exercise Summary Report FINAL.pdf
Berchi Baseline Report Annexes FINAL.pdf
CARE 3 Country Study To Be Well at Heart.pdf
CARE FP Annual Report 2013.pdf
CARE Psychosocial Well-being Study Burundi.pdf
CARE Psychosocial Well-being Study Nepal.pdf
Case stories Nepal.pdf
CCRLA Kick Off Workshop Report.pdf
Conflict Study Uganda.pdf
Draft concept note VSLA and SAA 28 august.pdf
Election Report Nepal.pdf
Engaging Men and Boys GED 501 Manual_FINAL.pdf
EPLO_UNSCR_1325_in_Europe_20_Case_Studies_of_Implementation.pdf
Faymann_Sicherheitsstrategie_Friends1325_okt11.pdf
FGD Summary Report With Partner Staff Uganda.pdf
Frauensolidarität no 123_siehe Seite 30.pdf
GLAI Final Evaluation Report.pdf
Holistic Approach Program Activities.pdf
IWD_2013_GBV_Issue_Brief.pdf
Nepal CA Election Report Gender Monitoring.pdf
Nepal Men Engagement Leaflet.pdf
No_Excuse_for_Inaction-CAREs_demands_for_UN_climate_talks_in_Warsaw.pdf
SAA manual for FS Programs.pdf
SACCPProgramBriefCAREMay2013.pdf
Annex 1 - Section 4 Table Baseline Results.pdf
The SEE_PET for Women.pdf
Uganda EMI mid term review.pdf
Uganda psychosocial study final.pdf
Value Chain Analysis Uganda.pdf
VAW Campaign in Nepal.docx
Workshop Report Prep CARE Staff Launch Berchi.pdf
2.9_20140801_Cross Country MSC Selection Report.docx
2.10_Required Participant Survey on the Symposium and LC.docx
2.11_Research Learning Question(s).docx
<b>3_2013_OVERALL LEARNING</b>

<b>3.1_GENDER</b>
3.1.1_Gender Training Workshop Report Draft.docx
3.1.2_20140124 Gender Security Discussion.docx
3.1.3_20140126 Gender in Projects Survey Results.pptx
3.1.4_20140428 Holistic Model_EB.pdf
3.1.5_Program Staff Survey.pptx
3.1.6_Gender Audit.pptx
<b>3.2_ENGAGING MEN&amp;BOYS</b>
3.2.1_20140310 Training of staff on Engaging Men and Boys_draft.docx
<b>3.2.2_EMB 501 Module</b>
501 Activity 4 What do we mean by EMB for gender equality.pptx
501 Activity 8 Global Snapshot Evidence and Gaps.pptx
501 Activity 11 Young Men's Initiative gender socialization promising practices.pptx
501 Activity 13 Engaging men as fathers.pptx
501 Activity 23 Gender, Power and Violence.pptx
501 Activity 30 ISOFI sexuality promising practice.pptx
501 Activity 33 Promising Practices and Program Elements and Resources.pptx
501 Curriculum Video Links.docx
Engaging Men and Boys GED 501 Manual (2).pdf
<b>3.3_CLIMATE CHANGE</b>
3.3.1_201308 PECCN ACRES discussion paper summary INTERNAL.pdf
3.3.2_201308 PECCN ACRES discussion paper INTERNAL.pdf
<b>3.4_MSC</b>
3.4_MSC_CCRLA Kick Off Workshop Report.pdf
<b>4_2014_PROGRAM</b>
4.1_20141031 REPORT RV Annual Planning Meeting_ENG.docx
<b>4.2_UGANDA</b>
4.2.1_Bi-annual brief on the advocacy within WEPIII-NUWEP[1].docx
14.2.2_ASC MEconsultative meeting UGA Report 2014.docx
<b>4.3_NEPAL</b>
4.3.1_20140730 GA Sakcham Project Debrief.docx
4.3.2_20140812 GA Sakcham Trip Report_draft.docx
4.3.3_Datassist Sakcham III Recommendations.pdf
4.3.4_Final RPGA Report - CARE Nepal_Mar15.docx
4.3.5_GA Sakcham PGA agenad slt_12pm Wed.docx
4.3.6_Report of Pss Outcome study 2014.doc
4.3.7_Study Report Launch Nepal Final.pdf
4.3.8_CaseManagementTraining2014Nepal.docx
4.3.9_PSHandbookSakchamIII_Draft.docx
4.3.10_FINAL_Review of Gaps UNSCR1325 Nepal.docx
<b>4.4_ETHIOPIA</b>
4.4.1_ToR Berchi Project-Exposure visit to Nepal and Uganda EB.docx
4.4.2_Berchi VSLA Manual with TA Austria.docx
4.4.3_Draft Report ToT VSLA DG.docx

4.4.4_Annex II Briefing Note ToT VSLA Discussion.docx
<b>4.5_Country reports 2014</b>
<b>4.5.1_Uganda</b>
4.5.1.1_1_WEPIII UGANDA 2014 Annual_report draft.docx
4.5.1.2_WEPIII Audit report 2014.pdf.pdf
<b>4.5.2_Nepal</b>
4.5.2.1_Annual Report (Jan-Dec) 2014.docx
4.5.2.2_Annex- 1 CA election Report.docx
4.5.2.3_Annex-2 Contribution on Women Empowerment Framework.docx
4.5.2.4_Audit Report Dec'14.pdf
<b>4.5.3_Ethiopia</b>
4.5.3.1_GA report_FSF project_April 2014_FINAL (2).docx
4.5.3.2_2014 Annual Report-BERCHI.doc
4.6_20141204 Internal Mid-term review meeting.docx
4.7_20150119 TA reports 2014.xlsx
4.8_2015 Planning Mtg Flip Charts Write Ups.docx
<b>5_2014_OVERALL LEARNING</b>
<b>5.1_GENDER</b>
5.1.1_CARE Global Gender WHS Position 030315_EB.docx
5.1.2 Women's Empowerment Overview Brief 2009
<b>5.2_CLIMATE CHANGE</b>
5.2.1_201406 CARE PMERL revised manual.pdf
5.2.2_201406 PECCN ACRES position paper INTERNAL.pdf
5.2.3_201406 PECCN CBA in practice.pdf
5.2.4_201408 C ETH CVCA for program dec-making.pdf
5.2.5_201409 PECCN eradicating poverty and cc.pdf
5.2.6_201409 PECCN gender equality and climate justice.pdf
5.2.7_201411 PECCN expactations COP20 Lima.pdf
5.2.8_201412 PECCN double injustice cc gender.pdf
<b>5.3_WOMEN PEACE &amp; SECURITY</b>
5.3.1_Vienna Symposium Policy paper (final).pdf
5.3.2_Vienna Symposium_Outcome_Document_draft_CARE_comments.docx
5.3.4_CARE_beyond 2015-final.pdf
<b>5.4_GBV</b>
5.4.1_GBV Impact report.pdf
5.4.2_GBV stratregy draft 4.docx
<b>5.5_PSYCHOSOCIAL</b>
<b>5.5.1_PS Training</b>
5.5.1.1_PsychosocialTrainingEthiopia2014.docx
5.5.1.2_CARE_AUSTRIA_Psychosocial Guidelines Handout.docx
5.5.1.3_ETH HANDOUT M AND E PS Wellbeing.docx
5.5.2_CARE PS Case Management Draft.docx

5.5.3_IASC MHPSS ME Logframe development work rep 2014.docx
5.5.4_Interventions Article on PS WB.pdf
<b>5.6_ENGAGING MEN&amp;BOYS</b>
5.6.1_CARE EMB Brief 1.pdf
5.6.2_CARE EMB Brief 2.pdf
5.6.3_20140917 EMB GLP presentation.pptx
5.6.4_Engaging Men and Boys GED 501 Manual (2).pdf
5.6.5_Learning con EMB presentation _Gupta.pptx
<b>5.6.7_EMB Global Learning</b>
CARE EMB Brief 1_Final.pdf
CARE EMB Brief 2_Final.pdf
CARE EMB learning project report two wheels.docx
CARE EMB learning rep two wheels annexes.docx
EMB video questions.docx
Key EMB links.docx
<b>5.6.8_Learning Conference</b>
2nd MenEngage Workshop Evaluation Summary_qualitative.docx
2nd MenEngage Workshop Evaluation Summary_quantitative.docx
20150202 FP Learning Conference Report_draft.docx
All report sheets.docx
Annex 11 - Austria (Global Learning EMB and CCRLA).pptx
Annex 12 - Ethiopia (Berchi progress update).pptx
Annex 13 - Nepal (Engaging Men in Sakcham).pptx
Annex 14 - Uganda (Male Engage Initiative).ppt
Changed attitudes and assumptions.docx
Learning Conf Eval Form_Results.docx
MenEngage_brief.docx
Word Clouds.docx
5.6.9_Protokoll_Engaging Men_25 09 2014-final.pdf
<b>5.7_Cambodia (NEPAL)</b>
5.7.1_ReportLearningConCambodia_Shah.docx
5.7.2_Short Report Gender CoP, Cambodia - ADA.docx
5.7.3_CambodiaLearningCon_PsychosocialProgram_Shah.pptx
<b>7_2015_OVERALL LEARNING</b>
<b>7.1_PROGRAM RESEARCH</b>
7.1.1_20150209 LiteratureReview_draft.docx
7.1.2_20150220 LiteratureResearch_final.docx
7.1.3_Datassist Sakcham III Recommendations.pdf
7.1.4_DRAFT A Successful Anti-poverty strategy Practitioner report_EB.docx
7.1.5_INTERNAL REPORT revised BH 151214.docx
<b>7.2_CLIMATE CHANGE</b>
7.2.1_201501 CARE et al Six issues facing CC and FS.pdf
7.2.2_201504 PECCN ACRES approach paper INTERNAL.pdf
7.2.3_201504 PECCN ACRES SuPER principles paper INTERNAL.pdf

7.3_GBV strategy draft 4.docx
<b>7.4_PSYCHOSOCIAL</b>
7.4.1_PS Wellbeing Report for distribution.pdf
7.4.2_Achieving our vision_PS Brief 2020 final.docx
<b>B) TO BE CATEGORISED - .msg files converted; .pub file sent by CARE.</b>
4.3.4_Final Report - CARE Nepal's Rapid Participatory Gender Audit .msg
2013_RE procurement of consultancy attachmnets.msg
2013_RE This weeks discussion topic Husbands Engagement.msg
2013_This weeks discussion topic Husbands Engagement.msg
2014_FW sharing on transformer netowrk.msg
FW Short Experience report and Presentation regarding Psychosocial activity at Cambodia Gender CoP workshop with in the CARE Interanational.msg
RE SKYPE Learning from measuring the impact of GBV programs.msg
Re This weeks discussion topic Husbands Engagement Uganda.msg
Re This weeks discussion topic Husbands Engagement Uganda2.msg
20141015 Holistic Model.pub
<b>C) OTHER DOCS SENT BY CARE (NOT REORGANIZED)</b>
20090925_Programmdoc_final.pdf
20121119_Framework_Program_FINAL.pdf
20140328_concept note_BK.docx
All logframes AUT901.docx
AUT902HolisticModel2014.pdf
Berchi_MHPSS_TOT_Training FINAL_Report_May_2015-2.doc
CARE 2020 Program Strategy.pdf
CARE Osterreich Strategie 2013.pdf
Datassist Sakcham III Recommendations.pdf
Design Workshop Phase III.doc
EOI PHase IV.docx
Further Scenario Development_Final.docx
Kirumara Analysis Sept 1.pdf
LINKS & Cost Benefit
Protokoll Planung Phase IV.docx
Section 4 Table Baseline Results.pdf
SURVEY MONKEY
VSLA Discussion Manual July 11.docx
Women's Empowerment Overview Brief 2009.pdf
contact list for External Review AUT902_EB highlights.docx
Endline Uganda (ID 14893)-PT.docx
F survey 2014 final.docx
HH survey 2014.doc
M survey final.docx
Qualitative report Uganda DRAFT for comments.docx

#### **ANNEX 4 - LIST OF PEOPLE CONSULTED FOR THE REVIEW**

**Information was gathered from 31 people through:**

16 interviews: 4 face to face interviews, 1 telephone interview, 11 Skype interviews.

11 responses from completed online Survey Monkey questionnaires.

4 email responses

**List of people contacted between 9 June 2015 and 5 August 2015 for the FPIII external review:**

<b>Stakeholder Details</b>	<b>Method of Contact</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>CARE AUSTRIA</b>		
<b>Elisabeth Schreiber, FPIII Program Coordinator</b>	In Vienna, email, Skype	<b>Interview</b>
<b>Elizabeth Brezovich – FPIII</b>	In Vienna, email, Skype	<b>Interview</b>

<b>Gender Advisor and Program Coordinator</b>		
<b>Janine Wurzer – FPIII Psychosocial Advisor</b>	In Vienna, email, Skype	<b>Interview</b>
<b>Stefan Mielke Climate Change Advisor</b>	In Vienna	<b>Interview</b>
<b>Daniel Seller, Programs Director</b>	In Vienna, email, Skype	<b>Interview</b>
<b>Pablo Torija, Consultant</b>	Email, Skype	<b>Interview</b>
<b>Valerie Neuhold-Maurer, Program Officer</b>	Email	
<b>Marisa Tasser, Advocacy Officer</b>	Email	
<b>Thomas Haunschmid, Head of Advocacy &amp; Communications</b>	Email	
<b>UGANDA</b>		
<b><u>CARE Country Office</u></b>		
<b>Rose Amulen, Programme Manager WEP III, Gulu Office, CARE Uganda</b>	Email for Interview	<b>Skype Interview</b>
<b>Moses Owuri, M&amp;E officer WEP III, Gulu Office, CARE Uganda</b>	Email for Interview	<b>Skype Interview</b>
<b>Rose Nyakato</b>	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	<b>3 (1 executive staff, 1 field staff, 1 did not disclose)</b>
<b>Dennis Mwaka</b>	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	
<b>Elizabeth Katusiime</b>	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	
<b>Jacky Ackong</b>	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	
<b>John Perry</b>	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	
<b><u>Partner Organisation</u></b>		
<b>John Paul Oola, GWED G formerly VISO</b>	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	<b>1 response</b>
<b>Prossy , GWED G</b>	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	
<b>Betty Akullo, WORUDET</b>	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	
<b>Betty Akullo, Executive Director, WORUDET</b>	Email for interview	<b>Skype Interview</b>
<b>NEPAL</b>		
<b><u>CARE Country Office</u></b>		
<b>Lex Kassenberg, CARE Nepal</b>	Email request for interview sent	Declined owing to emergency in Nepal
<b>Indu Pant, CARE Nepal</b>	Email request for interview sent	
<b>Bandana Khand</b>	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	<b>4 responses (all executive staff)</b>
<b>Gupta KC</b>	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	
<b>Indu Pant</b>	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	
<b>Cathy Riley</b>	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	

<b>Partner organization</b>		
Sharmila, Former Project Coordinator RWSC – Rural Women’s Service Centre	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	
Govinda Dhawal Project coordinator DSDC - Dalit Social Development Centre	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	<b>1 response</b>
Pampha Puri, Project Coordinator RWSC – Rural Women’s Service Centre	Email for Interview	<b>Skype Interview</b>
<b>ETHIOPIA</b>		
Esther Watts, Programme Director, CARE Ethiopia	Email	<b>Skype Interview</b>
Helal Huq, Chief of Party, FS+ (Food Security Plus which includes BERCHI, responsible for M&E), CARE Ethiopia	Email	<b>Skype Interview</b>
Fanaye GebriHiwot, Gender Adviser, FSFP (Food security for poor farmers - BERCHI), CARE Ethiopia.	Email	<b>Skype Interview</b>
Askalemariam	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	<b>2 responses received (field staff)</b>
Girma T	Survey Monkey - Email & reminder	
<b>PARTNERS</b>		
Andrea Schmid, Head of Unit Civil Society & International ADA	Email	<b>Phone Interview</b>
Christina Stummer, Gender Advisor, ADA	Email, reminder sent	<b>Skype Interview</b>
Sonja Grabner, ADA	Email, reminder	
Ulrike Nguyen, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Austria	Email with questions sent; reminder sent	
Diana Wu, Gender Program Advisor CARE International	Email with questions sent	<b>Response received by email</b>
Magda Seewald, Consultant, VIDC - Vienna Institute for International Dialogue and Diplomacy	Email with questions sent	<b>Response received by email</b>
Godfrey Otobi, former employee CARE Uganda & consultant	Email with questions sent	<b>Skype interview</b>
Ursula Dullnig, WIDE	Email with questions sent	
Nikki de Zwaan, Gender Advisor, CARE Netherlands	Email with questions sent	<b>Response received by email</b>
John Crowner, CARE	Email with questions sent	

<b>Balkans</b>		
<b>Ingvild Oia, CARE Norway</b>	Email with questions sent	
<b>Benedicte Pete, CARE Norway</b>	Email with questions sent -	
<b>Howard Mollet, Senior Policy Advisor, CARE UK</b>	Email with questions sent -	<b>Response received by email</b>
<b>Lilian Mpabulungi, former employee of CARE Uganda and Ethiopia</b>	Email with questions sent	
<b>Ruth Ochieng, Isis-WICCE, Uganda</b>	Email with questions sent	
<b>Eshetu Kassie, Government of Ethiopia</b>	Email with questions sent	

## ANNEX 5

### PARTNERS' INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

**Q1: Please mention: ROLE / COUNTRY**

**Q2: How much did you participate in designing the Theory of Change (ToC) and Logical Framework (LF) of the program?**

**Q3: Do you think there is added value in the holistic approach (food security, economic empowerment, psycho-social care, climate change, engagement with men)? Are there components that you consider not relevant to your context? – What difference did it make for phase 3 of not having PSS as a separate result area?**

**Q4: How much is the holistic approach based on beneficiaries' needs assessments?**

**Q5: Do you think there is added value in the learning agenda?**

**Q6: How much is the learning agenda based on your organization's capacity assessment?**

**Q7: Please list effective and ineffective aspects of the program: a) in terms of women's empowerment b) in terms of learning agenda**

**Q8: Do you believe that money was well spent in relation to the Results achieved?**

**Q9: What are the key elements for the sustainability of the program for the 4<sup>th</sup> phase?**

**Q10: Do you believe the Indicators, MoV (means of verification), action plans and systems for M&E were properly formulated and followed? Why**

## ANNEX 6

### SURVEY MONKEY QUESTIONNAIRE

**Q1: Please enter your country and indicate whether you are executive/field staff**

**Q2: How did you participate in designing the Theory of Change (ToC) and the Logical Framework (LF) of the program?**

**Q3: Do you think there is added value in the holistic approach (food security, economic empowerment, psycho-social care, climate change, engagement with men)? Please elaborate. Are there components that you consider not relevant to your context?**

**Q4: How much is the holistic approach based on beneficiaries' needs assessments? Please provide an example if possible.**

**Q5: Please list effective and ineffective aspects of the program: a) in terms of women's empowerment; b) in terms of learning agenda**

**Q6: Do you think there is added value in the learning agenda? How much is the learning agenda based on your organization's capacity assessment?**

**Q7: Do you believe that money was well spent in relation to the results achieved? Do you have an example?**

**Q8: What are the key elements for the sustainability of the program?**

**Q9: Do you believe the Indicators, MoV (means of verification), action plans and systems for M&E (monitoring and evaluation) were properly formulated and followed? Please provide an example of one result indicator.**

**Q10: In case there was a 4th Phase of the Framework Program, what would be your main recommendations?**

## ANNEX 7 – THE KIRKPATRICK MODEL

### THE KIRKPATRICK MODEL

The ‘Kirkpatrick Model’ is a useful tool to think about **capacity building, learning and research** in terms of the ‘**change**’ that the learning aims at producing, while bearing well in mind the main **learning ‘stakeholders’** (organizations staff, organizations, beneficiaries of the work of such organizations, impact groups with whom the organizations work etc.). The ‘**Kirkpatrick model**’ to learning and education entails thinking about the different stages in the learning process both at individual (people taking part into the learning process) and organizational level. In this model, individual and organizational changes related to learning are formulated and measured by looking at different incremental steps (from Reaction, to Learning, to Behaviour and Organizational Change):

Key stages of Kirkpatrick	Reaction	Learning	Behaviour change	Organisational change
<b>Description of the changes</b>	It is the feel good factor at the end of an event. This is most commonly assessed at the end of a workshop or training event.	This is what has actually been absorbed and articulated by the participants and is what they feel is relevant to them.	This is the result of a participant applying the learning regularly over time and constantly, so that their behaviour has changed.	This is the result of the influence of the participant on the organisation so that the training has led to significant change in the organisation.
<b>Interventions and assessments</b>	End of workshop evaluation sheets, feedback forms.	Follow-up visits and mentoring for clarifying and articulating the learning assessments: questionnaires, visits.	Review practice and mistakes in trying to apply the learning. Gathering stories of change.	Organisational assessments; review; social audits; PQASSO benchmarking; case studies, stories of change.
<b>Timing</b>	End of training event.	3-6 months after the training.	3-12 months after the training.	9-18 months after the training.

Table from: INTRAC, November 2011, *Advanced Me&E Handbook, The Kirkpatrick Model for evaluating training and capacity building*, INTRAC: Oxford, page 60-62

To formulate and monitor a ‘**learning**’ project, thus, we should ideally have **outcomes and related Indicators** formulated in terms of:

- **Short term outcomes (Results – short term):** Improved knowledge of the staff thanks to the Learning agenda (specify content)
  - **Possible Indicators:**
    - Improved understanding of (specify) by trainees  
**MoV:** ex-ante and ex-post test results – closed questions
    - Increase in % of staff who are able to explain correctly the (specify)  
**MoV:** ex-ante and ex-post test results - open questions
    - Perception of increased knowledge of (specify) by trainees  
**MoV:** ex-ante and ex-post self-assessment

These Indicators are actually already monitored at the end of the individual trainings and correspond somehow to the 'Reaction' stage of the Kirkpatrick model.

Nevertheless, more medium and long term Indicators should be included, corresponding also to the further steps of the Kirkpatrick model (Learning; Behaviour Change; Organizational Change).

- **Medium term outcomes (Results – medium term):** Improved practices of the staff thanks to the Learning agenda (specify content)
  - **Possible Indicators:**
    - % of field staff who has introduced in his/her work i at least two of the three good learning he/she had planned to implement at the moment of finishing the training (specify)  
**MoV:** questionnaires (open questions) – 6 months after trainings compared to baseline (end of training)
    - At least 50% of field staff who is able to identify at least three examples of successful use of the acquired learning (specify)  
**MoV:** questionnaires (open + closed questions) – every 6 months
- **Long term outcomes (Programme Objective - endline):** Improved organizational culture in relation to the Holistic Approach
  - **Possible Indicators:**
    - Increase in % of executive staff showing a sense of ownership for the (specify)  
**MoV:** Interviews (FGDs with Executive Staff in relation to (specify) – baseline, mid-term, endline
    - Increase in % of Field Staff showing a sense of ownership for the (specify)  
**MoV:** Interviews (FGDs with Field Staff in relation to (specify) – baseline, mid-term, endline
    - The acquired learning (specify) is incorporated into plans, policies and practices of the organization  
**MoV:** Analysis plans, policies and practices of the organization

If then, the programme were aimed not only at increasing the organizational learning of affiliates and partners, but also intended – as in FPIII – to more ambitiously contribute the effectiveness and the quality of development programming, then CARE should also be establishing a longer term objective:

- **Long Term outcome (Overall Objective - beyond endline):** To contribute to improved quality and effectiveness of programme on the targeted beneficiaries
  - **Possible Indicators:**
    - The initiatives implemented through acquired learning (specify) are of better quality and more effective than initiatives implemented without (specify)  
**MoV:** Surveys, with control groups, at endline against baseline. Well planned from the baseline phase. This is actually the **type of analysis (on the effectiveness of the Holistic approach, with the use of 'control groups')** that the consultant Pablo Torija is carrying out on the endlines available for Nepal and Uganda in case of FP III. The use of control group is very innovative – more and more donors and implementing agencies are using it to better discern the impact of 'their' program from that of other programs – even if it is quite challenging to identify groups that are really comparable.

- The (specify) is being taken on board in more programming initiatives within CARE, in Austria, in the targeted countries and regions, and internationally  
**MoV:** Evidence from reports, tool and methodology guidelines, etc.

**ANNEX 8 – Table of Recommendations**  
(see separate document in landscape format)