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Purpose of the meeting

• Part one
  • Introduce evaluation team & national evaluation reference group (NRG) members to each other
  • Present the objectives, scope and methodology of the joint evaluation
  • Review roles and responsibilities of NRG, EMG and evaluation team.

Part two

• Preliminary discussion of key evaluation questions
• Review reconstructed programme Theory of Change
Purpose of the evaluation

Assess the extent to which and under what circumstances (country context) the joint programme has accelerated the abandonment of FGM/C in programme countries over the last five years (2008-2012).

Ensure accountability to donors and other stakeholders.

A useful learning exercise.

Will provide UNICEF and UNFPA with insights into the successes and challenges in conducting joint programming and delivering jointly.
Objectives of the evaluation

To assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the holistic approach adopted by the joint programme.

To assess the adequacy and quality of the inter-agency coordination mechanisms at the global, regional and country levels.

To provide recommendations for a broader programming and partnership to further accelerate the achievements of FGM/C eradication roles.

To identify lessons learned, capture good practices, and generate knowledge to determine the shape of future joint programming on FGM/C.
1. The evaluation will cover the implementation and the results of the joint programme during the period 2008-2012.

2. The evaluation will cover all four levels of the programme scope and their interconnections:
   - Community level
   - National level
   - Regional level
   - Global level
3. Detailed country case studies will be conducted in four countries where the joint programme has been implemented: Kenya, Sudan, Senegal and Burkina Faso

Selection Criteria:
- Country entry date (2008-2009)
- Implementation rate
- Country context
- Geographical distribution
- Language
### Country entry date in the FGM/C joint programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Djibouti</td>
<td>9 - Burkina Faso</td>
<td>13 - Eritrea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Egypt</td>
<td>10 - Gambia</td>
<td>14 - Mali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Ethiopia</td>
<td>11 - Uganda</td>
<td>15 - Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Guinea</td>
<td>12 - Somalia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Guinea Bissau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Senegal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2007 estimated budget:** 44 million USD
- **2013 estimated budget:** 32 million USD
As of April 2012, approximately **20.6 million USD** have been implemented by both agencies.
Evaluation criteria

- Evaluating Effectiveness
- Evaluating Efficiency
- Evaluating Sustainability
- Evaluating Relevance
- Evaluating Coordination
### Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ1: How relevant has the programme been to national and community needs, priorities and commitments as well as to the global and regional priorities and commitments of UNFPA, UNICEF and key international stakeholders?</td>
<td>Relevance (including programme design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2: To what extent has the programme contributed to: the creation of sustainable favourable conditions and changes in social norms leading to the abandonment of FGM/C at the national and community levels and to strengthening the global movement towards abandonment of FGM/C in one generation?</td>
<td>Effectiveness and sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3: To what extent have the outputs of the joint programme been achieved or are likely to be achieved with the appropriate amount of resources/inputs?</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4: To what extent are the benefits and achievements of the joint program in terms of national ownership, leadership, scalability and partnerships are likely to continue after the programme has ended?</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 5: How efficient and effective was the coordination between UNFPA and UNICEF at the global, regional and country levels in view of achieving the joint programme's results?</td>
<td>Effectiveness, efficiency and coordination between UNFPA and UNICEF (including programme management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 6: How efficient and effective was the management of the joint programme at global, regional and country levels?</td>
<td>Effectiveness, efficiency and coordination between UNFPA and UNICEF (including programme management)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methods of Data collection

- Review of documents and secondary data
- Key informant interviews (global, regional, national)
- Survey and ‘virtual focus groups’ (11 countries not covered by country case studies)
- 4 Country case studies (including consultations at national and community levels)
Evaluation governance
The role of the national reference group

Mandate
To provide impartial and constructive feedback on the products of the evaluation, thus contributing to enhance the overall quality and utility of the joint exercise.

The role of the national reference group:

- serve as a resource group for the evaluation and facilitate access to information, and documentation
- assist in identifying external stakeholders to be consulted during the evaluation process.
- participate in the briefing and debriefing meetings as per the evaluation team’s request.
- provide comments (possible factual errors and omissions) and substantive feedback to ensure the quality of the Sudan Country Case Study Report;
- contribute to disseminating the findings of the evaluation and follow-up action planning
The evaluation process

Preparation
- Drafting of terms of reference
- Selection and recruitment of the evaluation team

Design & Desk Review
- Draft inception report
- Pilot mission
- Final inception report

Data collection & field visits
- 4 field missions
- Preparation of draft country reports
- Preparation of final country reports

Reporting
- Preparation of draft final evaluation report
- Preparation of final evaluation report

Dissemination & follow-up
- Management response
- Stakeholder workshop
Deliverables

The evaluation deliverables are the following:

- Inception report
- Four country case study reports
- Final evaluation report
Anticipated Timeline

Remaining 3 Site visits – Jan./Feb. 2013
3 Draft Country Case Study Reports – Feb./March 2013
Final Country Case Study Reports – early April 2013
Draft Evaluation Report – late April 2013
Final Evaluation Report - June 2013
Stakeholder Workshop - July 2013
The evaluation team & Joint EMG

Joint evaluation management group (EMG)
Alexandra Chambel | Chair, Evaluation Adviser, UNFPA
Krishna Belbase | Senior Evaluation Specialist, UNICEF
Olivia Roberts | Assisting the EMG, UNFPA

Case study team:
Ellen Gruenbaum | Senior Gender and FGM/C Expert
Samia Elnagar | National Consultant
Akram Abbas | National Consultant
Krishna Belbase | EMG, Senior Evaluation Specialist, UNICEF

Evaluation team
Anette Wenderoth | Team Leader and Gender Expert
Ellen Gruenbaum | Senior Gender and FGM/C Expert
Monica Trevino | Senior Evaluation Specialist
Silvia Grandi | Evaluation Specialist
Carolyn Rumsey | Research Assistant
Evaluation of the UNFPA-UNICEF Joint Programme on Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C)

http://www.unfpa.org/public/home/about/Evaluation/EPIER/TE/pid/10103

Any other questions?

Contact us: chambel@unfpa.org; kbelbase@unicef.org

THANK YOU!