

Independent External Final Evaluation Report

By

**Dr. Carroll Patterson &
Ms. Patharaporn Theeratham**

For

**United Nations Joint Programme “Every Home a Safe Home:
Supporting Thailand Towards Effective Implementation of
Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act B.E. 2550 (2007)”**

Implemented by UN Women, UNDP and UNFPA



Funded by the UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women



For questions and inquiries, please contact Dr. Carroll Patterson at cpatterson@socha.net

Description Page

Programme/Programme Name(s)	Final Evaluation of Every Home a Safe Home: Supporting Thailand Towards Effective Implementation of Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act B.E. 2550 (2007)
Programme/Programme Location(s)	Bangkok (Dusit and Klongsaan districts) and Phang-Nga Thailand (Takua Pa and Tai Muang districts)
Evaluation Contract Supervision	UN Trust Fund Asia and Pacific Regional Focal Point
Names of Programme/Programme Executants	1) UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women 2) UN Population Fund 3) UN Development Programme
Programme/Programme Budget Sources and Amounts (in USD)	Total Amount: \$1,277,651 Contribution from UNTF: \$ 999,651 Partner Contribution: \$278,000
Programme/Programme Duration	1 February 2010 to 31 October 2013
Evaluation Contract Number:	CFC-ROAP-2015-11 and CFC-ROAP-2015-12
Evaluation Duration	27 March 2015 to 14 June 2015
Name of Evaluator(s)	Dr. Carroll Patterson Patharaporn Theeratham

Acronyms

BPFA	Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
DV	Domestic Violence
GBV	Gender Based Violence
GEM	Gender Empowerment Measure
GDI	Gender-related Development Index
JP	Joint Programme
KAP	Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices
LoA	Letter of Agreement
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MoE	Ministry of Education
MoI	Ministry of Interior
MoJ	Ministry of Justice
MPH	Ministry of Public Health
MSDHS	Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
MSC	Most Significant Change
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
OAG	Office of Attorney General
OBEC	Office of Basic Education Commission
OSCC	One Stop Crisis Centre
OWAFD	Office of Women's Affairs and Family Development
ProDoc	Programme Document
RTP	Royal Thai Police
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women (currently UN Women)
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (formerly UNIFEM)
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNTF	United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women
VAW	Violence Against Women
VAW/G	Violence Against Women and Girls
WHRs	Women's Human Rights

Contents

Description Page.....	i
Acronyms	ii
Contents	iii
Executive Summary.....	v
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	10
Background/Description of the Project.....	10
Context.....	11
Scale and Complexity.....	11
Partner Budgets and Activities	12
Evaluation Scope of Work.....	13
Methodology	14
Challenges and Limitations.....	15
Chapter 2: Relevance Findings	15
Conclusions and Recommendations	18
Chapter 3: Effectiveness Findings	18
Output 1.1: Multi-sectoral coordination mechanism at the national and in the pilot areas standardised and adopted.....	19
Output 1.2: Quality monitoring and reporting system in place	21
Output 2.1: Knowledge on GBV/DV, DV Act, and gender responsive protection and support services of trained staff of multi-sectoral agencies in central administration and the pilot areas and of community-based organisations/civil society organisations in the pilot areas increased by 75 %	24
Output 2.2: Skills of responsible staff of multi-sectoral agencies in the pilot areas on usage of coordinated protocol, screening and referral practices, specialised services, including that of community peer educators/CSOs in organising community response system to end VAW/G increased by 75 %	26
Output 2.3: Awareness of multi-sectoral agencies staff and communities who are primary prevention of DV in the pilot areas increased by 75 %	28
Conclusions and Recommendations	29
Chapter 4: Efficiency Findings	30
Conclusions and Recommendations	xxxv
Chapter 5: Sustainability and Impact Findings:.....	xxxvi
Sustainability of Outcome 1	xxxvii
Sustainability of Outcome 2	xxxvii
Impact in Phang Nga.....	xxxviii
Conclusions and Recommendations	xl
Annex 1: Terms of Reference.....	xliii
Annex 2: List of Persons Interviewed	lii
Annex 3: List of Documents Received and Consulted.....	lv
Annex 4: Evaluator Profiles and CV	lviii
Team Leader - Carroll Patterson, PhD.....	lviii
Evaluation Expert - Patharaporn Theeratham	lxv
Annex 5: Evaluation Matrix.....	lxx

Annex 6: Logical Framework..... 2

Executive Summary

Thailand's domestic violence law, the Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act (DV Act), was promulgated in 2550 (2007).¹ The Act requires different government agencies to work together in a multi-sectoral mechanism approach to provide protection and support to victims of domestic violence, notably, the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS), Ministry of Public Health (MPH), Ministry of Justice (MoJ), Office of the Attorney General (OAG), the Royal Thai Police (RTP) and other related service providers. The United Nations Country Team (UNCT) in Thailand, with support of the United Nations Trust Fund (UNTF) to End Violence Against Women, and with the aforementioned partners in the Royal Thai Government, implemented the Joint Programme "Every Home a Safe Home: Supporting Thailand Towards Effective Implementation of Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act B.E. 2550 (2007) from January 2010 – October 2013" (hereafter JP). The JP's goal was to ensure that women and girls in Thailand facing domestic violence receive well-functioning and support services through rights-based and gender responsive implementation of DV Act. The JP contributed to two outcomes: (1) Multi-sectoral coordination mechanism amongst the DV Act implementing partners is improved, and (2) Capacity of multi-sectoral coordination mechanism to provide well-coordinated, rights-based and gender sensitive protection and support services in the DV Act implementation are increased. The UN participating agencies were: the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women). UN Women assumed the role of the Administrative Agent.

Two independent evaluation consultants were commissioned to conduct an external final evaluation of the JP at the end of March, 2015 until early June, 2015. The overall purposes of this evaluation were to assess:

- Relevance: extent to which the objectives of JP were consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country-needs and global priorities;
- Effectiveness: extent to which stated project goal, outcomes and outputs were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance; external factors which have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes and the project goals;
- Efficiency: measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) were converted to results.
- Sustainability: The probability of continued long-term benefits from the JP; the resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time; and
- Impact: positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the JP, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

The intended use of the evaluation is to (1) feed into UNCT programming on violence against women (VAW) in the future in Thailand and the work of other stakeholders and (2) provide accountability to the UNTF for the funds entrusted to the UNCT Thailand as well as contributing to knowledge pool in UNTF in terms of lesson learnt for future VAW programming. The evaluation may also be used by the Office of Women's Affairs and Family Development (OWAFD) and the Sub-committee on the Elimination and Prevention of Domestic Violence (chaired by OWAFD), and by line ministries and UN Participating Agencies to the JP, for making decisions on the future direction and design of policies and programmes to

¹ Most of the information on the background, context and scale/complexity sections has been taken from the original Joint Programme Document as well as its Final Report.

end domestic violence for women and girls particularly in the context of the DV Act and its implementation/revision.

During the evaluation period, the team interviewed and met with 33 relevant stakeholders (see Annex 2 for the complete list), visited the UN Women, UNFPA and UNDP offices, conducted site visits to pilot sites, including One Stop Crisis Centres (OSCCs), local official offices, NGO centres and schools in Dusit, Takua Pa and Tia Muang districts, visited respondents at MPH, Ministry of Education (MoE), MSDHS, OAG and various officers within the RTP. The team also received and consulted more than 30 documents.

Findings of the Evaluation

Relevance

Overall, the JP was extremely relevant to the national context responding to the need to support key aspects of implementing the DV Act and involved most, if not all, of the relevant national government stakeholders associated with the Act. All three UN agencies also brought relevant experience to bear on the JP. However, the JP did not develop a theory of change, which translated into a clear lack of implementation strategy and confusion around how the various components of the JP Log Frame and associated partner activities would work together and complement each other. The definition of who was the target group and how they could be helped was also unclear. Finally, the JP faced an inherent challenge in that the main agency designated to coordinate the implementation of the Act had limited leadership and management capacity to do so. This reality raises questions around the overall design of the JP, the absence of capacity building activities within OWAFFD, and which UN agency was best positioned to navigate this challenge.

Efficiency

The JP was efficient in terms of its ability to identify and mobilize high quality expertise across its various activities at relative low costs. In spite of this efficiency in mobilizing expertise, the overall ambitiousness of the JP's goals and the plethora of stakeholders involved, meant the programme was considerably under resourced. In particular, the "learning" aspects of the JP, such as lessons learned workshops, M&E activities and proof of concept studies, did not receive proper allocation and were not adequately implemented. Project management and implementation timing were also issues, as long delays in launching activities combined with rushed deliveries lowered the quality of JP's activities (e.g. training and piloting) and created tensions within the partnership. As such, the JP would have greatly benefited from a full-time programme coordinator, which would of course required more resources, but may have also better managed the implementation process, ensured greater coordination, documentation, sequencing and overall stronger planning.

Effectiveness

Overall, the JP had a strong track record of implementing various training and awareness raising activities across a wide spectrum of stakeholders. Notable outputs were the Operating Guidelines for the Implementation of DV Act, high quality policy training (targeting line ministry officers on DV Act and operating guideline), a standardized screening and referral system for victims of DV at OSCCs, high quality training materials (e.g.: gender-based violence, and DV & DV Act), a high quality publication on recommended relevant VAW/G indicators, and various case conferences involving a wide range of relevant respondents. However, a lack of a M&E system and program data prevented the evaluation from making any evidence-based claims on the JP's effectiveness in terms of the outcomes stated on its Logical Framework (e.g. a 75% increase in knowledge on GBV/DV). What is clear is that the awareness raising activities did leave a strong and favorable impression on the minds of its participants, literally years after the

activities had been completed as elaborated in the effectiveness section of this report. The strengths of the JP trainings was found in their ability to clearly articulate how to respond to DV abuses and identify where each stakeholder sat in a wider system of referral, support and service delivery. Another clear outcome was that many DV prevention and protection networks were strengthened as many of the trainings brought together multi-agency stakeholders who interacted with each other for the first time.

However, due to a lack of coordination and overall lack of strategic focus, the evaluation team could not establish that these activities combined to achieve Outcomes 1 and 2. Instead, many activities occurred in isolation of the others and were not designed to feed into or complement each other in apparent ways. As such, the effectiveness of the JP should be understood more at the activity level but not at the stated outcome level.

Sustainability and Impact

The JP experience has clearly heightened awareness of the importance of the DV Act and helped provide a clear experiential reference point for various stakeholders to advance its implementation. Although many of the activities launched by the JP were already occurring in various forms around Thailand, the JP notably hastened these nascent processes (e.g. coordination among multi-sectoral professionals and capacity building), provided more clarity and expanded previously established networks.

However, given the ad hoc nature of many of these activities, their short time frame and lack of follow up, most of the relevant agencies and organizations have returned to previous “stove piped” (i.e. the isolation of activities from each other) practices. Although the individual activities advanced under the JP did lead to some meaningful outputs and results, the evaluation team found very little evidence that any of these activities left an impact on indirect beneficiaries (e.g. victims) and were sustained by the main target groups (those involved in the implementation of the DV Act). Overall, most activities were viewed as one-off events that have not occurred since the JP was completed. Aside from some training materials (some of which were never used), a potential follow on JP would find itself mostly starting from scratch. There still may be an opportunity to consolidate some of the lessons learned by the JP, which may contribute to identifying additional longer-lasting sustainability and impacts.

Although the JP did not explicitly identify impact indicators, more reported DV cases could indicate potential impact on the improved monitoring and reporting system. Yet current information systems that capture domestic violence data do not demonstrate any meaningful impacts in one of the Pilot Areas, Phang-Nga. However it is unclear if this is due to reporting issues or if the JP lacked the potency to make a significant impact, or both. Nevertheless, the potential to use current information systems administered by MSDHS to confirm/reject programme impact in the future is high.

Recommendations are proposed to three key JP stakeholder groups:

UNCT in Thailand and UN Participating Agencies should consider

1. Explicitly clarifying a strategic focus (e.g. prevention vs. protection and the linkages between the two) by articulating a clear programme theory of change and ensuring that all relevant stakeholders are made aware of this theory of change.
2. Dedicating more resources when working with MSDHS to build the internal capacity of OWAFD to ensure better coordination among various other ministries and policy implementation.

3. Supporting a local organization to implement a national as well as local lessons learned JP review exercise given the substantial interest for this initiative.
4. Consolidating and documenting lessons learned from the JP and disseminating the findings to all relevant stakeholders in line with the previous recommendation to hold a national lessons learned conference.
5. Ensuring that Letters of Agreement are in place as part of a preparation phase before implementation is scheduled to begin.
6. Providing support to advance knowledge of the DV Act within the OAG, especially at the local levels, through a similar case conference approach that is enhanced with more legal expertise.
7. Ensuring that high level ministerial support is obtained prior to implementation of activities that require collaboration from its mid-level officials
8. Ensuring that M&E systems, baseline/endline data, and performance management systems are in place, especially when implementing pilot activities, to ensure that adequate lessons are learned to support a proof of concept.
9. Supporting further efforts of the RTP to introduce a sustained and formal DV Act training module for inquiry officers and line police across Thailand. This may take the form of a decentralized model in which a provincial representative may be designated as the focal point for sustaining the training.
10. Designing future awareness raising efforts with sustainability concerns in mind by not only ensuring that printed materials are produced, but also that these efforts are housed within their appropriate organisational bodies, that responsible staff positions are identified (as opposed to specific individuals, who come and go) and that periodic reviews and updates occur. Conversely, one-off events and trainings that lack follow up and are externally administered should be avoided.
11. Exploring how the MSDHS database could be improved to provide a comprehensive DV referral tracking mechanism across DV Act stakeholders. This should include efforts to increase its user-friendliness, functionality and overall compliance across organizational bodies, as well as include the ability to identify previous victims who may enter the system through other entry points. In doing so, explore how to coordinate the information captured in this database with other systems, such as those maintained by the Ministry of Interior (MoI)
12. Using the database as a power impact evaluation tool to gauge the effectiveness of programmes like the JP and facilitate multi-stakeholder learning on their own effectiveness.

UNTF should consider

1. Revising budget guidelines to allow allocation of resources for a full time programme/project coordinator when implementing inter-agency programmes/ projects such as the JP.
2. Supporting integrated program designs that clearly demonstrate how various activities complement each other and combine to achieve higher results
3. Making mid-course corrections by shifting resources to appropriate UN agencies that have necessary arrangements in place rather than granting no cost extensions to those that do not.

Royal Thai Government Ministries and Stakeholders should consider

1. Updating the Operating Guidelines as well as holding a national lessons learned conference
2. Establishing a stronger, multi-sectoral monitoring database system

3. Institutionalizing a sustainable process of VAW/G indicator data collection, coordination, etc. on an annual basis
4. Providing support to advance knowledge of the DV Act within the OAG, especially at the local levels
5. Supporting further efforts of the RTP to introduce a sustained and formal DV Act training module for inquiry.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Background/Description of the Project

Thailand's domestic violence law, the Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act (DV Act), was promulgated in 2550 (2007).² The Act requires different government agencies to work together in a multi-sectoral mechanism approach to provide protection and support to victims of domestic violence, notably, the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS), Ministry of Public Health (MPH), Ministry of Justice (MoJ), Office of the Attorney General (OAG), the Royal Thai Police (RTP) and other related service providers. The United Nations Country Team (UNCT) in Thailand, with support of the United Nations Trust Fund (UNTF) to End Violence Against Women, and with the aforementioned partners in the Royal Thai Government, implemented the Joint Programme "Every Home a Safe Home: Supporting Thailand Towards Effective Implementation of Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act B.E. 2550 (2007) from January 2010 – October 2013" (hereafter JP). The UN participating Agencies were: the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women, formerly UNIFEM). UN Women assumed the role of the Administrative Agent.

The goal of the JP was for women and girls facing domestic violence (DV) to receive well-functioning protection and support services through rights-based and gender responsive implementation of the Domestic Violence Act. The logical framework is attached below in Annex 6. As per the logical framework, JP had two expected outcomes and five corresponding outputs as follows:

- **Outcome 1:** Multi-sectoral coordination mechanism amongst DV Act implementing partner improved by 2013 (per the JP extension)
 - Output 1.1 Multi-sectoral coordination mechanism at the national and in the pilot areas standardized and adopted.
 - Output 1.2 Quality monitoring and reporting system in place
- **Outcome 2:** Capacity of the multi-sectoral mechanism to provide well-coordinated, rights-based and gender sensitive protection and services in the DV Act implementation increased by 50% in 2012-2013
 - Output 2.1 Knowledge on GBV/DV, DV Act and gender responsive protection and support services of trained staff of multi-sectoral agencies in central administration and the pilot areas and of community-based organizations /civil society organizations in the pilot areas increased by 75%
 - Output 2.2 Skills of responsible staff of multi-sectoral agencies in the pilot areas on usage of coordination protocol, screening and referral practices, specialized services, including that of community peer educators/CBOs/CSOs in organizing community response system to end VAW/G increased by 75%
 - Output 2.3 Awareness of multi-sectoral agencies staff and communities who are campaign targets on WHRs and primary prevention of DV in the pilot areas increased by 75%

JP used a multi-pronged strategy of advocacy, capacity development, awareness-raising and piloting the implementation of the DV Act with rights-based and gender-responsive approach.

² Most of the information on the background, context and scale/complexity sections has been taken from the original Joint Programme Document as well as its Final Report.

Pilot sites were in the provinces of Bangkok and Phang Nga. All these strategies aimed to enhance the effectiveness of the multi-sectoral response mechanism to domestic violence as stipulated in the DV Act and strengthen the accountability system for the government at the national and local levels.

Context

The JP was born in the context of high levels of Thai domestic violence. Research on women's health and violence in intimate partnerships, publicized in 2003, revealed that 23 percent of women in the capital city, and 34 percent in another province, admitted to having been physically abused by their intimate partners in their lifetime.³ Statistics of MPH also show that the numbers of children and women facing violence and seeking medical treatment at the Ministry's One-Stop Crisis Centers (OSCCs) in 2007 amounted to 19,068, about half of which are women. Of the children, a large majority (80.98%) were girls. Those numbers continue to rise. The 2009 data from the National Survey on Reproductive Health revealed that married women aged 15-19 suffered violence from their husbands twice as much as women from older age groups and the majority of them had education below secondary level⁴.

In July 2007, the Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act BE 2550 (2007) was finally promulgated and came into force. Article 276 of the Penal Code was also amended in the same year to extend the penalty for rape to, among others, cases of marital rape. Since the adoption of the Act and prior to the JP, MSDHS had set up the Operation Centre for the Prevention of Domestic Violence as the focal point to coordinate the multiple agencies that need to be engaged for an effective DV response. In 2008, MSDHS, MoJ and MPH jointly launched a National Plan of Action for the Protection of Persons Affected by Domestic Violence. The plan included advocacy for the establishment of a Sub-committee on Elimination and Prevention of Domestic Violence under the National Committee on Policy and Strategies for the Family, which is responsible for developing national policies to facilitate effective implementation of the Act. MSDHS has also issued guidelines for coordination among different agencies responsible for the multi-sectoral implementation of the DV Act.

As part of the justification for the ProDoc of this JP, it was identified that after three years of promulgation, implementation of the Act still faced major challenges: lack of understanding and knowledge of the Act amongst coordinating agencies, lack of rights-based and gender sensitive perspective of the agencies involved in the implementation of the law, fragmentation in the coordination mechanism both at the national and provincial levels, lack of strategic information and data to address violence against women and broad based understanding of the general public on gender equality, violence against women and domestic violence, a need to broaden space for civil society participation in the monitoring and support on the implementation of the domestic violence law. At a recent evaluation validation meeting held June 8, 2015 with the evaluation team, stakeholders reiterated the complexity of the DV Act implementation and its coordination.

Scale and Complexity

JP launched a multi-pronged strategy of advocacy, training, awareness-raising, and piloting the implementation of the DV Act with rights-based and gender-responsive approaches. All these strategies aimed to enhance the effectiveness of the multi-sectoral response mechanism to domestic violence as stipulated in the DV Act and strengthen the accountability system of the government at the national and local levels.

³ Kritaya Archavanichkul et. al., 2003 (2546 B.E.), *Kvam roonraeng nai chivit kboo kap sukabhap phuying* (Violence in intimate relationships and women's health), A research report by Institute of Population and Social Research and Foundation for Women, Supported by WHO. (in Thai)

⁴ National Statistical Office, 2009 National Survey on Reproductive Health. Draft, obtained from UNFPA Thailand office 30 October 2009

Advocacy with government agencies and stakeholders was aimed at promoting understanding of and commitment to multi-sectoral implementation of the DV Act among government agencies. Training focused on rights-based and gender responsive approaches of law enforcement personnel and services providers at the national and local levels. The JP piloted models for multi-sectoral response and prevention at the sub-national levels in Bangkok and Phang Nga with the aim of creating a workable model of a multi-sectoral DV response mechanism and primary prevention activities at the local level with the rights-based perspective and gender-responsiveness.

The pilot areas, one in an urban and one in a rural setting, were selected for their track record of handling gender-based and domestic violence cases, and their potential to become the driver of the pilot coordinated response system in its locality have been selected. These were the Dusit District and Klong Saan Districts of Bangkok, and Takua Pa District and Tai Muang District of Phang-Nga province. The community-based group included CSOs and school students and teachers who were mobilized to work together to create awareness-raising campaigns against domestic violence. National women’s NGOs were involved to share their expertise with local groups on campaign management and local media production to be used in the awareness raising campaign.

Partner Budgets and Activities

According to Official Budgets sent to the evaluators, the budget for the JP fell primarily across three primary partners: UNDP, UN Women (formerly UNIFEM) and UNFPA. The total budget for the JP was \$1,277,651, of which \$999,651 was funded by UNTF and \$278,000 were partner contributions (MSDHS and UN Women). Broken down across three years, the budget is summarized as follows:

Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total for Each Partner
UNTF-UNDP	77,575	71,690	65,805	215,070
UNTF-UNFPA	65,484	69,793	50,504	185,781
UNTF-UNIFEM	227,262	206,143	165,395	598,800
Partner Contribution (MSDHS)	248,000	-	-	248,000
UNIFEM (UN Women) Contribution	10,000	10,000	10,000	30,000
Total Program Costs	370,321	347,626	281,704	1,277,651

The following chapters will have more detailed discussions about each partner activities. Those activities are summarized as follows:

UNDP primarily contributed to Outcome 1, Output 1.2: Quality monitoring and reporting system in place. UNDP had originally also planned to contribute to Outcome 2, Output 2.3: Awareness of multi-sectoral agencies staff and communities who are campaign targets on WHRs and primary prevention of DV in the pilot areas increased by 75%, but subsequently withdrew their support for the associated activities due mainly to the uncertainty in extending the JP at that time. UNDP primarily worked with MSDHS.

UNFPA primarily focused on Outcome 2, Output 2.1: Knowledge on GBV/DV, DV Act and gender responsive protection and support services of trained staff of multi-sectoral agencies in central administration and the pilot areas and of community-based organizations /civil society organizations in the pilot areas increased by 75%; and Outcome 2, Output 2.2: Skills of responsible staff of multi-sectoral agencies in the pilot areas on usage of coordination protocol, screening and referral practices, specialized services, including that of community peer educators/CBOs/CSOs in organizing community response system to end VAW/G increased by 75%. These activities were particularly focused at the One Stop Crisis Centres (OSCCs) in public health facilities, and UNFPA primarily interfaced with MPH.

Finally, UN Women focused on Outcome 1, Output 1.1 Multi-sectoral coordination mechanism at the national and in the pilot areas standardized and adopted; Outcome 1, Output 1.2: Quality monitoring and reporting system in place (in cooperation with UNDP); Outcome 2, Output 2.1 Knowledge on GBV/DV, DV Act and gender responsive protection and support services of trained staff of multi-sectoral agencies in central administration and the pilot areas and of community-based organizations /civil society organizations in the pilot areas increased by 75% (in cooperation with UNFPA); Outcome 2, Output 2.2 Skills of responsible staff of multi-sectoral agencies in the pilot areas on usage of coordination protocol, screening and referral practices, specialized services, including that of community peer educators/CBOs/CSOs in organizing community response system to end VAW/G increased by 75% (also in cooperation with UNFPA). As the lead agency, UN Women interacted with all key partners at the national level, including MPH, MSDHS, MoE, OAG, the RTP, as well as civil society organizations (CSOs).

Through the combined Outputs and associated activities, the JP was intended to contribute Outcome 1: Multi-sectoral coordination mechanism amongst DV Act implementing partner improved by 2012; and Outcome 2: Capacity of the multi-sectoral mechanism to provide well-coordinated, rights-based and gender sensitive protection and services in the Domestic Violence Act implementation increased by 50% in 2012-2013.

Evaluation Scope of Work

Two independent consultants were commissioned to conduct the final evaluation of the JP at the end of March, 2015 until early June, 2015. The overall purposes of this evaluation were to assess:

- Relevance: extent to which the objectives of Joint Programme were consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country-needs and global priorities;
- Effectiveness: extent to which stated project goal, outcomes and outputs were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance; external factors which have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes and the project goals;
- Efficiency: measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) were converted to results.
- Sustainability: The probability of continued long-term benefits from the Joint Programme; the resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time; and
- Impact: positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the Joint Programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

As outlined in the TOR, the intended use of the evaluation is to (1) feed into UNCT programming on VAW in the future in Thailand and the work of other stakeholders and (2) provide accountability to the UNTF for the funds entrusted to the UNCT as well as contributing

to UNTF lesson learning for future VAW programming. The evaluation results may also be used by the Office of Women's Affairs and Family Development (OWAFD) and the Subcommittee on the Elimination and Prevention of Domestic Violence (chaired by OWAFD), and by line ministries and UN participating agencies to the Joint Programme, for making decisions on the future direction and design of policies and programmes to end domestic violence for women and girls particularly in the context of the DV Act and its implementation/revision.

The consultants were Dr. Carroll Patterson (Team Leader) and Ms. Patharaporn Theeratham (Evaluation Expert). Their CVs are attached below in Annex 4. During the evaluation period, the team interviewed and met with 33 relevant stakeholders (see Annex 2 for the complete list), visited the UN Women, UNFPA and UNDP offices, conducted site visits to pilot sites, including OSCCs, local official offices, NGO centres and schools in Dusit, Takua Pa and Tia Muang districts, visited official representatives at MPH, MoE, MSDHS, OAG and various officers within the RTP. The team also received and consulted more than 30 documents, which are listed in Annex 3

Methodology

As will be discussed below, the JP lacked significant documentation on M&E indicators, outputs, outcomes, and impacts. Moreover, there was very little in terms of documentation on beneficiaries i.e.: DV victims as stated for the JP goal. As a result, it was difficult for the evaluation team to conduct an adequate sampling strategy as well as conduct any kind of quantitative analysis on program effectiveness/impact. Instead, the evaluation team relied upon the reference group recommendations of UN Women staff, which of course introduced a potential bias into the respondent selection pool. To supplement the interview base, the evaluation team asked respondents for additional contact information of other potential respondents, but due to the time lag (see below) and lack of documentation, was only able to meet with a few additional beneficiaries (i.e.: trainees and those involved in the local working group) outside of the reference group (mostly concentrated on an extended focus group discussion held at Dusit district).

The main interviewing tactic used was taken from the "most significant change" (MSC) methodology. MSC is a qualitative, conversational method that is used to identify how/if interventions leave memorable (as opposed to average) changes to the lives of beneficiaries and stakeholders. MSC captures these changes through various domains of change, what types of changes are more significant and varying means of verification. Specifically, the domains of change that were explored were:

- Changes in coordination mechanisms among service providers supporting the DV Act
- Changes in the level of capacity and knowledge of how to address domestic violence among service providers supporting the DV Act
- Changes in lives of women and girls who were affected by domestic violence, including raised awareness and prevention among young people and within the communities they live.

MSC as a tactic leaves the door open to capturing both positive and negative changes, and thus learn more about which barriers are surmountable and which pose more significant challenges.⁵ As a result, the interviews were typically open ended in nature; and also explored themes around initial expectations/relevance, program implementation quality, coordination, perceived outcomes and impacts, current levels of sustainability and lessons learned. The evaluation team

⁵ More information on MSC can be found at <http://mande.co.uk/special-issues/most-significant-change-msc/>

also consulted all received documents and the evaluation expert translated many that were in Thai into English.

Although the evaluation team had developed protocols should victims of domestic violence be interviewed, in practice no victims were identified and therefore were not interviewed. A more detailed description of the methodology and approach taken by the evaluation team is found in the Inception Report, Annex 7.

Challenges and Limitations

Although the JP was completed on October 31, 2013, the evaluation was commissioned in March 2015. This time lag was associated with considerable challenges for the evaluation team, including:

Staff Turnover and Difficulties Identifying Beneficiaries: Many individuals identified in the original reference group were no longer occupying said positions and were no longer available for discussion. As many of the key individuals were employed by the government, esp. the RTP and OAG, they had been transferred to other parts of Thailand. The evaluation terms of reference, however, did not allocate travel and time to locate these individuals if they were outside of the target area. As a result, they were not interviewed. The evaluation team had also requested to meet with direct beneficiaries, such as trained police, but it appears no database of who was trained was maintained and they were unable to be identified. As such, the team could not adequately sample from beneficiaries.

Respondent Recall: Also connected to the time lag, many respondents had a difficult time recalling details of the JP, confused it with other programmes, did not remember key points, lacked documentation, could not recall names and numbers, and were unclear on many of the objectives of the JP.

Unavailability of key JP documents: Despite requesting additional specific key JP documents (e.g. minutes of JP steering committee meetings and detailed/ activity level financial reports⁶ from UN Women), these were not provided for the evaluation team to conduct a full review and analysis according to the evaluation criteria (they were indicated as either not on file or unavailable). This limited the quantitative and qualitative analysis and thereby ability to confirm a number of points particularly those under the topics of relevance and efficiency.

In the next chapter, the evaluation team presents the findings of the evaluation, which are organized according to each evaluative criterion and divided further into sub-categories addressing each specific activity. Chapter Three summarizes these findings and presents corresponding recommendations.

Chapter 2: Relevance Findings

Questions of relevance typically require that the evaluators embed the program within the context it was created, address its design and assess its strategic approach. For this evaluation, this is guided by two sub-questions.

- Extent to which the interventions was aligned with and contributed to national law and policies on domestic violence against women and girls from a human rights and gender equality perspective
- Extent to which the Joint Programme results address identified rights and needs of the target group(s) in the national and local contexts.

⁶ Noted that the activity level financial summary against the LogFrame was provided by UNFPA and UNDP but not by UN Women.

The JP was relevant to the context and contributed to national law by outlining a methodology to further implement the DV Act at national and lower levels. As was mentioned in the introduction and highlighted in the ProDoc, JP was born in the context of high levels of domestic violence. Although in July 2007 the Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act BE 2550 (2007) was finally promulgated and came into force, stakeholders identified that after three years of promulgation, implementation of the Act still faced major challenges—lack of understanding and knowledge of the Act amongst coordinating agencies, lack of rights-based and gender sensitive perspective of the agencies involved in the implementation of the law, fragmentation in the coordination mechanism both at the national and provincial levels, lack of strategic information and data to address violence against women and broad based understanding of the general public on gender equality, violence against women and domestic violence, a need to broaden space for civil society participation in the monitoring and support on the implementation of the domestic violence law.

The JP was also well positioned to mobilize the expertise of the three primary implementing UN agencies and their existing connections to work within the national law and policies on domestic violence against girls and women. UN Women possessed and continues to possess a great deal of technical expertise and knowledge on international human rights standards, such as CEDAW and international good practices and lessons learned on GBV and DV policies and legislations. This expertise was put to use in Thailand for supporting the development of policies and legislations against GBV, including advocacy of women’s human rights groups around the DV Act and amendments to the Penal Code to penalize marital rape, and developing expertise within the government and NGOs to address GBV and DV from a gender responsive and rights based perspective. Immediately prior to the JP, UN Women (known then as UNIFEM) had provided technical assistance to the Thonburi Criminal Court, which resulted in a gender responsive judicial procedure guide, and the rearrangement of courtrooms using partitions and cameras to protect the survivor from having to directly encountering the perpetrator.

UNFPA also mobilized its expertise in reproductive health and population development to promote gender equality. In line with the Fund’s previous 9th Country Programme of cooperation with the Royal Thai Government, UNFPA was able to work in close collaboration with the Ministry of Public Health and Provincial Health Offices to improve maternal health through gender-sensitive programming and deal with gender-based violence from human rights and health perspective. The ongoing country programme had already developed and implemented the basic and advance courses on counselling for health providers in premarital counselling and couple counselling in line with national law. The knowledge gained from these experiences would inform UNFPA’s efforts to establish a screening and referral system in public health units for women and girls affected by DV.

Finally, one of key priorities for UNDP technical support to Thai government agencies was (and still is) the mainstreaming of women’s issues and gender dimensions into decentralization process and rights based development. A previous project - “Support for Women in Politics through Constitutional Reform Process” (2007) - had generated dialogues on the role of women in national politics and promoted the idea of increasing number of women in the elected bodies. UNDP had also been working with the National Statistical Office (NSO) to strengthen MDG monitoring. Closer to the JP, UNDP Thailand had been working closely with the Office of Women’s Affairs and Family Development (OWAFD), the national focal point for implementing the Act, within MSDHS to strengthen Thailand’s statistics on the status of women, which resulted in the production of Thailand’s first *Gender-Disaggregated Statistics Report, Gender-related Development Index (GDI+) in 2008*. UNDP’s experience working with both NSO

and OWAFD gave them an advantage in supporting strengthening of the GBV/DV data collection in the JP.

The extent to which JP addressed the rights and needs of the target group was unclear, primarily because the definition of the target group itself was confusing. Ostensibly, the JP defined “primary beneficiaries” as women and girl survivors of domestic violence or those vulnerable to suffering from domestic violence (ProDoc, p. 2). Yet in practice, JP’s target groups were primarily national and local government officials; community-based groups, local administrative bodies, and local civil society organizations particularly women’s NGOs. To be sure, there were sets of community and youth representatives who were selected by the JP to receive training and participate in various functions, but these individuals were selected for their leadership status (in the case of community leaders), or “change agent” potential (in the case of youth). Thus, it is more accurate to gauge the relevance of the JP in terms of its ability to build the capacity of its main target groups to better assist women and girl victims of domestic violence, i.e. women and girl victims are *indirect* or *secondary* beneficiaries.

The ability of the JP to fully understand the rights and needs of women and girls who faced domestic violence was also hampered by a lack of reliable and comprehensive data (i.e.: baseline, ongoing, mid-line, end-line, etc.) on the identification of the knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and perceptions on domestic violence within the target areas, which was directly connected to Output 2.3 “Increased public awareness in the pilot areas on GBV, with particular focus on DV and the DV Act.” Originally, UNDP had commissioned a consultant company to conduct the equivalent of a baseline study on the perceptions of DV Act in the pilot areas (which was to form the basis of the Campaign). The consultant company did conduct several focus groups and interviews in both areas, but the quality of the analysis and its corresponding report was not at a level that could be easily used as a baseline. The evaluation team could find no evidence that the report was used to support any subsequent decisions or curriculum designs; and, indeed, the UNDP respondent indicated that the low quality of the report⁷ was one of the factors that contributed to the decision to not move forward with the campaign.

The question of “who were the target groups” is much more than just an exercise of semantics. Instead, it was indicative of a lack of a clear articulation of how the many different moving parts of the JP were supposed to fit together to achieve its ultimate goal of “Women and girls facing DV receive well-functioning protection and support services through rights-based and gender responsive implementation of the DV Act in Thailand” (taken from the goal statement of the original Log frame). Such an articulation typically takes the form of a programme “theory of change,” but this was never created. Granted, even though not formulated in written form, programme theories of change may be inherently understood by programme implementers and articulated at various points of implementation.

But this was not so in the case of the JP. Instead, most respondents indicated to the evaluation team that, although they understood the goal was to further the implementation of the DV Act, they did not see how the pieces fit together in a bigger picture or as a continuous process. More precisely, stakeholders differed in their views on whether the JP was a “protection” programme with its clear focus on protecting victims and ensuring that criminal acts of DV are treated as such vs. a “prevention” programme with a deeper focus on preventing DV *before* it emerges by changing attitudes and behaviours within Thai society. Although prevention and protection should not be seen as mutually exclusive concepts, their programmatic focus is nevertheless still distinct.

⁷ Prepared by INIS Communication, a consultant company.

A theory of change would have helped resolve this identity issue, provide greater strategic focus and elaborate how the JP's many different parts combined to form a cohesive whole. This didn't happen, and unfortunately the JP appeared to many as an ad hoc coming together of various activities under various agencies with a lack of a clear focus. This point will be developed and elaborated throughout the rest of the evaluation, but it is important to point out here that programmes that lack of clear theories of change seldom provides cohesive explanations for how the various programme components should fit together.

The lack of a theory of change opens the door to additional comments on the JP's strategic choice of government counterpart(s). An persistent point reiterated by various stakeholders in the JP was that although the DV Act explicitly assigned OWAFD as the main focal point for coordination of the implementation of the Act, it faced a number of constraints in its management, monitoring and oversight capacity to fulfil this role on the one hand, and its lack of authority to regularly convene with other organizational departments on the other. The potential contradiction in the Act does raise the question of why the JP didn't originally dedicate more resources and programmatic focus on internal capacity building of the OWAFD, to ensure better coordination.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall, the JP was extremely relevant to the national context and involved most, if not all, of the relevant national government stakeholders associated with the Act. All three UN agencies also brought relevant experience to bear on the JP. However, the JP did not develop a theory of change, which translated into a clear lack of implementation strategy and confusion around how the various pieces fit together, especially regarding its definition as a protection or a prevention programme. The definition of who was the target group and how they could be helped was also unclear. Finally, the JP faced an inherent challenge in that the main agency designated to coordinate the implementation of the Act has limited leadership and management capacity to do so. This reality raises questions around the overall design of the JP, and the inadequacy of capacity building activities within OWAFD.

Future programmes may wish to consider:

- Explicitly clarifying a strategic focus (e.g. prevention vs. protection and the linkages between the two) by articulating a clear programme theory of change and ensuring that all relevant stakeholders are made aware of this theory of change.
- Dedicating more resources when working with MSDHS to build the internal capacity of OWAFD to ensure better coordination among various other ministries and policy implementation.

Chapter 3: Effectiveness Findings

For this evaluation, effectiveness is understood in terms of the extent to which project goals, outcomes and outputs were achieved by the JP; the relative importance of each; and any relevant external factors that may have come into place when achieving or not achieving these goals, outcomes and outputs. These are expressed in terms of specific sub questions:

- To what extent were the JP's goal, outcomes and outputs achieved, taking into account their relative importance and relationships between different levels of results.
- To what extent did the JP reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached?

- To what extent has the JP generated positive changes in the lives of targeted (and untargeted) women and girls in relation to the specific forms of violence addressed by this project? Why? What are the key changes in the lives of those women and/or girls?
- What internal and external factors contributed to the achievement and/or failure of the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs? How?

Although some of these sub-questions were partially addressed in the previous sections, here the evaluation team presents a metric that identifies all the planned versus actual goals, outcomes and outputs achieved, based upon the Logical Framework and Annual Progress reports. This metric will be used as a reference point to expand on JP effectiveness based upon evidence from in-depth interviews, site visits and inquires to verify their achievement as well as to understand what these achievements actually meant to their beneficiaries.

Notably, the JP Logical Framework was substantially modified as a result of a larger modification and extension of the programme in response to the significant delays mentioned in the previous section and national specificities. The evaluation team received email correspondence and a copy of the official acknowledgement of the no cost extension, but did not see a formal justification endorsed by the JP Steering Committee or other body commissioned to oversee the JP.⁸ Without a clear rationale, formally documented for the revision of the Logical Framework, the changes appear to be misaligned across the different levels of JP concept i.e. lacking clear inter-linkage among outcomes, outputs and activities. Additionally, there were revised versions of key project documents provided for the evaluation's literature review where inconsistencies were found. For example, two versions of Log Frame (original and revised) and the two versions of the annual work plan for year 2013 identified different activities to be undertaken for year 2013 without additional explanation on the basis for the differences. This affected the monitoring as well as limited the effectiveness of the implementation.

One of the biggest barriers to evaluating JP effectiveness was a lack of M&E systems and corresponding data. The JP started with an ambitious Logical Framework that identified several relevant indicators, suggested additional surveys and studies, and posed outcomes in terms of percentage increases (e.g. knowledge increased by 75%). All of this suggests originally there had considerable thought put into establishing an M&E system. Yet no visible attempt had been made under the JP to collect indicator data of any sort, and, more importantly, JP effectiveness was not monitored in any quantifiable terms. This of course severely limits the ability of this evaluation to make any substantive claims about JP effectiveness.

Output 1.1: Multi-sectoral coordination mechanism at the national and in the pilot areas standardised and adopted

Although the term “mechanism” was not clearly defined in the first place and took on a number of ambiguous forms, the activities under this output evolved to culminate in the creation of a ‘committee’ (or interchangeably called ‘working group’) at the sub-national level (i.e. provincial/district) of both Bangkok and Phang Nga. According to the annual reports, it was formally called the Coordinating Committee on the Implementation and Coordination of DV Act and was comprised of representatives of many agencies and sectors including civil society and community-based organizations. This sub-national multi-sectoral committee or working group was to provide support to the individual professionals of the multi-sectoral group in providing assistance and services to DV victims according to the requirements of DV Act.

⁸ In the Memorandum of Understanding between the Participating UN Organizations and UN Women regarding the Operational Aspects for this JP, it was clearly stated in Section III (Article 2, p. 5) that any modifications to scope of the signed JP Document will be subject to mutual agreement in writing between the participating UN agencies and the Steering Committee. Hence, a formal documentation on the revision of the LogFrame would have been necessary in order for the revised LogFrame to be in effect and form the basis for implementation of activities and subsequent M&E to be done accordingly and efficiently.

However, it was learned during the in-field fact-finding that this ‘coordination practice’ was actually in place prior to implementation of JP but could be considered an ‘informal’ structure which varied depending on the nature and working relationship within each area/ district/ province. As identified during the discussions, a value-added of JP to the coordination mechanism or practice was inclusion of the community level into the process. It helped established networking and relationships between the community and governmental agencies. Not only could the community watch group be set up within this JP to provide support and/ or protection to DV victims but also take proactive measures to prevent DV by providing knowledge to community people and raise awareness in relation to women’s human rights and DV. Nonetheless, it was not clearly stated, neither in any written evidence nor from the results of fact-finding, if the ‘formal’ coordination mechanism was to be sustained or functional after the end of JP. The ‘informal’ coordination practice appears to continue ‘naturally’ within its own local context.

It should also be noted that there was no documentation on the establishment of a ‘national’ coordination mechanism for supporting implementation of the DV Act. This is in line with the information received during the fact-finding that the national dialogue, where lessons learnt were supposed to be shared and a national mechanism could be discussed, did not happen.

In response to the gaps on coordination identified by the key partners, the “Inter-sectoral Agencies Guideline for the Implementation of Domestic Violence Victims Protection Act 2007,” a.k.a. the “operating guidelines,” was also developed and subsequently approved by the Inter-Ministerial Sub-committee on the Elimination and Prevention of Domestic Violence (hereafter Sub-committee) on 15 January 2012. The Sub-committee was chaired by the Director General of OWAFD and consisted of membership from the MPH, MoE, MoJ, OAG, RTP, and MoI.

Reflecting this broad base of stakeholders, the working group (estimated at around 30 members)

Overall Goal: Women and girls in Thailand facing DV receive well-functioning protection and support services through rights- based and gender responsive implementation of DV Act	
Outcome 1: Multi-sectoral coordination mechanism among DV Act implementing partners improved by 2012	
Output 1.1: Multi-sectoral coordination mechanism at the national and in the pilot areas standardised and adopted	
Planned Activities (Revised)	Status as Reported in Annual Reports
1.1.1 Conduct a study on existing policy, plan, coordination mechanism, capacities of ministries/ agencies at the national level and the DV response system in the pilot areas to suggest models for DV multi-sectoral coordination at the national and local levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report produced on Multi-stakeholder Coordination Mechanism for the Implementation of the Act on the Protection of Domestic Violence Victims (DV Act) - study of existing plan, policy, mechanism and capacities (Sep 2013) by Maytinee Bhongsvej, Sep 2013 • Development of a multi-sectoral coordination mechanism models in the two pilot provinces for the implementation of DV Act
1.1.2 Hold consultative meetings with local officials, DV Act implementing agencies and NGOs in the pilot areas to address specific DV coordination issues and on findings of the study with the agencies/ ministries involved in DV Act implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultations with previously established local working groups in September/October 2013
1.1.3 Hold high level meeting on domestic violence policy once a year based on findings and recommendations of the consultative meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of Inter-ministerial Sub-committee on the Prevention and Elimination of Domestic Violence by OWAFD • Meeting of the Inter-ministerial Sub-committee at the national level in 2011 and 2012 • High level meetings in the two pilot provinces in 2012 to present the results, tools and recommendations
1.1.4 Hold working group meetings and consultation to develop protocol/ guideline on multi-sectoral coordination for DV Act implementation, data collection, monitoring, and reporting of multi-sectoral coordination for DV Act implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formation of the working group in 2011 to do peer review for the development of the operating guidelines by relevant government agencies and women’s NGO • Development of the Operating Guidelines for the Implementation of DV Act (Mar 2012) • In 2012, approval and printing of the Operating Guidelines for distribution in pilot areas with the budget of OWAFD • Workshop to share experiences on the development of the NAP VAW to 60 government and non-governmental stakeholders with the purpose of preparing groundwork for the development of the NAP VAW in Jan 2012
1.1.5 Hold semi-annual meetings on monitoring the implementation of the guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of Coordination Committees consisting of provincial governmental agencies and community-based organizations in Bangkok and Phang Nga for policy planning, implementation and monitoring on DV protection and response • Memorandum of Understanding among 10 government agencies to create wider institutional commitment on multi-sectoral coordination in 2010
Output 1.2: Quality monitoring and reporting system in place	
Planned Activities (Revised)	Actual Implementation
1.2.1 Establish a technical working group for statistics/ indicators coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular meetings of technical working group consisting of representatives from UNDP, UN Women, and OWAFD (MSDHS) in 2010
1.2.2 Conduct a study on existing database, indicators and quality of data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study results on the existing database indicators
1.2.3 Hold a consultation meeting on standardizing indicators and database on VAW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the findings on availability and limitation of data against the nationally agreed indicators to determine the number of indicators which could be reported in the two pilot provinces • Two consultation meetings to present the preliminary results of the study in Mar 2011 • Validation workshop in Jun 2012
1.2.4 Produce a set of standardised indicators for VAW database	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on Gender-based Violence Against Women and Girls (VAW/G) Indicators (Dec 2011) • Development of Dataset according to VAW/G Indicators and Data Cooperation Mechanism in 2 Pilot Provinces (Oct 2012)
1.2.5 Produce annual report for the Cabinet, Parliament and public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination of OWAFD on the preparation of annual report for the Cabinet, parliament and public • In partnership with civil society organizations, review of the reporting process for the implementation of DV Act – Report on Strengthening Local Level Multi-sectoral Coordination Mechanism towards Effective Implementation of DV Act

was created to design the operating guidelines consisted of respondents and experts from OAG, MSDHS, MPH (including OSCCs), women's NGOs, consultant team and various others. All respondents who were on the working group expressed satisfaction with the way it functioned and that their contributions were duly incorporated. One of the most useful aspects of the operating guidelines was that it clearly articulated how measures for protecting victims, changing behaviours of DV abusers, and filing criminal charge to DV abusers could be brought together. In many ways, the operating guidelines had the potential and, to some extent, still do to form the blueprints of a more comprehensive, multi-sectoral implementation system of the DV Act. Thus, this output should be viewed as a high-quality, multi-stakeholder product that has provided clarity on how to implement the Act.

However, there were a number of unintended consequences as the result of the working group experience. Notably, respondents from MPH indicated that this experience revealed the limited capacity of OWAFD. Although OWAFD incorporated several OSCC and MPH experts, it did not go through higher level protocols at the Ministerial level to obtain support. Thus, some members of the working group were expected to attend while at the same time faced difficulties obtaining clearance from their superiors to attend. MSDHS's perceived capacity limitations to seriously own the monitoring of DV-related statistics was also allegedly intensified during the working group sessions, apparently convincing MPH to first centralize its DV-related reporting system at the national level at the expense of greater horizontal information sharing.

Moreover, it appears that once the operating guidelines were completed, MSDHS respondents indicated a lack of ongoing coordination and communication from UN Women. The respondent from OWAFD indicated that her department received only 2 informal updates from UN Women on the progress of the JP. The respondent attributed this to a lack of planning and organization on the part of UN Women to be able to seek a Letter of Agreement (LoA) under the life of the project and generate a request letter for OWAFD to seek approval from Cabinet. The OWAFD respondent also indicated that UN Women's decision to work through NGOs and Foundations undermined its ability to monitor progress on the implementation of relevant components of the JP and the DV Act, as these groups were unaccountable to the Ministry (or OWAFD) and did not report. Finally, the respondent identified the lack of a national lessons learned workshop as a major short coming of the experience, as her office currently has no demonstrable evidence that participation in the process was beneficial to its internal functioning.

Regardless of the internal grievances held by some of the key national stakeholders behind the multi-sectoral mechanism at the national level, what is clear is that the agencies tasked with implementing the DV Act remain in their respective approaches. Although the Sub-committee itself (which today is apparently a dysfunctional as a result of internal restructuring) was primarily tasked with setting policy, the appointed focal point behind the DV Act – OWAFD – faces capacity limitations in implementing the policies it generates or maintaining a proper system of DV tracking and follow up. Although a full assessment of OWAFD's capacity was out of the scope of this evaluation, it seems clear that its ability to act as a full-fledged social services coordinator and provider still faces many challenges.

Output 1.2: Quality monitoring and reporting system in place

This joint UN Women and UNDP output most notably led to the completion of the "Report on Gender-based Violence Against Women and Girls (VAW/G) Indicators" handbook, which identified 41 indicators that could be used by various agencies and civil society groups to monitor the status of violence against women and girls over time. The indicators were selected from a wide variety of sources, such as the Gender-related Development Index (GDI), the

Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM), the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), gender equality indicators, Decent and Productive Work (the International Labour Organization), the Global Gender Gap Report, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (BPFA) 1995. The report was high quality in terms of its production printing and was widely distributed within the MSDHS and to several partners. Indeed, the evaluation team found several copies on visits to various respondents, oftentimes in conjunction with the previously UNDP supported *Gender-Disaggregated Statistics Report, Gender-related Development Index (GDI+) in 2008* (these seem to be the two defining publications on Gender-related statistics in Thailand). This was a clear, tangible output that should form the foundation for any quality the DV Act monitoring and reporting system to use.

However, it is unlikely that the report will lead to any sustained changes to the way MSDHS approaches and monitors DV. After the report was completed, an additional review found severe gaps in the current capacity to collect and compile all but 5 indicators consistently across Thailand, while 17 of the identified indicators were and are not currently being collected at all. Although a preliminary study made these findings in 2012, a respondent at MSDHS indicated that the final report had just been approved in 2015. A second three-year phase was also about to be launched, in which plans to respond to the gap would be formulated and considered for approval. The statistics department within MSDHS currently lacks the capacity to maintain an annual version of the report, as well as lacks the authority to mandate other agencies to collect and submit many of the indicators. As such, without external funding, MSDHS will most likely not publish an updated version until 2018, if at all. Part of the difficulty is that the National Statistics Office (NSO) has not formally endorsed many of the indicators, and thus no resource or approved data collection methodology exists. Moreover, although the VAW/G Indicator Report was widely circulated, no respondent was able to provide an example of how the report was used to support their decision making or other activities. Rather, it was a commonly held view that the report would be most useful to academic institutions and NGOs for their own research purposes. Thus, it would be inaccurate to suggest that the JP succeeded in putting a quality monitoring and reporting system in place, and is more accurate to suggest that sustaining the VAW/G Indicator Report on an annual basis implies process of inter-agency coordination and collaboration that would form the backbone of well-functioning monitoring system which has yet to be achieved.

Outcome 2: Capacity of multi-sectoral mechanism to provide well-coordinated, right-based and gender sensitive protection and support services in DV Act implementation increased by 50 % in 2012	
Output 2.1: Knowledge on GBV/DV, DV Act, and gender responsive protection and support services of trained staff of multi-sectoral agencies in central administration and the pilot areas and of community-based organisations/civil society organisations in the pilot areas increased by 75 %	
Planned Activities (Revised)	Actual Implementation
2.1.1 Establish and advisory board to provide feedback on the training modules	<i>No Evidence this existed</i>
2.1.2 Conduct a study on in-depth analysis on existing training modules on GBV and DV for implementing agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study for Developing Training Modules on Gender-based Violence and Domestic Violence - analysis of the existing training modules by Mahidol University (Apr 2011)
2.1.3 Stakeholders meeting to identify strategic capacity development plan for public health personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizing of a consultation meeting of the stakeholders from the central administration and the two pilot provinces in Nov 2010 and site visit to Phang Nga province to assess the capacity of the existing referral system among the responsible parties in accordance of the DV Act Workshop in Dec 2011 to determine strategies for improving the effectiveness of OSCC in the areas of service provision, screening and referral
2.1.4 Draft and validate the core training module and specific modules: 1) Core Module – GBV/ DV Act and 2) Specific Modules – Gender Responsive Protection & Support Services	<p>MSDHS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of 3-day training program for the sub-national multi-sectoral coordination mechanism and the Operating Guidelines for the implementation of DV Act <p>MOPH:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development and validation of core (gender sensitivity) and specific (case screening and referral) training module for health service personnel Printing of training modules (Participant Manual, Facilitator Manual and Operation Manual) Printing of Rape Management Guideline Printing of Case Study from OSCC <p>Royal Thai Police</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of 5-day training program for police inquiry officers <p>OAG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration of knowledge on VAW and DV in the regular training of assistant prosecutors and provincial prosecutors <p>MOE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training program for high school students and teachers on gender equality, VAW and DV
2.1.5 Conduct training on GBV/ DV & DV Act for responsible staff in central administration and community mediators, women's group, CBOs and other CSOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training of responsible staff from MSDHS, MOI and other line ministries at the sub-national level, as well as community leaders in the two pilot provinces Training of NPF police inquiry officers in 3 batches (198 police inquiry officers – 137 female and 61 male) Training of secondary schools (230 students and 230 teachers) in the two pilot provinces
2.1.6 Conduct training on GBV/ DV & DV Act for Multi-sectoral team and justice personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training for health service personnel at OSCC and Maternal Health Care & Gynecology Unit from pilot sites in Bangkok and Phang Nga, 11-14 Dec 2012, by WHO-CC for Gender (organized in Bangkok)
2.1.7 Conduct training of trainers on GBV/ DV & DV Act and Gender Responsive Protection & Support Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training of Trainers on Gender Responsive Protection & Support Service for health service personnel, 16-19 Oct 2012, by WHO-CC for Gender (organized in Khon Kaen)
Output 2.2: Skills of responsible staff of multi-sectoral agencies in the pilot areas on usage of coordinated protocol, screening and referral practices, specialised services, including that of community peer educators/CSOs in organising community response system to end VAW/G increased by 75 %	
Planned Activities (Revised)	Actual Implementation
2.2.1 Develop training module and conduct training workshop on Coordinated DV Act implementation, monitoring and reporting for the multi-sectoral team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training module developed by Sukothai In Sept-Oct, government officials and members from community-based women and men groups, trained in the DV Law and the Operating Guidelines on the DV Law Case studies were presented for their deliberations. Women's NGOs followed up with group support sessions in the communities.
2.2.2 Conduct case conference workshops for multi-sectoral team in the pilot areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following the training workshops, support to women's NGOs to organize case conferences and group support sessions in the pilot communities
2.2.3 Establish a screening and referral system in public health units, including in the antenatal care and family planning clinics for women and girls affected by DV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting to finalize OSCC screening and referral protocol & system within public health for hospitals in Bangkok (17-18 Dec 2012) and Phang Nga (20-21 Dec 2012)
2.2.4 Establish Community Watch Groups to help disseminate key features of DV Act and rights of women/ girl survivors under DV Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support to women's groups at the community level to act as watch groups to coordinate on the DV prevention and respond to the multi-sectoral coordination mechanism at the community level
Output 2.3: Awareness of multi-sectoral agencies staff and communities who are primary prevention of DV in the pilot areas increased by 75 %	
Planned Activities (Revised)	Actual Implementation
2.3.1 Conduct a study on perception of women and men of different aged groups on DV in the pilot communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study Report on Perception on DV in the pilot communities – presentation on the final draft of the study results at a workshop in Dec 2011
2.3.2 Hold a consultative meeting to identify campaign target groups (e.g. CBOs, women's groups/ youth groups, networks of boys and men, school administration and students, LGUs) and approach with CBOs and NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the above results of perception on DV, gathering of recommendations for advocacy campaign towards prevention and active engagement from the wider community and for the use of mass media advertising campaign and community action approach (focusing on behavioural change and creation of supporting environment; campaign to be done in phases)
2.3.3 Develop campaign materials (e.g. documentary film, poster, sticker) for the target groups identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Campaign Strategy Recommendation (Oct 2011)
2.3.4 Organise campaign activities for primary prevention awareness raising among the target groups identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizing of Youth to End EVAW projects in schools and communities in the two pilot provinces Organizing of community-based advocacy activities by women's groups Sensitization of primary school students through a painting competition on the theme of ending VAW and DV ('Paint in Park' event in Bangkok - Part of UNITE???)

Output 2.1: Knowledge on GBV/DV, DV Act, and gender responsive protection and support services of trained staff of multi-sectoral agencies in central administration and the pilot areas and of community-based organisations/civil society organisations in the pilot areas increased by 75 %

Leaving aside the fact that no M&E system was set up to elaborate what a “75%” increase in knowledge meant and confirm it occurred, Output 2.1 was a core pillar of the JP in terms of outputs and increased knowledge awareness. In practice, this took the form of several non-standardized and curriculum based trainings across various agencies and the pilot areas. The roots of these activities are found in the 2011 Study for Developing Training Modules on Gender-based Violence and Domestic Violence analysis of the existing training modules conducted by Mahidol University. It then continued through various mechanisms and agencies under the auspices of the JP. These include:

MSDHS:

- Development of 3-day training program for the sub-national multi-sectoral coordination mechanism and the Operating Guidelines for the implementation of DV Act

MPH:

- Development and validation of core (gender sensitivity) and specific (case screening and referral) training module for health service personnel
- Printing of training modules (Participant Manual, Facilitator Manual and Operation Manual)
- Printing of Rape Management Guideline
- Printing of Case Study from OSCC

RTP:

- Development of 5-day training program for police inquiry officers and cadets

OAG:

- Integration of knowledge on VAW and DV in the regular training of assistant prosecutors and provincial prosecutors

MOE:

- Training program for high school students and teachers on gender equality, VAW and DV

Across the entire spectrum, respondents indicated that the trainings were high quality and useful in terms of the knowledge they generated. Indeed, the fact that many respondents held on to original training materials and could recall specific details of the training after 2 and in some cases 3 years is a testimony to the impression it made on attendees.

Although many broader DV Act awareness raising campaigns and modules were in existence outside of the JP, respondents were quick to point out that the comparative advantage of the JP trainings was found in their ability to clearly articulate how to respond to DV abuses and identify where each stakeholder sat in a wider system of referral, support and service delivery. Another clear outcome was that many DV prevention and protection networks were strengthened as many of the trainings brought together multi-agency stakeholders who interacted with each other for the first time.

Agency-specific outcomes associated with the trainings are anecdotal and varied in terms of their intended effect. The following highlights are a summary of responses expressed by partners during the interviews:

MPH:

The training supported by UNFPA under the auspices of MPH was an opportunity to formalize and standardize the protocols underpinning the referral system for victims of DV who arrived at the OSCCs. Unlike the other activities of the JP, here UNFPA made a deliberate effort to understand if attendees increased their knowledge as part of the training.

The training aimed to increase capacity of the personnel of OSCC, Maternal Health and Gynecology Units to better understand and be able to integrate a gender dimension into their practices and operation. This would enable them to provide gender sensitive services to victims of violence and also to be a key change agent for gender equality in Thai society. In total, Twenty-three participants attended this training in Bangkok during 11-14 December 2012.

The training objectives were to enable the trainees to:

- Link and integrate issues around gender and women's human rights, gender equality and DV/ GBV into their work;
- Analyze cases applying a gender dimension/ lens in order to provide assistance to victims;
- Identify gender-based OSCC operational system; and
- Applying a gender sensitivity approach, develop their assessment, diagnosis, interview, counseling and empowerment of violence victims.

The training covered the following key topics:

- Sex, gender, rights, gender equality and equity, violence, domestic violence and sexual violence;
- Gender analysis;
- Gender sensitive OSCC operational system; and
- Gender sensitive provision of assistance/ services for victims of violence

The results of the pre-training assessment presented the trainees expectations, including gaining more knowledge and understanding on gender, its linkages to GBV and DV and issues around women's human rights; applying knowledge into their work at the hospital and enabling themselves to plan and better provide services to victims of violence.

After the training the post-event assessment indicated their better understanding and knowledge on the issues learnt. Both groups, who had been trained on gender, and those who never received training on gender, registered higher scores on the post-training test. Most of their scores generally rated between good and very good, while a few were considered fair on some training topics (e.g. interview techniques and gender-based operational system).

Additionally, participants also indicated additional knowledge and skills related to gender sensitivity and OSCC that are summarized below:

- Interview techniques and tools including samples of interview questions;
- Continuous monitoring after victims leaving OSCC;
- Application of knowledge on gender sensitivity into OSCC operation; and
- Other relevant knowledge and issues from multi-sectoral professionals.

All participants indicated that the training met their expectations and its contents were useful to their work, and for improving the OSCC system. Almost 95% recommended that this training

be conducted for other staff while only 60% expressed their confidence to transfer the knowledge they gained to others. Other recommendations included refresher sessions to be organized every one or two years and inclusion of multi-sectoral groups of people in the same training.

The content of these trainings alleged formed the basis of national standards and protocols that are currently being implemented across all OSCCs in Thailand. The experience also highlighted the important role that OSCCs play in the Thai health system and has been used to leverage requests for additional budgetary support made to MPH (OSCC respondent stated they are now receiving a specific budget allocation for their work). As such, the JP can point to the MPH training activity as a sustainable one that has led to a wide impact.

RTP:

RTP respondents not only indicated that the training they received increased their knowledge and confidence when dealing with DV issues (many indicated that they previously viewed DV as a domestic issue inappropriate for law enforcement's involvement), but also discussed how the trainings led to informal "line networks" of communication among inquiry officers who share information and expertise across a national platform. Although no subsequent trainings have occurred and no formal materials were created to guide future trainings, recognized DV experts within RTP are seeking additional funding to create a cadre of 20-30 DV experts who would leverage their expertise across Thailand's various provinces.

OAG:

OAG learned a great deal from the trainings that were provided, but the respondent indicated that most of the content for the RTP was not sufficiently tailored to OAG. While they recognized the value of the training as a useful mechanism to move DV implementation forward, OAG has subsequently replaced the JP training with its own standardized modules that are administered to cadets while in training. The OAG respondent also recognized that there still remains a widespread knowledge gap on the legal aspects of the DV Act at the local level, and recommended that UN agencies consider developing a specialized training for local OAG officers to better understand how to move DV cases forward to criminal court. Many cases do not reach criminal court due to technical mistakes.

MoE:

While the MoE respondent felt the participatory experiences behind the school activities in the pilot provinces were valuable, they were not comprehensive enough to facilitate longer term behaviour change. Rather, the respondent endorsed a "whole of system" approach in which prevention could only be effective if more sustained efforts were made to change the knowledge, attitudes and practices of students and the communities in which they are embedded. The JP training was a good start, but additional resources should have been applied over a longer period of time to produce behaviour change. Nevertheless, the MoE respondent did suggest that the identified student "change agents" had learned valuable lessons as part of their experience.

Output 2.2: Skills of responsible staff of multi-sectoral agencies in the pilot areas on usage of coordinated protocol, screening and referral practices, specialised services, including that of community peer educators/CSOs in organising community response system to end VAW/G increased by 75 %.

Again leaving aside the fact that no M&E system was set up to elaborate what a "75%" increase in skills meant and confirm it occurred, Output 2.2 was realized through the two main pilot activities that occurred in Bangkok and Phang-Nga. The activities began with the creation of the training handbook developed by the Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University and were

administered through the Foundation partners in each area in September-October 2013. The pilots worked on two levels. At the provincial level, government officials from MoE, OAG, RTP, MSDHS, and MPH came together for training on the DV Act and the Operating Guidelines. Trainees subsequently came together on a number of “study trips” to observe how the DV Act was applied elsewhere, as well as met on a quarterly basis to deliberate on various DV case studies that required a multi-sectoral approach. These working groups reviewed an average of 3-5 cases per session.

At the community level, leaders were also identified and trained by the partner foundations in each pilot area. They subsequently formed “watch groups” to alert community leaders on potential DV victims and help them find support either through informal community systems or through more formal government referrals. One interesting aspect of the community level watch groups was that RTP representatives were not consistently brought into the activities. The fact-finding in Phang Nga indicated good support from police due mainly to their existing and personal connections created prior to the JP, while a number of cases in Bangkok had not received proper assistance from police. One reason discussed was that those who were trained either were not around when the community people needed help or they did not come from the pilot areas of JP. Respondents from the Dusit district viewed this as a missed opportunity.⁹

Although these mechanisms were in place and partially functioning prior to the JP, the pilots did effectively expand the network of participants, provided resources for regular meetings and injected more authoritative knowledge on how each agency’s role in DV prevention and protection formed a larger system. The continued functioning of these working groups varies according to the capacity of various stakeholders at the local level. In the Dusit district, the local women’s group is seeking additional funding to expand its ability to act as a focal point for community watchdog activities, as the local MSDHS representatives lack the capacity to play a strong role. In Takua Pa, local working group sessions are mostly led by the local OSCC, who makes a proactive effort to maintain the momentum built under the JP. Unfortunately, that momentum was not sustained at the provincial level in Phang Nga, and there the reference group meets on a more ad hoc basis to review complicated cases.

Finally, it should be noted that the initial UNFPA-supported training provided to the OSCCs focused more on the internal referral system, while the much broader UN Women training included a discussion of the OSCCs within a larger module on the DV Act and the role of MSDHS (including a discussion of the indicators). More precisely, their content matter is presented in the following table:

Items	UNFPA/OSCC	UN Women/Pilot Group
Development of training curriculum	Developed by Khon Kaen University	Developed by Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University
Training objective	The training objectives were to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Link and integrate issues around gender and women’s human rights, gender equality and DV/ GBV into their work; ▪ Analyse cases applying a gender dimension/ lens in order to 	It was to provide knowledge and create a platform for exchanging experiences among multi-sectoral professionals.

⁹ Respondents informed the evaluators of one story in which a female victim in their community was married to a police officer who was abusing her. The watch group did not know how to respond and lacked additional police connections to prevent her subsequent murder by her husband. They suggested that had appropriate police been involved in the training, they may have been able to inform them and prevent the victim’s murder.

	<p>provide assistance to victims;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify gender-based OSCC operational system; and ▪ Apply a gender sensitive approach, develop their assessment, diagnosis, interview, counseling and empowerment of victims of violence. 	
Training content	<p>The training was intended to be a training of trainers (TOT) on Integrating Gender Issues into One-Stop Crisis Center.</p> <p>The training covered the following key topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sex, gender, rights, gender equality and equity, violence, domestic violence and sexual violence; ▪ Gender analysis; ▪ Gender sensitive OSCC operational system; and ▪ Gender sensitive provision of assistance/ services for victims of violence 	<p>The training was on Joint Operating Guidelines between the Multi-sectoral Professionals and Community for the Implementation of the DV Act.</p> <p>The training had three main parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understanding on gender, GBV/ DV and DV Act; ▪ Group support and case conference activities; and ▪ Formulation of community-based action plan between multi-sectoral team.
Targets/ trainees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Personnel of OSCC, Maternal Health and Gynecology Units ▪ Almost 50 people in total for the two TOTs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community leaders and local multi-sectoral professionals in the pilot areas ▪ About 70 people in total from Bangkok and Phang Nga
Training assessment	<p>There were both pre- and post-training assessments completed by each individual trainee.</p>	<p>Only the result of the post-training assessment by the training facilitators was included in the report.</p>
Training events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 16-19 October 2012 in Khon Kaen ▪ 11-14 December 2012 in Bangkok 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 11-13 September 2013 in Bangkok ▪ 7-9 October 2013 in Phuket

Note: Another separate training on development of screening and referral for DV victims was organized by MPH on 20-21 December 2012 for the OSCC staff and multi-sectoral professional in Phang Nga, including police, provincial staff of MSDHS and shelter and school teachers.

Output 2.3: Awareness of multi-sectoral agencies staff and communities who are primary prevention of DV in the pilot areas increased by 75 %

The planned ending violence against women campaign activity supported by UNDP was cancelled midway through the JP due to quality issues of the service provider and their outputs. UN Women, however, did support the organization and training of youth leader “change agents” to launch their own ending violence against women campaigns through various short term projects and community outreach activities. These low-cost activities were student-led and varied across each school.

One of the difficulties of gauging the effectiveness of this output is that there was no evidence of any attempt to measure its effectiveness. Ad-hoc accounts of teachers and MoE respondents

suggest that the experiences touched the lives of the students involved, but there was no data to suggest that these students continued to view VAW as a priority. Indeed, the main activity of the Takua Pa school was to create a VAW Facebook page, which has not been updated since November 2013. Instead, these students were selected based upon their leadership track record and potential. The evaluation team was informed by the respondent from MoE that many change agents are now involved in MoE supported activities around school bullying, and that now VAW activities have since been supported or initiated by the students themselves. Although the JP experience was most likely a meaningful activity for these change agents, it has not produced any lasting impacts that can be supported by existing evidence.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall, the JP had a strong track record of implementing various training and awareness raising activities across a wide spectrum of stakeholders. Notable outputs were the Operating Guidelines, high quality policy training, a standardized referral system for victims of DV at OSCCs, high quality training materials, a high quality publication on recommended relevant DV Act indicators, and various case conferences involving a wide range of relevant representatives. However, a lack of a M&E system and program data prevented the evaluation from making any evidence-based claims on the JP's effectiveness in terms of the outcomes stated on its Logical Framework (e.g. a 75% increase in knowledge on GBV/DV). What is clear is that the awareness raising activities did leave a strong and favorable impression on the minds of its participants, literally years after the activities had been completed. The strengths of the JP trainings versus previous DV Act trainings was found in their ability to clearly articulate how to respond to DV abuses and identify where each stakeholder sat in a wider system of referral, support and service delivery. As commonly noted by respondents from communities, RTP and OSCC, another clear outcome indicated by respondents was that many DV prevention and protection networks were strengthened during training events and study visits as many of the trainings brought together multi-agency stakeholders who interacted with each other for the first time.

However, due to a lack of coordination and overall lack of strategic focus, the evaluation team could not establish that these activities combined to achieve Outcomes 1 and 2. Instead, many activities occurred in isolation of the others and were not designed to feed into or complement each other in apparent ways. As such, the effectiveness of the JP should be understood more at the activity level but not at the stated outcome level.

Future programmes may wish to consider:

- Supporting integrated program designs that clearly demonstrate how their activities complement each other and combine to produce wider benefits
- Support the updating of the Operating Guidelines and their operationalization at the national and local levels
- Consider building the capacity of MSDHS to establish a sustainable process of DV Act indicator data collection, coordination, monitoring and dissemination on an annual basis.
- Consider providing support to advance knowledge of the DV Act within the OAG, especially at the local levels, through a similar case conference approach that is enhanced with more legal expertise.
- Ensure that high level Ministry support is obtained prior to implementation of activities that require support from its mid-level officials
- Ensure that M&E systems, baseline/endline data, and performance management systems are in place, especially when implementing pilot activities, to ensure that adequate lessons are learned to support a proof of concept. Indeed, ensure that all programmes have adequate M&E systems in place.

Chapter 4: Efficiency Findings

The Efficiency evaluative category typically involves some measure of how well a project converted its resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) into results. In what follows, the evaluation team addresses two specific sub-questions that identified in the evaluation ToR:

- Were the funds provided sufficient for achieving the short-term and long-term goals of integrating human rights and gender equality in the Programme intervention?
- To what extent did the Joint Programme use the resources in the most cost-effective manner to achieve its objectives

The first question is speculative in nature, whereby the evaluation team assesses if the budget allocation was appropriate, should there have been more, or could more have been done with less. For this question, the evaluation team reconstructed the activity budget identified in the JP log frame. The second question is retrospective in nature, and opens the door to a discussion on *how well* the JP was managed. For this question, the evaluation team discusses the timing, sequencing and overall management of the JP to better understand its cost effectiveness. These sub-questions are addressed jointly below.

Originally, the evaluation team had sought to analyze various implementation ratios, e.g. activity to administration ratios, unit cost per activity implemented ratios, etc., to determine the relative efficiencies within the Programme and in comparison with more general notions of cost reasonableness. Unfortunately, however, the team was unable to conduct this analysis as a. not every partner agency provided financial breakdowns to the activity level¹⁰ and b. there was a general lack of M&E data that would allow the team to determine output ratios.

The total amount budgeted for the JP was \$1,277,651, over which \$ 999,651 was contributed by UNTF, while \$278,000 was partner contributions (MSDHS and UN Women). More precisely, this money was to be spent over the course of three years across three UN agencies, who worked across five government bodies at national and local levels and with several NGOs and several communities/schools on the ground across two provinces. With these resources, the ProDoc originally estimated that the JP would reach out to 150,000 women in the Thonburi area of Bangkok and 30,000 in Phang Nga province. The ProDoc did not elaborate on how these numbers were calculated and what assumptions had to be met for the JP to reach this target. Yet no matter how the JP defines “reach out”, it is clear that the JP could not address such a wide scale within limited budget applied over almost four years of implementation. For these and other reasons, respondents from all three UN agencies indicated that the goals and objectives of the JP, given its limited budget, were overly ambitious, vague and potentially unachievable.

Rather than view the JP as a large scale beneficiary project, its budget structure suggests that it is better conceived of as a pilot program with much clearer intermediate objectives and a high potential for learning (particularly in regards to changes to knowledge, attitudes and practices, i.e. KAP). From this view, it useful to assess the costs allocated to achieving each output in terms of resource sufficiency. In doing so, the evaluation team drew upon the budget allocations identified in the JP logical framework, which contained more specific line item allocations for each activity and represented the most comprehensive budget view of the JP the evaluation team received. Thus, it was easier to draw out comparisons. It should be noted that the total UNTF amount allocated across the activities accounts for \$684,093 of the total budget¹¹ with the

¹⁰ Noted that the activity level financial summary against the LogFrame was provided by UNFPA and UNDP but not by UN Women.

¹¹ Calculated from the figures provided in the original Logical Framework.

remaining amounts absorbed by indirect and other non -direct costs¹².

Overall, the JP was impressive in terms of its ability to identify and mobilize high quality expertise to at relatively low costs. Part of this was due to the fact that many of the networks and working groups supported were in place prior to the launch of the JP, and therefore the programme served as a cost efficient catalyst to move the implementation of the DV Act forward. Moreover, the majority of ministerial support costs were modest, and corresponded to more modest goals. Capacity development activities and the development of training modules appear to be the main cost drivers of the activity allocation. Without further information regarding more specific breakdowns, the costs are considered to be reasonable as the implementation activities account for approximately 70% of the budget, with administrative and other indirect cost being 30%. On the other hand, learning and review, M&E, documentation, certain pilots and other types of “learning” activities received little or no allocation. As will be discussed below, low investments in learning activities did undermine the JP’s ability to demonstrate effectiveness and impact. Finally, “support” activities were a mid-range cost driver, and the evaluation team assumed that most of this “support” was allocated to travel expenses, per diems, etc.

While there was no specific documentation on the financial sufficiency capacity of JP, it was indicated by several respondents during discussions that the budget was generally deemed sufficient. Additionally, it was documented in the annual reports that there were a few cost-shared activities that helped supplement the budget (e.g. training of RTP supported by the MSDHS budget and meetings with partners hosted by the governmental counterparts). During the fact-finding, a concern was identified that it would have been beneficial to have additional budget for organizing more training events and for production of more copies of training manuals.

¹² Indirect and non-direct cost include personnel, monitoring & evaluation, audit, administrative fee, and miscellaneous based on Annex 4.1 Budget Summary attached to JP Prodoc.

Activity Budget Allocation across 3 Years				
Activities	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
1.1.1 Support high-level dialogues and consultations to be convened among ministries/agencies responsible for the DV Act implementation (Ministry of Social Development and	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
1.1.2 Support ministries/agencies responsible for the DV Act implementation (MSDHS, MPH, NPF, MJ, the Judiciary, MI, etc.), to identify gaps in the existing policies, plans of action and coordination guidelines of relevant ministries/agencies and update these documents in collaboration with civil society stakeholders, and convene regular coordination meetings to review implementation.	\$6,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$10,000
1.2.1 Support MSDHS and other relevant agencies such as MPH, NPF, the National Statistics Office, in collaboration with CSOs, to map out and review existing databases on GBV,	\$29,000	\$34,000	\$27,000	\$90,000
1.2.2 Provide technical assistance to MSDHS and other relevant agencies such as MPH, NPF, the National Statistics Office, and CSOs, to enhance their capacity to work together to define and develop a viable system for a coordinated GBV/DV database at the national level.	\$10,000	\$9,700	\$9,000	\$28,700
1.2.3 Provide technical assistance to MSDHS and other relevant agencies such as MPH, NPF, the National Statistics Office, and CSOs to set up a local-level GBV/DV database at the local level in the pilot areas (see Output 2.2) as a pilot for development of the national database.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1.2.4 Support MSDHS, in consultation with relevant agencies such as MPH, NPF, MJ, judicial courts, MI, and CSOs, to prepare annual reports on the DV Act implementation and present them to the public through public forums and the media.	\$6,500	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$36,500
1.2.5 Support MSDHS, in collaboration with other relevant agencies such as MPH, NPF, MJ, judicial courts, MI and CSOs (particularly women's groups), to carry out a participatory mid-term review of the DV Act, its implementation, and its impact on the protection of women and girls facing DV.	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$15,000
1.2.6 Organize a national conference on the results of the mid-term review targeting ministries/agencies responsible for the DV Act implementation and civil society stakeholders to share experiences, good practices and lessons learned from implementing the DV Act	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000
2.1.1 Set up a technical working group comprised of relevant ministries/agencies including MSDHS, MPH, NPF, MJ, the Judiciary, MI, CSOs (particularly women's groups), and	\$500	\$0	\$0	\$500
2.1.2 Support the mapping of existing training programmes on gender equality, women's human rights, GBV and DV with relevant ministries/agencies including MSDHS, MPH, NPF, MJ, the Judiciary, MI, and their training arms/units, CSOs (particularly women's groups) to identify strengths and gaps.	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$15,000
2.1.3 Support relevant ministries/agencies including MSDHS, MPH, NPF, MJ, the Judiciary, MI, and their training arms/units, and CSOs (particularly women's groups), to develop new or improve existing training modules for personnel of government agencies responsible for the DV Act implementation as well as non-governmental service providers on rights-based and gender-sensitive responses to DV.	\$36,468	\$32,000	\$15,468	\$83,936
2.1.4 Try out the training modules in the pilot areas (see Output 2.2) and review and revise the modules.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2.1.5 Support relevant ministries/agencies including MSDHS, MPH, NPF, MJ, the Judiciary, MI, and their training arms/units, and CSOs (particularly women's groups) to advocate for integration of the training modules developed into regular training programmes of the agencies.	\$0	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
2.2.1 Convene a consultative meeting among the national and local focal points of ministries/agencies responsible for the DV Act implementation, including MSDHS, MPH, NPF, MJ,	\$11,000	\$0	\$0	\$11,000
2.2.2 Set up a monitoring system of the pilot, including identification of indicators, development of a monitoring framework and collection of baseline data	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2.2.3 Organize capacity development activities for staff of the multi-sectoral DV response system and CSOs and community-based groups in the pilot areas, with special emphasis on coordinated support services and referrals, and the understanding and application of rights-based and gender-responsive approaches to DV cases.	\$70,000	\$58,000	\$34,000	\$162,000
2.2.4 Establish a screening and referral system in public health units, including in the antenatal care and family planning clinics, for women and girls affected by DV	\$0	\$14,027	\$11,000	\$25,027
2.2.5 Support community-based organizations and local women's groups, and others to work with experienced national women's NGOs and CSOs in providing legal counseling and support services to women and girls affected by DV in the pilot areas	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$20,000
2.2.6 Support community based organizations, including local women's groups, men and boys networks and local administrative organizations, to develop and implement primary prevention programmes (e.g. local network of men and boys, community awareness raising) for DV in the pilot areas.	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$20,000
2.2.7 Support MSDHS in conducting an evaluation of the pilot model and convening a national forum to share the evaluation findings and the model.	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000
2.2.8 Document the operational processes, good practices, challenges and lessons learned from the pilot project for replication of the pilot model in other areas	\$0	\$0	\$25,000	\$25,000
2.3.1 In the pilot areas, work with CBOs and local groups, (women's groups, youth groups, networks of boys and men, local authorities, school administration and students, etc.), to	\$15,000	\$4,030	\$0	\$19,030
2.3.2 Produce documentaries or short films on DV, to be used in the awareness-raising campaigns, public events, training programmes and broadcast by local and national media channels.	\$30,000	\$20,000	\$17,400	\$67,400
Totals	\$259,468	\$238,757	\$185,868	\$684,093

For longer-term implementation, the financial constraint is considered a problem for some government counterparts to support replication of specific activities. During the interviews, it was informed that RTP does not have budget for carrying on specific training events like the ones on DV and the DV Act which JP provided financial support for. To continue such training for new groups of police/ cadets, RTP will have to find a funding source. National budget allocation is considered critical for long-term planning and implementation if the JP goal on the provision of better and well-coordinated services to DV victims is to be met.

It is also interesting to note how the majority of expenditures were planned to take place during the first year. Although the evaluation team requested information regarding the detailed actual disbursements by activity and schedule of payments from UN Women, this level of information was never provided; however, it is noted that an annual summary of revenue/ expenditures and lump sum figures by broad category (e.g. personnel, training, contracts, etc.) were submitted which provided a general overview. What is clear is that most of the activities occurred much later than planned, with the bulk of many of the pilot activities in the provinces occurring in the final year, in some cases even in the final weeks/days of the program. This led to the JP's no cost extension. In regards to why disbursements were delayed, JP program management and the annual reports indicated a number of management difficulties that affected the disbursement of funds to the key implementing governmental agencies and hence delayed implementation.

First, an oft cited reason for delays involved the floods during the first year.¹³ After having some tools developed (study reports such as the preliminary recommendation on development of the coordinated multi-sectoral mechanism and the existing training modules and programme on GBV and DV) major flooding reportedly paralyzed implementation in Bangkok and shifted the attention of key partners, particularly MSDHS, to first provide assistance to affected people while resuming their normal functions after managing the flooding disaster.

Second, another issue was the interpretation of Article no. 190 of the 2007 Constitution and whether or not it needed approval from the National Assembly in addition to that of the Cabinet prior to signing an agreement between any governmental agencies and international organizations. This issue arose in December 2010. This is in line with responses from interviewees that the implementation was delayed due mainly to an attempt to building a national ownership through getting an agreement signed with, and funds transferred to, the partners for the national implementation. This happened to all participating UN agencies and their counterparts. On the one hand, each government counterpart interpreted Article no. 190 differently, which means that it was easier for UN agencies to establish LoAs in some ministries. On the other hand, the capacity of each UN agency to establish a LoA in the same agency also varied. What emerged was a plethora of MoUs, LoAs and contracts across the JP at various times. These are summarized here¹⁴:

UN Women

- LoA with Royal Thai Police
- LoA with Ministry of Education
- LoA with Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University (sub-contracted to Women and Men Progressive Network Foundation, as well as Friends of Women Foundation)

- Individual contracts for the development of the Operating Guidelines

¹³ It is referred within UNTF Annual and Final reports, as well as by respondents from all three UN participating agencies and key interviewees.

¹⁴ This categorization was based upon a patch work of respondent testimony, official documents and stated achievements in the annual reports. Not every arrangement could be verified, and therefore may be subject to error.

- Contracts with Mahidol University for background studies training gaps

UNFPA

- After taking the modality of direct implementation through the Ministry of Public Health for the first year and a half at least, a contract was signed with an NGO ‘Planned Parenthood Association of Thailand’ (PPAT)

UNDP

- A contract was signed with a company to produce a ‘communication strategy’ which was not finalized/ completed.
- LoA with MSDHS (allowing UNDP to implement the activities directly with no transfer of funds involved)

Finally, MSDHS did inquire and consider it an issue that UNDP was able to establish a LoA with their department while UN Women could not. The MSDHS respondent said that this was most likely due to a lack of planning on the part of UN Women. In turn, UN Women respondents have indicated that their use different modalities; a point which was not clearly understood by MSDHS.

It should be noted that it is not clear how these lack of formal arrangements influenced the actual delays in implementation, as elements of the JP proceeded without formal arrangements in place. The most striking example is involves the time gap between the training of RTP and the signing of the LoA (which was heralded by the UN Women respondent as the first of its kind to date). The LoA was written on 11 Oct 2013 and signed on 14 Oct 2013 to cover implementation duration from 14-31 Oct 2013 (2 weeks) for a budget of THB 830,900 or USD 26,571 approximately. The LoA stated that its key activities were to develop training curriculum, conduct a training event, document lessons learnt to finalize the curriculum and present the results in a national workshop (which did not take place). In the workplan attached to the LoA, most activities were identified as ‘preparatory phase’ i.e. Aug and Sep 2013 (taking place before the period of the LoA), including collection of inputs and development of training curriculum, as well as conduct of training events. Only two activities i.e. 1) documentation of lessons learnt and finalization of training modules and 2) organizing national workshop were identified for the implementation period in Oct 2013. Yet as per the Annual Reports and interviewee responses, the majority of training provided to RTP in practice took place in 2012 and early 2013. The LoA also requested RTP to submit narrative (inception/ progress) and financial reports before the LoA was written and signed. None of these reports were provided to the evaluation team for review, and it is unclear if this LoA was used to cover previous expenses incurred in 2012, or for additional activities conducted in the last two weeks of the JP in 2013.

Regardless of type of agreement, implementation delays and misalignments influenced the ability of the UN agencies to cost share. On the one hand, it was documented in the annual reports that there were few cost-shared activities e.g. training of the RTP supported by the MSDHS budget and meetings with partners hosted by the governmental counterparts. On the other hand, trainings conducted under UNFPA and UN Women sometimes took place up to a year apart from each other. For example, UNFPA supported training at the Takua Pa OSCC in October-November 2012, while a similar training was implemented by UN Women with many of the same stakeholders the following year. Greater coordination across agencies could have resulted in more cost savings by bringing these two trainings together.

Some of these implementation delays spilled over into issues of proper timing and quality control. As already suggested, UNDP’s communication outreach activities encountered quality

issues early on and never fully recovered, leading to the cancellation of the communications campaign. At the time of the cancellation, UNDP stated they were not aware that the JP would be extended and thus cancelled the activity on the grounds that there was not enough time to find a replacement vendor. This was most likely a very rational and responsible decision on the part of UNDP. By contrast, UN Women took a very different position and prioritized rushed implementation over medium term planning. Even with the extension, both written and verbal evidence indicates many of its activities were implemented in a very short period of time in the last 6-8 weeks of the JP as demonstrated by the example of LoAs issued end-August and October 2013. Implementation counter parts in the provinces, especially Phang Nga, responded that this did lower the quality of the implementation and its overall effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

The case of the development of the operating guidelines is perhaps the most illustrative of the pitfalls of rushed implementation. During the first year of implementation, a local consultant team was brought in under UN Women to facilitate a key national working group, which led to the creation of the operating guidelines. Although the final product was useful, the consultant team indicated that prior planning had not been conducted, and they were thus forced to rush the process in less than two months.

Finally, UNFPA's work with MPH also faced delays that limited its efficiency. In 2012, MPH worked closely with Khon Kaen University to develop a very high quality training publication on how to link and integrate issues around gender and women's human rights, gender equality and DV/ GBV into the work of OSCCs; analyse cases through a gender sensitive lens in order to provide assistance to victims; and to identify gender-based OSCC operational system. The training materials were used as the basis for training of trainers in October and December 2012 (these materials had not been finalized in time for the training sessions which had to proceed with lower quality black and white print outs). According to the post-training assessments, the materials were completed in early 2013 with 500 copies produced, but, as of yet, still have not been used or applied to trainings elsewhere.

Although external factors outside a programme's control can always lead to implementation delays, many of the above listed issues suggest the need for stronger management practices. Yet unfortunately the JP did not allocate, or continue to sustain, a full time project coordinator. All three UN respondents were unanimous in stating that this was a major lesson learned and that similar efforts in the future should strongly consider allocating resources to ensure a full time project coordinator is present throughout the life of the programme. This could be initially interpreted as contradicting the information stated in the JP budget summary and details attached to the signed ProDoc as a budget line was set up for personnel i.e. National Coordinator under UNIFEM. However, the expenses for the 'personnel' category were meant for staff, consultants and travel, but no detailed documentation was made available for the evaluation team to review if any of that budget line was spent specifically for a JP coordinator.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The JP was efficient in terms of its ability to identify and mobilize high quality expertise across its various activities at relative low costs. Yet considering the ambitiousness of the JP's goals and the plethora of stakeholders involved, the programme was considerably under resourced. In particular, the "learning" aspects of the JP, such as lessons learned workshops, M&E activities and proof of concept studies, did not receive proper allocation and were not adequately implemented. Project management and implementation timing were also issues, as long delays in launching activities combined with rushed deliveries to lower the quality of JP's activities and create tensions within the partnership. As such, the JP would have greatly benefited from a full-time programme coordinator, which would of course required more resources, but may have

also better managed the implementation process, ensured greater coordination, documentation, sequencing and overall stronger planning.

Future programmes may wish to consider:

- Supporting a local organization to implement a national as well as local lessons learned JP review exercise given the substantial interest for this initiative.
- Ensuring that Letters of Agreement are in place as part of a preparation phase before implementation is scheduled to begin.
- Making mid-course corrections by shifting resources to appropriate UN Agencies that have necessary arrangements in place rather than granting no cost extensions to those that do not.
- Allocating resources for a full time programme/ project coordinator when implementing inter-agency programmes/ projects such as the JP.

Chapter 5: Sustainability and Impact Findings:

The impact section has been combined with the sustainability section of the evaluation. For this evaluation, sustainability is referred to the probability that the Joint Programme will continue to generate long term benefit over time.¹⁵ These are further addressed in the following three sub questions:

- To what extent has the Joint Programme supported:
 - Developing an enabling or adaptable environment for real change on human rights and gender equality?
 - Institutional change conducive to systematically addressing concerns of domestic violence in women and girls from human rights and gender equality perspectives?
 - Capacity development of targeted rights holders (to demand) and duty bearers (to fulfill) rights?
- Are the activities and their impact likely to continue when external support is withdrawn?
- Will the strategy be more widely replicated or adapted? What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the Programme?

Because the JP was completed in October 2013, the evaluation team faced an opportunity to determine to what extent aspects of the JP had continued. Many of these findings were already made clear in previous sections of the evaluation, and this section will summarize the sustainability aspects of the previously discussed activities below.

Impact is defined as positive (or negative) effects that go beyond the immediate beneficiaries (defined above) and actually improve the lives of victims of DV. This is further guided by the following sub questions:

- What are the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the Joint Programme as a whole and of individual participating agencies, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

¹⁵ This is because JP did not dedicate sufficient resources to maintaining an adequate M&E system that could capture and demonstrate its impact.

- Has the Joint Programme improved accountability, cohesion & collaboration between government, academia and civil society in the implementation of the Domestic Violence Act?

Although not perfect, one potential proxy impact indicator could be a change in the number of reported instances of DV in the pilot areas over time, in which both areas sought to reduce DV through a prevention strategy. Another way of interpreting changes to DV instances is that more reporting means a greater understanding that DV is a crime and confidence in reporting has improved; therefore, increases to DV incidents could be seen as a success. Regardless of the interpretation, one would expect to see some kind of significant change in DV incidents over time if the JP had a significant impact on the area. Here, the evaluation team was able to review reported instances of DV in the Phang Nga province, which will also be discussed below.

Sustainability of Outcome 1

In terms of the continued application of the operating guidelines, it is unclear to what extent it remains relevant. Some of the original members of the Working Group indicated that many of the clauses in the guidelines are out dated and need revision. These potential issues seem to reflect a wider potential revision to the DV Act itself. Although the details of the revision remain unclear, respondents did suggest that there is still too much discretionary power in the Act that prevents the prosecution of many cases of domestic violence. A potential revision would therefore be to further criminalize DV abuses in ways that force cases to court.

A particular loss was the momentum of the Sub-committee. Preliminary UN Women efforts were not enough to propagate a sustained, meaningful interaction of the Sub-committee and MSDHS still has limited leadership and management capacity to move a more serious coordination mechanism forward. As suggested in the Relevance section of this evaluation, this poses a difficult dilemma for future program designers, as the aforementioned capacity gaps within MSDHS to coordinate and monitor the implementation of policy appear to be significant, while at the same time, the DV Act currently assigns the OWFDA as the main focal point for its implementation.

The sustainability of Output 1.2 was already addressed in the previous section, in which the processes associated with generating the VAW/G Indicator report on an annual basis were unlikely to be sustained and with the next version potentially released in 2018, if at all.

Sustainability of Outcome 2

The knowledge and trainings generated under Outcome 2 (selected training events summarized in the following table)¹⁶ appear to be the key results of the JP and the post-training assessments, as reported by most respondents in general and as demonstrated by the pre-test/post test scores for the UNFPA OSCC trainings.

Training Topic	# of trainees
Operating guidelines	108 government officials from MSDHS/ MoI/ MPH/ MoJ/ RTP/ OAG/ and local government organizations; community leaders
DV & DV Act	198 police inquiry officers (3 batches) from RTP
Gender responsive protection & support service	50 Health service personnel
VAW/G; and DV & DV Act	230 students & 230 teachers

¹⁶ Other capacity building events included paint in park (awareness raising), study visits and community-based case conference process.

However, the training curricula developed for different partners appear to be used only for the JP-funded training event with little sign that they will continue:

- MPH is currently in the process of developing another separate curriculum with more details. This is despite using the curriculum designed during JP as an overall framework (the handbooks produced by JP fund were still not distributed although planned to be given away when a future training is to be conducted)
- MoE – No further VAW activities under the JP have been taken forward.
- RTP – No written (formal) training curriculum is used, but plans to form an expert cadre network are underway
- MSDHS – No further training activities have occurred or are likely to occur
- OAG – No specific curriculum designed for its staff during JP implementation and now using and developing its own curriculum
- Provincial Pilot Trainings – no further trainings have been offered, although attendees continue to retain and reference training materials.

Notably, the above summary does suggest that the trainings involving formal, written materials seem to have a higher chance of being taken forward either as reference documents or as the basis for improvements to subsequent modules.

One of the biggest barriers to wider impacts and more sustainable outcomes was the lack of a systematic lesson learning activities. Moreover, although there were a few activities that resulted in formal “lessons learned” reports, e.g. the Report on Strengthening Local Level Multi-sectoral Coordination Mechanism Towards Effective Implementation of Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act 2007, written by Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University, the results of these reports were not widely distributed and socialized. For example, the main respondent, who is listed as one of the formal authors of the report, indicated having not seen it and would like to obtain a copy. Overall, many respondents across the board indicated that this was a notable gap in the JP and many still expressed a high demand for multi-sector lesson learning workshops at both the local and national levels.

Seen from a wider lens, the sustainability and impact of the JP has had mixed results. First and foremost, the experience has clearly heightened awareness of the importance of the DV Act and helped provide a clear experiential reference point for various stakeholders to advance its implementation. Although many of the activities launched by the JP were already occurring in various forms around Thailand, the JP notably sped up these nascent processes, provided more clarity and expanded previously established networks. However, given the ad hoc nature of many of these activities, their short time frame and lack of follow up, most of the relevant agencies and organizations have returned to previous “stove piped” practices. Indeed, some of the key stakeholders in the JP process are less likely to work with other partners partially as a result of their experience under the JP. Regardless of future collaborative efforts, a sustained DV Act implementation mechanism is currently still lacking. Finally, it does not appear that the JP strategy will be taken forward by any of UN partners, as none of the respondents indicated that there were any current plans to launch a follow initiative, let alone do so through a Joint Programme type of approach.

Impact in Phang Nga

Although the JP did not make any visible attempts to measure its impact, the evaluation team was able to access two official statistical databases during their visit to Phang Nga Province. The first database is maintained by MSDHS and is found on line at osccserver.ega.or.th (requires

registration). OSCC staff were first trained on use of the system in November 2012, but there hasn't been a follow up to see if referral system was working or to train new replacement staff.

What is interesting about the MSDHS system is that it does allow the user the ability to track the outcome of the referred victim to the next referral. Once a DV victim is entered into the system, it goes to MSDHS 1. for acceptance and 2. for planned next step action. There were a few pending cases that had not been accepted and/or marked for follow up, dated in 2013\2, but these were initial entries that probably will not be addressed. Since then, entry to response time was relatively efficient and averaged under a month. Data is entered at each OSCC, and the system is linked across other provincial offices to identify cross border cases in which a victim may reside elsewhere. One drawback is that victims are not tracked across the entire system, and a prior abuse victim that was identified by RTP could show up to an OSCC and neither organization would be able to flag this. Nevertheless, the database is a potentially very useful system that could improve monitoring processes and gauge the effectiveness of programmes like the JP.

When looking at the data, the first entry was July 2012, i.e. approximately one year and four months prior to the start of the Phang Nga Pilot and approximately at the same time of the UNFPA training (in which better DV records should have been kept and increases to the number of incidents being reported were likely). Thus, the data potentially serves as a baseline/endline on the impact of the JP's prevention efforts in Phang Nga in the short to medium term. Data was captured from July 2012 until May 2015. Broken down further, it looks like this:

# of reported DV cases at OSCCs in the Phang Nga Province Jul 2012 to May 2015*	
Jul – Dec 2012	3 Cases
Jan – Jun 2013	10 Cases
Jul – Dec 2013	10 Cases
Jan – June 2014	10 Cases
Jul – Dec 2014	10 Cases
Jan – May 2015	8 Cases
*Taken from the OSCC database of statistics, found at osccserver.ega.or.th	

Based upon the above data, there were no noticeable reductions in reported instances of DV in the Phang Nga that could be attributed to the JP. The only real significant change comes when comparing the first 6 month period, July to December 2012, with the following six month period, which is most likely explained in terms of increased familiarity with reporting to the database. Indeed, the OSCC respondent indicated that initially some cases could not be reported because the database required that nurses input the phone numbers of victims into the file (Her solution was to put the phone numbers of nurses who failed to capture this information, which provided an incentive for them to do so). What is most striking is the seemingly complete lack of variation in reported DV instances across 2013 and 2014, suggesting that the JP has absolutely no noticeable impact on the province whatsoever. The number dips down to 8 cases in the last six month period, perhaps due to the fact that the final month was missing.

Caution must be exercised when attempting to use these numbers, as the OSCC personnel indicated that not all OSCCs data were fed into the database consistently, or even at all. This is partly due to the user-unfriendliness of the database. During the meeting with the evaluation

team, the OSCC respondent was involuntarily logged off the system three times, and each time required around 10-15 minutes to re log in. The numbers returned on various search queries were also not consistent, and the team had to run them several times until consistent numbers were found.

The OSCC respondent also discussed a separate DV system that is managed by MoI. She indicated this system was more reliable, had more consistent reporting compliance and was easier to navigate. The system was also highly secure, and required staff to enter special ID cards containing electronic chips to monitor user usage. However, this database does not track victim referrals. This database’s query functions were also not as flexible, and the evaluation team could only report annual totals of DV in Phang Nga:

# of reported DV cases at OSCCs in the Phang Nga Province 2012 to 2014*	
2012	44 Cases of Reported Violence
2013	37 Cases of Reported Violence
2014	41 Cases of Reported Violence
*Taken from the MoI Database, which cannot be accessed via the web.	

These numbers do not support any claims that the JP had a noticeable impact on reducing reported DV in Phang Nga, and in 2014 the numbers even increased. However, again it should be noted that these numbers can be misleading. First, they apparently do not distinguish between various types of violence, including child abuse as well as violence against victims of human trafficking until recently. Second, the 2012 and 2013 cases were paper based, and MoI only moved to a fully electronic system in 2014. Although the effects of this are unclear, the switch in reporting mechanism may have impacted the way instances are entered/reported. Regardless, the MoI Database does capture a larger number of reported instances than the one managed by MSDHS, potentially due to the fact that a wider number of stakeholders are able to input into the system and share this information jointly.

Potential misreporting issues aside, the overall effect on the biannual and annual numbers are most likely minimal, or none at all. What is clear is that the numbers from either database fail to demonstrate any noticeable impact the JP had on reported instances of violence, and yearly variations were most likely due to natural year to year variations. In any case, it is not clear why the JP failed to embrace either reporting system as a means of gauging its own effectiveness. Doing so could have potentially improved information sharing and coordination across ministries, which of course would have further strengthened the multi-sector mechanism JP had set out to improve.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The JP experience has clearly heightened awareness of the importance of the DV Act and helped provide a clear experiential reference point for various stakeholders to advance its implementation. Although many of the activities launched by the JP were already occurring in various forms around Thailand, the JP notably sped up these nascent processes (processes that

were already forming and starting to occur)¹⁷, provided more clarity and expanded previously established networks.

However, given the nature of many of these activities, their short time frame and lack of follow up, most of the relevant agencies and organizations have returned to previous practices. Although the individual activities advanced under the JP did lead to some meaningful outputs and results, the evaluation team found very little evidence that any of these activities left an impact on indirect beneficiaries and were sustained by the main target groups. Overall, most activities were viewed as one-off events that have not occurred since the JP was completed. Aside from some training materials (some of which were never used), a potential follow on JP would find itself mostly starting from scratch. There still may be an opportunity to consolidate some of the lessons learned by the JP, which may contribute to unlooked for types of stability.

In terms of impact, there is no evidence to sustain that the JP should be associated with any reductions in reported DV in the pilot areas. However, the potential to use current information systems administered by MSDHS to confirm/reject programme impact is high.

Future programmes may wish to consider:

- Updating the previous operating guidelines in terms of the relevance to the current context and monitoring the developments of potential changes to the DV Act to ensure they are in line with international norms.
- Supporting further efforts of RTP to introduce a sustained and formal DV Act training module for inquiry officers and line police across Thailand. This may take the form of a decentralized model in which a provincial representative may be designated as the focal point for sustaining the training.
- Consolidating and documenting current lessons learned from the JP and disseminating the findings to all relevant stakeholders in line with the previous recommendation to hold a national lessons learned conference.
- Designing future awareness raising efforts with sustainability concerns in mind by not only ensuring that printed materials are produced, but also that these efforts are housed within their appropriate organisational bodies, that responsible staff positions are identified (as opposed to specific individuals, who come and go) and that periodic reviews and updates occur. Conversely, one-off events and trainings that lack follow up and are externally administered should be avoided.
- Exploring how the MSDHS database could be improved to provide a comprehensive DV referral tracking mechanism across DV Act stakeholders. This should include efforts to increase its user-friendliness, functionality and overall compliance across organizational bodies, as well as include the ability to identify previous victims who may enter the system through other entry points. In doing so, explore how to coordinate the information captured in this database with other systems, such as those maintained by the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

¹⁷ Examples include: coordination among multi-sectoral professionals; and capacity building of OSCC personnel and RTP officers. As identified in JP product i.e.: Study Report on Multi-stakeholder Coordination Mechanism for the Implementation of Domestic Violence Victims Protection Act 2007 (Study on existing plan, policy, mechanism and capacities).

- Finally, using the database as a power impact evaluation tool to gauge the effectiveness of programmes like the JP and facilitate multi-stakeholder learning on their own effectiveness.

Annex 1: Terms of Reference



Terms of Reference

UN Women Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific

Title	Evaluation Team Leader
Location	Thailand—Bangkok and Phang-Nga
Purpose	Independent External Final Evaluation for the Joint Programme “Every Home a Safe Home: Supporting Thailand Towards Effective Implementation of Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act B.E. 2550 (2007)
Contract Duration	40 days (25 March, 2015 – 3 June 2015)
Contract Supervision	UN Trust Fund Asia and Pacific Regional Focal Point

I. BACKGROUND

Thailand’s State Report to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women in 2006 noted the severity and worsening of the situation of violence against women and the prevalence of violence perpetrated by family members or acquaintances of the victims. In 2007, Thailand took a significant step in promulgating the Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act B.E. 2550 (2007), in line with the 2006 CEDAW Concluding Observations.

In 2010, the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security, and the United Nations Country Team in Thailand launched the Joint Programme “Every Home a Safe Home: Supporting Thailand Towards Effective Implementation of Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act B.E. 2550 (2007)¹⁸. The United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) assumed the role of the administrative agent of the Joint Programme, while the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and UN Women served as the UN Participating Agencies that jointly implemented the programme. The duration of the Joint Programme was 1 February 2010 to 31 October 2013. The Joint Programme was funded by the United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women.

The Joint Programme’s goal is to ensure that women and girls in Thailand facing domestic violence receive well-functioning and support services through rights-based and gender responsive implementation of Domestic Violence Act. The Joint Programme contributes to two outcomes:

¹⁸ Hereinafter referred to as the Domestic Violence Act.

(1) Multi-sectoral coordination mechanism amongst the Domestic Violence Act implementing partners is improved, and (2) Capacity of multi-sectoral coordination mechanism to provide well-coordinate, rights-based and gender sensitive protection and support services in Domestic Violence Act implementation is increased.

The Joint Programme utilized a multi-pronged strategy of advocacy, capacity development, awareness raising, and piloting the implementation of the Domestic Violence Act with rights-based and gender responsive approaches. In partnership with the Ministry Social Development and Human Security, Ministry of Public Health, Ministry of Education, Office of the Attorney-General, Royal Thai Police, the Sukhothai Thammathirat University and women's NGOs, multi-sectoral coordination mechanism guidelines including referral and screening guidelines, indicators for violence against women, and capacity development modules for service providers were developed at the national level, and subsequently tested in selected districts in two provinces—Bangkok and Phang Nga.

The Joint Programme targeted women and girls survivors of domestic violence or those vulnerable to suffering from domestic violence as the primary beneficiaries. Secondary beneficiaries included targeted decision makers and middle level officers at the national level, provincial administration officials, community-based groups and local women's groups, civil society partners, hospitals and primary and secondary schools, both at the national level and in the pilot sites.

II. PURPOSE AND USE OF THE EVALUATION

The overall purposes of this evaluation are to assess:

- **Relevance:** extent to which the objectives of Joint Programme are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country-needs and global priorities;
- **Effectiveness:** extent to which stated project goal, outcomes and outputs were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance; external factors which have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes and the project goals;
- **Efficiency:** measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.
- **Sustainability:** The probability of continued long-term benefits from the Joint Programme; the resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time; and
- **Impact:** positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the Joint Programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Use of the evaluation report

- The evaluation findings shared in the consultants' final report will be used by the Office of Women's Affairs and Family Development (OWAFD) and the Sub-committee on the Elimination and Prevention of Domestic Violence coordinated by OWAFD, and by line ministries and UN Participating Agencies to the Joint Programme, for making decisions on the future direction and design of policies and programmes to end domestic violence for women and girls particularly in the context of the DV Act and its implementation/revision.
- The evaluation findings will also be used by the United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women in its strategic directions and decisions.

III. THE SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Evaluation scope: The evaluation will focus on the Joint Programme overall and on components implemented by each UN Participating Agencies.

Geographical coverage: The evaluation will focus on sub-projects implemented in Bangkok as the national level implementation, as well as Bangkok and Phang Nga as the pilot province implementation, including travel to project sites.

Stakeholder coverage: The evaluation will reach out to principle stakeholders, i.e. Joint Programme beneficiaries, Joint Programme government and civil society partners and implementing partners at the national and provincial levels¹⁹, and participating UN agencies.

Substantive scope: The evaluation will analyse the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the Joint Programme objectives in terms of results achieved against objectives, change on human rights and gender equality, ownership of stakeholders, sustainability of the action, both financial and organizational. It should consider the nature of the joint programme, exploring the extent to which it has allowed the UN to work in more coordinated manner with partners, and how/the extent to which this has been achieved in practice and the efficacy of the model.

IV. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The consultants should be guided but not limited to the scope of the evaluation questions listed below. The consultants should raise and address any other relevant issues that may emerge during the evaluation:

Relevance Questions:

- Extent to which the interventions were aligned with and contributed to national law and policies on domestic violence against women and girls from a human rights and gender equality perspective
- Extent to which the Joint Programme results address identified rights and needs of the target group(s) in the national and local contexts.

Effectiveness Questions:

¹⁹ Office of Women's Affairs and Family Development, Ministry of Social Development and Human Security, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Public Health, Office of the Attorney General, Royal Thai Police, Mahidol University, Sukhothai Thammathirat University, Friends of Women Foundation, Women and Men Progressive Network Foundation

- Extent to which the Joint Programme's goal, outcomes and outputs were achieved, or are on track or likely to be achieved and how, taking into account their relative importance and relationships between different levels of results.
- To what extent did the project reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached?
- To what extent has this project generated positive changes in the lives of targeted (and untargeted) women and girls in relation to the specific forms of violence addressed by this project? Why? What are the key changes in the lives of those women and/or girls? Please describe those changes.
- What internal and external factors contributed to the achievement and/or failure of the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs? How?

Efficiency Questions:

- Extent to which the Joint Programme used the resources in the most cost-effective manner to achieve its objectives
- Are the funds provided sufficient for achieving the short-term and long-term goals of integrating human rights and gender equality in the programme intervention?

Impact Questions:

- What are the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the Joint Programme as a whole and of individual participating agencies, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.
- Has the Joint Programme improved accountability, cohesion & collaboration between government, academia and civil society in the implementation of the Domestic Violence Act?

Sustainability Questions:

- To what extent has the Joint Programme supported:
 - Developing an enabling or adaptable environment for real change on human rights and gender equality
 - Institutional change conducive to systematically addressing concerns of domestic violence in women and girls from human rights and gender equality perspectives
 - Capacity development of targeted rights holders (to demand) and duty bearers (to fulfill) rights
- Are the activities and their impact likely to continue when external support is withdrawn?
- Will the strategy be more widely replicated or adapted? What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?

V. METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS

An initial meeting of the evaluation team with UN Women and the Joint Programme Participating UN Agencies staff, when the consultants begin the evaluation, shall be organized to determine the methods and develop a feasible joint work plan. The work plan should describe in great detail how the evaluation will be carried out, suggest further clarification on the applied methodology, roles and responsibilities of the participants, specify field visits if any, and outline the timeframe for the consultancy.

The suggested methods for the evaluation include analyses of various sources of information, including in-depth desk review and documentation analysis (e.g. progress and completion reports,

workshop and mission reports, knowledge and advocacy products, and other appropriate documentation produced and related by the Joint Programme); conducting surveys of individual projects, meeting with the project partners; field visits to project sites; in-depth interviews with key stakeholders, focus group discussions and other means to allow cross-validation of data.

Based on consultations with Joint Programme UN Participating Agencies and key members of the Joint Programme Technical Committee, the consultants will visit selected project sites to validate the findings of the desk review and documentation analysis, and identify best practices and lessons learned. To make this evaluation more participatory, there will be a stakeholder meeting at which the initial findings are presented. UN Women and the UN Participating Agencies will work with the evaluation team to make sure the meeting includes a wide variety of stakeholders. The evaluation team will also hold separate meetings with and interview partners from government institutions, civil society organizations, as well as the UN Participating Agencies.

VI. INDICATIVE EVALUATION TIMELINE

The final evaluation will be conducted according to the following tentative timeline (March 25 – Jun 3, 2015)

Stage 1: Inception Stage

Task	Responsible Party	Number of days	From	To	Remarks
Briefing of evaluators and desk review of key documents	Evaluation team	3	25 Mar, 15	27 Mar, 15	Home-based (Team Leader only)
Development of evaluation methodology	Evaluation team in cooperation with UN Women and Joint Programme UN Participating Agencies	2	30 Mar, 15	31 Mar, 15	Home-based; Bangkok (Team leader only)
Consultations with key members of the Joint Programme Technical Review Committee to reach an agreement on the evaluation designs and methods	Evaluation team in cooperation with UN Women Thailand Programme and the Joint Programme Technical Review Committee	3	1 Apr, 15	3 Apr, 17	in Bangkok
Prepare and finalize the inception report	Evaluation team	3	6 Apr, 15	8 Apr, 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit Inception Report on 8 Apr, 15 • Evaluation Manager provide feedback by 14 Apr, 15 • Consultants submit revised inception report by 16 Apr, 15

Stage 2: Data Collection and Analysis

Task	Responsible Party	Number of days	From	To	Remarks
Conduct field trips to project sites, including in-depth interviews and focus group meetings	Evaluation team in cooperation with UN Women and UN Participating Agencies	7	20 Apr, 15	24 Apr, 15	Phang Nga sites
		2	27 Apr, 15	28 Apr, 15	Bangkok sites
Conduct in-depth interviews and focus group meetings in Bangkok according to the agreed list	Evaluation team	3	29 Apr, 15	1 May, 15	Bangkok
Data classification, systematization, and analysis and interpretation of	Evaluation team	5	4 May, 15	8 May, 15	Home based

findings					
----------	--	--	--	--	--

Stage 3: Synthesis and Reporting Stage

Task	Responsible Party	Number of days	From	To	Remarks
Draft the draft evaluation report, which summarizes key findings and recommendations. National consultant to review Thai translation if translation is required. Present initial findings and recommendations at a stakeholder meeting including key members of the Joint Technical Review Committee, UN Women, UN Participating Agencies, implementing partners, and other agreed-upon stakeholders for initial feedback.	Evaluation team Evaluation team in cooperation with UN Women and UN Participating Agencies	6	11 May,15	18 May,15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Home based Submit Draft Final Report on 11 May, 15 Evaluation Manager provide feedback by 14 May, 15
		2	19 May	20 May,15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bangkok Consultants Presents initial findings to UNW and Participating agencies
Incorporate comments and feedback from the stakeholders meeting and revise and finalize the full evaluation report. National consultant reviews its translation into Thai if translation is required.	Evaluation team	6	21 May, 15	27 May,15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Home-based Submit Final Report on 26 May, 15 Evaluation Manager provide feedback by 28 May, 15 Consultants submit revised inception report by 3 Jun, 15

VII. DELIVERABLES

Expected key outputs will include:

- Evaluation tools to be developed by 31 March 2015 and shared with UN Women.
- An agreed evaluation inception report) by 8 April 2015 (note that all dates are tentative).The inception report should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures. The inception report should also include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product.
- A draft evaluation report, summarizing key findings and recommendations is to be shared with UN Women by 5 May 2015.
- A PowerPoint presentation on the initial evaluation findings and recommendations to be presented to members of the Joint Technical Committee and key stakeholders at a stakeholders meeting by 18 May 2015.
- A draft final evaluation report to be submitted to UN Women for review by 26 May 2015.

- An analytical and comprehensive final evaluation report not exceeding 50 pages (including annexes) in hard and soft copy to be submitted to UN Women by 3 Jun 2015
- Mission reports to project sites to be submitted to UN Women within 1 week after each mission.

Guidelines for External Evaluation Reports, by the United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women (Annex I)

VIII. MANAGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation team will work in close collaboration and consultation with Joint Programme staff and management structure as per the table below.

Who: Actors and Accountability	What: Roles and Responsibilities
Evaluation Team Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lead the whole evaluation process ▪ Work closely with the Evaluation Specialist; Manage the evaluation process in timely manner, ▪ Communicate with UN Women on key progress of the evaluation ▪ Conduct field visits to the project sites identified and collect data. ▪ Report to UN Women as required ▪ Produce the inception report, draft evaluation report and final report
Evaluation Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engage and contribute substantively to the whole evaluation process ▪ Share responsibilities for conducting desk review and interviews ▪ Conduct field visits to the project sites identified and collect data ▪ Provide substantive inputs, and writing as required, to the data analysis and to the inception report, draft evaluation report and final evaluation report. ▪ Review translation of inception report, draft evaluation report and final evaluation report into Thai by professional translators (in case translation is required).
Joint Technical Committee members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participate in the review of the evaluation methodology and provide comments to the evaluation team and the UN Women Evaluation Task Manager. ▪ Observe the process of the evaluation
UN Women Evaluation Manager (UN Trust Fund Asia and Pacific Regional Focal Point)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure the decisions to be made on time for the evaluation team ▪ Facilitate recruitment and selection of the evaluation team ▪ Lead the collection of key documents and data to be shared with the evaluators at the beginning of the inception stage

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Liaise and coordinate with the evaluation team, the reference group, the commissioning organization and the advisory group throughout the process; facilitate communication and collaboration ▪ Monitor evaluation implementation and provide technical support and guidance to the evaluation team ▪ Report to the Commissioning Organization and core members of the Joint Technical Review Committee any significant deviation from the evaluation plan ▪ Facilitate a management response to the evaluation and facilitate the implementation of committed actions in the management response ▪ Facilitate dissemination of evaluation findings to stakeholders
Technical Officers of UN Participating Agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide substantive inputs to the evaluation process, through and in close collaboration with the UN Women Evaluation Manager ▪ Contribute to collection of key documents and data to be shared the Evaluation Task Manager in a timely manner, for sharing with the evaluators at the beginning of the inception stage ▪ Facilitate coordination with key informants and members of the Reference Group pertaining to own agencies. ▪ Contribute to preparation of the management response
Commissioning Organization (Senior Management of UN Women)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allocate adequate human and financial resources for the evaluation ▪ Guide the evaluation manager ▪ Prepare responses to the recommendations generated by the evaluation
Reference Group (Agreed beneficiaries, partners, and stakeholders to the Joint Programme)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide necessary information to the evaluation team ▪ Review draft report for quality assurance
Advisory Group (Country Programme Coordinator, Thailand, the Portfolio Manager and the M&E Specialist of the UN Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women Secretariat)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review and comment on the draft report for quality assurance ▪ Provide technical support as needed.

IX. TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation will be conducted by 2 experts—one evaluation team leader and one evaluation specialist. Experts will be selected and recruited based on the requirements outlined below.

The Evaluation Team Leader is expected to lead the process and work closely with the Evaluation Specialist and to manage the evaluation process in timely manner. The Evaluation Team Leader is primarily responsible for writing and producing the final report.

The Evaluation Specialist will contribute to the process substantively, sharing responsibilities for conducting desk review and interviews, provide substantive input to data analysis and preparation of the reports, including writing as required, and review its translation into Thai by translators (in case translation is required).

While the Evaluation team will work in an independent manner, UN Women, as the administrative agent of the Joint Programme, with support from UN Participating Agencies as relevant, will provide logistical and other support to facilitate the evaluation team mission, particularly for field visits, including the provision of professional interpreters to accompany the Evaluation Team Leader during field visits, if required. The Joint Programme Technical Review Committee members and UN Participating Agencies will join the evaluation team field missions as observers if agreed to be necessary.

Evaluation Team Leader (International or National Consultant)

Required Expertise/Qualifications

- Master's degree in relevant discipline (e.g., gender, development and social studies, sociology, political science, etc);
- Strategic thinking and proven expertise in gender analysis;
- At least 10 years of experience in programme preferably in evaluation and proven accomplishment in undertaking evaluations, including leading evaluations of multi-stakeholder programmes for multilateral organizations
- Experience in conducting complex evaluations in the development field and with international organizations (at least 5 evaluation of which at least two as team leader)
- Knowledge in results-based programming in support of gender justice and human rights, and in the area of the elimination of violence against women and domestic violence;
- Excellent inter-personal and communication skills
- Excellent written and spoken English and presentational capacities
- Extensive knowledge of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods
- Knowledge of the UN system a strong asset
- Knowledge of the development context of Thailand and preferably previous experience in development initiatives in Thailand (in case of international applicants)
- Knowledge of Thailand and the working context and environment of government and civil society agencies in Thailand (in case of national applicants);
- Excellent drafting and writing skills to produce and present concise and analytical reports and communicate clearly with evaluation stakeholders;
- Excellent interpersonal and teamwork skills.

Competency

- **Integrity:** Demonstrate consistency in upholding and promoting the values of UN Women in actions and decisions, in line with the UN Code of Conduct.
- **Professionalism:** Demonstrate professional competence and expert knowledge of the pertinent substantive areas of work.
- **Cultural sensitivity and valuing diversity:** Demonstrate an appreciation of the multicultural nature of the organization and the diversity of its staff. Demonstrate an

international outlook, appreciating difference in values and learning from cultural diversity.

X. EVALUATION ETHICS

Evaluations in the UN will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in both UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System and by the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. These documents will be attached to the contract. Evaluators are required to read the Norms and Standards and the guidelines and ensure a strict adherence to it, including establishing protocols to safeguard confidentiality of information obtained during the evaluation.

XI. SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

No	Milestone/Deliverable	Payment Schedule
1	Upon submission of the inception report	30%
2	Upon submission of the draft report	30%
3	Upon submission and approval by UN Women of final study	40%

Annex 2: List of Persons Interviewed

No.	Name/ Position	Organization	Contact Details
PARTNERS & BENEFICIARIES			
1.	Ms. Sirikul Inthaphanich <i>Chief, Domestic Violence Act Coordinating Center</i>	MSDHS, Office of Women's Affair and Family Development	Tel: 081-875-0692 pom_pom1@hotmail.com
2.	Ms. Tassanee Sushevagul <i>Social Development Worker</i>	MSDHS, Professional Senior	Tel: 080-060-7972
3.	Mr. Sumeth Buaboocha	MSDHS, Provincial Office of Phang Nga	Tel: 076-412-179, 089-728-7982
4.	Mrs. Boonploy Tulaphan <i>Public Health Technical Officer</i>	MOPH, Bureau of Public Health, Office of the Permanent Secretary	Tel. 02-590-1635, 02-590-1630, 081-346-8445 bunpoy@yahoo.com
5.	Ms. Achima Kerdkla <i>Public Health Technical Officer</i>	MOPH, Bureau of Public Health, Office of the Permanent Secretary	Tel. 086-665-8549
6.	Ms. Woraphat Saengkaeo <i>Head of Social Welfare Department, OSCC for Prevention of DV and VAW</i>	MOPH, OSCC at Pathum Thani Hospital	Tel: 089-815-5811 saengkaeo_oscc@hotmail.com
7.	Ms. Mansaoreeya Talee <i>Social Worker</i>	MOPH, OSCC at Takuapa Hospital	Tel: 087-6230254
8.	Ms. Supanij Worakit <i>Social Worker</i>	MOPH, OSCC at Tai Muang Hospital	Tel: 089-588-3790
9.	Mrs. Pennarin Sartchamroen <i>Social Worker</i>	BMA, OSCC at Charoengkrung Pracharak	Tel: 089-857-5645

		Hospital	
10.	Dr. Saipan Sripuapankul <i>Senior Educator</i>	MOE, Office of Basic Education Commission	Tel: 086-374-8051 saipans@hotmail.com
11.	Ms. Niramol Watcharanunthakul <i>Director of Educational Promotion Unit</i>	MOE, Phang Nga Education Service Area 14	Tel: 081-370-4306 mon_07500@hotmail.com
12.	Ms. Chanakarn Muenphanchoo <i>Deputy Director</i>	MOE, Takuapa Senanukul School	Tel: 081-370-0511
13.	Ms. Nittaya Engsontia <i>Teacher</i>	MOE, Takupa Senanukul School	
14.	Mr. Saroj Nakbet <i>Senior Expert Public Prosecutor and Secretary of Chief of Inspector Generals</i>	OAG	srj.2557@gmail.com
15.	Police Colonel Chatkeo Wanchawee <i>Inquiry Official (Advisory Level)</i>	NPF, Makkasan Police Station	Tel: 089-559-4169
16.	Police Chaiyuth Boonyai	NPF, Tai Muang District, Phang Nga	Tel: 081-368-1536
17.	Associate Professor Boonserm Hutabaedya	Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University, School of Human Ecology	Tel: 089-965-4078 boonserm_dv@windowslive.com
18.	Associate Professor Suraporn Siansalai	Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University, School of Human Ecology	
19.	Ms. Tanavadee Thajeen <i>Director</i>	Friends of Women Foundation	Tel: 081-854-0289 fowomen@gmail.com
20.	Ms. Supensri Puengkoksueg <i>(former) Head of Gender Equality Section</i>	Women & Men Progressive Network Foundation	Tel: 081-618-0613 supensri_ko@hotmail.com
21.	Ms. Manee Khunphakdee <i>Staff</i>	Women & Men Progressive Network Foundation	Tel: 086-380-4047
22.	Ms. Arunsri Meewongtham <i>Staff</i>	Women & Men Progressive Network Foundation	Tel: 089-680-7667
23.	Ms. Patcharee Iamkamala <i>Assistant Director</i>	Dusit District Office	
24.	Mr. Somsak Kamakate <i>Assistant Director</i>	Dusit District Office	
25.	Ms. Ladda Pongchalearm <i>Chief</i>	Dusit District Office, Community Development and Social Welfare Section	Tel: 084-019-3836
26.	Mrs. Cha-on Weerasunthorn <i>Social Worker</i>	Dusit District Office, Community Development and Social Welfare Section	
27.	Mr. Manas Suwanpanich <i>Chief of Family Service Center</i>	Wat Pracharabueham Family Service Center	Tel: 081-375-2449
28.	Ms. Pranee Watphakdee <i>Community Leader</i>	Wat Pracharabueham Community, Bangkok	Tel: 087-697-9322

29.	Ms. Naiyana Yoljorhor <i>Community Leader</i>	Wat Sawaswarisimaram Community, Bangkok	Tel: 085-168-3274
PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT TEAM			
30.	Mrs. Ryratana Rangsitpol	UN Women	Tel: 081-627-0398 ryratana.rangsitpol@unwomen.org
31.	Mr. Somchai Yensabai	UNDP	Tel: 081-932-6682 somchai.yensabai@undp.org
32.	Dr. Wassana Im-em	UNFPA	Tel: 081-846-5974 im-em@unfpa.org
33.	Ms. Sukanya	Currently working for UN Women	Tel: 02-288-1383, 085-834-4432

Note:

MSDHS = Ministry of Social Development and Human Security

MOPH = Ministry of Public Health

MOE = Ministry of Education

MOJ = Ministry of Justice

OAG = Office of Attorney General

NPF = National Policy Force

BMA = Bangkok Metropolitan Administration

Annex 3: List of Documents Received and Consulted

No.	Title	Language	Provided By	Date Received
1.	Project Document and Annexes	Eng.	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
	- Annex 1: Memorandum of Understanding between Participating UN Organizations and the United Nations Development Fund for Women regarding the Operational Aspects of Every Home A Safe Home: Supporting Thailand Towards Effective Implementation of Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act B.E. 2550 (2007)	Eng.	UN Women	15 May 2015
	- Annex 2: Logical Framework Results	Eng.	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
	- Annex 3: Annual Work Plan - Year 2010	Eng.	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
	- Annex 4.1: Budget Summary	Eng.	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
	- Annex 4.2: Budget Details	Eng.	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
2.	Revised Logical Framework Results	Eng.	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
3.	Email Communication on Revision of LogFrame (without formal documents attached, e.g. Minutes of Steering Committee)	Eng.	UN Women	15 May 2015
4.	Annual Work Plan - Year 2013	Eng.	UN Women	15 May 2015
5.	Email Communication on No Cost Extension to 31 Oct 2013	Eng.	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
6.	Letter on Approval of No Cost Extension to 15 Jun 2015 for the purpose of final evaluation	Eng.	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
7.	Briefing for Donor Meeting	Eng.	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
8.	Power Point Presentation for RPAC: Project Brief	Eng.	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
9.	2010 UNCT Thailand Narrative Progress Report submitted to UNTF (Jan to Dec 2010)	Eng.	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
10.	2011 UNCT Thailand Narrative Progress Report submitted to UNTF (Jan 2011 to Jan 2012)	Eng.	UN Women	27 Mar 2015
11.	2012 UNCT Thailand Narrative Progress Report submitted to UNTF (Jan to Dec 2012)	Eng.	UN Women	27 Mar 2015
12.	2013 UNCT Thailand Narrative Progress Report submitted to UNTF (Final: Jan 2010 to Oct 2013)	Eng.	UN Women	27 Mar 2015
	- Annex 1: Comparison of Original and Revised Logical Framework Results	Eng.	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
	- Annex 2: Development of Inter-sectoral Agencies Operating Guidelines for the Implementation of Domestic Violence Victims Protection Act 2007 (by the Multi-stakeholder Working Group,	Thai	UN Women	04 Apr 2015

Jan 2012)				
○ Annex 2: Chart 1 – Overview of Protection of Domestic Violence Victims in accordance to the Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act 2007	Eng. & Thai	UN Women	04 Apr 2015	
○ Annex 2: Chart 2 – Justice & Multi-sectoral Coordination Mechanisms for Protection of Children, Women and Family Members under the Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act 2007	Eng. & Thai	UN Women	04 Apr 2015	
- Annex 3: Report on Multi-stakeholder Coordination Mechanism for the Implementation of Domestic Violence Victims Protection Act 2007 (study on existing plan, policy, mechanism and capacities by Maytinee Bhongsvej, Sep 2013)	Thai with Eng. Summary	UN Women	04 Apr 2015	
- Annex 4: Report on Gender-based Violence Against Women and Girls (VAW/G) Indicators (Dec 2011)	Eng. & Thai	UN Women & UNDP	04 Apr 2015	
- Annex 5: Dataset according to VAW/G Indicators and Data Cooperation Mechanism in 2 Pilot Provinces (Oct 2012)	Thai	UN Women	04 Apr 2015	
- Annex 6: Report on Strengthening Local Level Multi-sectoral Coordination Mechanism towards Effective Implementation of Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act 2007 (by Sukhothai Thammathirat University in collaboration with Friends of Women Foundation and Women & Men Progressive Network Foundation)	Thai	UN Women	04 Apr 2015	
- Annex 9: Summary Reports submitted by the Ministry of Education				
○ Summary on Training of Students	Thai	UN Women	15 May 2015	
○ Summary on School Projects by Students and DVD	Thai	UN Women	15 May 2015	
○ Summary on Training of Teachers	Thai	UN Women	15 May 2015	
- Annex 10: Study for Developing Training Modules on Gender-based Violence and Domestic Violence (analysis of the existing training modules by Mahidol University, Apr 2011) -	Thai & Eng. Summary	UN Women & UNFPA	04 Apr 2015	
- Annex 11: Training Manual/ Modules on Integration of Gender Issues into the Implementation of One Stop Crisis Center - OSCC – 1) Training Curriculum/ Modules, 2) Manual for Organizing Training Workshops, and 3) Training Facilitation Manual (by Khong Kaen University, Oct 2012)	Thai	UN Women & UNFPA	04 Apr 2015 & 02 Apr 2015	
○ Chart on Idea of Integrating Gender Issues into the Implementation of OSCC	Thai	UNFPA	02 Apr 2015	
○ Evaluation of (existing) Training Materials/ Power Point Presentation	Thai	UNFPA	02 Apr 2015	
○ Training Curriculum and Programme	Thai	UNFPA	02 Apr 2015	
○ Training of Trainers in Khon Kaen, 16-19 Oct 2012: Training documents/ materials and	Thai & Eng.	UNFPA	02 Apr 2015	

	reports (e.g. brief on training programme and budget, expectation of trainees, participants' opinions after watching VDO Clip during the training, results of pre and post training tests, training workshop report, and report on validation of training modules with an Eng. Executive)	Summary		
	○ Training of Trainers in Bangkok, 11-14 Dec 2012: Training documents/ materials and reports (e.g. brief on training programme, expectation of trainees, participants' opinions after watching VDO Clip during the training, results of pre and post training tests, and summary of training evaluation)	Thai	UN Women & UNFPA	04 Apr 2015 & 02 Apr 2015
	- Annex 12: Recommendations to Improve Screening and Referral System at OSCC	Thai	UN Women & UNFPA	04 Apr 2015
13.	Campaign Strategy Recommendations (by Maytinee Bhongsvej and Wijit Wongwareethip, Oct 2011)	Eng.	UN Women	27 Mar 2015
14.	UNFPA Summary on the Project Implementation (OSCC)	Thai	UNFPA	02 Apr 2015
15.	Certified Consolidated Financial Donor Report for Period ended 31 December 2010	Eng.	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
16.	Certified Consolidated Financial Donor Report for Period ended 31 December 2011	Eng.	UN Women	03 Apr 2015
17.	Certified Consolidated Financial Donor Report for Period ended 31 December 2012	Eng.	UN Women	03 Apr 2015
18.	Certified Consolidated Financial Donor Report for Period ended 31 December 2013	Eng.	UN Women	03 Apr 2015
19.	Certified Consolidated Financial Donor Report for Period ended 31 December 2014	Eng.	UN Women	15 May 2015
20.	UNFPA Expenses Summary 2010-2012 (against each of the responsible outputs)	Eng.	UNFPA	02 Apr 2015
21.	UNDP Expenses Summary	Eng.	UNDP	1 May 2015
22.	Memorandum of Understanding between the Office of Attorney General and UN Women	Eng.	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
23.	Letter of Agreements between UN Women and the Ministry of Education	Eng.	UN Women	16 Apr 2015
24.	Letter of Agreements between UN Women and the Royal Thai Police	Eng.	UN Women	16 Apr 2015
25.	Letter of Agreements between UN Women and the Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University	Eng.	UN Women	16 Apr 2015
26.	Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act (B.E. 2550) 2007	Thai & Eng. (unofficial)	UN Women	04 Apr 2015
27.	Approved Mission Report by Programme Officer (ROAP), 25-26 Oct 2013	Eng.	UN Women	03 Apr 2015
28.	UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports	Eng.	UN Women	27 Mar 2015
29.	Draft Reference Group (for discussion)	Eng.	UN Women	27 Mar 2015
30.	Tentative Timeline of the Final External Evaluation	Eng.	UN Women	31 Mar 2015

Annex 4: Evaluator Profiles and CV

Team Leader - Carroll Patterson, PhD

Overview

Highly capable professional with more than fifteen years of experience formulating strategy/planning, conducting research, designing and managing surveys, managing organizational and project performance, monitoring and evaluating programs, and building capacity in rural and difficult environments. Global thought leader in applying qualitative comparative analysis to program evaluation, cost effectiveness analysis, rigorous experimental design impact evaluations. Solid expertise in conducting program and portfolio assessments and evaluations, setting up organizational learning systems, advancing testable theories of change and development hypotheses, writing M&E manuals, formulating scopes of work and work orders, advising and formulating policy, measuring impact and leading teams effectively. Strong emphasis on using various social science methodologies to measure the impact of international assistance programs and facilitate learning. Sector specializations in Gender, Education/Youth, Social and Rural Development, Democracy/Governance, Peace/Stabilization, Aid Effectiveness, and Improved Livelihoods. A motivated manager of high performance teams, who possesses excellent presentation and negotiation skills at the government, international donor and counterpart levels.

Countries worked in: Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, South Africa, Ethiopia, China, Indonesia, Vietnam, US, India, Afghanistan, Hong Kong, Mozambique, Cambodia, Thailand, Japan, Nepal, Laos, Georgia, Moldova, Turkey, Kyrgyzstan, Mali, and Yemen.

Education

September 2009	PhD in Sociology, emphasis on Evaluation Research and Rural Development <i>Johns Hopkins University</i> , Baltimore, USA <i>Dissertation: Evaluating Donor-led Agrarian Reform in Georgia and Moldova, 1991-2008</i>
May 2002	MA in Sociology, emphasis on Research Methodology <i>Johns Hopkins University</i> , Baltimore, USA
June 1998	BS in International Area Studies/Minor in Business Administration Magna Cum Laude <i>Drexel University</i> , Philadelphia, USA

Entrepreneur

September 2010 – Current	Co-Founder and Partner, SoCha, llc , www.sochaglobal.com . I co-founded SoCha to help foundations and donor organizations establish world-class ME&L systems and institutionalize learning. We are the only M&E firm currently specializing in Qualitative Comparative Analysis. We operate out of Thailand and Tanzania.
--------------------------	---

Evaluations

Selected Evaluations, Assessments and Reviews Led, Managed and/or Conducted

- “Saving Mothers, Giving Life” Phase 1 Cost Effectiveness Analysis (Winter 2014, USAID)
- Early Childhood Development Diagnostic Review (Fall 2014, UBS Optimus Foundation)
- Kenya Gender Assessment (Summer 2012, USAID)
- PMEAL Theory of Change Workshop & Program Review in Indonesia (Spring 2013, Oxfam)
- WASH in Schools in Mali Mid-Term Evaluation (Winter 2013, Dubai Cares)
- Uongozi Kenya Lessons Learned Workshop and Impact Evaluation (Winter 2013, Inuka Trust)
- INVEST Vocational Education Training Mid-term Evaluation in Helmand (Fall 2012, DfID)
- Healthcare Waste Management Assessment Kenya (Spring/Summer 2012, USAID)
- Qualitative Baseline Evaluation of Yes Youth Can! Program Kenya (Summer/Fall 2012, USAID)
- Quantitative Baseline Evaluation of Yes Youth Can! Program Kenya (Summer 2012, USAID)
- Kenya Civil Society Assessment (Summer/Fall 2012, USAID)
- Office of Foreign Assistance Resilience in Kenya Final Evaluation (Summer 2012, USAID)
- Strategic Assessment of Dubai Care’s Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Systems Dubai (Summer 201, Dubai Cares)
- ASIA Cross-Border Sustainable Trade and Timber Final Evaluation in China, India and Vietnam (Fall 2011, WWF)
- Helmand Growth Program Baseline Assessment and Annual Review (Summer 2011, DfID)
- Strengthening Communities through Integrated Programming and National Programs in Mozambique Survey Quality Assessment (April 2011, CDC)
- Local Governance & Community Development Evaluation in Afghanistan (2011, USAID)
- Evaluating Donor-led Market Reform in Moldova and Georgia (2004-2006, US Embassy)

Ongoing and Long Term Positions

February 2014 – Current

Partner at SoCha, llc (based in Thailand)

- Currently lead the final evaluation for UN Women’s “Every Home a Safe Home” protection of domestic violence victims in Thailand program.
- Manage and oversee the “Enhanced M&E Services Contract” to the “Fursa kwa Watoto” program in Tanzania. Fursa is a four year program to improving school readiness and learning outcomes at Standard II, and my role has been to build the theory of change, implement the M&E plan, develop metrics of program effectiveness and build the capacity of 20 field monitoring and M&E staff.
- ME&L Advisor to “Ilifa Labantwana” program in South Africa; a national effort to scale Early Childhood Development services to South Africa’s most vulnerable children. My role has been to conduct progress reviews, design a new M&E system, develop the theory of change and build staff capacity.
- ME&L Advisor to the Asian Development Bank on the “Gender and Climate Change” project in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. My role has been to build the M&E frameworks for each country, establish the reporting systems and populate the baselines for each framework.
- Support the development of Teacher Instruction Practices and Process Systems (TIPPS) tool in cooperation with New York University to monitor classroom quality and changes to teacher pedagogy using psychometrically rigorous measures of teacher/pupil interactions.

- Technical Qualitative Comparative Analysis expert, currently applying it to cost effectiveness analyses for a Ugandan maternal health program and to support an impact evaluation of a Tanzanian pre-primary education program.
- Provide policy guidance, additional technical expertise and ME&L systems development to a variety of clients through on demand requests.

July 2013 – February 2014

Chief of Party, “The Learning Contract,” Kampala, Uganda (USAID, implemented by QED Group, LLC).

- Oversaw \$15.7 million USD ME&L project dedicated to enhancing Mission-level M&E systems and operationalizing the “Collaboration, Learning and Adaptation” approach.
- Managed a core team staff of up to 12 and two local subcontracting partners.
- Produced high quality evaluations, provided ongoing M&E capacity building, improved performance management systems, built several theories of change, established baselines and integrated qualitative methods into project design.
- Serve as the focal point for a variety of “learning networks” involving Government of Uganda national and district officials, academics, various donor organizations, and the Ugandan Evaluation Association.

August 2011 – May 2013

Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Advisor and Team Leader, SoCha: ME&L Partner Agreement, Dubai, UAE and Bamako, Mali (Dubai Cares). Intermittent support.

- Conducted a systemic review of Dubai Care’s ME&L system and education portfolio.
- Authored Dubai Cares’ strategy and policies for organizational learning through ME&L, which is now a model for other foundations in the Middle East (e.g. ADFD).
- Conducted performance evaluations of various ME&L systems and impact measurement tools for education programs in Mali, Cambodia, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Laos and Indonesia.
- Trained Dubai Cares’ programming staff in evaluation methodology, survey management, performance management, experimental design and regression analysis.
- Represented Dubai Cares at functions to present the Foundation’s organizational learning strategy.

June 2012 – October 2012

DCOP, Senior Analysis and M&E, dTS: Kenya Program Analysis Communication and Evaluation (PACE), Nairobi, Kenya (USAID).

- Designed and managed several research and survey-based sector assessment and evaluation teams in Agriculture, Gender, Natural Resource Management, Youth & Education, and Democracy & Governance sectors.
- Oversaw and built the capacity of a team of 38 professionals who provide ongoing performance monitoring, evaluation, verification and analytical services to USAID Kenya's country portfolio.
- Developed and managed a wide range of scopes of work, evaluation methodologies, work orders, and verification tools for the USAID Mission.
- Worked with USAID Mission staff to develop technical sector learning processes.
- Provided leadership and technical expertise through a variety team building initiatives.

April 2011 – November 2012

Team Leader and M&E Advisor, Coffey International: Helmand Growth Programme, Afghanistan (DfID). Intermittent support.

- Conducted Mid-Term Evaluation of INVEST Vocational Training program (Mercy Corps) and supervised a large-scale employment verification survey.
- Provided ongoing M&E technical assistance to DfID staff and implementing partners.
- Developed testable hypotheses for social transition from conflicted environments.
- Worked in partnership with a variety of Helmandi government counterparts.
- Conducted Annual Reviews of program design, implementation and effectiveness.

July 2009 - December 2010

Senior M&E and Research Advisor, DAI: Local Governance & Community Development Program, Kabul, Afghanistan (USAID).

- Planned, coordinated and supervised a complex, multi-leveled monitoring and impact evaluation system for over 2,000 activities across 23 Afghan provinces.
- Designed and analyzed LGCD's "Measuring the Impact of Stability Operations" (MISO) stabilization survey, which tested and refined the stabilization hypothesis and in turn fed into strategic planning and programming.
- Managed complex group dynamics among community stakeholders, programme staff and provincial and district government officials to understand impact findings and improve local governance.
- Designed and managed the "District Governance Impact Evaluation," a qualitative evaluation tool designed to capture progress in community/local government interactions.
- Provided leadership and capacity building development to an Afghan/Expatriate team of 57 GIS/M&E/Communications/ Research Analysis staff members across 23 Afghan Provinces.
- Successfully communicated regular and ad-hoc impact management briefs to coalition force personnel in close cooperation with USAID technical staff.

September 2007 - June 2009

Editor and Higher Education Consultant, World Bank and Bilimevi Institute, Washington, DC and Istanbul, Turkey

- Editor for selected World Bank publications.
- Consulted Turkish education organizations on US higher education outreach and performance management through the use of strong multi-cultural skills.
- Consulted on American higher education standardized test (e.g. GMAT, SAT, GRE) preparation courses.

January 2005 – September 2007

Researcher, Johns Hopkins University, Moldova and Georgia

- Managed \$82,000 in research grant funds (U.S. Fulbright, NSEP, IREX, ACCELS and the Gov. of Georgia) to conduct evaluative research on the impact of donor-led land reform and rural migration in Georgia and Moldova.
- Managed two teams of data collectors and research assistants simultaneously in Georgia (4) and Moldova (6) and built capacity to analyse program data.
- Worked closely with the Moldovan and Georgian Departments of Statistics on the development and analysis of household budget and labor workforce surveys.

January 2004 – December 2004

International Monitor and Team Leader, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Georgia, Chechnya and Ingushetia.

- Served as the seconded US representative to a multi-national field monitoring effort to observe population movements and conflict mitigation interventions in the conflicted regions of the Caucasus.
- Managed complex group dynamics on a regular basis through interactions with local Georgian, Ingushetian, and Chechen officials as a means of establishing the OSCE's impartiality and effectiveness in the region.
- Provided leadership and training to a team of 12 international monitors on intensive four hour to five day border observation operations in mountainous terrain and intense cold weather climate.

September 2002 – December 2003 **Visiting Fellow and Higher Education Consultant, *Open Society Institute***, Tbilisi, Georgia and Issyk-Kul, Kyrgyzstan

- Evaluated departmental capacity, developed curriculum and created key performance indicators (KPIs) for the Masters of Social Science degree.
- Co-managed and lectured at the Issyk-kul Summer Graduate School program, which prepared students from Central Asia and the Caucasus for graduate study in the US and UK.
- Taught courses for graduates on Social Theory, Economy, Research Methods and Statistics.
- Coordinated three trans-Caucasian civil society, student debate and educational conferences.

September 2000 – August 2002 **Research Analyst, *Johns Hopkins University: Global Civil Society Project***, Baltimore, USA

- Research Analyst to Dr. Christopher Chase-Dunn, Dept. of Sociology and to Dr. Lestor Salamon, Institute for Policy Studies.
- Compiled international civil society indicators for the Global Civil Society Index.
- Co-authored "Trajectories and Causes of Structural Globalization: 1800-2000", with Christopher Chase-Dunn.

September 1998 - September 2000 **Management Consultant, *PricewaterhouseCoopers***, New York, NY

- Worked as a part of a client/consultant team to map value-added opportunities within pharmaceutical supply chains.
- Managed knowledge management databases, created project plans, set targets and monitored their achievement, outlined client supply procedures, and managed information relevant to project goals.
- Managed all client site expenses and administered invoices between the client and accounting department.

September 1996 - September 1997 **Team Leader, *Moldova Pennsylvania International Center***, Chisinau, Moldova (USIA).

- Managed two United States Information Agency (USIA) grants in Moldova: "Community Connections" (USD\$510,000) and "High School Linkage" (USD\$120,000) programs.
- Worked with local NGOs and the US Embassy to bring Moldovan professionals to the US.

August 1990 - September 1993 **Infantryman, *United States Marine Corps***, Southern California and South East Asia

- Led a squad of 9-12 Marines through complex operations.
- Conducted international operations in Panama, Japan and Thailand.

- Gained valuable leadership, organizational and management skills.

Evaluations and Short-term Consultancies

May 2013 – July 2013	Regional M&E Advisor, SNV Netherlands through SoCha. Laos, Bhutan, Nepal and Vietnam. Intermittent support. Tasked with improving regional M&E systems across program portfolios in Agriculture, WASH and Renewable Energy. Designed survey tool for M&E staff in Renewable Energy sector.
April – May 2013	Evaluation Team Leader, Inuka Trust: Uongozi Reality TV Show November – December 2012 , Nairobi, Kenya (SoCha to DfID). Evaluated the impact of a reality TV show designed to empower Kenyan youth to support transformative leaders. Facilitated a five day “lessons learned” workshop for 120 attendees.
January – April 2013	Evaluation Team Leader, SoCha to Dubai Cares: WASH in Schools program, Bamako, Mali. Lead a team of international experts on a mid-term evaluation of the WASH in Schools program in Mali. Assessed the effectiveness of the DC steering committing structure in addressing emergency response and human trafficking prevention during times of Mali’s instability.
November 2012 – January 2013	Experiential Learning and Leadership Advisor, Uongozi 2012 Reality TV Show, Nairobi, Kenya (USAID through SoCha). Developed testable hypothesis of an “Experiential learning” Uongozi Reality TV Show project through the “leadership and empowerment panel study. Designed project M&E System, M&E Manual and impact measurement tools. Built staff capacity in developing theories of change.
January – March 2012	Consultant, Making Budgets and Aid Work, Remote and Kabul, Afghanistan (UNDP at the Ministry of Finance). Prepared the Project Document, Strategic Document, and Results Resource Framework for the program.
November – December 2011	Evaluator, SWITCH- ASIA, Beijing, Hanoi and New Delhi (WWF-London through SoCha). EC-ROM Evaluation of sustainable timber projects across China, Vietnam and India. Deployed participatory evaluation methods with team members to facilitate project learning.
April 2011	M&E Advisor, Strengthening Communities through Integrated Programming and National Programs, Nampula, Mozambique (CDC and USAID). Pathfinder International.

Analyzed the baseline survey data and revised the results-based monitoring, evaluation and reporting system dedicated to family planning, HIV/AIDS, maternal and early childhood development, WASH and local governance.

January 2011 – August 2011

M&E Advisor (intermittent), IESC: Change Management at the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock, Kabul and Remote, Afghanistan (USAID and USDA). Wrote and managed the Project Performance Management Plan, as well as advised the M&E Manager on best practice and donor reporting standards.

January 2011

M&E Advisor, Yemen Monitoring and Evaluation Project, Sana'a, Yemen. IBTCi. Provided advisory services to YMEP, which monitored USAID's stabilization program portfolio (\$250 Million) and assisted with developing the analytical framework used for testing the stabilization hypothesis.

Relevant Presentations

"Mixed Method Measurement: The Silver Standard," *3ie Evaluation Conference in Uganda*; held on May 21-23, 2014 in Kampala, Uganda.

"Qualitative Comparative Analysis: 3MSC and Enhanced M&E," *Effective Development Conference 2014*, held on May 15-16; Bangkok, Thailand.

"Mixed Method Measurement of Social Change (3MSC) and Enhanced M&E," *International Education Funder's Group Bi-Annual Meeting*; held on February 12-15; Wolfsberg, Switzerland.

"M&E as the Key Driver of Organizational Learning," *Round-table Workshop: Transparency and Accountability*; held on 5 December 2012, Abu Dhabi Fund for Development: Abu Dhabi.

"From M&E to Social Change: Implementation Imperatives and Organizational Learning," *2012 Learn M&E Forum*; Held on 26-26 November 2012, Evaluation Development Group: Bangkok.

"Dubai Cares: A Learning Organization," *Dubai Cares Global Conference on WASH in Education*; 20 February 2012, Dubai Cares: Dubai.

Computer and Research Skills

Adept at conducting survey, comparative, qualitative, quantitative, participatory and archival research and analysis.

Experienced in multivariate regression analysis and experimental design using STATA and SPSS.

Database management in MSACCESS and Lotus Notes.

Experience with ArcGis.

Professional Affiliations

American Sociological Association, Political Economy of the World System member.

Rural Sociological Association member.

American Evaluation Association member.

International Development Evaluation Association member.

Languages

Have worked in Russian and German. Intermediate French.

Evaluation Expert - Patharaporn Theeratham

SUMMARY

Management of development projects/ programmes; Project evaluations; Capacity development; Operations management; Research; Documentation and reporting; Coordination and organization of workshops/ events; and Translation/ interpretation; Country experience: Thailand, Timor- Leste, Cambodia, Myanmar; Master's Degree: Asia-Pacific Policy Studies, UBC (Canada).

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

February 2004 to Present

Independent Consultant - Contracted by various international development organizations for long- and short-term assignments as follows:

Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Mission (FELM)

Evaluation Consultant – *2 months of input from Aug to Nov 2014*: evaluated the diakonia work of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Thailand focusing on effectiveness and relevance of its social services provided to beneficiaries, as well as efficiency and sustainability dimensions of its operations; and reviewed and provided comments to strengthen FELM's new Church Development Cooperation Manual

Siemenpuu Foundation (Finnish Donor Organization)

Evaluation Consultant – *2 months of input from Dec 2013 to May 2014*: evaluated the Mekong Energy and Ecology Network (MEE Net) to assess 1) performance on effectiveness and efficiency, relevance to local needs, impacts and sustainability; and 2) overall energy development in the Mekong region

UN Women

Rapporteur – documentation and report writing for regional and national workshops and meetings e.g. 1) Planning Workshop for Migration Programme, 2) Thailand National Consultation Workshop, 3) Regional Inception Workshop on Preventing Exploitation of Women Migrant Workers in ASEAN, and 4) Expert Group Meeting on Gender and Macroeconomics

Operations and Programme Management Consultant – *16 months of input from May 2010 to Apr 2014* (capacity building for Timor-Leste Country Office and Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific): formulated and undertook baseline survey and conducted subsequent training/ day- to-day mentoring on operations and programme management for staff and personnel; monitored and assessed improvement in capacities leading to recommendations for future capacity development inputs; developed Internal Control Framework and Business Continuity Plan for UN Women Timor-Leste Office; established office management system including work processes, filing, logging/ tracking system for contracts/ agreements with partners and donor reports; and developed document checklists and guidelines to improve staff performance

Technical Consultant – *1 month of input in early 2010*: prepared TORs and Requests for

Proposals; reviewed and evaluated submitted proposals; and provided recommendations for selection of implementing partners for the following projects: Every Home A Safe Home, supported by UNTF 'To End Violence Against Women'; and Development of ASEAN Women's and Children's Human Rights Mechanisms (part of facilitating the development of an ASEAN Human Rights Mechanism)

Editor for CEDAW Programme – ~1 month of input in Mid-2010: edited "CEDAW Publication on Gender Equality Laws: Global Good Practice and A Review of Five Southeast Asian Countries"

Consultant for Development Programmes in Timor-Leste – 25 months of input from Oct 2007 to Dec 2009 (focus on women participation in politics and decision-making in the pursuit of nation-building, and gender-equality in democratic governance): provided technical input and necessary guidance for programme implementation (e.g.: preparing, reviewing and finalizing TORs/ proposals/ concept notes/ reports); involved in conducting programme monitoring and evaluation; assisted with financial management (e.g. budget planning and control, disbursements and reporting); and liaised with key stakeholders

Coordinator – 5 months of input to organize, support and document the following events:

Study Visit to the United Nations Office of the High Commission on Human Rights and European Court of Human Rights in Geneva and Strasbourg for ASEAN Commissions on Promotion and Protection of Rights of Women and Children; and

Training Seminar on Gender Dimensions of Mediation

UNDP Bangkok Regional Office

Report Writer – 2 weeks of input from late Jun to early Jul 2014: documented and drafted workshop report for Regional Training on Post Disaster Needs Assessment

Consultant to the Regional Gender Team – 3 months of input from Nov 2009 to Jan 2010: engaged in the improvement and finalization of the existing package of capacity assessment tools for Implementation of Gender Mainstreaming and Asia Pacific Gender Community of Practice (CoP); provided inputs related to regional practices of gender implementation; prepared workshop report for the Gender CoP Annual Learning Event/ documentation packages/briefing notes; and facilitated meetings/ workshops

UNDP Thailand Country Office

Dispute Resolution Publication Editor – ~2 months of input from Nov 2012 to Feb 2013: edited the following publications for the Governance Unit: Conflict-related Development Analysis (CDA); Community Security and Social Cohesion: Toward a UNDP Approach; Governance in Conflict Prevention and Recovery: A Guidance Note; and Local Governance and Basic Service Delivery in Conflict Affected Areas

National Counterpart Expert to Multi Stakeholder Conflict Analysis Advisor – 3 months of input from Jul to Sep 2011: in collaboration with the Truth for Reconciliation Commission of Thailand, provided technical support in developing the Strategic Framework, preparation of training materials on conflict analysis, and design of UNDP Programme on Social Cohesion and Conflict Prevention

Associate to Project Expert 'Support for Rehabilitation of Traditional Communities Affected by the Tsunami in Thailand' – 2 months of input in 2005: provided support in collecting and assessing project best practices and lessons learnt on disaster preparedness, recovery, mitigation and reconstruction

Project Assistant 'Support for Rehabilitation of Traditional Communities Affected by the Tsunami in Thailand' – 11 months of input in 2006: provided technical, financial and administrative support involving assistance with project monitoring and documentation, liaison and coordination with all partners, budget allocation and control, maintenance and sharing of project database, and organization of meetings/ workshops/ field trips

World Bank

Continuity, Liaison, and Implementation Consultant for the Public Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility – 8 months of input from Apr to Nov 2005: provided technical support and operational facilitation to the National Telecommunications Commission of Thailand in the areas of institutional development and transformative governance

Consultant for elaborating Infrastructure Indicator Database – *2 months of input in late 2004 to early 2005*

Research Assistant for the Social Investment Fund (SIF) Programme – *3 months of input in 2004*: reviewed and provided technical assessment with the focus on monitoring and evaluation of funded projects, and the Mission for the Implementation Completion Report

Institutional Analyst for Policy Coordination, Planning and Infrastructure Provision in Thailand Project (cooperation with the National Economic and Social Development Board of Thailand) – *2 months of input in 2004*: developed a strategic paper

Researcher on ‘Urban Industry’ for the East Asia/ Pacific Economic Section – *~3 months of input in 2004*

Asian Development Bank (ADB)

Urban & Regional Planning Analyst/ Project Administrator for Project on Planning for Sustainable Urbanisation in Thailand (technical co-operation between ADB and NESDB) – *3 months of input in 2004*: drafted and reviewed project strategic papers, provided support to project workshops and in-field activities, participated in project meetings and fact-finding activities, as well as prepared minutes and reports

German Agency for Technical Co-operation (GTZ)

Consultant to the Post Evaluation Team for the Urban Environmental Management Project (cooperation with the Thai Ministry of Interior) – *5 months in 2005*: gathered information and conducted interviews with partners and stakeholders in the field, as well as contributed assessment of results from fact-finding as input to the evaluation report

Co-trainer on ‘Participatory Land Use Planning and Management in Urban Areas’ for Land Management and Administration Project, Phnom Penh (cooperation with Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction, Cambodia) – *2 weeks of input in 2004*

Urgent Action Fund for Women’s Human Rights (UAF)

Consultant for Outreach Visit to Thailand – *2 months of input in late 2010*: planned and coordinated the itineraries for UAF Team’s visit to Thailand to meet activists and organizations working on women’s issues, as well as provided technical inputs to assess current situation and challenges as to facilitate better understanding of women’s human rights issues and movements in Thailand

Commission on Preparation for the Establishment of Political Development Council and Drafting of Political Development Master Plan (under the Secretariat Office of the Prime Minister)

Coordinator for the Public Consultation Sub-committee – *6 months of input from Jan to Aug 2007*: provided technical inputs and operational support involving review and preparation of proposals/ briefing notes/ discussion points/ reports/ and other documents for public hearings, organization of meetings/ regional & national public hearings, liaising with partners, and managing budget and disbursement processes

May to June 2002

Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) Administrative Assistant for ‘Australian Community Assistance Scheme’: assisted with project appraisals and contract preparation; reviewed narrative and financial reports; provided translation/ interpretation; managed database and filing system; and provided general administrative and financial support.

November 1996 to March 2002

German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) Project Secretary/ Liaison to the National Municipal League of Thailand for ‘Urban Planning and Management Project’ (Decentralization of physical and urban development planning), cooperation with the Thai Ministry of Interior: worked with the Department of Local Administration as to support the implementation of Thai decentralization initiatives in the field of urban planning and management; liaised with the National Municipal League of Thailand to work towards building institutional capacity; assisted the expert and international consultants in project monitoring & evaluation; coordinated with Thai Government officers at all levels on project concepts and

in-field demonstration activities in the key areas of strategic planning, public participation, legal and administrative policy and regulations, monitoring & evaluation, and capacity building; organized and assisted project training events, seminars and workshops; involved in the production of project handbooks and manuals, as well as training materials and related documents; and supported logistic arrangements and equipment procurement, and managed monthly budgeting and basic accounting.

March 1995 to October 1996

Tri Construction Management Co., Ltd. Secretary responsible for international contracts and projects: coordinated with concerned parties; assisted with project documentation; and prepared correspondence letters, monthly reports, schedules and graphics.

EDUCATION

Sep. 02 – Dec. 03 Master of Arts, Asia-Pacific Policy Studies (MAPPS), University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada (Specialization: Governance and Human Rights)
May 91 – Mar. 95 Bachelor of Arts, Silpakorn University (Major: German)

Special Courses & Scholarship:

Training on 'Effective Presentation and Communication Techniques', Bangkok, Apr 1998;

Scholarship from DAAD Institute for Language and Literature Course and Intellectual Ideal Course, Bayreuth, Germany, Aug-Sep 1994

SKILLS & ABILITIES

Language Skills:

Thai: Mother tongue English: Very good German: Fair French: Basic

Key Official Written Translation Work:

Report (a companion to the World Development Report) on 'Toward Gender Equality in East Asia and the Pacific', by the World Bank, Jun 2012
Field manual: "Mainstreaming gender into project cycle management in the fisheries sector", by FAO, Jan-Mar 2012
"Chartering A New Low-Carbon Route to Development", by UNDP Thailand, Nov 2010-Jan 2011

"Legal Protection for Migrant Domestic Workers in Asia and the Arab States: Employment Contract in Jordan", by UNIFEM, Mar 2010
"Case Studies: Support for Rehabilitation of Traditional Communities Affected by the Tsunami in Thailand", by UNDP and UN-Habitat, Sep 2007
"Toward Urban Sustainability in Thailand", by ADB and NESDB, Jul 2004

Official Verbal Interpretation Work:

City Development Initiative for Asia – Meetings and field trips for data collection

2-week Training Workshop on Life Skill Education: Integration of Life Skills into Thai Normal Curriculum/ Basic Education, conducted by Rights To Play (International) in collaboration with the Ministry of Education of Thailand

KPI Congress on Social Quality and Quality of Thai Democracy

Rolls Royce Thailand – Energy Media Briefing

Roundtable Discussion on Information Technology Business – Regional Moderation Guide for Local Adaptation

Other Skills & Abilities:

Effective interpersonal and communication skills; Ability to manage complexities and immediate challenges; Computer and internet skills; Familiar with project documentation and office functions (e.g. TORs, reporting, organizational charts, and basic accounting); Strong logistical

capabilities; Typing (Thai and English); and Structuring and processing filing systems.

Summary of Evaluation Framework in terms of Questions, Nature of Inquiry, Data, Analytical Strategy and Potential Limitations				
Question	Nature of Inquiry	Type of Data	Analytical Strategy	Potential Limitations
Relevance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the extent to which the interventions was aligned with and contributed to national law and policies on domestic violence against women and girls from a human rights and gender equality perspective? • What is the extent to which the Joint Programme results addressed identified rights and needs of the target group(s) in the national and local contexts? 	Prospective inquiry on the design of the Programme	Program Documents, Interviews with Programme Designers	Evaluated according to SMART: Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-Bound Criteria	Lack of a Theory of Change; Potentially inappropriate beneficiary designations
Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent were the Joint Programme’s goal, outcomes and outputs achieved, taking into account their relative importance and relationships between different levels of results. • To what extent did the Joint Programme reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached? • To what extent has the Programme generated positive changes in the lives of targeted (and untargeted) women and girls in relation to the specific forms of violence addressed by this project? Why? What are the key changes in the lives of those women and/or girls? • What internal and external factors contributed to the achievement and/or failure of the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs? How? 	Confirmatory, both quantitative (when possible) and impressionistic, based upon views and impressions of stakeholders	Mostly interview data, M&E data and social statistics if available	Most significant change method to guide and analyze qualitative interviews; supported by descriptive statistics if possible.	Potential lack of M&E and Programme implementation data; Limited access to potential beneficiaries
Efficiency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent did the Joint Programme use the resources in the most cost-effective manner to achieve its objectives • Were the funds provided sufficient for achieving the short-term and long-term goals of integrating human rights and gender equality in the Programme intervention? 	Explicit comparisons of how resources have been converted to results	Budget and output data; human resource data	Centered on unit cost and other types of cost/output ratios	Lack of output data (hopefully not a lack of detailed budget data)
Sustainability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the Joint Programme supported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Developing an enabling or adaptable environment for real change on human rights and gender equality? ◦ Institutional change conducive to systematically addressing concerns of domestic violence in women and girls from human rights and gender equality perspectives? ◦ Capacity development of targeted rights holders (to demand) and duty bearers (to fulfill) rights? • Are the activities and their impact likely to continue when external support is withdrawn? • Will the strategy be more widely replicated or adapted? What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the Programme? 	Speculative and Confirmatory in terms of verify if outputs and entites created by the Programme still exist	Program data to confirm what was created, human resource records, current budget allocations, site visit confirmations	Process analysis in terms of understanding through what processes have the benefits delivered by the Programme been sustained.	Staff turnover; Long duration since Programme was completed until current evaluation
Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the Joint Programme as a whole and of individual participating agencies, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended? • Has the Joint Programme improved accountability, cohesion & collaboration between government, academia and civil society in the implementation of the Domestic Violence Act? 	Speculative and unstructured in the sense that unintended consequences are difficult to identify a priori	Any program and Ministry data that may exist; anecdotal and individual accounts of impact	Potentially ordered around a conceptual map of the journey of the victim through the DVA support system	A lack of conceptual clarity regarding this category; lack of impact data
*Note: We reserve the right to modify the structure of the evaluation criteria and corresponding questions accordingly in order to better meet the terms and objectives of the evaluation.				

Annex 5: Evaluation Matrix

Annex 6: Logical Framework

Overall Goal: Women and girls facing DV receive well-functioning protection and support services through rights-based and gender responsive implementation of the DV Act in Thailand								
Outcome 1 A well-coordinated and accountable multi-sectoral mechanism for the implementation of the DV Act established at the national level					Budget			
Output 1.1	Activities	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Better coordination among different ministries/agencies responsible for the DV Act implementation	1.1.1 Support high-level dialogues and consultations to be convened among ministries/agencies responsible for the DV Act implementation (Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS), Ministry of Public Health (MPH), the National Police Force (NPF), Ministry of Justice (MJ), the Juvenile and Family Court, the Criminal Court, Ministry of Interior (MI), etc.) in order to promote understanding of and commitment to well-coordinated implementation of the DV Act	- Decisions/ agreements/recom mendations coming out of the high-level consultations and dialogues	- Meeting reports - Guidelines and policies - Documents coming out of the coordination meetings,	All relevant government agencies will recognize the importance of the DV Act and assign strategic high-level representatives to participate in the dialogues and consultations.	\$ 10,000 UNIFEM	\$ 10,000 UNIFEM	\$ 10,000 UNIFEM	\$ 30,000 UNIFEM
	1.1.2 Support ministries/agencies responsible for the DV Act implementation (MSDHS, MPH, NPF, MJ, the Judiciary, MI, etc.), to identify gaps in the existing policies, plans of action and coordination guidelines of relevant ministries/agencies and update these documents in collaboration with civil society stakeholders, and convene regular coordination meetings to review implementation.	- Quality of coordination guidelines and policy documents produced - Frequency of coordination meetings among agencies			\$ 6,000 UNIFEM	\$ 2,000 UNIFEM	\$ 2,000 UNIFEM	\$ 10,000 UNIFEM

Output 1.2	Activities	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions and risks	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
A performance (and incidence) monitoring and reporting system of the DV Act implementation, established at the national level.	1.2.1 Support MSDHS and other relevant agencies such as MPH, NPF, the National Statistics Office, in collaboration with CSOs, to map out and review existing databases on GBV, with a particular focus on DV, to identify existing tools, data sources and gaps.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data on incidence of intimate partner violence and violence from others; - Data on programs addressing VAW/G in health, education, justice and security, social welfare sectors, in humanitarian emergency situations; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The GBV/DV database in pilot province - Annual reports of the DV Act implementation - Reports of consultations with stakeholders 	<p>MSDHS is willing to expand its mandate regarding DV data collection and reports, and aims to develop instead a more comprehensive, coordinated database.</p> <p>Government agencies and civil society stakeholders are willing to work together to establish a monitoring and reporting system and conduct the participatory mid-term review of the implementation of the DV Act.</p>	\$ 29,000 UNDP	\$ 34,000 UNDP	\$ 27,000 UNDP	\$ 90,000 UNDP
	1.2.2 Provide technical assistance to MSDHS and other relevant agencies such as MPH, NPF, the National Statistics Office, and CSOs, to enhance their capacity to work together to define and develop a viable system for a coordinated GBV/DV database at the national level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data on prevention of VAW among youth, communities, men and boys in accordance with the Compendium of Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators on VAW are available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews with key informants about the performance review process - Information on how MSDHS has disseminated the annual and mid-term review reports. 		\$ 10,000 UNDP	\$ 9,700 UNDP	\$ 9,000 UNDP	\$ 28,700 UNDP
	1.2.3 Provide technical assistance to MSDHS and other relevant agencies such as MPH, NPF, the National Statistics Office, and CSOs to set up a local-level GBV/DV database at the local level in the pilot areas (see Output 2.2) as a pilot for development of the national database.							

	<p>1.2.4 Support MSDHS, in consultation with relevant agencies such as MPH, NPF, MJ, judicial courts, MI, and CSOs, to prepare annual reports on the DV Act implementation and present them to the public through public forums and the media.</p> <p>1.2.5 Support MSDHS, in collaboration with other relevant agencies such as MPH, NPF, MJ, judicial courts, MI and CSOs (particularly women’s groups), to carry out a participatory mid-term review of the DV Act, its implementation, and its impact on the protection of women and girls facing DV.</p> <p>1.2.6 Organize a national conference on the results of the mid-term review targeting ministries/agencies responsible for the DV Act implementation and civil society stakeholders to share experiences, good practices and lessons learned from implementing the DV Act</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extent to which existing and new data is collated into one report - Quality of annual reports on the DV Act implementation - Annual workplans of implementing agencies addressing issues raised in annual reports - Level of stakeholders’ participation in the reporting and mid-term review process - Extent to which the performance reports are being made public 			<p>\$ 6,500 UNIFEM</p>	<p>\$ 15,000 UNIFEM</p> <p>\$ 15,000 UNIFEM</p>	<p>\$ 15,000 UNIFEM</p> <p>\$ 10,000 UNIFEM</p>	<p>\$ 36,500 UNIFEM</p> <p>\$ 15,000 UNIFEM</p> <p>\$ 10,000 UNIFEM</p>
--	--	---	--	--	------------------------	---	---	---

Outcome 2 Capacity of the multi-sectoral mechanisms responsible for the DV Act implementation, both at the national and local levels enhanced, enabling them to provide well coordinated, rights-based and gender-sensitive multi-sectoral protection and support services to women and girls facing DV					Budget			
Output 2.1	Activities	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions and risks	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Training modules on rights-based and gender-responsive approaches to DV cases developed, implemented and institutionalized in existing training programs of relevant agencies	2.1.1 Set up a technical working group comprised of relevant ministries/agencies including MSDHS, MPH, NPF, MJ, the Judiciary, MI, CSOs (particularly women’s groups), and individual experts and UN agencies, to oversee the development and institutionalization of training modules on rights-based and gender-responsive approaches to DV cases.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Content analysis of the training modules produced - FGD of key informants (e.g. trainers, trainees, managers of training institutions) - Pre- and post-training assessment of participants’ understanding of the rights-based and gender-responsive approaches - Interviews with training institutions - Review of training institution curriculums 	Relevant government agencies, different women’s NGOs and individual experts will come together, find a common ground, and work collectively on developing the training modules.	\$ 500 UNIFEM			\$ 500 UNIFEM
	2.1.2 Support the mapping of existing training programmes on gender equality, women’s human rights, GBV and DV with relevant ministries/agencies including MSDHS, MPH, NPF, MJ, the Judiciary, MI, and their training arms/units, CSOs (particularly women’s groups) to identify strengths and gaps.			Government agencies and NGOs providing trainings will effectively integrate the modules developed under this project into their training programmes	\$ 10,000 UNIFEM \$ 5,000 UNFPA			\$10,000 UNIFEM \$ 5,000 UNFPA

	<p>2.1.3 Support relevant ministries/agencies including MSDHS, MPH, NPF, MJ, the Judiciary, MI, and their training arms/units, and CSOs (particularly women’s groups), to develop new or improve existing training modules for personnel of government agencies responsible for the DV Act implementation as well as non-governmental service providers on rights-based and gender-sensitive responses to DV.</p> <p>2.1.4 Try out the training modules in the pilot areas (see Output 2.2) and review and revise the modules.</p> <p>2.1.5 Support relevant ministries/agencies including MSDHS, MPH, NPF, MJ, the Judiciary, MI, and their training arms/units, and CSOs (particularly women’s groups) to advocate for integration of the training modules developed into regular training programmes of the agencies.</p>	<p>- Numbers and quality of the training modules developed</p> <p>- Number of training modules adopted by the ministries and their training institutions, police training schools, by judiciary training institutions courts</p> <p>- Number of health care, law enforcement professionals, social workers and other service providers trained to respond to incidents of VAW/G</p>			<p>\$ 15,000 UNIFEM</p> <p>\$ 15,000 UNFPA</p> <p>\$ 6,468 UNIFEM to administer in collaboration with OHCHR</p>	<p>\$ 15,000 UNFPA</p> <p>\$ 17,000 UNIFEM to administer in collaboration with OHCHR</p> <p>\$ 5,000 UNIFEM</p>	<p>\$ 10,000 UNFPA</p> <p>\$ 5,468 UNIFEM to administer in collaboration with OHCHR</p>	<p>\$15,000 UNIFEM</p> <p>\$40,000 UNFPA</p> <p>\$28,936 UNIFEM to administer in collaboration with OHCHR</p> <p>\$ 5,000 UNIFEM</p>
--	--	---	--	--	---	---	---	--

Output 2.2	Activities	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions and risks	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
A local-level comprehensive and replicable pilot model of a multi-sectoral DV prevention and response system that is rights-based and gender-responsive	2.2.1 Convene a consultative meeting among the national and local focal points of ministries/agencies responsible for the DV Act implementation, including MSDHS, MPH, NPF, MJ, the Judiciary, MI, and civil society stakeholders in the pilot area to set up the model of coordinated support services and referrals to be tested, and develop a workplan.	Evidence of gender responsive and rights based services adopted and implemented by all sectors in pilot areas in accordance with the Compendium of Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators - Number of cases handled by each service provider in health care, justice and security system, social welfare, other sector by governmental and NGOs - Number of cases handled through collaboration of multiple agencies	- Reports from the GBV/DV data collection system established in the pilot area - FGD with women and girls who have received services - Survey of general public in pilot areas on the support services - Reports from DV operating centres and CBOs - Evaluation Report Documentation of the pilot model	Apart from the support to be provided under this project, staff of relevant agencies and local communities in the pilot areas will be able to contribute adequate time, expertise and other resources necessary to make the pilot model successful.	\$ 11,000 UNIFEM			\$ 11,000 UNIFEM
	2.2.2 Set up a monitoring system of the pilot, including identification of indicators, development of a monitoring framework and collection of baseline data.							
	2.2.3 Organize capacity development activities for staff of the multi-sectoral DV response system and CSOs and community-based groups in the pilot areas, with special emphasis on coordinated support services and referrals, and the understanding and application of rights-based and gender-responsive approaches to DV cases.							
					\$ 21,000 UNIFEM	\$ 24,000 UNIFEM	\$ 10,000 UNIFEM	\$ 55,000 UNIFEM
					\$ 39,000 UNFPA	\$ 34,000 UNFPA	\$ 24,000 UNFPA	\$ 97,000 UNFPA
					\$ 10,000 UNIFEM			\$ 10,000 UNIFEM

	<p>Capacity development activities include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trainings for relevant agencies using training modules developed under Output 2.1 - Networking forums of different sectors working on DV, including DV Act officers appointed by MSDHS, the police, medical and health personnel, providers of emergency shelters, CSOs/women's groups providing legal aid and other support services, public attorneys, judges and court personnel, etc. - Technical assistance for case conferencing - Technical assistance to the DV operating centres of the MSDHS at provincial and sub-district level to act as coordinating and information hubs for the multi-sectoral DV response <p>2.2.4 Establish a screening and referral system in public health units, including in the antenatal care and family planning clinics, for women and girls affected by DV</p>	<p>- Number of referrals by health care, law enforcement, justice and security system, legal aid, social and other services</p>				<p>\$ 14,027 UNFPA</p>	<p>\$ 11,000 UNFPA</p>	<p>\$ 25,027 UNFPA</p>
--	---	---	--	--	--	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

	<p>2.2.5 Support community-based organizations and local women’s groups, and others to work with experienced national women’s NGOs and CSOs in providing legal counseling and support services to women and girls affected by DV in the pilot areas</p> <p>2.2.6 Support community based organizations, including local women’s groups, men and boys networks and local administrative organizations, to develop and implement primary prevention programmes (e.g. local network of men and boys, community awareness raising) for DV in the pilot areas.</p> <p>2.2.7 Support MSDHS in conducting an evaluation of the pilot model and convening a national forum to share the evaluation findings and the model.</p> <p>2.2.8 Document the operational processes, good practices, challenges and lessons learned from the pilot project for replication of the pilot model in other areas</p>	<p>- Number of women and children using legal counseling and support services in pilot areas</p> <p>- Number and types of initiatives focusing on prevention of DV at the community level (by youth, men and boys, community based groups and administration)</p> <p>Availability of documentation of a model for rural and urban areas</p>			<p>\$ 10,000 UNIFEM</p> <p>\$ 10,000 UNIFEM</p>	<p>\$ 10,000 UNIFEM</p> <p>\$ 10,000 UNIFEM</p>	<p>\$ 10,000 UNIFEM</p> <p>\$ 25,000 UNIFEM</p>	<p>\$ 20,000 UNIFEM</p> <p>\$ 20,000 UNIFEM</p> <p>\$ 10,000 UNIFEM</p> <p>\$ 25,000 UNIFEM</p>
--	---	--	--	--	---	---	---	---

Output 2.3	Activities	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions and risks	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Increased public awareness in the pilot areas on GBV, with particular focus on DV and the DV Act.	2.3.1 In the pilot areas, work with CBOs and local groups,(women’s groups, youth groups, networks of boys and men, local authorities, school administration and students, etc.), to develop and implement awareness-raising campaigns against GBV, particularly DV, the DV Act and support services to women and girls affected by DV..	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proportion of women and girls who know of local organizations that provide legal aid, other services to VAW/G survivors in pilot area - Proportion of individuals who know of legal rights of women, of legal sanctions on DV/ GBV/VAW; - Proportion of men and boys who agree with gender equality and that men can prevent VAW/G, youth - Proportion of individuals who report they heard or saw a mass media message on issues related to VAW/G, youth - Number of broadcasting times and/or public events and/or workshops make used of the documentaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Surveys of knowledge of DV, the DV Act in the pilot areas at beginning and end of the project - FGD with participants of training and events where the documentaries have been screened - Reports of number of participants attending awareness raising events + estimated number of audience of documentaries and broadcasting channels - Pre-testing and post-testing participants in events/training on the understanding of DV 	Apart from the support to be provided under this project, CBOs and local groups in the pilot areas will be able to contribute adequate time, expertise and other resources necessary to the awareness-raising campaigns.	\$ 15,000 UNIFEM	\$ 4,030 UNIFEM		\$ 19,030 UNIFEM
	2.3.2 Produce documentaries or short films on DV, to be used in the awareness-raising campaigns, public events, training programmes and broadcast by local and national media channels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proportion of men and boys who agree with gender equality and that men can prevent VAW/G, youth - Proportion of individuals who report they heard or saw a mass media message on issues related to VAW/G, youth - Number of broadcasting times and/or public events and/or workshops make used of the documentaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reports of number of participants attending awareness raising events + estimated number of audience of documentaries and broadcasting channels - Pre-testing and post-testing participants in events/training on the understanding of DV 		\$ 30,000 UNDP	\$ 20,000 UNDP	\$ 17,400 UNDP	\$ 67,400 UNDP