

# Final Evaluation of Project “The Empowerment and Capacity Building of Lesbian and Transgender Women to Mitigate Violence, Stigma and Discrimination based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity”

Location of Evaluation: Bangkok, Ubon Ratchathani, Chiang Mai and Songkhla, Thailand

Project Period: 1/1/2015-12/31/2017

Date of Evaluation Report: September 2018

Evaluators: Kerry Richter, Dusita Phuengsamran & Nippon Darawuttimaprakorn

Prepared for: Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand (RSAT)

This Evaluation Report has been developed by an independent evaluation team. The analysis presented in this report reflects the views of the authors and may not necessarily represent those of the RSAT, their partners or the UN Trust Fund.



## Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	iv
List of acronyms and abbreviations.....	v
Acknowledgments .....	vi
Executive summary .....	vii
1 Context of the project.....	1
2 Description of the project.....	2
3 Purpose of the evaluation.....	4
4 Evaluation objectives and scope.....	5
5 Evaluation Team .....	6
6 Evaluation Questions.....	6
7 Evaluation Methodology .....	10
8 Findings and Analysis per Evaluation Question .....	15
1) To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs achieved and how?.....	15
2) To what extent did the project reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached? .....	25
3) To what extent has this project generated positive changes in the lives of targeted (and untargeted) populations in relation to the specific forms of violence addressed by this project? Why? What are the key changes in the lives of those populations? Please describe those changes. ....	30
4) What internal and external factors contributed to the achievement and/or failure of the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs? How?.....	34
5) To what extent was the project strategy and activities implemented relevant in responding to the needs of the targeted populations? .....	37
6) To what extent do achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of the targeted populations? .....	40
7) How efficiently and timely has this project been implemented and managed in accordance with the Project Document?.....	43
8) How are the achieved results, especially the positive changes generated by the project in the lives of the targeted populations at the project goal level, going to be sustained after this project ends? .....	44

10)	What are the unintended consequences (positive and negative) resulting from the project?.....	49
11)	Has there been any change in attitude toward GBV issues and stigmatization among stakeholders? .....	51
12)	What are the key lessons learned that can be shared with other practitioners on Ending Violence against Women, Girls and LBT women? .....	52
13)	Are there any promising practices? If yes, what are they and how can these promising practices be replicated in other projects and/or in other countries that have similar interventions? .....	52
9	Conclusions .....	54
10	Key recommendations.....	55
11	Annexes .....	57
1)	Final Version of Terms of Reference (TOR) of the evaluation .....	58
2)	Evaluation Matrix .....	73
3)	Results and Resources Framework (RRF).....	77
4)	Final version of Results Monitoring Plan .....	95
5)	Beneficiary Data Sheet.....	102
6)	Additional methodology-related documentation .....	105
	Information Sheet for LBW/TGW .....	105
	Informed Consent Form for Lesbian Women .....	108
	List of resources given to respondents if they need to seek assistance:.....	109
	Guideline for in-depth interviews .....	110
	Key informant interview guide: .....	117
	Online Survey Questionnaire .....	120
7)	List of persons and institutions interviewed or consulted.....	146
8)	List of supporting documents reviewed.....	150
9)	CVs of evaluators .....	152
10)	Tables from the online survey .....	166

## List of Tables

Table 6.1: Work plan with specific timeline and deliverables.....	7
Table 8.1: Verification of project numbers reached from January to June 2017 .....	27
Table 8.2: Original and revised project numbers reached from January 2015 to June 2017, RSAT.....	28
Table 6.1: Number of in-depth interviews conducted at baseline and endline .....	146
Table 6.2: Profile of in-depth interview respondents.....	147
Table 9.1 Responses to the question of how you would describe your physical sex in the online survey .....	166
Table 9.2 Responses to the question of how you would describe your sexual orientation or gender identity.....	166
Table 9.3 Classification of online survey respondents into LBW, TGW and Other SOGI categories.....	167
Table 9.4 Age group of online survey respondents .....	168
Table 9.5 Educational attainment of online survey respondents .....	168
Table 9.6 Occupation of online survey respondents .....	168
Table 9.7: Topics in the RSAT workshops picked as the 1 <sup>st</sup> or 2 <sup>nd</sup> most relevant and as “most applicable to me” by online survey respondents.....	169
Table 9.8: Experiences of violence, bullying and stigma and discrimination reported in the online survey .....	170
Table 9.9 Knowledge of human rights of online survey respondents .....	171
Table 9.10: Recall of RSAT IEC materials.....	172
Table 9.11: Where respondents saw the RSAT IEC materials (multiple response).....	173



## List of acronyms and abbreviations

AJWS	American Jewish World Service
ET	Evaluation team
FGD	Focus group discussion
IDI	In-depth interviews
IEC	Information, education & communication
IGLHRC	International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission
ILGA	International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association
ILO	International Labour Organization
KII	Key informant interview
LBT	Lesbians, bisexual women and transgender women
LBW	Lesbian women
LGBT	Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender
LGBTI <sup>1</sup>	Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MSDHS	Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
MSM	Men who have sex with men
NHRC	National Human Rights Commission of Thailand
RSAT	Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand
S&D	Stigma and discrimination
SOGI	Sexual orientation and gender identity
TGW	Transgender women
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNTF	United Nations Trust Fund To End Violence Against Women

---

<sup>1</sup> This report consistently uses LGBTI to refer to all sexual minority groups; however quotations sometimes use different terms, which are also listed here.

## Acknowledgments

Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand (RSAT) implemented the project, “The Empowerment and Capacity Building of Lesbian and Transgender Women to Mitigate Violence, Stigma and Discrimination based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity” with funding from the United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence against Women (UNTF). The evaluation team wishes to thank Pattarawan Ucharatna for her work in verifying the monitoring data for the project. We would also like to thank all of the RSAT staff who helped provide contact information and documents for the evaluation. Finally, we thank all respondents to the interviews and online survey, without which the evaluation would not be possible.

The Evaluation Team

## Executive summary

Article 30 of Thailand's 2007 Constitution states that, "All persons are equal before the law and shall enjoy equal protection under the law. Men and women shall enjoy equal rights. Unjust discrimination against a person on the ground of differences in origin, race, language, sex, age, physical or health condition, personal status, economic and social standing, religious belief, education, or political views, shall not be permitted." In 2015, the Gender Equality Act was passed which prevents discrimination on the basis of gender.

Despite this, lesbian and transgender women are still victims of both physical and verbal abuse and violence, and face discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. A 2012 study by International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (IGLHRC) documented that 15 Thai lesbian women (LBW) were murdered by men who objected to their relationships with other women and/or their "tom" or masculine appearance from 2006-2012.<sup>2</sup> The study also cited sexual assaults of LBW that were motivated by the same mentality. A qualitative study in 2015 found that many Thai transgender women (TGW) and (LBW) faced rejection, verbal and physical abuse from their family when they first began to express their gender identity.<sup>3</sup> In school, most TGW had faced problems with teachers and school officials because of their dress and speech, as well as physical abuse, sexual abuse and bullying. Finally, several studies have documented the economic and job discrimination that LBW and especially TGW face in the Thai labor market.<sup>4</sup>

Moreover, few of the LBW and TGW respondents from the 2015 baseline study were knowledgeable about human rights, in terms of whether Thai laws protected them from discrimination due to their sexual orientation or gender identity. They also had an accurate view of the limited forms of support available to them to seek help in discrimination or abuse cases. Most said that they rely on themselves, their peer group and/or their family for support in times of trouble.

---

<sup>2</sup> Tan, S. (2012, March 29). 15 targeted killings of lesbians in Thailand since 2006: IGLHRC report. *Fridae.Asia*. Retrieved from <https://www.fridae.asia/gay-news/2012/03/29/11627.15-targeted-killings-of-lesbians-in-thailand-since-2006-iglhrc-report>

<sup>3</sup> Richter, K, Phuengsamran, D. & Darawuttimaprakorn, N. (2015). *The empowerment and capacity building of lesbian and transgender women to mitigate violence, stigma and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity: Baseline report*. Submitted to Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand (RSAT). Note: this is the baseline study for this project.

<sup>4</sup> UNDP, op. cit.; Suriyasarn B. (2016) Discrimination and marginalization of LGBT Workers in Thailand. In: Köllen T. (eds.) *Sexual orientation and transgender issues in organizations*. Springer, Cham. doi: [10.1007/978-3-319-29623-4\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29623-4_12); Suriyasarn, B. (2014). *Gender identity and sexual orientation in Thailand* / ILO Country Office for Thailand, Cambodia and Lao People's Democratic Republic ; Promoting Rights, Diversity and Equality in the World of Work (PRIDE) Project. – Bangkok : ILO.

In 2014 Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand (RSAT) received a grant by the UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women (administered by UNWOMEN) to implement a project to address these issues and improve Thailand's responses for lesbian and transgender women. The project was implemented from January 2015 through December 2017 with a budget of \$600,000; additional funds from the American Jewish World Service (AJWS) raised the budget to \$924,000. The project engaged Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand and its provincial offices in Bangkok, Nonthaburi, Pathumthani, Ubon Ratchathani, Nakornsawan, Lamphun, Chonburi, and Songkhla that work with lesbian and transgender women.

The goal of the project was that "Lesbian and transgender women from four regions of Thailand experience greater freedom from violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity, and better access to assistance when violence does occur". The proposed outcomes of the project were as follows:

**Outcome 1:** Groups of lesbian and transgender women have gained greater capacity to advocate for change in government policy and the broader society related to violence, stigma & discrimination and human right violation against women on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.

**Outcome 2:** RSAT has strengthened an existing monitoring and reporting surveillance system that provides a more effective platform for prompting government agencies to provide the appropriate response to cases of violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in four areas of Thailand.

**Outcome 3:** Government agencies and the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) in Thailand increase their awareness and improve their responsiveness to cases of violence and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.

The purpose of this final evaluation is to ensure that RSAT's implementation has yielded the results proposed to the UN Trust Fund in the project's results chain and measured by project targets (accountability); to identify promising practices that proved to be effective in achieving the project's goals and outcomes (evidence for decision making) and the lessons learned during project implementation to improve the project design (learning and

development).<sup>5</sup>. The objectives of the evaluation are to evaluate the project in terms of effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and impact; to generate key lessons-learned and identify promising practices for learning; and to generate knowledge that can be adapted to lesbians, bisexual and transgender women (LBT) capacity building program focus, and inform adjustments to the program. The intended audience for the evaluation are those who design similar programs to address violence against women and stigma & discrimination towards the LGBTI community, including NGOs, CSOs and government agencies. Lessons learned and promising practices found in this evaluation will also help UNTF and RSAT to improve its initiatives in this area.

The evaluation used mixed methods to explore these topics, in order to triangulate the findings with a variety of data that may be compared and contrasted. Qualitative methods were used to allow beneficiaries and key informants tell their own stories about their interactions with the program, and to allow probing into topics of interests. The qualitative methods used were in-depth interviews and key informant interviews. A quantitative online survey of project participants was also conducted, to get a sense of the proportions of beneficiaries who expressed various opinions about the program. The quantitative survey asked some similar questions to the qualitative interviews so that the findings could be compared. The evaluation team also reviewed all project reports and validated project monitoring data. Analysis techniques included systematic organization and thematic analysis for the qualitative data; simple frequencies and crosstabulations for the quantitative data, and data verification for the monitoring data; these are described in more detail in Section 7. While the methodological design of the study is sound, the evaluation did face some limitations in implementing the design fully, which are discussed further in Section 4.

---

<sup>5</sup> UN Women Independent Evaluation Office. (2015). *UN Women Evaluation Handbook: How to manage gender-responsive evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://www.unwomen.org/-/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2015/un-women-evaluation-handbook-en.pdf?la=en&vs=1401>; UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). (2011). *Evaluating Human Rights Training Activities: A Handbook for Human Rights Educators*, Retrieved from <https://www.refworld.org/docid/4db80ad22.html>

## 1 Context of the project

Article 30 of Thailand's 2007 Constitution states that, "All persons are equal before the law and shall enjoy equal protection under the law. Men and women shall enjoy equal rights. Unjust discrimination against a person on the ground of differences in origin, race, language, sex, age, physical or health condition, personal status, economic and social standing, religious belief, education, or political views, shall not be permitted." In 2015, the Gender Equality Act was passed which prevents discrimination on the basis of gender.

Despite this, lesbian and transgender women in Thailand are still victims of both physical and verbal abuse and violence, and face discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. A 2012 study by International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (IGLHRC) documented 15 murders of Thai lesbian women (LBW) from 2006-2012. The women were murdered by men who objected to their relationships with other women and/or their "tom" or masculine appearance.<sup>6</sup> The study also cited sexual assaults of LBW that were motivated by the same mentality; a comprehensive UNDP study on LGBTI gave evidence of a rise in sexual violence cases based on sexual identity. It also concluded that the Thai media are reluctant to report on cases of stigma, discrimination and violence against LGBTI and that the government did not recognize such incidents as hate crimes.<sup>7</sup>

A qualitative study in 2015 found that many Thai LBW had a negative reaction from their family when their sexual orientation or gender identity was first revealed.<sup>8</sup> Some faced physical violence, verbal abuse and rejections from their parents. But the situation for transgender women (TGW) was found to be much worse; nearly all dealt with rejection and verbal and physical abuse from their family when they first began to express their gender identity. In school, most of the TGW had faced problems with teachers and school officials because of their dress and speech. Several TGW respondents reported incidents of physical abuse, sexual abuse and bullying in school as well. In their sexual partnerships, one LBW

---

<sup>6</sup> Tan, S. (2012, March 29). 15 targeted killings of lesbians in Thailand since 2006: IGLHRC report. *Fridae.Asia*. Retrieved from <https://www.fridae.asia/gay-news/2012/03/29/11627.15-targeted-killings-of-lesbians-in-thailand-since-2006-iglhrc-report>

<sup>7</sup> UNDP, USAID (2014). *Being LGBT in Asia: Thailand Country Report*. Bangkok.

<sup>8</sup> Richter, K. Phuengsamran, D. & Darawuttimaprakorn, N. (2015). *The empowerment and capacity building of lesbian and transgender women to mitigate violence, stigma and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity: Baseline report*. Submitted to Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand (RSAT). Note: this is the baseline study for this project.

respondent had experienced physical violence and several TGW respondents reported violence, financial exploitation and verbal abuse in their sexual partnerships.

Several studies have documented the economic and job discrimination that LBW and especially TGW face in the Thai labor market.<sup>9</sup> A comprehensive ILO study states,

*The majority of LGBT respondents in the research have experienced discrimination in various aspects and stages of employment and occupation. In particular, they face discrimination in education and training and barriers to access to employment, career opportunity and advancement, as well as social security benefits.<sup>10</sup>*

Moreover, few of the LBW and TGW respondents from the 2015 study were knowledgeable about human rights. The study found that they had a range of opinions about whether Thai laws protected them from discrimination due to their sexual orientation or gender identity. They also had an accurate view of the limited forms of support available to them to seek help in discrimination or abuse cases. Most said that they rely on themselves, their peer group and/or their family for support in times of trouble. Many lesbian and transgender women experience “self-stigma” as they absorb the societal view that their sexual orientation and gender identity makes them less valuable than heterosexual people.<sup>11</sup> Given that Thai society overall is not well informed about human rights, such abuse, stigma and discrimination against lesbian and transgender women is seen as socially justified.

## 2 Description of the project

In 2014 the Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand (RSAT) received a grant by the UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women (UNTF) (administered by UNWOMEN) to implement a project to address these issues and improve Thailand’s responses for lesbian and transgender women. The specific types of violence that the project was designed to address were intimate partner violence (violence in the family); psychological or emotional violence; non-partner violence (violence in the family); psychological or emotional violence; sexual harassment and violence in public spaces/institutions (violence in the community); violence in schools; and violence in public spaces. The project was implemented from January 2015 through December 2017 with a budget of \$600,000; additional funds from the American

---

<sup>9</sup> UNDP, op. cit.; Suriyasarn B. (2016) Discrimination and marginalization of LGBT Workers in Thailand. In: Köllen T. (eds.) Sexual orientation and transgender issues in organizations. Springer, Cham. doi: [10.1007/978-3-319-29623-4\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29623-4_12); Suriyasarn, B. (2014). *Gender identity and sexual orientation in Thailand* / ILO Country Office for Thailand, Cambodia and Lao People’s Democratic Republic ; Promoting Rights, Diversity and Equality in the World of Work (PRIDE) Project. – Bangkok : ILO.

<sup>10</sup> Suriyasarn (2014): p. 45.

<sup>11</sup> UNDP, op cit.; Ojanen, T. T., Ratanashevorn, R., & Boonkerd, S. (2016). Gaps in responses to LGBT issues in Thailand: Mental health research, services, and policies. *Psychology of Sexualities Review*, 7(1), 41-59.

Jewish World Service (AJWS) raised the budget to \$924,000. The project engaged Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand and its provincial offices in Bangkok, Nonthaburi, Pathumthani, Ubon Ratchathani, Nakornsawan, Lamphun, Chonburi, and Songkhla that work with lesbian and transgender women, who are the primary beneficiaries of the project. The secondary beneficiaries are civil society organizations, community groups, public health professionals, and government civil servants from the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security Office of Women's Affairs and Family Development, the Ministry of Justice Department of Rights and Liberty Protection, and the National Human Rights Commission.

The goal of the project was that "Lesbian and transgender women from four regions of Thailand experience greater freedom from violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity, and better access to assistance when violence does occur". The outcomes of the project were as follows:

**Outcome 1:** Groups of lesbian and transgender women have gained greater capacity to advocate for change in government policy and the broader society related to violence, stigma & discrimination and human right violation against women on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.

**Outcome 2:** RSAT has strengthened an existing monitoring and reporting surveillance system that provides a more effective platform for prompting government agencies to provide the appropriate response to cases of violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in four areas of Thailand.

**Outcome 3:** Government agencies and the National Human Rights Commission in Thailand increase their awareness and improve their responsiveness to cases of violence and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.

The project's full Results and Resources Framework is shown in Annex 3. While the project did not explicitly include a theory of change in its design, it can be inferred that IF 1) capacity is built for Thai LBW and TGW to better understand their rights and to advocate for policy change; and 2) a stronger monitoring, reporting and surveillance system is built to track cases of violence and discrimination against LBW and TGW; and 3) awareness is increased among Thai government agencies and responsiveness to these cases is improved; THEN the goal of greater freedom from violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violations can be attained for LBW and TGW.

The intervention sought to empower lesbian and transgender women through building understanding that "it is not okay for them to be abused, stigmatized and discriminated against". The project was designed to build their capacity to understand human rights and



to advocate to their surrounding communities, society and related government agencies for these rights. It did this through conducting capacity building workshops and peer-led community outreach for LBW and TGW and creating groups of peer leaders who would work together to advocate for policy changes at the local and national level. To strengthen the national surveillance system to track cases of violence and discrimination, it planned to establish an online system to receive petitions and monitor cases of violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violations and to establish a hotline (telephone) system to receive petitions and monitor cases of violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violations. Finally, RSAT planned to produce IEC materials to address the issues of violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violations and to hold regular meetings with key stakeholders to strengthen their dialogue with these groups.

### **3 Purpose of the evaluation**

The purpose of this final evaluation is to ensure that RSAT's implementation has yielded the results proposed to the UN Trust Fund in the project's results chain and measured by project targets (accountability); to identify promising practices that proved to be effective in achieving the project's goals and outcomes (evidence for decision making) and to explore the lessons learned during project implementation to improve the project design (learning and development).<sup>12</sup> The intended audience for the evaluation are those who design similar programs to address violence against women and stigma & discrimination towards the LGBTI community, including NGOs, CSOs and government agencies. Lessons learned and promising practices found in this evaluation will also help UNTF and RSAT to improve its initiatives in this area. This is a mandatory final project evaluation by the UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women. The results will also help RSAT to identify additional capacity needs or strategies to improve access to assistance for LBW and TGW when violence does occur.

The evaluation results will be used by Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand to identify good practices should be continued and can be shared to other partners for replications and to identify which actions do not work and require improvement. The results will be also shared with relevant government agencies including RSAT's partners in the project,

---

<sup>12</sup> UN Women Independent Evaluation Office. (2015). *UN Women Evaluation Handbook: How to manage gender-responsive evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://www.unwomen.org/-/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2015/un-women-evaluation-handbook-en.pdf?la=en&vs=1401>; UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). (2011). *Evaluating Human Rights Training Activities: A Handbook for Human Rights Educators*, Retrieved from <https://www.refworld.org/docid/4db80ad22.html>

Ministry of Social Development and Human Security Office of Women's Affairs and Family Development, the Ministry of Justice Department of Rights and Liberty Protection, and the National Human Rights Commission.

#### **4 Evaluation objectives and scope**

The objectives of the evaluation are as follows:

- ◆ To evaluate the entire project in terms of effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and impact, with a strong focus on assessing the results at the outcome and project goals.
- ◆ To generate key lessons-learned and identify promising practices for learning
- ◆ To generate knowledge that can be adapted to LBT capacity building program focus, and inform adjustments to the program

The evaluation covers the entire period of project implementation. In-depth interview respondents were selected from Bangkok, Ubon Ratchathani, Chiang Mai and Songkhla (but also including participants from Yala, Pattani and Narathiwat provinces). Online survey respondents and key informant interview respondents were nationwide.

The evaluation faced several limitations. Budgetary constraints did not allow focus group discussions (FGDs) to be conducted. RSAT was only able to provide contact information for the workshop participants<sup>13</sup> (discussed further below) which limited the pool from which to select in-depth interview (IDI) and online survey respondents. The ET experienced delays in obtaining key information from RSAT, which affected the scheduling of fieldwork and delayed completion of the evaluation. Turnover in RSAT staff and rotation of government officials, as well as some unwillingness on the part of these two groups to be interviewed, also limited the number of key informant interviews (KIIs) and delayed the evaluation. Finally, because the budget and the IRB approval of protocols had been set at the outset of the project, the ET was limited in its ability to revise the evaluation design. For this reason, online and hotline beneficiaries and LBW and TGW from the (leadership) working groups were not interviewed.

---

<sup>13</sup> Workshop participants are referred to as "peer educators" by RSAT as the project design was for their role to continue to educate others. In this report, the ET calls them "workshop participants" in order to make clear that we are referring to that role only.

## 5 Evaluation Team

The work plan with specific timeline and deliverables for the final evaluation is shown on the next page.

Kerry Richter, an independent consultant, served as principal investigator of the evaluation. She was responsible for the evaluation design, oversight of data collection and data quality, quantitative data analysis, and writing the final report.

Dusita Phuengsamran, a Lecturer at the Institute for Population and Social Studies, served as co-investigator of the project. She was responsible for managing the project budget, coordination with Rainbow Sky, data collection, qualitative data analysis, and contributing to the baseline and final report.

Niphon Darawuttimaprakorn, a Senior Professional Level Researcher at the Institute for Population and Social Studies, served as researcher of the project. He was responsible for managing the fieldwork, data collection, implementing the online survey, participation in the data analysis, and contributing to the baseline and final report.

## 6 Evaluation Questions

The evaluation questions below are developed from UNTF's standard questions and were included in the inception report. The questions are designed to measure the standard evaluation categories of effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Knowledge generation questions were also included as an extension of sustainability.

### **Effectiveness**

1. To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs achieved and how?
2. To what extent did the project reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached?
3. To what extent has this project generated positive changes in the lives of targeted (and untargeted) populations in relation to the specific forms of violence addressed by this project? Why? What are the key changes in the lives of those populations? Please describe those changes.
4. What internal and external factors contributed to the achievement and/or failure of the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs? How?

**Table 6.1: Work plan with specific timeline and deliverables**

Date	5-Feb	12-Feb	19-Mar	2-Jul	6-Aug	13-Aug	27-Aug	3-Sep	17-Sep	24-Sep	29-Oct	24-Dec
Team planning meeting												
Finalize methodology and prepare guidelines												
Key informant interviews												
In-depth interviews												
Quantitative analysis of monitoring data												
Set-up of web-based survey												
Web-based survey data collection												
Data analysis												
Report writing												
Draft report												
Feedback on report draft												
Submission to UNTF												

## **Relevance**

5. To what extent was the project strategy and activities implemented relevant in responding to the needs of the targeted populations?
6. To what extent do achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of the targeted populations?

## **Efficiency**

7. How efficiently and timely has this project been implemented and managed in accordance with the Project Document?

## **Sustainability**

8. How are the achieved results, especially the positive changes generated by the project in the lives of the targeted populations at the project goal level, going to be sustained after this project ends?
9. What is the likelihood or tendency of leading peer-educators, who have been trained in the project's capacity building sessions, to continue educating their peers after the project completion?

## **Impact**

10. What are the unintended consequences (positive and negative) resulted from the project?
11. Has there been any change in attitude toward GVB issues and stigmatization among stakeholders?

## **Knowledge Generation**

12. What are the key lessons learned that can be shared with other practitioners on Ending Violence against Women, Girls and LBT women?
13. Are there any promising practices? If yes, what are they and how can these promising practices be replicated in other projects and/or in other countries that have similar interventions?

Each of the evaluation questions is operationalized using the sub-questions shown in the Evaluation Matrix in Annex 2.

## 7 Evaluation Methodology

Sub-sections	Inputs by the evaluator(s)
Description of evaluation design	Post-test only non-experimental design
Data sources	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Key informant interviews</li> <li>2. In-depth interviews</li> <li>3. Quantitative on-line survey</li> <li>4. RSAT reports</li> <li>5. RSAT database</li> </ol>
Description of data collection methods and analysis (including level of precision required for quantitative methods, value scales or coding used for qualitative analysis; level of participatio	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Key informant interviews (KII) were conducted according to a structured guideline (Annex 5). Some interviews were conducted by phone or skype if it was not possible to meet in person. Qualitative data analysis was conducted by organizing the findings into a matrix by evaluation question and respondent.</li> <li>2. The in-depth interviews (IDI) were conducted according to a structured guideline (Annex 5). All IDIs were conducted in person. Qualitative data analysis was conducted by organizing the findings into a matrix by topic and respondent ID code.</li> <li>3. The online survey was conducted using a structured questionnaire (Annex 5) which was set up using the Quicktionnaire online platform. The quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS for frequencies and crosstabulations.<sup>14</sup></li> </ol>

---

<sup>14</sup> No minimum sample size was set for the online survey, since participation in the survey was at the discretion of those who received the email invitation. As discussed further below, the number of participants with contact information was a small proportion of the total number of participants in the program. For this reason, the sampling error of the estimated proportions reported in the quantitative survey is likely to be high. The sampling error cannot be estimated because the online survey sample was not selected randomly from the total population of beneficiaries.

<p>n of stakeholders through evaluation process, etc.)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The RSAT annual and final reports were provided by RSAT. The reports were analyzed simply by reading and by triangulating RSAT's findings with our own data.</li> <li>5. The RSAT databases for workshops (including pre- and post-test survey data), outreach, counselling (hotline and online) and some health center databases were provided by RSAT. The ET analyzed the data by verifying the numbers of beneficiaries reached from the reports, as described further below.</li> </ol>
<p>Description of sampling</p> <p>Area and population to be represented</p> <p>Rationale for selection</p> <p>Mechanics of selection limitations to sample</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For both key informants and in-depth interview respondents, the sampling frame was designed to obtain a wide variety of perspectives. For the key informant interviews, we sought to obtain representatives from different levels of government (national and provincial), from a variety of government agencies, and from a number of provinces where the project was active. For the in-depth interviews, we sought out respondents from different SOGI and from a number of provinces. Age was not used as a criteria to select IDI respondents, but because respondents were selected randomly from the lists of contacts we had the IDI respondents' ages mirrored those of participants. More details about the respondents are given in Annex 6.</li> <li>2. The key informants from government were identified by UNTF and RSAT. These were the main focal points who had contact with RSAT about the program.</li> </ol> <p>The ET interviewed RSAT staff from the provincial offices and the head office in Bangkok, including database managers and M&amp;E officers. This was to assure that we received all needed information about the program. We have not identified the three provincial staff interviewed in order to protect their anonymity.</p> <p>The full list of key informants interviewed is given in Annex 6.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The ET requested lists of participants in the program from RSAT so that we could contact them for IDIs. RSAT only had contact information for the women who participated in the workshops; other forms of participation in the program including outreach, visiting a health center, and hotline or online counseling, which were all confidential. Of the list of 776 workshop participants that we received, 52 had no contact information at all and 325 had only an email address. The reason for this was that only the sign-in sheets for the workshops listed contact information for participants, and many of these had errors or were out of date.</li> </ol>

	<p>From these lists, respondents were stratified by province and SOGI and then selected randomly. The ET contacted potential respondents until they were able to complete the target number of interviews in the province (2 LBW and 2 TGW in each province for a total of 32). A profile of the IDI respondents interviewed is shown in Annex 6.</p> <p>4. The ET used the same lists of participants to contact people for the online survey. We attempted to expand the pool of respondents by asking respondents to the survey to forward the link for the survey to other RSAT workshop participants that they knew. Of the 724 participants who were emailed with the survey link, 139 responded (response rate 19.2%). An additional 46 respondents were reached through referral from a friend.<sup>15</sup></p> <p>The survey included questions on SOGI and on whether the respondent had attended an RSAT workshop. We learned by examining the database and from meetings with RSAT staff that not all workshop participants were LBW and TGW; some gay men and others who were interested also attended the RSAT workshops, and so we did not want to restrict the analysis to LBW and TGW. We decided to eliminate 28 cases who were referred by a friend but said they never attended an RSAT activity and 15 cases of heterosexual men who were referred by a friend. The remaining sample is 142 respondents, 133 from the workshop lists and 9 referred by friends.</p> <p>In order to classify the respondents by SOGI group, we looked at the responses that were given for self-identified physical sex and self-identified SOGI. As seen in Tables 9.1-9.3 in Annex 9, there was great variety in how the respondents self-identified. We classified the respondents into 55 LBW, 51 TGW and 36 Other SOGI. The latter group included some respondents who refused to identify their SOGI, said they didn't know, or gave ambiguous answers.</p> <p>A socio-demographic profile of the respondents is given in Tables 9.4-9.6 of Annex 9. Most respondents are in their 20s, with the LBW slightly younger than the other groups. About half of them have a bachelor's degree. About 30% work in the private sector and about one-fifth are</p>
--	---

---

<sup>15</sup> The representativeness of the online survey sample is affected by several factors, including: 1) workshop participants whose contact information had changed since the workshop could not be reached, meaning that more stable and less mobile women were more likely to be contacted for the survey; 2) participation in the survey was voluntary, so that participants who are more likely to be online and who enjoy taking surveys were more likely to participate; 3) the additional 46 participants reached by friends may be more likely to be connected to networks of LBTI women; and 4) participants who feel more attached to the program are more likely to participate.



	<p>students, although the LBW group is about 28% students. This profile corresponds well to the description of workshop participants given in the RSAT monitoring data.</p>
<p>Description of ethical considerations in the evaluation</p> <p>Actions taken to ensure the safety of respondents and research team</p> <p>Referral to local services or sources of support</p> <p>Confidentiality and anonymity protocols</p> <p>Protocols for research on children, if required.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Key informants were assured that their opinions would be kept confidential by the evaluation team. All KIIs were conducted in a private place so that respondents could speak freely, or were conducted on the phone.</li> <li>2. At the time of the baseline study, the KII protocols were approved by the Institute for Population and Social Research, Mahidol University's Institutional Review Board (IRB), approval number COA No. 2015/1-1-36. The protocols for the study followed the principles outlined in the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidelines.<sup>16</sup> These included that interviews were conducted one-on-one in a neutral location of the respondent's choosing. Study protocols were developed to assure that respondents did not experience any stress, discomfort or threat to their anonymity, confidentiality and privacy. Respondents were given the information sheet to read (Annex 5). They were also given a verbal explanation of the study, including the study objectives and the estimated duration of the interview, and invited to ask any questions they may have had about the study. They were then asked to sign the consent form (Annex 5).</li> </ol> <p>Information that the respondents gave in the interviews was strictly guarded. In-depth interview respondents did not have any identifying information placed on their interview recordings or transcripts; an ID number was assigned such as "LW_CM_1". While the interviews were recorded if the respondent gave permission, recordings were destroyed after the transcripts were completed. The researchers will not discuss the information provided by the respondents with anyone outside of the research team. It is only presented in the research report and care is taken not to include any identifying information when presenting the results.</p> <p>Because the respondents would be discussing sensitive issues such as their sexual orientation, gender identity, and experiences with violence, stigma and discrimination, we anticipated that they may have asked the interviewers for support services. While the interviewers were not in a position to give continued support to the respondents, they were able to</p>

---

<sup>16</sup> United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). (2008). *Ethical guidelines for evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/548>

	<p>provide information about community resources provided by RSAT (Annex 5).</p> <p>To compensate them for their time, IDI respondents were given 400 baht. The ET also reimbursed any transportation expenses that they incurred up to 200 baht.</p> <p>3. Respondents to the online survey read an introduction that informed them the purpose of the survey and that their information would be kept confidential. They could skip or mark “refuse to answer” for any question and could leave the survey whenever they wished.</p> <p>Online survey respondents were paid 100 baht for completing the survey if they gave their bank account information. Names, contact information and bank account information will be removed from the data before the data is archived.</p>
Limitations of the evaluation methodology used	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Lack of response from key informants:</b> In some cases due to government rotation and the unwillingness of former government staff to make an appointment with us (after repeated emails, voice mails and phone messages), the ET resorted to interviewing the current person in the position. These KIIs usually ended up discussing their interactions with RSAT in general and their perspective on SOGI issues in general rather than the UNTF program, unfortunately.</li> <li>2. <b>Potential biases in participant samples:</b> As discussed above, the fact that RSAT had a limited contact list for participants means that the IDI and online respondents may be more open to revealing their SOGI than the workshop participants who did not give contact information.</li> <li>3. <b>Lack of response from beneficiaries/participants:</b> The sample size for the online survey was limited by the size of the contact list as well as the fact that the survey was voluntary. As discussed above, the incentives offered for completing the online survey attracted some who were not really participants in the program; however we were able to eliminate these by asking questions about their participation.</li> </ol>

## 8 Findings and Analysis per Evaluation Question<sup>17</sup>

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	Effectiveness
<b>Evaluation Question 1:</b>	<b>1) To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs achieved and how?</b>
<b>Response to the evaluation question with analysis of key findings by the evaluation team</b>	<p><b>Whether the project achieved its targets for each project indicator<sup>18</sup></b></p> <p><b>Project Goal:</b> Lesbian and transgender women from four regions of Thailand experience greater freedom from violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity, and better access to assistance when violence does occur.</p> <p>At the goal level, the project developed mechanisms to fight violence, stigma and discrimination (S&amp;D) and human rights violations and provide better access to assistance for LBW and TGW. While only limited progress was made towards achieving actual change in Thai society (as would be possible for a short-term project), the development of these mechanisms showed steps forward in developing agency and building channels for the future, both for individual women and for advocacy at the national level of government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ <b>Greater freedom from violence and human rights violations:</b> Eight working groups were formed of women leaders from the TGW and LBW communities. The groups worked on settling one case of sexual assault against four LBW in Yala with monetary damages paid by the perpetrator. The project also developed the workshop participants' knowledge on where to get assistance in the case of violence.</li> </ul> <p><i>We told participants in each batch to tell at least three friends about information they gained from the training course such as violence, human rights, where to claim their rights, what is Gender Equality Act, Social Development and Human Security at Provincial Level. (RSAT project manager)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ <b>Greater freedom from S&amp;D:</b> At the national level, RSAT's leadership worked to advocate for TGW and LBW rights and to develop</li> </ul>

<sup>17</sup> Please note that the report has been restructured so that qualitative and quantitative evidence has been interspersed with the findings text. The "Quantitative and/or qualitative evidence gathered by the evaluation team to support the response and analysis above" sections have been removed from the tables.

<sup>18</sup> Indicators from the Evaluation Matrix are shown in blue within each Evaluation Question table.

	<p>understanding among government officials of how LBW and TGW face discrimination.</p> <p><i>One of our greatest accomplishments was our effective implementation of the Gender Equality Act, in collaboration with the government. We have also made progress on the civil union law and on improving rights for TGW prisoners (RSAT project director)</i></p> <p>RSAT reported that during the course of the three-year project, there were over 16 cases of transgender women filing complaints to the Judging Committee for Gender-based Discrimination; a number of cases filed through RSAT were satisfied at the negotiation stage. TGW working group leaders effectively fought for the right for TGW to wear female university uniforms.</p> <p>Two of the 32 workshop participants interviewed said that they gained the confidence to act when confronted with discrimination through attending the workshops. One said that at a recent job interview, she was asked if she was a tomboy and whether she could wear skirts or make-up. She said she was a lesbian woman and could do anything other girls could. In the end she got the job (<i>LBW, lesbian, age 26</i>).<sup>19</sup> Another participant who is transgender successfully negotiated with the hospital director where she had an internship that she could dress as a woman. This was after her university dean required her to sign an agreement that she would have her hair cut and dress as a man to get an internship (<i>TGW, transgender, age 27</i>).</p> <p>Through the in-depth interviews with workshop participants the ET found evidence that the workshops built the participants knowledge of how LBW and TGW face S&amp;D. About three-quarters of the participants interviewed (23 of 32) said that they feel they have greater self-confidence, a better understanding of the stigma and discrimination that LBW and TGW face, greater knowledge of human rights, and knowledge and access to sources of help when they experience stigma and discrimination (S&amp;D), violence and other human rights violations. About one-third of the in-depth interview respondents (8 of 23)</p>
--	--

---

<sup>19</sup> To align with the baseline study, quotes from respondents are identified by their group, their self-identified SOGI, and their age. When asked how they self-identify, the lesbian women fell into three groups: tomboys, who typically have short hair and wear pants; lady LBW, who dress similarly to heterosexual women and partner with tomboys; and women who love women (WWLW) who have female partners but do not want to be confined to rigid roles. Transgender women can be classified as to whether they have had sex re-assignment surgery or not; some of the latter group hope to have surgery in the future and some do not. Some transgender women dress as women always, while others sometimes have to dress as men due to their family's attitudes, school policies, or job protocols.

	<p>described their greater understanding as being empowering and giving them greater self-efficacy.</p> <p><i>The activities truly raised our self-esteem, confidence, and empowered us to be the way we want to be. (TGW, gay and sometimes dresses like a woman, age 25)</i></p> <p>◆ <b>Greater access to assistance for GBV and other human rights violations:</b></p> <p>All of the workshops trained participants on where to seek help for discrimination, incidents of violence and other human rights violations. The majority of women interviewed in the IDIs (23 of 32) said that they had a better understanding of where to get help.</p> <p><i>The session that let TGW participants share their experiences of violence or S&amp;D was very useful; it changed my mind and attitude. I got better understanding about the problems all TGW are facing. Also, the session providing information about getting help was very useful, because now I know where to get help for my S&amp;D experiences. (TGW, transgender, age 20)</i></p> <p>One TGW respondent did say that the session on getting help in the case of experiencing violence was the most important session for her (TGW, transgender, age 28). And several participants mentioned that the information about getting help was very useful, even if they had not experienced violence themselves, because they would be able to help friends who experience violence (7 of 32 respondents).</p> <p><b>Challenges to achieving project goals:</b></p> <p><b>Outcome 1:</b> Groups of lesbian and transgender women have gained greater capacity to advocate for change in government policy and the broader society related to violence, stigma &amp; discrimination and human right violation against women on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity</p> <p>◆ While all of the participants interviewed said that they learned a great deal in the workshops about human rights and S&amp;D and how to seek help for discrimination and violence, none of the IDI respondents mentioned taking action to advocate for change in policies. This is not surprising given that the 32 IDI respondents were selected randomly from the workshop participant lists, and only eight working groups of LBW and TGW leaders were formed to conduct advocacy activities.</p>
--	---

	<p>RSAT staff explained that the original plan for having workshop participants continue to meet to carry out advocacy actions had evolved over time, as it was found not to work in practice. Participants were described as being “naïve” in that they were more concerned with their own sexual identity and their individual experiences with alienation from their families, violence and S&amp;D than with societal issues. One explanation for this was that the participants were generally young and still affected by self-stigmatization; thus supportive discussion on self-identity was most useful. This is supported by the findings and recommendations of the baseline report. The new curriculum, which included “Open your heart” exercises for women to express their past experiences to the group, was found to be effective at raising awareness about violence and S&amp;D towards TGW and LBW and access to help for these issues, as evidenced by the interviews with workshop participants described throughout the report. Greater emphasis was placed on participants’ understanding of their own rights, recognizing their S&amp;D experiences and of sharing this knowledge with their peers, rather than creating advocacy skills in the workshops.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ As planned in the project’s design, eight groups of leaders (four LBW and four TGW) were formed to conduct advocacy activities; these women tended to be drawn from the peer mentors who conducted the workshops rather than the participants. These working groups effectively won the right for TGW to wear female school uniforms at several schools and universities and on the prosecution of a sexual assault case in Yala brought by LBW in southern Thailand, which resulted in a monetary settlement.<sup>20</sup> RSAT considers that these advocacy efforts are preliminary steps by the working groups and that their success will help to expand efforts in the future.</li> <li>◆ Project leaders and facilitators also worked as volunteers at the International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association (ILGA) international conference in November 2016, and through that were able to network and meet valuable contacts. For many it was the first chance that they had to meet their peers from other countries and to hear about the activities taking place globally to advocate for LGBTI rights. RSAT reported that they felt the leaders’ working groups were inspired by this and energized to continue their work in Thailand</li> </ul>
--	---

---

<sup>20</sup> From RSAT’s Final Report: “Four young women in a southern province of Thailand was [sic] sexually abused by a person, who impersonated as a government officer. The four women reached out to a community leader, who is our program partner and this case was brought to the police until the case was final (Ref: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/jt6w0vv7p02zzhk/Police%20Record%20and%20Court%20Verdict%20-%20Original%20Thai%20%2B%20translated%20English%20version.pdf?dl=0>).”

	<p><b>Output 1.1:</b> Lesbian and transgender women have better understanding about various forms of violence, stigma and discrimination and the concept of fundamental human rights and know how to respond to human right violations in the existing channel.</p> <p>The ET found substantial evidence that the project achieved this output. . About one-third of the IDI respondents expressed how the workshops helped them understand the stigma and discrimination that they face, coupled with a better understanding of human rights (13 of 32).</p> <p><b><i>Understanding S&amp;D</i></b></p> <p><i>I learned a lot about things I never expected that might happen to me as well. (LBW, tomboy, age 36)</i></p> <p><i>The most important information was about stigma and discrimination as it was related most to the real life. (LBW, tomboy, age 25)</i></p> <p><b><i>Greater awareness of human rights</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Baseline study:</i></b></p> <p><i>I never experienced any rights violation, so I cannot answer this question (LBW, woman who loves women, age 30, leader)<sup>21</sup></i></p> <p><i>I have limited knowledge about the law. I don't know (TGW, no surgery, age 25, non-leader)</i></p> <p><b><i>Final evaluation:</i></b></p> <p><i>The activities helped me to understand that LBW had equal rights as other gender. For those who never participate in the activities might not know about this (LBW, lesbian, age 26)</i></p> <p><i>I learned a lot about S&amp;D and how to deal with those situations of S&amp;D (TGW, gay, age 24)</i></p> <p><i>It helped us to be more confident to protect our rights. (LBW, lady, age 25)</i></p>
--	--

---

<sup>21</sup> The baseline study interviewed both potential leaders in the UNTF project and non-leaders.

*I can convey the message about LGBT rights to my friends and also my family. And this helps people understand me more. (LBW, tomboy, age 21)*

**Output 1.2:** New lesbian and transgender women leaders report to have more confidence in using advocacy tools and communicating with relevant government agencies for policy development and change

- ◆ RSAT reported achievements on this output through their internal surveys, finding that 79.7% reported having addressed (or feeling able or equipped to address) the issue of violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights with government agencies, relevant sectors and community members three months after the training.
- ◆ The advocacy tools included training for women leaders on how to effectively deliver their messages. RSAT produced developed two IEC tools, a “Citizen’s Guide” to the Gender Equality Act 2015 and a booklet on records of LGBTI persons who experience violence, discrimination and human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity. d
- ◆ The KIIs conducted by the ET revealed that the two male leaders of RSAT continued to have the most prominent role in serving on government committees to advocate for human rights for LGBTI. However RSAT staff felt that the women leaders who received training and were serving in the working groups were beginning to have an advocacy role.

*Essential knowledge for this project are human rights, prevention, and care. These are subject the project staff should learn and be good at, but we don’t have those people because of a high turnover rate of staff in this province. New staff always takes time to learn and cannot continue the project’s work immediately (RSAT former staff #1).*

**Output 1.3:** Working groups of lesbian women and transgender women are formed with clear advocacy strategy to communicate with relevant government agencies

- ◆ By the end of the project, eight working groups of LBW and TGW women had been formed to advocate for human rights issues. As discussed at the goal level, the groups largely focused on issues that affected their daily lives, such as the right for TGW to wear female university uniforms. One case of sexual assault against four LBW in Yala was settled with monetary damages paid by the perpetrator with the help of a group of women leaders.



	<p><b>Outcome 2:</b> RSAT has strengthened an existing monitoring and reporting surveillance system that provides a more effective platform for prompting government agencies to provide the appropriate response to cases of violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in four areas of Thailand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ RSAT established a hotline and an online reporting system where women could report incidents of violence, stigma and discrimination. The RSAT annual report from 2015 states that, “We already have 2 serious human right cases recorded. In 2016 “Our surveillance system is functional and we have received six complaints in the first half of this year. We have a few reported cases of lesbian and transgender women who successfully seek [sic] assistance from local authorities when violence occurred.” However, due to the small number of cases being reported (in part due to the changes in the program at the workshop level), RSAT with the agreement of UNTF began monitoring media stories about LBW and TGW issues, including discrimination cases. Though this effort has not been officially abandoned, the fact that the Thai press tends to focus on sensationalism rather than serious cases has caused RSAT to lose interest in continuing it. In other words, the Thai press cannot in any way be seen as have a documentary function, such as a “paper of record” like the New York Times. Thus the time spent monitoring cases through media was not seen to be effective, but RSAT did not find an alternative.</li> <li>◆ The monitoring and reporting surveillance system that was planned in conjunction with the RSAT’s partner, Division of Gender Equality, Department of Women’s Affairs and Family Development, MSDHS also did not come into fruition. RSAT reports that this was due mainly to the lack of M&amp;E capacity in the division, according to RSAT. This topic is discussed further under Evaluation Question 4.</li> </ul> <p>Output 2.1: RSAT surveillance and reporting system to record and report cases of violence, stigma and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity is strengthened, systematic and functional.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ See above under Outcome 2.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome 3:</b> Government agencies and the National Human Rights Commission in Thailand increase their awareness and improve their responsiveness to cases of violence and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ RSAT signed an official Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Women’s Affairs and Family Development, Lawyers’</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>Council of Thailand and the Women Lawyers' Association of Thailand in response to the Gender Equality Bill 2015 to facilitate policy development for lesbian (LBW) and transgender (TGW) women. Their work with MSDHS and the NHRC has continued to strengthen, according to all of the key informants in government who were interviewed. RSAT shared their knowledge on SOGI issues in meetings, contributed to focal points training, and participated in regional trainings.</p> <p><i>SOGI is the mission [of my department] in accordance to the Gender Equality Act. Our department was assigned to focus only on women, but these days SOGI has already been included, although it has just started. I think work on SOGI or women or other aspects should be integrated. After disseminating SOGI related knowledge to governmental staff, it was found that there is still unclear understanding about this. Even worse, this aspect is viewed as uncommon....Working with RSAT has helped us to realize that our works are not limited to women, but other gender. We feel that our work is more valuable. (Dr. Cheera Thongkrajai, MSDHS)</i></p> <p><i>We applied RSAT's activities/approaches into our work such as 'Power Walk' during the training course we organized among our focal points. It went well and participants also became realized that although they all were officials, but they were different. We also provided knowledge on SOGI throughout the training. Although, we did not get much involvement from the participants as they were not keen in expressing their thoughts, but it was still a good start for the next step. (Dr. Cheera Thongkrajai, MSDHS)</i></p> <p><i>When we organized training courses in four regions of Thailand, we also received collaboration from RSAT branch in Ubon Ratchathani and Had Yai. They provided their staff to share knowledge or experiences among the training's participants. In the past, RSAT was a representative organization to proceed relevant complaints with us. Mostly their issues were addressed on policies or new laws. (Praepailin Bubpa, NHRC)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ When interviewed, key stakeholders from MSDHS and the NHRC both stated that their relationships with RSAT were extremely helpful for them to understand other gender identities. At the national level, contact with the government ministries was through the RSAT Director rather than through TGW and LBW leaders, as it was felt that they did not yet have the capacity to do advocacy at the national level.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>Output 3.1: RSAT increases the number and quality of IEC tools and data available for advocacy and awareness-raising among policy makers and the general public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ RSAT developed two IEC tools, a “Citizen’s Guide” to the Gender Equality Act 2015 and a booklet covering on records of LGBTI persons who experience violence, discrimination and human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity. RSAT produced 40,000 copies in Thai and 4,000 copies in English of the Gender Equality Bill (Citizen Version) and 10,000 copies of the booklet. The use and relevance of the booklet to the LBW and TGW participants of the project is covered under Evaluation Question 5.</li> </ul> <p><b>Whether program leaders can explain how they achieved project goal, outcomes and outputs</b></p> <p>RSAT staff were able to explain how the program changed and evolved over time. These changes included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the shift in the workshop curriculum away from global level human rights, such as the Yogyakarta Principles, to more individually based understanding of sexual orientation and gender identity, recognition of S&amp;D and knowledge on channels to seek help for discrimination and violence;</li> <li>• the shift to taking action on issues that affected LBW and TGW’s daily lives rather than national-level human rights issues; and</li> <li>• the shift from a surveillance system monitoring cases of violence and discrimination to one monitoring news articles about LBW and TGW issues.</li> </ul> <p>With regard to advocacy, RSAT staff said that the LBW and TGW leaders learned to articulate messages about their sexual diversity but not advocate at the structural level. Working with schools and universities rather than local and national government was seen to be a more realistic goal for the leadership groups. However, RSAT conveyed that the leaders are young and will continue to develop their capacity for advocacy. The ET notes that, in a small organization such as RSAT, the organizational leadership does not have the resources to both participate in policy advocacy at the national level and work to improve capacity with these small working groups. However, rather than lose the momentum created by the successful efforts of raising awareness and self-efficacy among the workshop participants and leaders, it would be of great benefit to build more capacity for advocacy among LBW and TGW.</p>
--	--

	<p><b>If targets were not met, program leaders' and RSAT staff's explanations of the barriers they faced</b></p> <p>Most of the RSAT program staff interviewed explained that the workshop participants were much more “naïve” about human rights than was expected. In this context, “naïve” may be interpreted as lacking insight into the importance of human rights in that they directly affect the participants’ lives. As explained above, the majority of workshop participants were young and were mainly concerned with their own SOGI and S&amp;D issues. One RSAT staff member conveyed that one of the main lessons learned by the project was to act more quickly when problems are perceived with an intervention. In hindsight, staff said that they should not have taken a year to realize that they needed to revise the curriculum, once they gained a greater understanding of the participants’ needs.</p> <p>Another major barrier to the program’s ability to work with government was the regular rotation of government officials into new positions. This occurred after a great deal of trust and communication channels had been developed, and then needed to be re-built. The ET experienced this difficulty themselves as the provincial officials we spoke to were not familiar with this specific program, although they were familiar with RSAT.</p> <p>RSAT’s own staff turnover, particularly in finance and M&amp;E, created a barrier to achieving project outcomes; this is discussed further in Evaluation Question 2. Provincial staff also had a high turnover rate, creating the need to continually re-train people.</p> <p>One RSAT staff expressed dissatisfaction with the way the program had evolved. They said that the project had stressed the need to reach the target number of people reached rather than to develop them into leaders, capable of doing advocacy. Another felt that the workshops dealt only with surface issues and were frustrated with the lack of progress on advocacy.</p>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>For the most part, RSAT achieved the goal, outcomes and outputs that they committed to UNTF for this project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ <b>Awareness of human rights and S&amp;D among LBW and TGW:</b> both the IDIs and online survey provided evidence that participants gained awareness on these topics and benefitted from them.</li> <li>◆ <b>Greater capacity for advocacy among LBW and TGW:</b> eight groups of LBW and TGW leaders successfully advocated for TGW’s right to wear female school uniforms and for a settlement in a sexual assault case. LBW and TGW leaders participated in an international</li> </ul>

	<p>conference. But for the most part, advocacy with national government ministries was implemented by RSAT's male leadership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ <b>Not achieved: surveillance system established with MSDHS:</b> This outcome was found not to be feasible given the M&amp;E capacity of the ministry. The outcome was adapted with the agreement of UNTF.</li> <li>◆ <b>IEC materials developed for advocacy:</b> The IEC materials were produced d.</li> <li>◆ <b>Strong relationships with national ministries:</b> evidenced by key informant interviews.</li> </ul> <p>T. T</p>
--	---

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	Effectiveness
<b>Evaluation Question 2:</b>	<b>2) To what extent did the project reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached?</b>
<b>Response to the evaluation question with analysis of key findings by the evaluation team</b>	<p><b>Final monitoring database of project beneficiaries</b></p> <p>The ET met with RSAT's Strategic Information Manager, Khun Nopporn Saejung, to verify the number of beneficiaries reported to UNTF in project reports. In the final round of verification, the project director Khun Rapeepun Jommaroeng was also present and concurred with our findings. The results are shown in Table 1 below. Because the Strategic Information Officer had been with RSAT only a short time, we began the verification process with the January-June 2017 report.</p> <p>The ET found several errors with RSAT's report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ For a few of the "Type of activity" categories, there were minor discrepancies between the number reported and the number verified in the database. These categories are Counseling (Online) (1,298 vs. 1,297); Health Center Had Yai (406 vs. 442); and Health Center Bangkok (1,626 vs. 1,622). This results in a total of 5 cases reported in error and 36 cases omitted in error, with a net omission of 31 cases. It is believed that these discrepancies were due to human error, and that routine data quality audits would help to improve accuracy.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Three activity categories were omitted in error: the Focus Groups (121), 3-month Follow-up outreach (18) and 6-month Follow-up outreach (47). This resulted in 186 cases omitted in error.</li> <li>▪ The most notable error that we found in RSAT's reporting was that men who have sex with men (MSM) and other males who attended RSAT's non-UNTF activities were counted as being reached by the project, when only LBW and TGW should have been counted. The activities where men were counted in error were Counselling (Online and Hotline), Outreach and the two Health Centers. In total, 13,263 men were counted in error.</li> </ul> <p>These errors mean that the correct number of cases reached by the UNTF project during the time period is 3,018, not 16,099 as was reported.</p> <p>RSAT said that the main reason for this error was that there was turnover in the M&amp;E position during the UNTF project; a total of four M&amp;E officers served during this period. Khun Rapeepun was adamant that no MSM or males were counted in the UNTF report when we first approached him about this, but conceded the errors readily when he was shown the raw numbers from the database.</p> <p>RSAT has now verified all of the numbers reported to UNTF during the entire time period, as shown in Table 8.2 below. The greatest discrepancy was the more than 10,000 additional beneficiaries reported for outreach, as was reported by the ET. RSAT also found that they had overreported the beneficiaries for the online and hotline counseling and health programs.</p>
--	--

**Table 8.1: Verification of project numbers reached from January to June 2017**

Type of activity	Numbers reported in Report to UNTF	Validation according to three sources			# non-target group (based on actual number shown in database)	Verified number reached	Remarks
		Case summary report (2 <sup>nd</sup> secondary source)	Individual spreadsheet (1 <sup>st</sup> secondary source)	Database			
Workshop	120	120	120	120	None	120	
Counseling (Online)*	1,298	1,298	1,291	1,297 <sup>22</sup>	1,069 (82%) from 1,297	228	There was an error made so that 130 males and 939 MSM were included in the numbers reported.
Counseling (Hotline)*	406	406	406	406	341 (83%) from 406	65	There was an error made so that 81 males and 260 MSM were included in the numbers reported.
Focus Group (FGD)/UNTF outreach	N/A	121	121	Paper-database	None	121	The number from this activity was normally included as outreach in the report for UNTF, but not for this period.
Follow-up (3 months)	N/A	18	18	18	None	18	Data from this activity was not used in the table as annex to the narrative report, but it was used to report towards outcome indicator 1.1.
Follow-up (6 months)	N/A	47	47	Paper-database	None	47	
<b>Non-UNTF activities</b>							
Outreach	12,207	11,491	11,491	12,207	10,052 (82%) from 12,207	2,155	There was an error made so that 10,052 MSM were included in the numbers reported.
Health center Had Yai	406	406	406	442	382 (86%) from 442	60	There was an error made so that 53 males and 329 MSM were included in the numbers reported.
Health center BKK	1,626	1,626	1,626	1,622	1,419 (84.4%) from 1,622	203	There was an error made so that 54 males, 1,364 MSM and 1 MSW were included in the numbers reported.

<sup>22</sup> Note: where there was a discrepancy between the database and the number reported, we assumed the database to be correct

Type of activity	Numbers reported in Report UNTF	Validation according to three sources			# non-target group (based on actual number shown in database)	Verified number reached	Remarks
		Case summary report (2 <sup>nd</sup> secondary source)	Individual spreadsheet (1 <sup>st</sup> secondary source)	Database (Primary source)			
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,099</b>			<b>16,095</b>	<b>13,263</b>	<b>3,018</b>	In total, 318 males, 12,944 MSM and 1 MSW were counted as persons reached for the UNTF project in error

**Table 8.2: Original and revised project numbers reached from January 2015 to June 2017, RSAT**

	Original	Revised	Discrepancy
Workshop	777	777	-
Online	4,496	1,038	(3,458)
Hotline	2,228	380	(1,848)
FGD	379	379	-
3MFU	336	336	-
6M FU	226	226	-
Health HD	487	361	(126)
Health RAM	2,504	1,230	(1,274)
Outreach HD	2,219	6,736	+4,517
Outreach RAM	13,858	3,664	(10,194)
	26,948	14,565	(12,383)



<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>RSAT leveraged their ongoing HIV testing and counseling HTC activities so that outreach to LBW and TGW would include human rights, S&amp;D and gender violence counseling. For this reason they counted LBW and TGW who attended their health clinics for HTC in their reported numbers reached for the UNTF project. Unfortunately, staff turnover in the M&amp;E staff led to errors in extracting the correct target groups from the database. It took the ET more than one month to understand how the data was reported and to reconcile it with the project database, in collaboration with RSAT staff. However, because the numbers of MSM and males included in error were quite large, the ET was surprised that the error was not caught by RSAT. Data quality assurance procedures and greater oversight by more senior (experienced) staff, as well as proper training and orientation for new M&amp;E staff as they come onboard, is needed for RSAT to conduct M&amp;E functions at a higher standard. The examples given of how certain categories of beneficiaries were omitted in the RSAT reports provide evidence of this.</p> <p>Fortunately, the corrected monitoring figures reveal that RSAT still far outreached their target of 9,400 beneficiaries: the final corrected total is 14,565, which is 55% higher than the target.</p>
<b>Other</b>	<p><b>*For this specific question on beneficiaries, please complete the Beneficiary Data Sheet in Annex 4C.</b></p> <p>We filled in Annex 4c and Annex 4b as required, however we would like to note that we had a difficult time finding the required information for the forms. The RSAT reports did not include any dates of data collection. Many of the baseline levels for the indicators were left blank, while the others were marked N/A.</p> <p>In searching for the final total number of beneficiaries to fill into Annex 4c, we found three possibilities: 1) sum the total number reported in each of the three annual reports (2,071+6,242+16063 = 24,376); 2) use the number in the final report (14,260); or 3) use the number in the “Annex 1 Tables and Graphs” document (26,569). RSAT was not able to explain the differences in these numbers and we do not know which one is “correct”. We have taken the number from the final report (14,260) as this seems to be closest to accurate, given the errors reported above.</p>

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	Effectiveness
----------------------------	---------------

<b>Evaluation Question 3</b>	<b>3) To what extent has this project generated positive changes in the lives of targeted (and untargeted) populations in relation to the specific forms of violence addressed by this project? Why? What are the key changes in the lives of those populations? Please describe those changes.</b>
<b>Response to the evaluation question with analysis of key findings by the evaluation team</b>	<p><b>Whether LBW and TGW beneficiaries report positive changes in their ability to respond to violence</b></p> <p>The RSAT reports to UNTF report many positive changes from their interviews with beneficiaries. The ET sought to validate and triangulate these findings through independent interviews with beneficiaries and the quantitative online survey.</p> <p>All of the IDI interview respondents said that they benefitted from the RSAT workshops. The most frequently mentioned benefit expressed by participants (15 of 32 respondents) was that they gained understanding of themselves and their sexual identities. Also prominent in the interviews was the benefit from understanding their human rights (11 of 32 respondents). The ability to respond to violence was not given as the main benefit by the women we interviewed when they discussed the RSAT workshops (3 of 32 respondents). This was true even for women who had experienced violence themselves (violent experiences were reported by 2 of 16 LBW interviewed and 2 of 16 TGW).</p> <p>In the online survey, when asked which of the topics discussed in the RSAT workshops were most relevant for them, 21.8% of LBW, 19.6% of TGW and 8.3% of other SOGI listed gender-based violence as one of the top two topics. Only a small percentage (1.8%, 2.0% and 8.3% respectively) listed help-seeking as being in the top two (Table 9.7a, Annex 9). When asked which topics were “most applicable to you”, less than 5% in each group chose GBV or seeking help as most applicable (Table 9.7b).</p> <p>However, 14.5% of LBW, 51.0% of TGW and 30.6% of other SOGI said they had experienced violence in their lifetime. In the past year, 1.8% of LBW, 3.9% of TGW and 8.3% of other SOGI had experienced violence (Table 9.8). Those who experienced violence in the past year were asked if they sought help; only 13.5% did so. For the 7 cases who sought help, 3 sought help from RSAT, MSDHS and their parents; and 2 from police, siblings, relatives and friends (multiple response was possible).</p> <p><b>Whether LBW and TGW beneficiaries report other positive changes resulting from the program; What key positive changes are reported</b></p>

	<p>When asked about what positive changes occurred as the result of the workshops, there were three topic areas that were mentioned most frequently by the IDI respondents. The first were personal changes such as feeling more confident and “understanding myself better” (14 of 32). Several respondents said that they gained knowledge and support in the workshops that helped them with their family relationships and friends (4 of 32). Dr. Cheera from MSDHS also commented that she thought reaching out to the women on a personal level was extremely effective.</p> <p><i>I learned how to live freely, more confidently and free of stigmatization. (LBW, tomboy, age 20)</i></p> <p><i>These activities mainly aimed to help people accept their own sexuality, and do not stigmatize themselves or other people. (LBW, Lady, age 35)</i></p> <p><i>Participating in RSAT activities unraveled my heart. I understand more about myself and accept more the way I am. (TGW, transgender, age 27)</i></p> <p><i>I like the curriculum they used for the training. It encouraged participants to be aware of their rights in relation to their gender. The sharing experience session was helpful in assisting participants to unlock themselves. Some participants cried, but they learned that they can talk about their feelings on this aspect. At the end, they realized that they need to exercise their rights. This is so different from giving information or talking about issues with governmental officials, that process was boring as it was more like one way-communication. (Dr. Cheera Thongkrajai, MSDHS)</i></p> <p>The second common response from the IDI participants was that the workshops helped them understand the stigma and discrimination that they face, coupled with the better understanding of human rights described in more detail below (13 of 32). Many of the interviewees described incidents in their lives when they experienced discrimination or stigmatization (26 of 32). Mistreatment by family was the most common experience described (9 of 32). Respondents also often mentioned bullying at school (6 of 32), job discrimination (8 of 32), public harassment (5 of 32), mistreatment by police (3 of 32), and being turned down for a blood donation (4 of 32). Examples of the incidents described by the IDI respondents are given in the next section. The awareness raising about stigma and discrimination provided by the</p>
--	---

	<p>workshops helped the participants feel that they were not alone, and that there were actions they could take to fight discrimination.</p> <p><i>The session that let TG participants share their experiences of violence or S&amp;D was very useful as it changed my mind and attitude. I got better understanding about the problems all TGs are facing. Also, the session providing information about getting help was very useful, because I now know where to get help for my S&amp;D experiences. (TGW, Transgender, age 20)</i></p> <p><i>Both my parents and my partner's parents could not accept our relationships. I don't understand why we were so disgusting. (LBW, tomboy, age 32)</i></p> <p><i>My mom said my tomboy [partner] was not allowed to come to her house. She said I was a psycho. She asked why I was not afraid of sin. (LBW, lady, age 25)</i></p> <p><i>Since I was born, my mom never appreciated me. I don't know why. (LBW, tomboy, age 24)</i></p> <p><i>I started dressing up and using cosmetics when I was in secondary school; then when I dyed my hair red, my grandfather chased me away. He said I was not allowed to step on his soil anymore. Being a khatoey<sup>23</sup> or gay is a sin for Muslims. If I cannot change to be a man, the sin may affect the whole family. Grandpa said I was an animal. (TGW, transgender, age 23)</i></p> <p><i>I got rejected when I applied for a part-time job in a franchise restaurant just because the recruiter realized that I was a tomboy—explicitly said that a tomboy was not acceptable. (LBW, tomboy, age 28)</i></p> <p><i>Recently, I applied for a bus hostess in a company and the manager required me to have a haircut and dress like a man otherwise he wouldn't accept me. So I refused the job. (TGW, transgender, age 32)</i></p> <p>The third change that the IDI respondents described was that their understanding of human rights and the channels that they could take to fight for their rights gave them self-efficacy that they did not have before (4 of 32).</p>
--	---

---

<sup>23</sup> Thai term for transgender.

	<p><i>The activities truly raised our self-esteem, confidence, and empowered us to be the way we want to be. (TGW, gay and sometimes dress like a woman, age 25)</i></p> <p>While all of the beneficiaries interviewed in the IDIs had positive comments about the RSAT workshops, not all said that the workshops led to positive changes in their life (4 of 32). Some reported that the social aspect of attending the workshops, to meet other women like themselves, was the most important thing for them.</p> <p><b>Whether LBW and TGW beneficiaries are more aware of their human rights and can better identify human rights violations</b></p> <p>The baseline study for this project found that few of the IDI respondents could give a definition of human rights (about 5 of 32). Opinions on whether LGBTI had equal rights in Thai society were mixed, about evenly split between those saying that LGBTI do have equal rights, those saying that they do not, those saying that LGBTI should have equal rights but that there is stigma and discrimination affecting LBW and TGW's ability to get employment and advancement, and the remainder saying that they do not know.</p> <p>In the IDIs for this final evaluation, respondents often cited (21 of 32) their sense of empowerment from the workshops, that they now understand their rights and know where to go to seek help if they face S&amp;D. The quotes in the next section show how the workshops' emphasis on rights, especially with regard to discrimination, helped the women in attendance.</p> <p>RSAT also reported the results of their workshop pre-surveys and post-surveys to UNTF and consistently found improvement in human rights knowledge. The 2015 annual report said that in a survey of workshop participants conducted three months after the workshop, 81.2% correctly identified a stigma pattern; 73.3% correctly identified a discrimination pattern; 53.1% correctly identified at least one key principle of the Yogyakarta Principles; and 63.8% correctly identified at least one form of violence based on sexual orientation and gender identity.</p>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>The RSAT workshops achieved positive results for LBW and TGW participants for their personal understanding of their SOGI, understanding and knowledge of human rights, stigma and discrimination, and knowledge of where to seek help for violence and discrimination. The ET finds that the IDI respondents are much more knowledgeable about human rights than the non-leader respondents interviewed for the baseline study. About 5 of the 32 respondents at IDI</p>

	could give a definition of human rights whereas 29 of 32 respondents at baseline could do so.
--	---

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	Effectiveness
<b>Evaluation Question 4</b>	<b>4) What internal and external factors contributed to the achievement and/or failure of the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs? How?</b>
<b>Response to the evaluation question with analysis of key findings by the evaluation team</b>	<p><b>For goal, outcomes and outputs, what are the explanations provided for achievement or failure to meet the project targets</b></p> <p><b><i>Achievements</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ RSAT had an existing program addressing the health needs of LBW and TGW. It was able to use the <b>existing networks of women</b> to find peer leaders and “snowball sample” to find workshop participants.</li> <li>◆ RSAT had already opened a <b>dialogue with relevant government agencies</b>, including the Ministry of Social Welfare and Human Security and the National Human Rights Commission, to work on previous policies and legislations.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Failure to meet project targets</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ The original project design did not take into account the needs of LBW and TGW to work through their own self stigmatization and recognize the S&amp;D that they face. Criticisms of the original workshop design, came from participants, including that it was “boring”, “difficult to understand”, and also RSAT staff.</li> </ul> <p><i>I was confused when someone was lecturing on a stage, I didn’t know who was a key lecturer and who was a supporter. Because they didn’t have sequence of talking, we just turned our heads left and right to follow a speaker (RSAT former staff #3).</i></p> <p>However, the revised workshop design proved to be appropriate and was effective in raising awareness and personal understanding of the issues, as described in other sections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ RSAT leadership had to adjust to working with the Ministries that it worked with in this project. In the past RSAT had worked closely</li> </ul>

	<p>with the Ministry of Public Health (MOPH) on HIV prevention. The Global Fund's emphasis on monitoring and evaluation and their performance-based funding strategy has raised the capacity of the MOPH to work with project results and to have sound M&amp;E practices. RSAT found lower capacity for monitoring and evaluation in the ministries that they worked with on this project, which was unanticipated. <i>(KII with project director)</i> This is the chief region that the project did not set up the planned surveillance system to track incidents of violence and S&amp;D.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ RSAT also found that they had to do a great deal of groundwork to raise awareness with the government ministries about SOGI and working with other SOGI populations. The MOPH has also worked with MSM for many years, whereas RSAT confronted more resistance to recognizing other SOGI populations in working with these new ministries.</li> </ul> <p><i>The culture of each ministry is different. We could adjust, but we could not control their attitudes. We heard people say "I'm ok with sexual diversity as long as not my son or daughter". Also, some feel like LGBTI in Thailand already have a good living status compared to other countries and do not know about the discrimination and violence that they face. We have to show them the data, but we find that they don't grasp numbers and statistics quickly, like the people in public health; we also find that they don't trust numbers and are more interested in the qualitative approach. (RSAT project director)</i></p> <p>However, RSAT also cited that the leadership of the organization had greatly improved its own advocacy skills through the work on the UNTF project. This is because the project had to be systematic in reaching and working with government staff, in documenting their accomplishments, and in adapting when their original strategies did not work. RSAT also moved beyond its key constituency of MSM and its substantive skills in HIV prevention and treatment to progress in this project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Despite RSAT's reportedly good relationships with the government ministries, the project failed to develop a surveillance system for incidents of violence, S&amp;D and other human rights violations (detailed elsewhere in the report).</li> <li>◆ Advocacy activities by the LBW and TGW peer educators were limited to eight groups of leaders and actions were mainly taken on local issues, such as rights within schools and universities. Most advocacy at the national level was conducted by RSAT's male</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>leadership, as mentioned in Evaluation Question 1. For sustainability, greater attention to developing leadership and advocacy skills among the LBW and TGW would have great benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ In the area of stigmatization however, RSAT received some criticism from one former staff and one government official as to whether their own practices may contribute to stigmatization. This criticism was about the lack of realization that jokes and teasing can reinforce cultural stereotypes and send a message that contributes to self-stigmatization.</li> </ul> <p><i>Working with this diverse population is not easy. Some activist/NGO's workers unintentionally stigmatize themselves and others. Even if we have a stigma reduction, and even if an individual attends multiple workshops he/she can't avoid stigmatization. I have seen the trainers/lecturers still stigmatize their friends or participants during the workshop. For example, by dividing participants into groups based on whether they have long hair, who did breast surgery, etc. In one aspect it is for fun but in another aspect it creates trauma for them. (Provincial government HIV prevention program coordinator, Ubon Ratchathani )</i></p> <p><i>I get confused when I saw a male model in the training course. I asked them [RSAT organizers] why they brought a male model into this training course, they said male models would draw the attention of participants. I disagreed with that idea, I think the organizers already stigmatize Katoey that they like men. More importantly, the participants didn't pay attention to the content of the training course process [because they were distracted]. The male model spent time teasing participants, I think it's not worth bringing the model into this training course. It's like to satisfy the organizer's needs (RSAT former provincial staff #3).</i></p>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>Advocacy activities were mainly conducted by RSAT's male leaders, due to the different needs and abilities of the LBW and TGW described above. RSAT had to adjust its activities to develop a good working relationship with the MSDHS and NHRC; leaders found themselves needing to communicate basic awareness of LGBTI issues and needing to use a qualitative approach, as the two ministries' orientation and skills were different from the MOPH, who they had collaborated with for many years. RSAT feels that it has greatly improved its advocacy skills through this project.</p>



<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	Relevance
<b>Evaluation Question 5</b>	<b>5) To what extent was the project strategy and activities implemented relevant in responding to the needs of the targeted populations?</b>
<b>Response to the evaluation question with analysis of key findings by the evaluation team</b>	<p><b>Whether beneficiaries report that the program was relevant to their needs</b></p> <p>The majority (26 of 32) of the respondents to the IDIs felt that the workshops addressed issues that were directly relevant to them.</p> <p><i>(After the workshop) I could convey the messages about LGBT rights to my friends and also my family. And this helps people understand me more. (LBW, tomboy, age 21)</i></p> <p><i>I thought what I faced was so harsh, but we found in the workshops that others shared the same or worse experiences as mine. It was so encouraging. (TGW, transgender, age 23)</i></p> <p>A minority (2 of 32) while they made positive remarks about the workshops, did not find the workshops directly relevant to their lives.</p> <p><i>The most useful thing was about sharing experiences with other people, so I could learn from others. But overall, I don't feel that the knowledge can be applied much in real life for me; for example, about law and the legal process. (TGW, transgender, age 32)</i></p> <p>As shown in Table 9.7a, the most frequently top-rated topics for relevance in the online survey were human rights, stigma and discrimination and LGBTI's rights. Human rights was the number one answer (46.5% placed it in the top two topics for relevance), 42.3% said stigma and discrimination and 35.2% said LGBTI rights (Table 9.7a, Annex 9). All respondents were able to name at least two topics of relevance. The least frequently named topics were gender identity (4.9%), channels for seeking help (3.5%), and rights to education (1.4%); however the ET found qualitative evidence that these topics were important to participants.</p> <p><i>The activities made me understand myself more and know that I could claim for rights protection and seek for help. (TGW, gay and sometimes dress as a woman, age 24)</i></p>

	<p><i>I got more confidence in being who I am after participation in the activities. (LBW, lady, age 21)</i></p> <p>When asked which topic in the workshop was most applicable to them (single answer), 28.9% put S&amp;D in the top two choices, 26.1% said human rights and 10.6% said SOGI (Table 9.7b). . Both the qualitative and quantitative evidence aligns well with the workshop priorities in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year of implementation, which focused more on self-stigmatization, self-esteem, and a recognition of human rights.</p> <p>A minority of participants (2 of 32) that were interviewed felt that the workshops were worthwhile but that they didn't particularly address issues of importance to them. These references were made to the workshops given in the first year, which talked about human rights more than sexual identity and personal experiences of the participants.</p> <p><i>Some sessions were very interesting and useful, but some sessions were also too difficult to understand (TGW, transgender, age 32).</i></p> <p>One participant suggested that the workshops be more in the form of games and activities rather than lectures; indeed, the revised curriculum did include games and role playing, and participants commented that they liked this.</p> <p><i>I really like this activity. I think it was really useful and helpful for us. Not only the content, but also the activities (like game and play) that helped us understand so well. (LBW, Lady, age 25)</i></p> <p><b>Recognition and use of IEC materials</b></p> <p>RSAT produced two IEC materials for the project. One was a two-sided information sheet or poster that was termed a "Citizen's Version of the Gender Equality Law". The other was a booklet on records of LGBTI persons who experience violence, discrimination and human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity. RSAT produced 40,000 copies in Thai and 4,000 copies in English of the Gender Equality Bill (Citizen Version) and 10,000 copies of the booklet.</p> <p>In the online survey, respondents were asked about their awareness of these two IEC materials. They were first asked a general question such as, "Have you ever seen any poster about the Gender Equality Act 2015?" "Have you ever seen any booklet about the story of LGBTIQ?" If the respondents answered yes, they were asked an open-ended question about the content of the IEC material. All respondents were then shown</p>
--	---

	<p>a picture of the IEC material and then asked whether they had seen it, if so where, whether they had used the material, and if so how.</p> <p>Only a minority of respondents knew the materials (Table 9.10 in Annex 9). Of the whole sample, 23% said that they had seen the Citizen’s Guide and also recognized it; an additional 9% knew the Citizen’s Guide when they were shown a picture of it. TGW and those in the “other” group were more likely to know the Citizen’s Guide than LBW (total of 43% and 31% vs. 22% respectively). For the booklet, the percentages were much lower; only 12% had heard of the booklet while an additional 1% recognized it when shown a picture. Very few LBW knew the booklet (4%) compared to TGW (24%) and others (14%).</p> <p>For those who knew the Citizen’s Guide, most said that they saw it in an RSAT training (79%) or by attending a meeting (33%) (Table 9.11). While for LBW the major source for the Citizen’s Guide was an RSAT training (81%), a substantial percentage of TGW said that they saw the guide on the RSAT website (33%) or MSDHW website (24%). The results were very similar for the booklet.</p> <p>When asked if they used the materials, 25% of the sample said that they had used the Citizen’s Guide, with the highest percentage (37%) among TGW. The most frequent use of the guide was to share it with friends: two-thirds of the respondents who said that they used it gave this answer. For the booklet, 9% said that they used it total but for TGW this was 16%. Over half of those who used the booklet said that they used it for everyday life (54%) with another 31% saying that they shared it with friends. The responses for these questions had too few cases to break down by population or present in tables.</p> <p><b>Whether the program addressed issues identified in the baseline report</b></p> <p>The Conclusion and Recommendations section of the baseline report concluded that self-stigmatization was an important topic to address for LBW and TGW, as most absorb the majority’s perspective that their different sexual or gender identity makes them worth less than mainstream, heterosexual individuals. This “self-stigmatization” is difficult to address, as it begins at such a young age and often begins within the women’s own families. The baseline study also found that few TGW and LW are able to name sources for assistance or support when these experiences happen, beyond their peer group or sometimes family.</p> <p>The recommendations from the baseline study were that the program help LGW and especially TGW to provide support in handling the emotional distress caused by parents’ rejection, to include strong LGW</p>
--	--

	<p>and TGW role models in the program, and to hold community-level events including parents; to begin advocacy activities at secondary schools and universities to gain publicity and empower the group; to engage private sector international corporations to take a stand on S&amp;D; and to provide more openness about transgender relationships and recognition that violence and financial exploitation is not acceptable.</p> <p>RSAT followed some of the baseline study's recommendations fairly closely in implementing the project: providing support for SOGI and an outlet to discuss parental rejection and other types of S&amp;D; beginning advocacy activities at schools and universities; and providing a forum where TGW could be open about violence within relationships. Self-stigmatization, self-esteem, and a recognition of human rights were stressed in the workshops, although this did not become the main priority until the curriculum was revised in the second year of the program. These elements were prominent in the reflections of the workshop participants that we interviewed (22 of 32 mentioned that addressing stigma and relating their personal experiences was important to them), and they also felt that the knowledge gained on what to do in the case of violence or discrimination was valuable.</p>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>RSAT's reworking of the curriculum for Year 2 resulted in an alignment of the needs of LBW and TGW, as evidenced in the online survey, IDIs and baseline study. The IEC materials were known only by a minority of the respondents in the online survey, but a higher proportion of TGW knew the materials compared to LBW. Many of those who recognized the materials said that they used them in their daily life (54% of those who used the materials), which fulfills the objectives of RSAT.</p>

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	Relevance
<b>Evaluation Question 6</b>	<b>6) To what extent do achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of the targeted populations?</b>
<b>Response to the evaluation question with analysis of key findings by the</b>	<p><b>Whether project goal, outcomes and outputs are aligned with the issues identified by LBW and TGW beneficiaries</b></p> <p>As discussed in the previous sections, RSAT found that the original emphasis on global level human rights and advocacy were not relevant for the workshop participants. By the second year, the new curriculum stressed individual SOGI issues, recognition of S&amp;D and sources of help for discrimination and violence. All of the workshop participants</p>

<p><b>evaluation team</b></p>	<p>interviewed in depth found these directly relevant, as found in the evidence presented above.</p> <p>Other evidence emerged however that brought the relevance of the program into question. All of the four former RSAT staff who were interviewed had opinions on the relevance of the workshops for the participants. Three former staff felt that the workshops were relevant, but did not go far enough.</p> <p><i>The training course helped them to appreciate themselves, know their values, not stigmatize themselves and others. But overall, the project only answered to some of TGW/LBW's questions that they can take some part to use in their real lives. There are still other issues that the project did not cover such as policy issues. (RSAT former provincial staff #2)</i></p> <p><i>People in the community thought that this RSAT training course was not interesting, and not important because they didn't understand about the core issues. If LGBT people are discriminated against from the society, then what? The participants are still living their lives, still live with their families like nothing happened. This actually creates a dark spot into their hearts. The project does not have mechanism to move to the next step. It only touched on the surface. (RSAT former provincial staff #1)</i></p> <p>Another former RSAT staff member criticized the early workshops for bringing five RSAT staff to their region from Bangkok, who conducted the workshop in a lecture format and then returned to Bangkok without interacting with the community.</p> <p><i>The way they worked is as if they are intervening with people in the community. I had problems with people in the community after they went back to Bangkok. There was more work to do, to reconcile with local communities/organizations. (RSAT former provincial staff #3).</i></p> <p>Another key issue expressed by two of the staff members was the lack of continuity of the program. The workshops were designed so that each woman could only participate once, although it was planned for them to continue to be involved with other RSAT activities. Two former staff stated that the project should keep in touch with workshop participants and continue to reinforce the messages (and provide the support) for them.</p> <p><i>I want to have continuous activities. Each province that we visited, there should be activities for participants to continue, to make them</i></p>
-------------------------------	--

	<p><i>realize how important they are and how they can work for us )RSAT( and with us )RSAT( in the future. We should make them )participants( realize that they are equipped with knowledge, they can collaborate with government sectors to work on their rights. At present, budget from the UN is focused on reaching larger numbers of the target group more than putting an emphasis on building peer leaders. (Former RSAT project manager)</i></p> <p><i>I think at the end the RSAT training course didn't provide anything much to people in the community, except conducting the training course. After the training team left the project area, there is nothing left to be continued. The RSAT training course started to move the issues of TGW/LBW, but it come from the community themselves. They just took information and knowledge from the training course. (RSAT former provincial staff #1)</i></p> <p><i>Participants joined the training course only one time, there was no further planning to conduct training course to be family camp, such as inviting participants to bring their parents to the family camp (RSAT former provincial staff #2)</i></p> <p>RSAT has continued its funding from AJWS and received new funding from The Asia Foundation to continue the workshops. The design of having women only attend one workshop is continued, but some previous workshop participants are being trained as facilitators. The Asia Foundation grant included funding to re-visit and repackage the curriculum.<sup>24</sup> The activities have also been expanded to include disabled women.</p> <p>.</p>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>The IDIs and online survey provide evidence that the issues covered in the workshops continue to be relevant for IDI and online survey respondents. However, some have criticized the project design where participation is limited to one workshop. This is discussed further in the sustainability section.</p>

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	Efficiency
----------------------------	------------

---

<sup>24</sup> Personal communication, RSAT project director.

<b>Evaluation Question 7</b>	<b>7) How efficiently and timely has this project been implemented and managed in accordance with the Project Document?</b>
<b>Response to the evaluation question with analysis of key findings by the evaluation team</b>	<p><b>Whether project results were delivered as laid out by the Project Document</b></p> <p>The project reports to UNTF reveal that several project deliverables were submitted late. These include the IEC materials and the surveillance system (which was never ultimately established).</p> <p>Another inefficiency in project implementation was the fact that the original workshop curriculum design was ineffective; as detailed elsewhere in the report, it focused on international human rights rather than the personal experiences of participants and the S&amp;D issues particular to Thailand. In his KII, the project director stated that he regretted that it took one year for RSAT to revise the curriculum. In fact, the findings of the baseline study clearly outlined the needs of LBW and TGW: that they may not recognize the stigmatization and discrimination that they experience, or be aware of the rights they may have.</p> <p><i>Like other minority groups, LW and TGW absorb the majority's perspective that their different sexual or gender identity makes them worth less than mainstream, heterosexual individuals. This "self-stigmatization" is difficult to address, as it begins at such a young age and often begins within the women's own families.<sup>25</sup></i></p> <p>The baseline study also found that few TGW and LBW are able to name sources for assistance or support when discrimination or other human rights violations happen, and that they mainly rely on their peer group for help and support. Finally, the study reinforced the soundness of the project's design—to build capacity for leadership among LBW and TGW, thus diffusing models of resilience, building self-worth and awareness, and creating strong networks among these groups. The ET suggests that if RSAT followed these recommendations, the curriculum may have suited the needs of the women in its original form, thus improving its efficiency.</p> <p>Other former RSAT staff also criticized the "top-down" implementation of the original workshops, noting inefficiencies in having the staff from Bangkok facilitate it.</p> <p><i>I think, I really like the content of the RSAT training course, but the organizing process should be improved. I still had questions in my mind:</i></p>

<sup>25</sup> Richter, Phuengsamran & Darawuttimaprakorn. (2015). *op. cit.*

	<p><i>why they need to bring many people to the field site (budget matters), why they asked us for a place to sleep (management matters). I gave them 100% for the training course content, but for the management team – I think they failed.</i></p> <p><i>I think what they should do is 1) search for qualified lecturers/speakers 2) RSAT central office from Bangkok should manage the budget and organize a training course. But they should divide into smaller (tailored) training courses because the content is very rich, sensitive, has various perspectives, touch directly on people's lives. Then, the organizing team should also plan about follow-up activity from the beginning of the training course. The team also should focus on the organizing process e.g., how to communicate and collaborate with staff in a local area or target area. They also should mention about follow-up process with participants as well. (RSAT former staff #3)</i></p> <p>While the original curriculum was implemented with Bangkok RSAT staff, resulting in cost inefficiencies, eventually the curriculum had more local content and was implemented with local peer educators.</p>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>The RSAT staff reported on several lessons learned in the project's implementation, which have been discussed above. Some of the project's deliverables were produced late in the project's lifespan, reducing its effectiveness. The biggest loss in efficiency was with the original workshop curriculum, which was found to be ineffective, and the delay in revising it to better suit LBW and TGW needs, especially at the local level.</p>

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Sustainability</b>
<b>Evaluation Question 8 &amp; 9</b>	<p><b>8) How are the achieved results, especially the positive changes generated by the project in the lives of the targeted populations at the project goal level, going to be sustained after this project ends?</b></p> <p><b>9) What is the likelihood or tendency of leading peer-educators, who have been trained in the project's capacity building</b></p>



	<p><b>sessions, to continue educating their peers after the project completion?</b></p>
<p><b>Response to the evaluation question with analysis of key findings by the evaluation team</b></p>	<p><b>Whether there are plans and resources committed to continue project activities</b></p> <p>With regard to its advocacy activities, RSAT now serves on several government committees on gender equity and human rights, and the organizational leadership will continue to do so.</p> <p><i>During the course of the three-year project, we had 12 official meetings with staff under the Ministry of Justice. Most issues are about progressing the civil union laws and the application of the Justice Fund for Justice System-Abused Victims. We had 18 official meetings under the structure of the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security. The main issue discussed here is about the implementation of the Gender Equality Law. We had one official meeting with the National Human Rights Commission for the preparation of ILGA World Conference. But we have several informal meetings with these agencies. We also regularly use online chatting application named 'LINE' (similar to WhatsApp) to communicate about data, information, arranging meetings or checking facts. (RSAT project director)</i></p> <p><i>Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand was the only LGBT organization that signed an official MoU with the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security to promote this [Gender Equality] law... Many RSAT board members have been elected/selected in many policy bodies, including the National Gender Equality Committee, which is chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister, a sub-committee on research, the Gender Equality Fund etc.... Our RSAT President has been also selected as a member of the Justice Fund Board and also the Committee to draft the First Civil Union Law. (RSAT Final Report)</i></p> <p>RSAT's strong relationships with MSDHS and the NHRC are evidenced by positive statements from our KIIs.</p> <p><i>I recall RSAT first contacted us in 2015 which was considered good timing because the Act was just enacted. The department's structure was then changed in compliance to the Act, but we had no one having clear knowledge on this aspect. Therefore, RSAT support at that time was valuable to us. (Dr. Cheera Thongkrajai, MSDHS)</i></p> <p><i>RSAT is like the coordination point for receiving and referring any complaints made regarding this aspect [the Gender Equality Act]. Working with RSAT has helped us to realize that our work is not limited</i></p>

	<p><i>to women, but other genders. Thus, we feel that our work is more valuable... The Gender Equality Act may not be interpreted into practice, if there is no support from LGBT's networks. Working with LGBT network was specific and we learned a lot from experiencing with real case. Based on learning from LGBT network's support, we then included the gender issues in our training. Yet, it would be more effective, if this gender could be integrated in every area of our work. (Dr. Cheera Thongkrajai, MSDHS)</i></p> <p><i>I can say that their work has given positive mobilization in the society, since they can access to their target group. Besides, they also have offices in other regions, so knowledge can be further disseminated throughout the country, not only in Bangkok. The strategy they use is to build capacity of staff or volunteers in educating or facilitating knowledge to others. In addition, their activities allow their staff and volunteers to put knowledge and skills into real practice. This is an effective strategy for sustaining knowledge which I think I did not experience before. (Khun Praepailin Bubpa, NHRC).</i></p> <p>At the provincial level, the two officials we interviewed were not familiar with the project. Although they were both new to their position, this provides evidence that advocacy activities were not continuing at the provincial level. New funding has been received from the TIDES foundation for advocacy on marriage laws, but at the central level.</p> <p><b>Whether there are current or planned activities involving the peer educators</b></p> <p>The eight working groups of peer leaders are continuing to meet for advocacy activities. The design of the UNTF workshops was that participants were to only attend one workshop; however, that workshop was seen as a training for them to then educate their peers on human rights, S&amp;D etc. While some workshop participants also participated in awareness campaigns, outreach and public forums, the RSAT reports only total figures for these activities so it is not known how many of the 777 workshop participants participated in these.</p> <p>RSAT reported that their three-month and six-month follow-ups with workshop participants indicated that women continue to pass on what they have learned from the capacity building sessions.</p> <p><i>From the surveyed participants, 79.7% reported having addressed (or feeling able or equipped to address) the issue of violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights with government agencies, relevant</i></p>
--	---

	<p><i>sectors and community members 3 months after the training. (RSAT Annual Report 2016)</i></p> <p><b>Whether project advocacy efforts have resulted in local or national-level legislation</b></p> <p>As mentioned above, RSAT worked closely with MSDHS on raising awareness on the Gender Equality Act 2015, which was enacted right before the project started. The MSDHS actively participated in RSAT's activities under the project and RSAT also was asked to participate in MSDHS training for local officials.</p> <p><i>We applied RSAT's activities/approaches into our work such as 'Power Walk' during the training course we organized among our focal points. It went well and participants also became aware that although they all were government officials, they were different. We also provided knowledge on SOGI throughout the training. Although, we did not get much involvement from the participants as they were not keen in expressing their thoughts, but it was still a good start for the next step. (Dr. Cheera Thongkrajai, MSDHS)</i></p> <p>During the tenure of the project no new legislation was enacted, but RSAT was an integral part of developing the First Civil Union Law. This bill was approved by the Cabinet in December 2018 and is expected to be voted on by Parliament after general elections in 2019.<sup>26</sup></p> <p>While RSAT's national level work with the Thai government has been productive and has continued, the workshops for LBW and TGW have not. There are no plans to continue the workshops or to re-contact previous participants, because this was not part of the original design or budget.</p> <p>Several of the workshop participants mentioned that they thought the workshops should continue so that they can include more people (6 of 32).</p> <p><i>This should be continued as there must be more people who want to participate. (TGW, gay, age 23)</i></p>
--	--

---

<sup>26</sup> Smith, N. (2018, December 28). Thailand steps closer to recognising same-sex civil unions. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2018/12/28/thailand-steps-closer-recognising-same-sex-civil-unions/>

	<p>Dr. Cheera from MSDHS advised that RSAT do continued follow-up with the LBW and TGW who participated in the workshops, to ensure that the messages from the workshops are sustained.</p> <p><i>I have no idea whether training participants are followed-up on their life improvement. I think participants' personal data may be collected, and they may be followed up to see how they can utilize knowledge they gain for their lives. Beyond that, it would be necessary to find out if they can share such knowledge to others. If RSAT has already done all of this, I think it would be supportive for target group to keep reminding themselves about using and sharing knowledge. (Dr. Cheera Thongkrajai, MSDHS)</i></p> <p>Two former RSAT staff members criticized the design of the project, which didn't involve community members in developing the content of the workshops and did not continue activities with workshop participants afterwards.</p> <p><i>I think at the end the RSAT training course didn't provide anything much to people in the community, except conducting the training course. After the training team left the project area, there is nothing left to be continued (RSAT former staff #1).</i></p> <p><i>I want to have continuous activities. Each province that we visited, there should be activities for participants to continue, to make them realize how important they are and how they can work for us (RSAT) and with us (RSAT) in the future. We should make them (participants) realize that they are equipped with knowledge, they can collaborate with government sectors to work on their rights. These participants can turn themselves to be peer leaders in the project site, to help MSM/TG, lesbian/tomboy who need help. These people would be proud of themselves and feel that their lives have value and it's important to them and other people. (RSAT former project manager).</i></p> <p>Two RSAT staff who worked on the project felt that the program did not go far enough to advocate for human rights and against S&amp;D, especially at the provincial level. One believed that the project should do more community work and create mechanisms to link the target communities to government.</p> <p><i>The project needs to create a mechanism for target communities to start working from the bottom-up to other levels, it will then be able</i></p>
--	---

	<p><i>to link our work to government agencies. Not only touching on the surface, as it is doing now (RSAT former provincial staff #1).</i></p> <p>Another former staff member was frustrated that the project did not move activities beyond the workshops at the local level, and felt that building understanding with the TGW and LBW was not enough to make an impact on Thai society.</p> <p><i>The activity helps to improve the situation but, if I have to rate it, I'll give it 4 out of 10 because stigmatization is very sensitive issue, we cannot only aim for our target groups we should target other related sectors as well such as teachers, community leaders. If we have enough budget, we should work with mass media to do PR and present TGW/LBW issues e.g., soap opera or series on TV (RSAT former provincial staff #2).</i></p> <p><b>Whether the trend in the surveillance database shows increased reports of violence</b></p> <p>Because the surveillance database was not established, this question cannot be answered.</p>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>The prospects for sustainability of the project are good, given the continued funding was obtained from AJWS and additional funding from the Asia Foundation. However, some staff have questioned the one-time workshop design from two perspectives: 1) that the understanding and bonds created by the workshop may be lost without continued contact with participants and 2) that greater use of mass media is needed to really address S&amp;D. National-level advocacy continues with the organizational leadership and it is hoped that the LBW and TGW working groups continue their advocacy. However, RSAT's relationships with leaders at the ministries may depend on their longevity at their positions.</p>

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Impact</b>
<b>Evaluation Question 10</b>	<b>10) What are the unintended consequences (positive and negative) resulting from the project?</b>
<b>Response to the evaluation question</b>	<b>Whether participants report negative experiences as a result of participating in the project</b>

<p><b>with analysis of key findings by the evaluation team</b></p>	<p>As reported in several of the previous sections, workshop participants often became emotional when talking about their previous experiences with their families or with violence. This was reported by the participants themselves, by RSAT staff and by some key informants. None of the respondents referred to this as a negative experience, but as a release of emotions that they had not been able to express in a supportive environment previously. RSAT staff reported that they began to have social workers on hand to help the participants cope with these strong feelings, and that this strategy was effective.</p> <p><i>It's important to have a social worker join this training course because sometimes there are sensitive issues that TGW are facing and they could not disclose their stories easily. For example, TGs who are Christian, they are accused from their Bishop/Father that TGW are devil people. When TGs tell us their stories, [they] are crying - such a case is a bit difficult for us to cope. We then invited social workers (or multidisciplinary counselors) to join the training course from the beginning of the training session, it's good for them to see and understand our situation from the beginning. (RSAT former provincial staff #2)</i></p> <p><i>Having them telling their stories is like to ask them to cut and open their wounds. They can tell stories in any comfortable position i.e., sitting, lying down. Sometimes they shout, cry, or smash a wall. We let them release those feelings. (RSAT former project manager)</i></p> <p>No participants reported negative experiences with the project, either in the IDIs or online survey.</p> <p><b>Whether positive experiences are reported by participants that are beyond those expected at the outset of the project; whether policy advocacy had results beyond those expected at the outset</b></p> <p>A comparison of the project proposal's plans for the workshops and their expected outcomes with the evidence presented above shows that positive experiences by participants were as expected at the outset of the project. As reported in previous sections, the policy advocacy achievements also did not go beyond those expected, particularly since some project activities did not go as planned; however it should be noted that all modifications to project activities were discussed with UNTF as the project progressed.</p>
<p><b>Conclusions</b></p>	<p>Participants did not report negative experiences; expressions of strong emotions in the workshops were an overall positive experience for</p>

	<p>releasing emotion in a supportive environment. Social workers were on hand in the workshops to help participants if needed.</p> <p>Positive experiences by participants and policy advocacy achievements did not go beyond what was expected.</p>
--	--

Evaluation Criteria	Impact
Evaluation Question 11	<b>11) Has there been any change in attitude toward GBV issues and stigmatization among stakeholders?</b>
Response to the evaluation question with analysis of key findings by the evaluation team	<p><b>Whether there are reports of attitude changes among stakeholders</b></p> <p>The government stakeholders that we interviewed made clear that RSAT had greatly influenced their views about SOGI and about sexual minorities in Thailand. This was accomplished through advocacy at national level committees and participating in provincial level trainings of government officials.</p> <p><i>After disseminating SOGI related knowledge to governmental staff, it was found that there is still unclear understanding about this. Even worse, this aspect is viewed as uncommon....Working with RSAT has helped us to realize that our works are not limited to women, but other gender. We feel that our work is more valuable. (Dr. Cheera Thongkrajai, MSDHS)</i></p> <p><i>When we organized training courses in four regions of Thailand, we also received collaboration from RSAT branch in Ubon Ratchathani and Had Yai. They provided their staff to share knowledge or experiences among the training's participants. (Praepailin Bubpa, NHRC)</i></p> <p>Dr. Cheera of MSDHS reported some progress with government officials' understanding of LGBTI issues.</p> <p><i>At the operational level, staff who directly deal with LGBT have shown positive understanding and perspectives about LGBT's lifestyle. For example, they manage separate accommodation for each type of gender. This kind of practice should be perceived among policy makers, so that they may consider about any relevant changes or any integrated work. (Dr. Cheera Thongkrajai, MSDHS)</i></p>



	Workshop participants clearly felt that they understood more about discrimination, stigma and GBV at a deep level, as reported in detail in other sections.
<b>Conclusions</b>	The ET finds evidence of attitude change through RSAT's direct contact with government staff and workshop participants. Attempts to change attitudes at the societal level have been limited to the small-scale efforts of the peer leaders' working groups.

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Knowledge Generation</b>
<b>Evaluation Questions 12 &amp; 13</b>	<p><b>12) What are the key lessons learned that can be shared with other practitioners on Ending Violence against Women, Girls and LBT women?</b></p> <p><b>13) Are there any promising practices? If yes, what are they and how can these promising practices be replicated in other projects and/or in other countries that have similar interventions?</b></p>
<b>Response to the evaluation question with analysis of key findings by the evaluation team</b>	<p><b>Whether there are lessons learned that can be shared with other practitioners</b></p> <p>There are several lessons learned that may provide helpful insights for other practitioners. All of these conclusions are discussed elsewhere in the report with evidence provided in those sections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ As was found in the baseline report for the project, <b>Thai LBW and TGW need support for reducing self-stigmatization.</b> The project design that built improvement in understanding of human rights and S&amp;D proved to be an effective strategy for improving self-efficacy and stigma awareness.</li> </ul> <p><i>A multidisciplinary counselor or a social worker introduced an activity called "molding a star". The process is to ask participants to tell their stories, any kind of verbal, physical, written language violence that they have been facing, violence that they did to others or other people did to them. The social worker demonstrated by using a toothpick dipping in the clay. Each dip is violence action we faced and when we took out the toothpick, there are holes in the clay and still there. The activity would make them understand that those holes affect our lives (RSAT former provincial staff #2).</i></p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ For newly trained women leaders, <b>advocacy activities that address individual incidents of discrimination and violence at the local level</b>, where advocacy can be effective in a fairly short time period, are most suitable for the majority of these women who are young and in the process of building awareness.</li> <li>◆ RSAT's experience working closely with the Thai government, particularly the Ministry of Public Health, in HIV prevention and AIDS treatment did not prepare them for the lower level of understanding of SOGI and of stigma and discrimination towards LBW and TGW that is more typical of other government ministries. Several KII respondents also mentioned the disparity in understanding between Bangkok and provincial areas, as evidenced by the quote below.   <i>I firstly perceived RSAT as TG working group and I though only TG is their target group. Nevertheless, I found out that their work focuses on sexual diversities, particular on gaining level of acceptance on people's differences. I perceive that their work in Pattaya or Chiang Mai is quite concentrated. For LGBT in Lamphang, RSAT does not yet reach them much. Although, we organize some activities that are relevant to LGBT group, but we only cover numbers of LGBT who come to us. We do not know where to reach them. Thus, we expect them to come to us and give us a support on designing responsive activities for them. Alternatively, we may have budget for them to organize their own activities. Beyond that, if it is possible; we would like to have RSAT here, so we can work more together. )Korapin Wongcharoen, MHSDS staff in Lamphang)</i>             Building gender equality for all people will take time, even at the national government level.   <b>Whether there are project strategies that achieved effective results that can be replicated</b>             RSAT's workshop curriculum had effective results that should be replicated and continued.             RSAT has provided effective advocacy and good working relationships at the national level.             RSAT's local offices can be a useful resource for government ministries working on human rights and gender equity issues, who may not know how to reach sexually diverse populations.         </li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Conclusions</b>	RSAT's curriculum for the workshops should be shared at the national level so that it can be replicated for other groups. It may also be useful for groups in surrounding countries. RSAT's advocacy at the national level should continue as progress in gaining gender equality will take continued effort; skills in this area should be replicated at the provincial level as government officials are in need of resources to promote gender equality.

## 9 Conclusions

For the most part, RSAT achieved the goal, outcomes and outputs that they committed to UNTF for this project. All evidence found by the ET documents that the workshops effectively raised awareness of human rights and S&D among LBW and TGW. A comparison of human rights awareness of the endline IDI respondents with the baseline respondents found considerable improvement: about 5 of the 32 respondents at baseline could give a definition of human rights whereas 29 of 32 respondents at endline could do so.

While the advocacy efforts of the peer educators occurred on a smaller scale than originally designed, the eight LBW and TGW working groups could point to accomplishments in fighting violence, stigma and discrimination.

RSAT's plans to establish a surveillance system with MSDHS to monitor incidents of discrimination, violence and other human rights violations did not come to fruition, nor was RSAT able to set up its own internal system. UNTF accepted RSAT's explanation that the M&E capacity of the ministry did not allow for establishing the system.

At the national level, RSAT's leadership built effective relationships with its three government partners, and was asked to be a member of several committees working to strengthen human rights policies for LGBTI.

While the project effectively reached and exceeded its targets for the number of beneficiaries reached, the ET found errors in the reported figures which had to be corrected. Data quality assurance procedures and greater oversight by more senior (experienced) staff, as well as proper training and orientation for new M&E staff as they come onboard, is needed for RSAT to conduct M&E functions at a higher standard.

The ET found inefficiency in the project's slow reaction time to the need to revise the workshop curriculum to make it more relatable to the needs of LBW and TGW. However, the

new curriculum had favorable results with the peer educators, as evidenced by the IDIs and online survey. However, several former staff criticized the project's design for only involving LBW and TGW in one workshop, thus lacking continuity in maintaining ties with the target group.

The IEC materials were rated highly by those who received them, but their reach was limited.

## 10 Key recommendations

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Relevant Stakeholders</b> (Recommendation made to whom)	<b>Suggested timeline</b> (if relevant)
<b>Overall: Effectiveness, relevance, sustainability, impact, knowledge generation</b>	Build on successful efforts with LBW and TGW by continuing to work with this group. Besides expanding the workshops to additional LBW and TGW, plan activities with the UNTF workshop participants to re-energize this group and reinforce the workshop messages. Community fairs or potlucks can be inexpensive ways of joining people for a social event that can lead to further advocacy and/or contact with new potential peer leaders who have not been in contact.	RSAT	Now
	Expand peer leader working groups if possible, perhaps working at the local level but mobilized around a single issue that can be leveraged for media messages. Step up efforts to form networks of LBW and TGW in provincial areas for continued support and growth in leadership for these groups	RSAT	Continual

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Relevant Stakeholders</b> (Recommendation made to whom)	<b>Suggested timeline</b> (if relevant)
<b>Effectiveness</b>	Continue national level advocacy and relationship building among ministries concerned with human rights and gender equality	RSAT leadership	Now
	Expand distribution of IEC materials; they were rated highly, but did not reach a large number of people.	UNTF; RSAT	Now
	Reduce turnover in NGO staff by professionalizing positions and making the case to board members and funders that M&E and financial positions are critical to projects' success	RSAT	Continual
<b>Efficiency</b>	Work smarter by improving documentation, maintaining networks and using evidence to further develop programs	RSAT	Continual
	Improve M&E systems to better use evidence; develop data quality assurance mechanisms	RSAT	Now

## 11 Annexes

## 1) Final Version of Terms of Reference (TOR) of the evaluation

FINAL | 15 NOV 17

---

### Term of Reference

**Final Evaluation for the Project “The Empowerment and Capacity Building of Lesbian and Transgender Women to Mitigate Violence, Stigma and Discrimination based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity”**

#### 1. Project Background and Context

Against the Thai Constitution Law Article 30, lesbian and transgender women are still victims of both physical and verbal abuse and violence, according to the “Violated Lives” published by Theeranat Kanjana-aksorn Foundation, Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand, Anjaree Group and The Global Fund in March 2011. They are discriminated based on sexual orientation and gender identity despite a clear statement in the Thai constitution Article 30 that “All persons are equal before the law and shall enjoy equal protection under the law. Men and women shall enjoy equal rights. Unjust discrimination against a person on the ground of the difference in origin, race, language, sex, age, physical or health condition, personal status, economic and social standing, religious belief, education, or Constitution political views, shall not be permitted.”

Although there is no quantitative records of how many lesbian and transgender women are abused, stigmatized and discriminated per year but there are qualitative records, including stories in the media. According to our past training with lesbian and transgender women, many of them are not aware of their fundamental rights. Some even think they deserve the abuse, stigma and discrimination because they have deviant sexual orientation and gender identity, making them less valuable than heterosexual people. Together with the Thai society that is not well literate on human right, such abuse, stigma and discrimination against lesbian and transgender women is socially justified.

The proposed intervention in this project will empower lesbian and transgender women to understand that it is not okay for them to be abused, stigmatized and discriminated against. It will build their capacity to understand human rights and how to advocate to their surrounding communities, society and related government agencies for these rights.

Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand (RSAT) has been granted by the UN Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women administered by UNWOMEN to implement a project to address these issues and improve Thailand responses for lesbian and transgender women.

This project has engaged Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand and its provincial offices countrywide that are working with lesbian and transgender women. This has covered those who are living in other regions of the country, where the context of violence, stigma and discrimination is different. By mobilizing and building the capacity of lesbian and transgender women, we have been able to expect to influence their peers, families, communities and related government agencies, especially the health and social welfare sectors. By making the influence, lesbian and transgender women are able to address their rights and advocate them assertively with the materials to be produced under this project. A

mechanism has been developed by Rainbow Sky to monitor and record the events of violence, stigma and discrimination against lesbian and transgender women. This has helped develop reliable evidence to advocate with the government and advocate for prioritization of this issue in the national agenda since the country has limited resources and prioritization is made based on evidence in hand. This has provided reliable evidence to the government and helped advocate for the allocation of national resource to sustain the program subsequently after the project completion.

RSAT is looking for an institute/organization/individual to work with us as an external evaluator for final evaluation of this project to examine whether this three-year project has achieved its expected outcomes and project goal.

### **1.1 Description of the project that is being evaluated**

**Name of the project and organization:** “The Empowerment and Capacity Building of Lesbian and Transgender Women to Mitigate Violence, Stigma and Discrimination based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity”, Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand

**Project duration:** Three years (1 January 2015 – 31 December 2017) **Current project status:** Active and in the last quarter of its last year. **Description of the specific forms of violence addressed by the project:**

1. Violence in the family
  - a. Intimate partner violence
    - i. Psychological or emotional violence
  - b. Non-partner violence
    - i. Psychological or emotional violence
2. Violence in the community
  - a. Sexual harassment and violence in public spaces/institutions
  - b. Violence in schools
  - c. Violence in public spaces

**Main objective of the project:** To empower and build the capacity of lesbian and transgender women to mitigate violence, stigma and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity

#### **Description of the targeted primary and secondary beneficiaries:**

*Primary target beneficiaries:* Lesbian, bisexual and transgender women (Expected targets: 9,400 persons in 3 years)

*Secondary beneficiaries:*

1. Civil society organizations (approximately 40 organizations)
2. Community groups (120 groups)
3. Public health professionals (30 persons)
4. Government civil servants from the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (30 persons)

### **1.2 Results Chain of the Project:**

This project puts emphasis on capacity building of LBT women to increase their knowledge on violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity. We found from our baseline assessment that the knowledge of violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity among LBT women is minimal or almost none. It is believed that LBT women would be capable of addressing violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violations if they possess such knowledge, including the capacity to pass this to their peers. At the same time, we work with relevant government agencies such as the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security, the Ministry of Justice and the National Human Rights Commission to ensure that existing laws on gender equality as well as other relevant laws for LBT women and LGBT people are effectively implemented.

Results and Resources Framework (RRF)			Source for measurement (responsible agency):
<b>Project Goal</b>	Lesbian and transgender women from four regions of Thailand experience greater freedom from violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity, and better access to assistance when violence does occur.		External evaluator
<b>Outcome 1</b>	Groups of lesbian and transgender women have gained greater capacity to advocate for change in government policy and the broader society related to violence, stigma and discrimination and human rights' violations against women on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.	<b>Output 1.1</b>	Lesbian and transgender women have better understanding about various forms of violence, stigma and discrimination and the concept of fundamental human rights and know how to respond to human right violations in the existing channel.
		<b>Output 1.2</b>	New lesbian and transgender women leaders report to have more confidence in using advocacy tools and communicating with relevant government agencies for policy development and change.
		<b>Output 1.3</b>	Working groups of lesbian women and transgender women are formed with relevant government agencies. clear advocacy strategy to communicate with
<b>Outcome 2</b>	RSAT has strengthened an existing monitoring and reporting	<b>Output 2.1</b>	RSAT surveillance and reporting system to record and report cases of violence, stigma and discrimination based on sexual orientation



	surveillance system that provides a more effective platform for prompting government agencies to provide the appropriate response to cases of violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in four areas of Thailand.		and gender identity is strengthened, systematic and functional.	External evaluator
<b>Outcome 3</b>	Government agencies and the National Human Rights Commission in Thailand increase their awareness and improve their responsiveness to cases of violence and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.	<b>Output 3.1</b>	RSAT increases the number and quality of IEC tools and data available for advocacy and awareness- raising among policy makers and the general public.	Number: Project monitoring (RSAT) Quality: External evaluator
		<b>Output 3.2</b>	RSAT has strengthened their dialogue with the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security and the National Human Rights Commission.	External evaluator

For more information, please refer to more detailed in the attached Results and Resources Framework (RRF).

### 1.3 Geographic Context

Project coverage: Four regions of Thailand (Central, North, Northeast and South)

To be recognized as a national project, we have divided Thailand into four different regions based on context, dialects and culture. The North of Thailand appears to be the most accepted culture for sexual diversity due to its history of Lanna culture, which used to be an independent country before the reunification of Siam. The movement of civil society sector is the most active in this region. However, stigma and discrimination against people with sexual diversity seems to be the least in

Thailand (if Bangkok is not included). The northern region is drawn from Uttaradith and the provinces north of Uttaradith province. The northeastern region is very similar to the northern region with great acceptance of gender diversity. The northeastern region is considered Nakhon Ratchasima province and provinces in the northeastern radius to the borders connected to Lao PDR and Cambodia. Most people in this region usually migrate to other parts of the country for employment opportunities and it is safe to assume that people with sexual diversity are also the same in terms of migration. The central region includes Bangkok and provinces extended to Pitsanulok province in the northern direction, to Prachuabkhirikhan province in the southern direction. The central region also includes provinces in the East and West. The Southern region includes provinces from Chumporn provinces down south to Pattani, Yala and Narathiwat provinces connected to Malaysia. The southern region is regarded as the region where people with sexual diversity are the most stigmatized and discrimination due to the southern culture and Islam.

In this project, the primary cities of interventions are as follow:

1. Central: Bangkok, Pathumthani, Nonthaburi and Samutprakarn
2. North: Chiang Mai
3. Northeast: Ubon Ratchathani and Khon Kaen
4. South: Songkhla, Pattani, Yala and Narathiwat

However, the target populations are not confined only in the mentioned provinces since we are using the Internet (Facebook and LINE™) to reach out to LBT women. Therefore, LBT women who participated in our capacity building sessions are also from several other provinces in each region.

#### **1.4 Total resources allocated for the intervention**

**Total Grant Amount:** US \$600,000

**Contribution by Grantee:** US \$ 324,000

**Total Project Budget:** \$ 924,000

#### **1.5 Key partners involved**

- o Ban Bunteng Group, Yala Province
- o Ministry of Social Development and Human Security Office of Women's Affairs and Family Development Department of Gender Equality
- o Ministry of Justice Department of Rights and Liberty Protection
- o National Human Rights Commission of Thailand
- o Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand (regional offices in Ubon Ratchathani province and Hat Yai, Songkhla province)

## **2. Purpose of the evaluation**

This is a mandatory final project evaluation by the UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women. This project is currently in its last quarter of its last year. We need to measure whether the project activities that have been implemented for almost three years have achieved its expected outcomes and outputs so that the actions can be verified as successes for replications or scaling up or failures for lessons-learned and future improvement. This evaluation will inform UNTF whether this project is effective and yields expected outcomes as designed at the beginning of this project. The results will also help RSAT to identify additional capacity needs or strategies to improve access to assistance for LBT women when violence does occur.

The evaluation results will be used by Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand to identify good practices that we need to continue and can be shared to other partners for replications and to identify which actions do not work and require improvement. The results will be also shared with relevant government agencies including the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security Office of Women's Affairs and Family Development (in, Ministry of Justice Department of Rights and Liberty Protection, and the National Human Rights Commission).

### 3. Evaluation objectives and scope

#### 3.1 Scope of Evaluation

*Timeframe:* this evaluation needs to cover the entire project duration

*Geographical coverage:* Selected four cities, including Bangkok, Ubon Ratchathani or Khon Kaen, Chiang Mai and Songkhla (possibly including those from Yala, Pattani and Narathiwat provinces).

*Target groups to be covered:* this evaluation needs to cover the target primary and secondary beneficiaries as well as broader stakeholders.

#### 3.2 Objectives of Evaluation

- a. To evaluate the entire project in terms of effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and impact, with a strong focus on assessing the results at the outcome and project goals.
- b. To generate key lessons-learned and identify promising practices for learning
- c. To generate knowledge that can be adapted to LBT capacity building program focus, and inform adjustments to the program

### 4. Evaluation Questions

The questions that need to be answered by this evaluation include the following divided into five categories of analysis. The five overall evaluation criteria – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact – will be applied for this evaluation.

Evaluation Criteria	Mandatory Evaluation Questions
Effectiveness	<p>1) To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs achieved and how?</p> <p>2) To what extent did the project reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached?</p> <p>3) 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.</p> <p>4) What internal and external factors contributed to the achievement and/or failure of the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs? How?</p>
Relevance	<p>1) To what extent was the project strategy and activities implemented relevant in responding to the needs of lesbian and transgender women?</p>

	2) To what extent do achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of lesbian and transgender women?
Efficiency	1) How efficiently and timely has this project been implemented and managed in accordance with the Project Document?
Sustainability	1) How are the achieved results, especially the positive changes generated by the project in the lives of lesbian and transgender women at the project goal level, going to be sustained after this project ends? 2) What is the likelihood or tendency of leading peer-educators, who have been trained in the project's capacity building sessions, to continue educating their peers after the project completion?
Impact	1) What are the unintended consequences (positive and negative) resulted from the project? 2) Has there been any change in attitude toward GVB issues and stigmatization among stakeholders?
Knowledge Generation	1) What are the key lessons learned that can be shared with other practitioners on Ending Violence against Women and Girls? 2) Are there any promising practices? If yes, what are they and how can these promising practices be replicated in other projects and/or in other countries that have similar interventions?

## 5. Evaluation Methodology

This section provides suggestions on the evaluation methodology. However, the final decision on of the design shall emerge from consultations between RSAT, key stakeholders and the evaluator(s).

- 1) Proposed evaluation design: Post-test only non-experimental design
- 2) Data sources: Desk review of program monitoring documents and progress reports Primary data to be collected by the evaluator(s), and RSAT project database will be made available to the evaluator(s).
- 3) Proposed data collection methods and analysis: Preferred a mixed method of qualitative and quantitative approach. The qualitative method should include in-depth interviews and/or focus group discussions. The quantitative approach should at least include an online survey.
- 4) Proposed sampling methods: Any method that has a similar concept in Social Networking Theory (such as Respondent-Driven Sampling: RDS) – this depends on budget availability and possibility.
- 5) Field visits: Selected four cities, including Bangkok, Ubon Ratchathani or Khon Kaen, Chiang Mai and Songkhla (possibly including those from Yala, Pattani and Narathiwat provinces)

The data gathered from these evaluation methods will be analyzed by the evaluation consultant and compiled into an evaluation report to be submitted RSAT for review by 15 February 2018 prior to submission to UNTF on 28 February 2018.

## 6. Evaluation Ethics

The evaluation must be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' <http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>.

It is imperative for the evaluator(s) to:

- Guarantee the safety of respondents and the research team.
- Apply protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of respondents.
- Select and train the research team on ethical issues.
- Provide referrals to local services and sources of support for women that might ask for them.
- Ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and youth.
- Store securely the collected information.

The evaluator(s) must consult with the relevant documents as relevant prior to development and finalization of data collection methods and instruments. The key documents include (but not limited to) the following:

- World Health Organization (2003). Putting Women First: Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Research on Domestic Violence Against Women. [www.who.int/gender/documents/violence/who\\_fch\\_gwh\\_01.1/en/index.html](http://www.who.int/gender/documents/violence/who_fch_gwh_01.1/en/index.html)
- Jewkes, R., E. Dartnall and Y. Sikweyiya (2012). Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Research on the Perpetration of Sexual Violence. Sexual Violence Research Initiative. Pretoria, South Africa, Medical Research Council. Available from [www.svri.org/EthicalRecommendations.pdf](http://www.svri.org/EthicalRecommendations.pdf)
- Researching violence against women: A practical guide for researchers and activists November 2005 [http://www.path.org/publications/files/GBV\\_rvaw\\_complete.pdf](http://www.path.org/publications/files/GBV_rvaw_complete.pdf)
- World Health Organization (WHO), 'Ethical and safety recommendations for researching documenting and monitoring sexual violence in emergencies' 2007, [http://www.who.int/gender/documents/OMS\\_Ethics&Safety10Aug07.pdf](http://www.who.int/gender/documents/OMS_Ethics&Safety10Aug07.pdf)

## 7. Key deliverables of evaluators and timeframe

	Deliverables	Description of Expected Deliverables	Timeline of each deliverable (Date/month/year)
1	Evaluation inception report (Language of report: English)	<p>The inception report provides RSAT and the evaluator(s) with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.</p> <p>An inception report must be prepared by the evaluators <u>before</u> going into the technical mission and full data collection stage. It must detail the evaluator's understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation</p>	5/January/2018

		<p>question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection/analysis procedures.</p> <p>The inception report must include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility of each task or product.</p> <p>The structure must be in line with the suggested structure of the annex of ToR.</p>	
2	Draft evaluation report (language of report: English)	<p>Evaluators must submit draft report for review and comments by all parties involved. The report needs to meet the minimum requirements specified in the annex of TOR.</p> <p>The grantee and key stakeholders in the evaluation must review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.</p>	15/February/2018
3	Final evaluation (language of report: English)	<p>Relevant comments from key stakeholders must be well integrated in the final version, and the final report must meet the minimum requirements specified in the annex of TOR.</p> <p>The final report must be disseminated widely to the relevant stakeholders and the general public.</p>	28 February 2018

## 8. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The Evaluation Team can be an individual or an institution with team members that can be consisting of international consultant(s) and/or national consultant(s).

### 8.1 Evaluation Team Composition and Roles and Responsibilities

The evaluating institute/organization or individual will be responsible for undertaking the evaluation from start to finish and for managing the evaluation team under the supervision of evaluation task manager from the grantee organization, for the data collection and analysis, as well as report drafting and finalization in English.

The external evaluator will work with the Evaluation Manager (Mr. Rapeepun Jommaroeng) and RSAT M&E Unit in the following activities:

1. Communicating on the progress of the evaluation, including feedback on the inception report. Please note that the official advisory committee include UNTF portfolio manager and UNTF focal point.

2. Acquiring program data from RSAT M&E Team
3. RSAT M&E Team is able to identify beneficiaries to be included in the evaluation

**Number of working days:** 60 person-working days

## 8.2 Required competencies

- ✓ Evaluation experience at least 5 years in conducting external evaluations, with mixed-methods evaluation skills and having flexibility in using non-traditional and innovative evaluation methods
- ✓ Expertise in gender and human-rights based approaches to evaluation and issues of violence against women and girls (preferably experience in working with lesbian and transgender women)
- ✓ Specific evaluation experiences in the areas of ending violence against women and girls (preferably experience in working with lesbian and transgender women)
- ✓ Experience in collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data
- ✓ In-depth knowledge of gender equality and women's empowerment
- ✓ A strong commitment to delivering timely and high-quality results, i.e. credible evaluation and its report that can be used
- ✓ A strong team leadership and management track record, as well as interpersonal and communication skills to help ensure that the evaluation is understood and used.
- ✓ Good communication skills and ability to communicate with various stakeholders and to express concisely and clearly ideas and concepts
- ✓ Regional/Country experience and knowledge: in-depth knowledge of Thailand is required.
- ✓ Language proficiency: fluency in English and Thai is mandatory.

## 9. Management Arrangement of the Evaluation

Name of Group	Role and responsibilities	Actual name of staff responsible
Evaluation Team	External evaluators/consultants to conduct an external evaluation based on the contractual agreement and the Terms of Reference, and under the day-to-day supervision of the Evaluation Task Manager.	External evaluator(s)
Evaluation Task Manager	Someone from the grantee organization, such as project manager and/or M&E officer to manage the entire evaluation process under the overall guidance of the senior management, to: lead the development and finalization of the evaluation TOR in consultation with key stakeholders and the senior management;  - manage the recruitment of the external evaluators;	RSAT Project Manager Mr. Rapeepun Jommaroeng

Name of Group	Role and responsibilities	Actual name of staff responsible
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lead the collection of the key documents and data to be share with the evaluators at the beginning of the inception stage;</li> <li>- liaise and coordinate with the evaluation team, the reference group, the commissioning organization and the advisory group throughout the process to ensure effective communication and collaboration;</li> <li>- provide administrative and substantive technical support to the evaluation team and work closely with the evaluation team throughout the evaluation;</li> <li>- lead the dissemination of the report and follow- up activities after finalization of the report</li> </ul>	
Commissioning Organization	Senior management of the organization who commissions the evaluation (grantee) – responsible for: 1) allocating adequate human and financial resources for the evaluation; 2) guiding the evaluation manager; 3) preparing responses to the recommendations generated by the evaluation.	Senior Management of RSAT Mr. Nopporn Saejung – Assistant Director for Strategic Information
Reference Group	Include primary and secondary beneficiaries, partners and stakeholders of the project who provide necessary information to the evaluation team and to reviews the draft report for quality assurance	LBT women from the four regions on Thailand, who were reached by the project through capacity building activities. Please refer to Section 3.1: <i>Geographical coverage</i>  Please also refer to Annexes: Key stakeholders and partners
Advisory Group	Must include a focal point from the UN Women Regional Office and the UN Trust Fund Portfolio	UN Trust Fund Portfolio



Name of Group	Role and responsibilities	Actual name of staff responsible
	Manager to review and comment on the draft TOR and the draft report for quality assurance and provide technical support if needed.	<p>Manager Isabella Poeschl Email: isabella.poeschl@unwomen.org</p> <p>UN Women Focal Point Nuntana Tangwinit Email: nuntana.tangwinit@unwomen.org</p>



## 10. Timeline of the entire evaluation process

Stage of Evaluation	Key Task	Responsible	Number of working days required	Timeframe
<b>Preparation stage</b>	Prepare and finalize the ToR with key stakeholders	RSAT and evaluation task manager	80	1/Sep/17 – 15/Nov/17
	Compiling key documents and existing data		15	10/Dec/17 – 25/Dec/17
	Recruitment of external evaluator(s)		15	15/Nov/17 – 1/Dec/17
<b>Inception stage</b>	Briefing of evaluators to orient the evaluators	RSAT Evaluation task manager	1	4/Dec/17
	Desk review of key documents	Evaluation Team	3	5/Dec/17 – 7/Dec/17
	Finalizing the evaluation design and methods	Evaluation Team	3	8/Dec/17 – 12/Dec/17
	Preparing an inception report	Evaluation Team	5	13/Dec/17 – 19/Dec/17
	Review Inception Report and Provide feedback	Evaluation Task Manager, Reference Group and Advisory Group	5	19/Dec/17 – 27/Dec/17
	Submitting final version of Inception Report	Evaluation Team	3	28/Dec/17 - 5/Jan/18
<b>Data collection and analysis stage</b>	Desk research	Evaluation Team	5	8/Jan/18 – 12/Jan/18
	In-country technical mission for data collection (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires, etc.)	Evaluation Team	18	13/Jan/18 – 30/Jan/18
<b>Synthesis and reporting stage</b>	Analysis and interpretation of findings	Evaluation Team	7	31/Jan/18 – 6/Feb/18
	Preparing a draft report	Evaluation Team	5	7/Feb/18 – 11/Feb/18
	Review of the draft report with key stakeholders for quality assurance	RSAT Evaluation Task Manager, Reference Group and Advisory Group	7	12/Feb/18 – 18/Feb/18

	Consolidate comments from all the groups and submit the consolidated comments to evaluation team	RSAT Evaluation Task Manager	4	19/Feb/18 – 22/Feb/18
	Incorporating comments and revising the evaluation report	Evaluation Team	5	23/Feb/18 – 27/Feb/18
	Submission of the final report	Evaluation Team	1	28/Feb/18 - 28/Feb/18
	Final review and approval of report	Evaluation Task Manager, Reference Group, RSAT Senior Management, and Advisory Group	15	1/Mar/18 – 15/Mar/18
Dissemination and follow-up	Publishing and distributing the final report	RSAT led by evaluation manager	5	16/Mar/18 – 20/Mar/18
	Prepare management responses to the key recommendations of the report	Senior Management of RSAT	5	21/Mar/18 – 25/Mar/18
	Organize learning events (to discuss key findings and recommendations, use the finding for planning of the following year, etc)	RSAT	1	25/Mar/18 – 30 Mar/18

## 11. Budget

The total budget for this evaluation is US\$27,480 (Twenty-seven thousand four hundred and Eighty United States Dollars)

Position	Daily Fee	Number of Days	Total
Evaluator	USD 383.33	60	23,000.00
Transportation for the Evaluation Team	-	-	2,480.00
Reimbursement for participants in the data collection process			2,000.00

### Note:

The payment will be made with Thai Baht.

## 12. Annexes

1. The total target population of LBT women in this project is 9,400 persons.
2. Key stakeholders and partners consulted (suggested and not limited to)
  - o Ban Bunteng Group, Yala Province – suggesting to interview the leader of the group – Ms. Boonyamat Issadul based in Yala Province
  - o Ministry of Social Development and Human Security Office of Women’s Affairs and Family Development Department of Gender Equality – suggesting to interview the director of the Gender Equality Department or the designated focal point for LGBT populations and Dr. Cheera Thongkrajai
  - o Ministry of Justice Department of Rights and Liberty Protection – suggesting to interview the director-general or the designated focal point for LGBT populations
  - o National Human Rights Commission of Thailand – suggesting to interview the LGBT focal point – (the former LGBT focal point – Dr. Surachet Sathitniramai and possibly the current LGBT focal point Ms. Angkhana Neelapaijit) and 1 – 2 NHRC staff working with LGBT groups
3. Documents to be consulted
  - o Gender Equality Act B.E.2555 (A.D.2015)
  - o Baseline assessment report of this project by Mahidol University Institute for Population and Social Research (to be provided by RSAT)
  - o Project documents (to be provided by RSAT)
  - o Indicators and summary of monitoring data (to be provided by RSAT)
  - o Project progress and annual reports (to be provided by RSAT)
  - o Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation in Thailand, ILO  
[http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/---sro-bangkok/documents/publication/wcms\\_356950.pdf](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/---sro-bangkok/documents/publication/wcms_356950.pdf)
4. Required structure for the inception report  
Please consult Section 4.3 in the Guidelines for Baseline/Endline Data Collection and Final External Project Evaluations of the United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence against Women from the following link:  
[https://www.dropbox.com/s/zn0uqv020aoz1i1/EvaluationGuideline\\_en.pdf?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/s/zn0uqv020aoz1i1/EvaluationGuideline_en.pdf?dl=0)
5. Required structure for the evaluation report  
Please consult Section 4.4 in the Guidelines for Baseline/Endline Data Collection and Final External Project Evaluations of the United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence against Women from the following link:  
[https://www.dropbox.com/s/zn0uqv020aoz1i1/EvaluationGuideline\\_en.pdf?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/s/zn0uqv020aoz1i1/EvaluationGuideline_en.pdf?dl=0)

----- End of Record -----

## 2) Evaluation Matrix

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Questions</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Data Source and Data Collection Methods</b>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	1. To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs achieved and how?	<p>Whether the project achieved its targets for each project indicator</p> <p>Whether program leaders can explain how they achieved project goal, outcomes and outputs</p> <p>If targets were not met, program leaders' and RSAT staff's explanations of the barriers they faced</p>	<p>Results Monitoring Plan with actual endline data</p> <p>Project reports</p> <p>IDIs of program leaders</p> <p>KIIs of RSAT staff</p>
	2. To what extent did the project reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached?	Final monitoring database of project beneficiaries	Quantitative analysis of project monitoring data Project reports
	3. To what extent has this project generated positive changes in the lives of targeted (and untargeted) populations in relation to the specific forms of violence addressed by this project? Why? What are the key changes in the lives of those populations? Please describe those changes.	<p>Whether LBW and TGW beneficiaries report positive changes in their ability to respond to violence</p> <p>Whether LBW and TGW beneficiaries report other positive changes resulting from the program</p> <p>What key positive changes are reported</p>	IDIs with beneficiaries Quantitative online survey

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Data Source and Data Collection Methods
		Whether LBW and TGW beneficiaries are more aware of their human rights and can better identify human rights violations	
	4. What internal and external factors contributed to the achievement and/or failure of the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs? How?	For goal, outcomes and outputs, what are the explanations provided for failure to meet the project targets	IDIs with beneficiaries KIIs with external stakeholders and RSAT staff
	5. To what extent was the project strategy and activities implemented relevant in responding to the needs of the targeted populations?	Whether beneficiaries report that the program was relevant to their needs  Whether the program addressed issues identified in the baseline report	IDIs of beneficiaries Quantitative online survey Comparison of program components with issues identified in baseline reports IEC materials
Efficiency	6. To what extent do achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of the targeted populations?	Whether project goal, outcomes and outputs are aligned with the issues identified by LBW and TGW beneficiaries	IDIs of beneficiaries Quantitative online survey
	7. How efficiently and timely has this project been implemented and managed in accordance with the Project Document?	Whether project results were delivered as laid out by the Project Document	Results Monitoring Plan with actual endline data Project reports
Sustainability	8. How are the achieved results, especially the positive changes generated by the project in the lives of	Whether there are plans and resources committed to continue project activities	RSAT staff KIIs Government stakeholder KIIs

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Data Source and Data Collection Methods
	<p>the targeted populations at the project goal level, going to be sustained after this project ends?</p> <p>9. What is the likelihood or tendency of leading peer-educators, who have been trained in the project's capacity building sessions, to continue educating their peers after the project completion?</p>	<p>Whether project advocacy efforts have resulted in local or national-level legislation</p> <p>Whether the trend in the surveillance database shows increased reports of violence</p> <p>Whether there are current or planned activities involving the peer educators</p>	
Impact	<p>10. What are the unintended consequences (positive and negative) resulted from the project?</p>	<p>Whether participants report negative experiences as a result of participating in the project</p> <p>Whether positive experiences are reported by participants that are beyond those expected at the outset of the project; whether policy advocacy had results beyond those expected at the outset</p> <p>Whether there are reports of attitude changes among stakeholders</p>	<p>IDIs with participants; KIs with government and other NGOs</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Data Source and Collection Methods
	11. Has there been any change in attitude toward GBV issues and stigmatization among stakeholders?		
Knowledge Generation	12. What are the key lessons learned that can be shared with other practitioners on Ending Violence against Women, Girls and LBT women?	Whether there are lessons learned that can be shared with other practitioners	Project reports; KIIIs with project staff
	13. Are there any promising practices? If yes, what are they and how can these promising practices be replicated in other projects and/or in other countries that have similar interventions?	Whether there are project strategies that achieved effective results that can be replicated	



### 3) Results and Resources Framework (RRF)

Project Goal		
<b>Project Goal</b>	Lesbian and transgender women from four regions of Thailand experience greater freedom from violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity, and better access to assistance when violence does occur.	
<b>Form(s) and manifestation(s) of violence</b>	<p>Intimate partner violence - (Violence in the family)</p> <p>Psychological or emotional violence</p> <p>Non-partner violence - (Violence in the family)</p> <p>Psychological or emotional violence</p> <p>Sexual harassment and violence in public spaces/institutions - (Violence in the community)</p> <p>Violence in schools</p> <p>Violence in public spaces</p>	
<b>Beneficiaries at the Project Goal level</b>	Lesbian, bisexual, transgender	Number: 9,400
<b>Context</b>	Lesbian and transgender women do not understand the constitute of fundamental human rights, allowing violence, stigma and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity to happen to them without properly addressing them to relevant sectors and government agencies. There is still a limited number of lesbian and transgender women, who are adequately empowered to advocate for policy and social changes.	
<b>Expected situation of the beneficiaries</b>	Lesbian, bisexual, transgender	

	Lesbian and transgender women understand the concept of fundamental human rights and various forms of violence, stigma and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity and can address them properly with concerned sectors and relevant government agencies with clear advocacy action plan.
<b>Project Goal Indicators</b> (minimum 1 indicator and maximum 3 indicators, maximum 40 words per indicator)	<b>Data Collection Methods</b> (maximum 40 words)
<b>Indicator 1:</b> Increased % of lesbian and transgender women who can identify violence, stigma and discrimination, and human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity.	Pre- and post-training surveys and in-depth interviews.
<b>Indicator 2:</b> Increased % of lesbian and transgender women who indicate their capacity to seek assistance in case of violence, stigma and discrimination, and human rights violation based on sexual orientation and gender identity.	Pre- and post-training surveys and in-depth interviews.
<b>Indicator 3:</b> Perspectives of lesbian and transgender women on their resilience (ability to cope with, respond to and access to assistance) when dealing with violence, stigma and discrimination, and human rights violation based on sexual orientation and gender identity.	In-depth interviews.
<b>Outcome 1</b>	
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Groups of lesbian and transgender women have gained greater capacity to advocate for change in government policy and the broader society related to violence, stigma & discrimination and human right violation against women on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.	

<b>Outcome Indicators</b> (minimum 1 indicator and maximum 3 indicators, maximum 40 words per indicator)		<b>Data Collection Methods</b> (maximum 40 words)		
<b>Indicator 1.1:</b>	% of Lesbian and transgender women who report having confidence in addressing the issue of violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights with government agencies, relevant sectors and community members 3 months after the training.	Follow-up Questionnaire to participants.		
<b>Indicator 1.2:</b>	% of Lesbian and transgender women who report understanding violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights and know where to seek help when violence or human rights violations occur, after being reached by Outreach Worker and/or Peer-educator more than twice.	Outreach case record (form).		
<b>Indicator 1.3:</b>	Lesbian and transgender women who are reached by trained peer-leaders, peer-educators and volunteers have better understanding about fundamental human rights, violence, stigma and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity.	Focus groups.		
<b>*Beneficiaries at the outcome level</b>	<b>*Current situation of beneficiaries (baseline)</b>	<b>*Targeted no. of beneficiaries by project's end</b>		<b>*Expected situation of targeted beneficiaries at project's end</b>
		Estimated no. of institutions (if applicable)	Estimated no. of individuals (if applicable)	
<b>Beneficiary 1:</b> Lesbian, bisexual, transgender	Lesbian and transgender women experience violence, stigma and discrimination because they do not		9,600	Lesbian and transgender women realise that they do have rights and it is unacceptable to

	know their rights and think that this is what they deserve due to their different SOGI.					allow violence, stigma and discrimination based on SOGI. Also, they understand different forms of violence, stigma and discrimination that may come in different forms and are concealed in the social services and structures.
<b>Beneficiary 2:</b>						
<b>Beneficiary 3:</b>						
<b>*Strategic area of intervention for Outcome 1:</b>						
<b>Strategic area of intervention for Outcome 1 (OPTIONAL):</b>						
<b>Output 1.1</b>						
<b>Output 1.1</b>	<b>*Output Indicators (maximum of 3)</b>	<b>*Baseline per output indicator</b>	<b>*Annual Targets for each output indicator</b>			
			<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>	
			Number	Qualitative information	Number	Qualitative information
Lesbian and transgender women have better understanding about various forms of violence, stigma and	% of lesbian and transgender women who can clearly identify key fundamental human rights and different forms of violence, stigma and discrimination based on SOGI.	70%	300		640	660



<b>Key Project Activity 1.1.2:</b> Conduct community outreach by trained lesbian and transgender peer-leaders, peer-educators and volunteers to increase awareness.	Rainbow Association of Thailand	Sky of Thailand	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Rainbow Association of Thailand	Sky of Thailand	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Rainbow Association of Thailand	Sky of Thailand	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Rainbow Association of Thailand	Sky of Thailand	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Rainbow Association of Thailand	Sky of Thailand	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Rainbow Association of Thailand	Sky of Thailand	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Rainbow Association of Thailand	Sky of Thailand	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Rainbow Association of Thailand	Sky of Thailand	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Rainbow Association of Thailand	Sky of Thailand	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Rainbow Association of Thailand	Sky of Thailand	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>Output 1.2</b>																				
<b>Output 1.2</b>	<b>*Output (maximum of 3)</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>*Baseline per output indicator</b>	<b>*Annual Targets for each output indicator</b>																
				<b>Year 1</b>				<b>Year 2</b>				<b>Year 3</b>								
				Number	Qualitative information	Number	Qualitative information	Number	Qualitative information	Number	Qualitative information	Number	Qualitative information	Number	Qualitative information	Number	Qualitative information	Number	Qualitative information	Number
New lesbian and transgender women leaders report to have more confidence in using advocacy tools	% of trained lesbian and transgender women who report to have more confidence in using advocacy tools and communicate with relevant government	50%	300			640						660								



		*Baseline per output indicator	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3						
*Output Indicators (maximum of 3)			Number	Qualitative information	Number	Qualitative information	Number	Qualitative information					
Working groups of lesbian women and transgender women are formed with clear advocacy strategy to communicate with relevant government agencies.	Number of working groups of lesbian women and transgender women formed with clear advocacy strategy to communicate with relevant government agencies	One lesbian working group and one transgender working group in each of 4 regions of Thailand	8		8	8 lesbian and transgender groups are still functional from Year I.	8	8 lesbian and transgender groups are still functional from Year I.					
*Strategy for Output 1.3:													
Activities													
*Description of key project activities	*Responsible Party(ies)	*Time Frame											
		Year 1				Year 2			Year 3				
		PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4	PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4	PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4
Key Project Activity 1.3.1: Conduct lesbian and transgender	Rainbow Association Thailand Rainbow Sky of Sky	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



transgender women working group meeting	Association of Thailand Northern Regional Center of Ubon Ratchathani Rainbow Sky Lampoon Rainbow Sky Songkhla																		
<b>Outcome 2</b>																			
<b>Outcome 2:</b> RSAT has strengthened an existing monitoring and reporting surveillance system that provides a more effective platform for prompting government agencies to provide the appropriate response to cases of violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in four areas of Thailand.																			
<b>Outcome Indicators</b> (minimum 1 indicator and maximum 3 indicators, maximum 40 words per indicator)										<b>Data Collection Methods</b> (maximum 40 words)									
<b>Indicator</b> Perspectives of RSAT's relevant staff and stakeholders from the government agencies and within the community on the surveillance system.										<b>2.1:</b> In-depth interviews/Focus group discussion.									
<b>Indicator</b> The National Human Rights Commission has a clear designated focal point to proceed cases/petitions from RSAT.										<b>2.2:</b> Program statistics/case studies									
<b>Indicator 2.3:</b>																			
<b>*Beneficiaries at the outcome level</b>					<b>*Current situation of beneficiaries (baseline)</b>					<b>*Targeted no. of beneficiaries by project's end</b>					<b>*Expected situation of targeted beneficiaries at project's end</b>				



	*Output Indicators (maximum of 3)	*Baseline per output indicator	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3							
			Number	Qualitative information	Number	Qualitative information	Number	Qualitative information						
RSAT surveillance and reporting system to record and report cases of violence, stigma and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity is strengthened, systematic and functional.	Surveillance system is created and generates project reports quarterly	Program report		of the reported cases		of the reported cases		of the reported cases						
	Description of RSAT surveillance and reporting system to record and report cases of violence, stigma and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity is documented in a user manual	Program report	1	Description of this mechanism in the report	1	Description of this mechanism in the report	1	Description of this mechanism in the report						
*Strategy for Output 2.1:			ISD: Creating community-based protection systems											
Activities														
*Description of key project activities	*Responsible Party(ies)	*Time Frame												
			Year 1			Year 2			Year 3					
			PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4	PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4	PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4

<b>Key Project Activity 2.1.1:</b> Establish online system to receive petitions and monitor cases of violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violation	Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>Key Project Activity 2.1.2:</b> Establish hotline (telephone) system to receive petitions and monitor cases of violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violation	Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>Outcome 3</b>																			
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Government agencies and the National Human Rights Commission in Thailand increase their awareness and improve their responsiveness to cases of violence and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.																			
<b>Outcome Indicators</b> (minimum 1 indicator and maximum 3 indicators, maximum 40 words per indicator)										<b>Data Collection Methods</b> (maximum 40 words)									
<b>Indicator</b> Perspectives of lesbian, transgender women and stakeholders from relevant government agencies on the utility of IEC materials to assist their dialogue or advocacy on violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violation based on SOGI.										In-depth interviews/Focus group discussion.									
<b>Indicator</b> % of lesbian and transgender women who report that the IEC materials assist their dialogue or advocacy or help boost their confidence for the response.										End line Questionnaire.									

Indicator 3.3:				
*Beneficiaries at the outcome level	*Current situation of beneficiaries (baseline)	*Targeted no. of beneficiaries by project's end		*Expected situation of targeted beneficiaries at project's end
		Estimated no. of <u>institutions</u> (if applicable)	Estimated no. of <u>individuals</u> (if applicable)	
<b>Beneficiary 1:</b> Lesbian, bisexual, transgender	Lesbian and transgender women do not understand human rights and therefore do not realise when they are experiencing violence, stigma and discrimination based on SOGI.		9,600	Lesbian and transgender women have better understanding of human rights and can respond to violence, stigma and discrimination based on SOGI and can use this information to effectively request for appropriate responses and influence changes.
<b>Beneficiary 2:</b>				
<b>Beneficiary 3:</b>				
*Strategic area of intervention for Outcome 3:		Preventing Violence		
Strategic area of intervention for Outcome 3 (OPTIONAL):		Strengthening Institutional Responses		
Output 3.1				

Output 3.1	*Output Indicators (maximum of 3)	*Baseline per output indicator	*Annual Targets for each output indicator						
			Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		
			Number	Qualitative information	Number	Qualitative information	Number	Qualitative information	
RSAT increases the number and quality of IEC tools and data available for advocacy and awareness-raising among policy makers and the general public.	Perspectives of stakeholders about how the IEC materials have changed knowledge and awareness of violence based on SOGI among policy makers or the general public.	In-depth interview	5,000	in-depth interviews		5,000		5,000	in-depth interviews
	Perspectives of lesbian and transgender women who report to have seen or used the IEC materials from the program.	End questionnaire		questionnaire			questionnaire		questionnaire
*Strategy for Output 3.1:			PV: Public outreach/awareness-raising						
Activities									
*Description of key project activities	*Responsible Party(ies)	*Time Frame							
			Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		

		PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4	PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4	PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4	PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4
<b>Key Project Activity</b> <b>3.1.1:</b> Produce IEC materials to address the issues of violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violation	Rainbow Association of Thailand		✓			✓								✓			
<b>Output 3.2</b>																	
<b>Output 3.2</b>	<b>*Output Indicators (maximum of 3)</b>	<b>*Baseline per output indicator</b>	<b>*Annual Targets for each output indicator</b>														
			<b>Year 1</b>			<b>Year 2</b>			<b>Year 3</b>								
			Number	Qualitative information		Number	Qualitative information		Number	Qualitative information		Number	Qualitative information		Number	Qualitative information	
RSAT has strengthened their dialogue with the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security and the National Human	Number and types of actions taken by government agencies to improve their response to cases of violence as a result of dialogue with RSAT.	N/A	1	Detailed description in the progress report		1	Detailed description in the progress report		1	Detailed description in the progress report							
	Perspectives of stakeholders from RSAT about changes in the level of open dialogue with key	N/A		in-depth interviews			in-depth interviews			in-depth interviews						in-depth interviews	

Rights Commission.	government agencies about SOGI as a result of project supported activities.													
*Strategy for Output 3.2:		PV: Advocacy												
Activities														
*Description of key project activities		*Responsible Party(ies)	*Time Frame											
			Year 1				Year 2				Year 3			
			PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4	PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4	PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4
Key Project Activity 3.2.1: Organize regular project meetings with stakeholders	Rainbow Association of Thailand	Sky of	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and Audit Activities														
M&E														
		*Time Frame (?)												



*Description of key M&E activities	*Responsible Party(ies)	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3			
		PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4	PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4	PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4
<b>Key M&amp;E activity 1:</b> Conduct a final external project evaluation	Rainbow Association Thailand											✓	✓
<b>Key M&amp;E activity 2:</b> Conduct baseline assessment on current violence, discrimination and human rights violation based on SOGI.	Rainbow Association Thailand		✓										
<b>Key M&amp;E activity 3:</b> Establish M & E committee and conduct annual review of current performance using Appreciative Inquiry	Rainbow Association Thailand		✓						✓			✓	
<b>Audit</b>													
<b>*Key Audit activities</b>	<b>Responsible Party(ies)</b> <sup>(*)</sup>	<b>*Time Frame (?)</b>											
		<b>Year 1</b>				<b>Year 2</b>				<b>Year 3</b>			
		PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4	PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4	PQ1	PQ2	PQ3	PQ4



#### 4) Final version of Results Monitoring Plan

A. Statement of Project Goal, Outcomes and Outputs	B. Indicators for measuring progress towards achieving the project goal, outcomes and outputs	C. Data collection methods	D. Baseline Data Please provide actual baseline data per indicator	E. Timeline of baseline data collection For each indicator listed in column B, when was BASELINE data collected? Please specify month/year.	F. Endline Data Please provide actual endline data per indicator	G. Timeline of endline data collection For each indicator listed in column B, when was endline data collected? Please specify month/year. <sup>27</sup>
<b>Project Goal:</b> Lesbian and transgender women from four regions of Thailand experience greater freedom from violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity, and better access to assistance when violence does occur.	<b>Indicator 1:</b> % of lesbian and transgender women surveyed who can identify violence, stigma and discrimination, and human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity.	Pre- and post-training surveys and in-depth interviews.	<sup>28</sup>		38	
	<b>Indicator 2:</b> % of lesbian and transgender women who indicate their capacity to seek assistance in case of violence, stigma and discrimination, and human rights violation based on sexual orientation and gender identity.	Pre- and post-training surveys and in-depth interviews.	<sup>2</sup>		32	
	<b>Indicator 3:</b> Perspectives of lesbian and transgender women on their resilience (ability to cope with, respond to and access to assistance) when dealing with violence, stigma and discrimination, and human rights violation	In-depth interviews.	<sup>2</sup>		According to Section: Voices from the Field, LBW and TGW indicate the increased capacity on their resilience due to their increased knowledge, skill and changes in their attitudes, self-esteem and perception on GBV, S&E and HRV.	

<sup>27</sup> No dates are given for data collection in RSAT reports. The final report covers the period up to December 31, 2017.

<sup>28</sup> Baseline figures for goal indicators are blank in RSAT reports.

A. Statement of Project Goal, Outcomes and Outputs	B. Indicators for measuring progress towards achieving the project goal, outcomes and outputs	C. Data collection methods	D. Baseline Data Please provide actual baseline data per indicator	E. Timeline of baseline data collection For each indicator listed in column B, when was BASELINE data collected? Please specify month/year.	F. Endline Data Please provide actual endline data per indicator	G. Timeline of endline data collection For each indicator listed in column B, when was endline data collected? Please specify month/year. <sup>27</sup>
	based on sexual orientation and gender identity.					
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Groups of lesbian and transgender women have gained greater capacity to advocate for change in government policy and the broader society related to violence, stigma and discrimination and human rights' violations against women on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.	<b>Indicator 1.1:</b> % of Lesbian and transgender women surveyed who report having addressed (or feeling able or equipped to address) the issue of violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights with government agencies, relevant sectors and community members 3 months after the training.	Follow-up Questionnaire to participants.	<sup>29</sup>		78	
	<b>Indicator 1.2:</b> Proportion of Lesbian and transgender women surveyed who report to experience violence or human rights violations occur and seek assistance, after being reached by Outreach Worker and/or Peer-educator more than twice.	Outreach case record (form).	<sup>3</sup>		40	
	<b>Indicator 1.3:</b> Perspectives of Lesbian and transgender women who are reached by trained peer-leaders, peer-educators and volunteers about their understanding of fundamental human rights,	Focus groups.	<sup>30</sup>		LBW and TGW who have been reached by trained peer-leaders, peer-educators and volunteers have indicated their improved knowledge, new attitudes, confidence to live their lives. Please refer to	

<sup>29</sup> Baseline figures for outcome indicators are blank in RSAT reports.

<sup>30</sup> Baseline figures for outcome indicators are blank in RSAT reports.

A. Statement of Project Goal, Outcomes and Outputs	B. Indicators for measuring progress towards achieving the project goal, outcomes and outputs	C. Data collection methods	D. Baseline Data Please provide actual baseline data per indicator	E. Timeline of baseline data collection For each indicator listed in column B, when was BASELINE data collected? Please specify month/year.	F. Endline Data Please provide actual endline data per indicator	G. Timeline of endline data collection For each indicator listed in column B, when was endline data collected? Please specify month/year. <sup>31</sup>
	violence, stigma and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity and their confidence and capacity to address it.				the Section: Voices from the Field for more details.	
<b>Outcome 2:</b> RSAT has strengthened an existing monitoring and reporting surveillance system that provides a more effective platform for prompting government agencies to provide the appropriate response to cases of violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in four areas of Thailand.	<b>Indicator 2.1:</b> Perspectives of RSAT's relevant staff and the stakeholders from the government agencies and within the community on the effectiveness of the surveillance system		4		Based on feedback from the program team, our surveillance system is functional and is being administered by our M&E Unit. The results are presented in monthly meeting and are used for program improvement.	
	<b>Indicator 2.2:</b> Number of cases of violence, stigma and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity recorded in RSAT and proportion referred to the NHRC		4		Although the situation of the National Human Rights Commission is uncertain, RSAT has been officially renewed as a human rights organization legally registered by NHRC. We are planning to nominate a community leader to candidate for a national human rights commissioner.	
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Government agencies and the National Human Rights Commission in Thailand increase their awareness	<b>Indicator 3.1:</b> Perspectives of lesbian, transgender women and stakeholders from relevant government agencies on the		31		In our project, we have distributed our produced IEC material on Facebook, outreach activities and our hotline/online services. LBW	

<sup>31</sup> Baseline figures are blank for outcome indicators in RSAT reports.

A. Statement of Project Goal, Outcomes and Outputs	B. Indicators for measuring progress towards achieving the project goal, outcomes and outputs	C. Data collection methods	D. Baseline Data Please provide actual baseline data per indicator	E. Timeline of baseline data collection For each indicator listed in column B, when was BASELINE data collected? Please specify month/year.	F. Endline Data Please provide actual endline data per indicator	G. Timeline of endline data collection For each indicator listed in column B, when was endline data collected? Please specify month/year. <sup>27</sup>
and improve their responsiveness to cases of violence and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.	utility of IEC materials to assist their dialogue or advocacy on violence, stigma, discrimination and human rights violation based on SOGI.				and TGW exposed to our program have increase relevant knowledge and skills to overcome their self-stigma and then effectively advocate others. Please refer to Section 3.12 and Voices from the Field.	
	<b>Indicator 3.2:</b> % of lesbian and transgender women who report that the IEC materials have assisted their dialogue or advocacy		5		There was 78.2 % of LBW and TGW who report that they have increased confidence in advocacy, although it is not clear whether to what extent this is attributed to the exposure of IEC materials but there is an increase of 28.2%.	
<b>Output 1.1</b> Lesbian and transgender women have better understanding about various forms of violence, stigma and discrimination and the concept of fundamental human rights and know how to respond to human right violations in the existing channel.	% of lesbian and transgender women who can clearly identify key fundamental human rights and different forms of violence, stigma and discrimination based on SOGI.		N/A		78	
	% of lesbian and transgender women reached by trained program staff, peer- leaders, peer-educators and volunteers indicate their increased knowledge and understanding in different forms of violence, stigma and discrimination based on SOGI.		N/A		79	
<b>Output 1.2:</b>	% of trained lesbian and transgender women		N/A		78	

A. Statement of Project Goal, Outcomes and Outputs	B. Indicators for measuring progress towards achieving the project goal, outcomes and outputs	C. Data collection methods	D. Baseline Data Please provide actual baseline data per indicator	E. Timeline of baseline data collection For each indicator listed in column B, when was BASELINE data collected? Please specify month/year.	F. Endline Data Please provide actual endline data per indicator	G. Timeline of endline data collection For each indicator listed in column B, when was endline data collected? Please specify month/year. <sup>27</sup>
New lesbian and transgender women leaders report to have more confidence in using advocacy tools and communicating with relevant government agencies for policy development and change	surveyed who report to have more confidence in using advocacy tools to communicate with relevant government agencies for policy development and change					
New lesbian and transgender women leaders report to have more confidence in using advocacy tools and communicating with relevant government agencies for policy development and change	% of trained lesbian and transgender women surveyed who plan to use the advocacy tools to communicate with relevant government agencies for policy development and change		N/A		72	
<b>Output 1.3</b> Working groups of lesbian women and transgender women are formed with clear advocacy strategy to communicate with relevant government agencies.	Number of working groups of lesbian women and transgender women formed Proportion of working groups of lesbian women and transgender women formed with a clear advocacy strategy to communicate with relevant government agencies and sectors.		1		8	
			N/A		4	
<b>Output 2.1:</b> RSAT surveillance and reporting system to record and report cases of violence, stigma and discrimination based on	Existence of a surveillance system and number of project report generated		N/A		The system is currently functional and is administered by RSAT M&E Unit. Please refer to Issues/Challenges section.	

A. Statement of Project Goal, Outcomes and Outputs	B. Indicators for measuring progress towards achieving the project goal, outcomes and outputs	C. Data collection methods	D. Baseline Data Please provide actual baseline data per indicator	E. Timeline of baseline data collection For each indicator listed in column B, when was BASELINE data collected? Please specify month/year.	F. Endline Data Please provide actual endline data per indicator	G. Timeline of endline data collection For each indicator listed in column B, when was endline data collected? Please specify month/year. <sup>27</sup>
sexual orientation and gender identity is strengthened, systematic and functional.	Existence of a documented description of RSAT surveillance mechanism and reporting system to record and report cases of violence, stigma and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity		N/A		The mechanism is already in place and was included in the report last year.	
<b>Outcome 3.1:</b> RSAT increases the number and quality of IEC tools and data available for advocacy and awareness- raising among policy makers and the general public.	Perspectives of stakeholders about how the IEC materials have changed knowledge and awareness of violence based on SOGI among policy makers or the general public.		N/A		We have observations based on Ardhanareswara Award that senior staff in the MSDHS understand more about SOGI through a series of committee meetings.	
	Perspectives of lesbian and transgender women who report to have seen or used the IEC materials from the program.		N/A		65 persons were followed up after three and six months after exposure to the program. Please see more details in the section for Voices from the Field in which IEC materials contribute to improved understanding and capacity of women to respond to violence.	
	Number of IEC tools and materials produced and disseminated by type for advocacy and awareness raising		N/A		Nothing to report during this period. The new sets of IEC materials are planned to be produced in the second half of this year. However, please refer to Annex 4: Semi-Final DRAFT of the training curriculum (Thai language). It is being finalized and then translated into English.	



A. Statement of Project Goal, Outcomes and Outputs	B. Indicators for measuring progress towards achieving the project goal, outcomes and outputs	C. Data collection methods	D. Baseline Data Please provide actual baseline data per indicator	E. Timeline of baseline data collection For each indicator listed in column B, when was BASELINE data collected? Please specify month/year.	F. Endline Data Please provide actual endline data per indicator	G. Timeline of endline data collection For each indicator listed in column B, when was endline data collected? Please specify month/year. <sup>27</sup>
<b>Output 3.2</b> RSAT has strengthened their dialogue with the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security and the National Human Rights Commission.	Perspectives of stakeholders from RSAT about changes in the level of open dialogue with key government agencies about SOGI as a result of project supported activities.		N/A		Stakeholders were more sensitized on the issues of sexual orientation and gender identity	
RSAT has strengthened their dialogue with the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security and the National Human Rights Commission.	Number of meetings between RSAT and the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security and other relevant agencies (measured through documented minutes.)				In this reporting period, RSAT board members/senior staff are permanent members in the following committee.  1. National Committee on Gender-based Discrimination 2. National Committee on judging gender-based discrimination cases 3. Sub-committee on research under the National Committee on Gender-based Discrimination An example of the minute in Thai language is attached in Annex 2.	

## 5) Beneficiary Data Sheet

Beneficiary group	The number of beneficiaries reached	
	At the project goal level	At the outcome level
Female domestic workers		
Female migrant workers		
Female political activists/human rights defenders		
Female sex workers		
Female refugees/internally displaced/asylum seekers		
Indigenous women/from ethnic groups		
Lesbian, bisexual, transgender	14,260	
Women and girls in general		
Women/girls with disabilities		
Women/girls living with HIV and AIDS		
Women/girls survivors of violence		
Women prisoners		

Others (specify)			
<b>Primary Beneficiary Total</b>			
Civil society organizations (including NGOs)	Number of institutions reached	NA	
	Number of individuals reached	NA	
Community-based groups/members	Number of groups reached	NA	
	Number of individuals reached	NA	
Educational professionals (i.e. teachers, educators)		NA	
Faith-based organizations	Number of institutions reached	NA	
	Number of individuals reached	NA	
General public/community at large		NA	
Government officials (i.e. decision makers, policy implementers)		NA	
Health professionals		NA	
Journalists/Media		NA	
Legal officers (i.e. lawyers, prosecutors, judges)		NA	
Men and/or boys		NA	
Parliamentarians		NA	

Private sector employers	NA	
Social/welfare workers	NA	
Uniformed personnel (i.e. police, military, peace-keeping officers)	NA	
Others (specify)	NA	
<b>Secondary Beneficiary Total</b>	NA	

## 6) Additional methodology-related documentation

### Information Sheet for LBW/TGW

**Project Title:** External Evaluation of Project “The Empowerment and Capacity Building of Lesbian and Transgender Women to Mitigate Violence, Stigma and Discrimination based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity”

**Principal Investigator:** Dr. Kerry Richter, PhD

**Significance and objectives of this study:** We are doing a study about lesbian women/transgender women in several cities in Thailand. The objective of the study is to learn about the challenges that lesbian and transgender women face in their daily lives with regard to human rights, stigma and discrimination. The information that we gather will be used to help develop a program for women like you to address the human rights violations, stigma and discrimination that they face.

**Methods:** This study is research. The interviewer will speak to you about your life as a lesbian woman living in this community. This will take about 60-90 minutes of your time. Your answers will help us to improve the lives of lesbian women in your community.

**Procedures:** There will be 3 steps in this study, which are:

1. We will explain what you have to do if you join the research study. We will read the informed consent form to you. After you have all your questions answered, we will ask if you want to join and ask you to sign the consent form. Your decision is totally voluntary. After you decide, we will give you a copy of the consent form to keep.
2. If you want to join this research study, you will sit together with an interviewer who will ask you some questions. You will be asked about your background and your life as a lesbian woman. It will take about 60-75 minutes to complete the interview.
3. We would like to ask you to recruit two of your friends who are lesbian women to also participate in the study. These should be women who identify as a lesbian and who have not been previously recruited for the study. We will ask you to contact these women about the study and, if they agree, you will give them our contact information.

### Cost and payment

You will get 400 baht to compensate you for your time for the interview. If you have transportation costs, we can reimburse you (up to 200 baht).

**Benefits of participation:**

You may not receive direct benefits from this study. But your answers will help us learn how to improve programs for women like you.

**Confidentiality and privacy**

We will keep your answers confidential. We do not need to know your name. Your answers will not be discussed with anyone.

We will ask your permission to record the interview so that we can remember your answers clearly. If you do not feel comfortable having the interview recorded, that is fine. The transcript of the interview and the interviewer's notes will be kept confidential at our research office in a locked cabinet. No one can trace back your answers to you. You will not be identified in any way. No one but the researchers will be able to access this information. All of the information from the project will be presented to others as grouped data, so your answers will never be seen.

**Risk and discomforts of participation**

This study may bring you discomfort because we will ask you some very personal questions about your sexual identity and your past experiences with violence, stigma and discrimination. Some questions may make you feel bad and awkward. If you do not want to answer any questions, you do not have to. You can end the interview at any time.

If you wish to receive information about resources in your community that can help you to cope with violence, stigma and discrimination, we can give you a list of these resources.

**Right to refuse or withdraw**

Your participation in the study is totally up to you. You have total right and freedom to join this study. You can decline to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. You are also free to leave the interview at any time. If you do not wish to take part in this research, we will keep your decision confidential. What you choose will not have any consequences for you.

**People to contact about this program**

You can come to the research site and talk to Khun Karen if you want to know more about this research or if you have questions about the study later, or you may think you might be harmed by being in the study. Then you can ask us to contact Dr. Dusita Phuengsamran at 02-441-0201-4 x606.

You can contact Khun Karen if you have questions about your rights as a research subject. They will contact Dr. Pramote Prasertkul, Chair of the Institutional Review Board, at 02-5918251 for you.

Thank you in advance for joining our study.

## Informed Consent Form for Lesbian Women

**Project Title:** External Evaluation of Project “The Empowerment and Capacity Building of Lesbian and Transgender Women to Mitigate Violence, Stigma and Discrimination based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity”

**Date of consent** \_\_\_\_\_

Before signing, the staff told me the research details. The staff told me the goal, the process, the dangers or discomfort I may have, and benefits I will get. And I understand it all clearly.

The staff agreed to answer all my questions truly and frankly. **They have agreed to give me information about resources available in my community to help me cope with violence, stigma and discrimination if I request it.**

I know that my participation is voluntary. I do not have to take part in this research if I do not wish to. My decision will not be revealed or reported to anyone.

I know that I can leave the interview whenever I want.

I understand that all my answers are kept secret between the research staff and me. All data will be presented without identifying anyone interviewed.

I clearly understood it all information above. I am signing this document with my consent.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Witness)



**List of resources given to respondents if they need to seek assistance:**

- ◆ RSAT in Bangkok, Ubon Ratchathani, and Songkhla
- ◆ RSAT and M Plus in Chiang Mai
- ◆ Office of Provincial Social Development and Human Security offices in the study provinces
- ◆ Office of Provincial Health Office in the study provinces

## Guideline for in-depth interviews

### Part 1: Personal characteristics

- 1.1 How old are you?
- 1.2 Are you from this city? If not, from what province/city are you? And for how long have you moved to this province?
- 1.3 Who do you currently live with? (Family, friend, partner, alone, etc.) (For those who moved into this province : who did you live with at your origin)
- 1.4 What is the highest level of education that you have achieved?
- 1.5 What is your current occupation? Where do you work? (If not working ) What is your source of income, spending money?

### Part 2: Gender identity / sexual orientation

*Intro: Now we would like to ask about your sexual identity and sexual orientation, We would like to understand how do you define yourself and if you ever change your sexual orientation*

- 2.1 How do you define yourself now, in terms of your gender identity or sexual orientation?
- 2.2 Have you ever change your SOGI from something else?
- 2.3 With whom do you disclose your SOGI (ask one by one)? For those whom do you not share your SOGI with, please tell me the reason

Family

Friends I school, college, University

Friend with same SOGI

Colleagues

General people

2.4 Now I'd like to ask you about your sexual/romantic partners. Currently do you have any regular partner(s)? Does this partner fit your preference for a sexual/romantic partner? How about in the past, can you tell me about your past partners?

### **Part 3: Social network and friends**

3.1 Do you have friends who are the same orientation/Gender identity as you?

- If yes, who are they? (e.g. friends from school, college, in same community, social network) How many of them are you still contacting with? How many of them you define as your close friends?

3.2 How difference in number of your friends who have the same SOGI and who do not?

3.3 What activities do you do have with these same SOGI friend, Parties, hangouts, meeting, just networks, etc.: How often do you get together?

3.4 Are you a member of group/organization set up for activities related to people who are lesbian/TG? This includes group in social network or web site.

3.5 If yes, do you ever do activities such as advocacy with these group/organization?

### **Part 4: Awareness of human rights**

4.1 If I say the term "human rights" to you, can you tell me what it means? (*open-ended*)

4.2 Do Thai citizens have human rights that are protected by law?

4.2.1 *Yes:* Can you tell me what these rights are? Anything else? (*ask respondent to keep listing them until she doesn't know any more*) And do you know what law protects these rights?

4.2.2 *No:* What makes you say that Thai citizens do not have any human rights protected by law?

4.2.3. *Don't know:* Go to 4.3

4.3 OK let me give you some examples of some human rights. These are rights that are recognized internationally. And then for each one I'll ask you again if Thai citizens have these human rights protected by law. *If respondent answered "yes" in 4.2.1 and clearly stated the right listed below, do not need to ask again.*

4.3.1. The right to equal access to health care services: This means that any Thai citizen can get health care services without discrimination based on their personal characteristics such as their sex, age, socioeconomic status, occupation, gender identity or sexual orientation, and that all Thai citizens should be treated with dignity by health care providers.

- a. Do all Thai citizens have this right protected by law?
- b. Do you think that (LW/TGW) have this right in current Thai society? Why/why not?

4.3.2. The right to equal access to government services: This means that any Thai citizen can get the government services that they are entitled to without discrimination based on their personal characteristics such as their sex, age, socioeconomic status, occupation, gender identity or sexual orientation, and that all Thai citizens should be treated with dignity by those who provide government services.

- a. Do all Thai citizens have this right protected by law?
- b. Do you think that (LW/TGW) have this right in current Thai society? Why/why not?

4.3.3. The right to equal access to education: This means that any Thai citizen can get education without discrimination based on their personal characteristics such as their sex, age, socioeconomic status, occupation, gender identity or sexual orientation, and that all Thai citizens should be treated with dignity by teachers, professors and educational officials.

- a. Do all Thai citizens have this right protected by law?
- b. Do you think that (LW/TGW) have this right in current Thai society? Why/why not?

4.3.4. The right to equal access to employment: This means that any Thai citizen should be able to obtain employment without discrimination based on their personal characteristics such as their sex, age, gender identity or sexual orientation, and that all Thai citizens should be treated with dignity by employers. *Note: do not confuse this right with the fact that people have different qualifications for employment e.g. two people with equal qualifications but different individual characteristics should be treated equally.*

- a. Do all Thai citizens have this right protected by law?
- b. Do you think that (LW/TGW) have this right in current Thai society? Why/why not?

4.3.5. The right to equal protection by the law: This means that any Thai citizen should be protected against violence based on their personal characteristics such as their sex, age, socioeconomic status, occupation, gender identity or sexual orientation, and that all Thai citizens should be treated with dignity by law enforcement officials.

- a. Do all Thai citizens have this right protected by law?
- b. Do you think that (LW/TGW) have this right in current Thai society? Why/why not?

4.3.6 The right to marry and have a family: This means that all Thai citizens may marry, may bear or sire children and may adopt children, regardless of their personal characteristics such as their sex, age, socioeconomic status, occupation, gender identity or sexual orientation.

- a. Do all Thai citizens have this right protected by law?
- b. Do you think that (LW/TGW) have this right in current Thai society? Why/why not?

## **Part 5: Stigma and discrimination**

5. We have discussed human rights in various areas, whether Thai citizens have these rights, and whether individuals are treated differently based on their personal characteristics. When individuals are not allowed the same rights as others because of their personal characteristics, it is called discrimination. For example, if a health care center did not allow access to TGW/LW, that would be discrimination. However, sometimes people show their judgement and negative attitude towards people based on their personal

characteristics even when they do not discriminate against them. This negative judgment is called stigma or stigmatization. For example, if TGW/LW are allowed to access a health care center but are not treated well by the health care providers, for example through negative comments, judgment about lifestyle, etc., this is stigmatization.

5.1a Have you ever been stigmatized in any aspect of your life because you are an LW/TGW? (open-ended)? Please tell me about it.

5.1b What did you do in response to this stigmatization? How did you feel?

5.1c Any other types of stigma that you have experienced? (*continue open-ended question until there is no more*)

5.1d. Just to make sure that we have discussed all of times that you may have experienced stigma, I would like to also ask you about: general life, using health service, employment/work; justice/law/policy; other government service; social welfare government; living arrangement; education; family/marriage/having child/ adopt; insurance. (ask about each aspect that has not already been mentioned)

5.1e Before leaving this topic, I'd like to ask one more thing. Sometimes we feel stigmatized even though no-one is actively doing anything to stigmatize us. For example, we don't even try to apply for a job that we want because we think no-one hire someone like us, in health services, and we are afraid of being treated badly, education, employment etc.? . Have you ever felt like this?

## **Part 6: Seeking for helps**

6.1 For those who **EVER** experienced some forms of violence, stigma, or discrimination:

6.1.1 For each of experiences on violence, stigma, or discrimination you had, had you ever sought for helps or counselling from someone (like your friends, colleagues, family or other people)? How? What kind of help did you seek for (counselling, sheltering, legal aid, etc.)

6.1.2 In case you never sought for any help for any events, why? And, if you chose not to seek for help for some issues/incidences, why?

6.1.3 Is there any of these violence, stigma, or discrimination still going on? How are you dealing with it?

6.2 For those who **NEVER** experienced some forms of violence, stigma, or discrimination:

6.2.1 Is there any chance you provided any form of help for some of your friends, colleagues, or know people who are lesbian or transgendered and who had experienced some forms of violence, stigma, or discrimination? Tell me what kind of experiences and how did you help them?

6.2.1 Do you know any individual, organizations, groups, or community-based organization providing helps, counselling or assistance for lesbian or transgendered who had experienced some forms of violence, stigma, or discrimination? Name those you know.

## **Part 7: Participation in and awareness of RSAT-UN Women activities**

7.1 Have you ever participate in any activities (such as trainings, workshops, campaigns) organized under the project of RSAT-UN Women which mainly focusing on rights of lesbian and transgendered? Tell me what the activities are and when did you participate in, and for how long?

7.2 Have you ever talk individually with any of RSAT-UN Women staff or peer educator, either during the activities you participated in or before and after that?

7.3 Overall, how do you feel about the activities of this RSAT-UN Women project? And, how do you feel about the RSAT-UN Women staff or peer educator – knowledge they have to provide during the activities, the helps they give in case you ever need, the enthusiastic, motivation, etc.

7.4 Have you ever seen media or campaign of this project – electronic media, printed media, posters, messages through social media, etc.? Explain what you have seen and how do you think about those media.

7.5 What are the key messages you think this project have been trying to communicate with lesbian and transgendered community and overall society?

- SOGI

- Human rights, gender-based violence, stigma and discrimination
- Sources of assistance for lesbian and transgendered who experienced some forms of violence, stigma, or discrimination

7.6 How do you think about the messages you got from the project's staff or peer educator – precise, useful, etc.?

7.7 Learning from this project, do you think you can better handle with any forms of violence, stigma, or discrimination that may happen to you or people you know? How?

Thank you



## key informant interview guide:

### **For government, international organizations and NGOs:**

1. Job responsibilities and relevance to SOGI issues:
  - a. Please describe your current job responsibilities, especially those related to sexual diversity issues.
  - b. Is the nature of your work academic, planning and policy, services or other?
  - c. Please give examples of activities or work done in relation to gender diversity issues.
2. SOGI situation in the area
  - a. Please describe the situation regarding sexual diversity in your area.
  - b. Would you say that there are many persons having sexual diversity in your area, an average number, or just a few?
  - c. Please give me an idea of the identity, expression and acceptance of people in the area.
  - d. How about the level of discrimination situations, stigma, and/or violence, or other expressions of disapproval of persons with sexual diversity in the area? Do you hear about these, and could you give me some examples?
3. Do you and / or your organization have activities addressing issues that arise in the area of sexual diversity in the area? What is the current activity or operation?
4. Rainbow Sky Activity Recognition (Focus on UNWOMEN Project)
  - a. Do you know of any projects that work with lesbian and transgender women in your area?
  - b. (If Rainbow Sky not mentioned) Have you heard of the Rainbow Sky program offering activities for LBW and TGW in your area? (Explain the project)
  - c. Have you ever had a chance to attend an event or participate in any activity of this project?
  - d. If yes, what did you think about the program? What do you think is the key objective of this program? Do you think that the program is effective at achieving this objective? Why or why not?
  - e. Do you think that this project can provide the knowledge needed to support LBW and TGW in the area? Is the knowledge set consistent with the situation in the area?
  - f. What are some suggestions to improve the activities of this project?

### **For RSAT staff:**

1. Please describe your role in the RSAT project.

- a. What was your experience in working with Rainbow Sky? Was the training given by the program sufficient for you to run the program activities? How could the training be improved?
  - b. Did RSAT provide the resources, information, and support that you needed to run the project activities? Please give examples.
2. From your perspective, what were the objectives of the RSAT project?
  - a. From your perspective, was the program effective at achieving those objectives? Why or why not? Please give examples.
3. To what extent has this project generated positive changes in the lives of TGW and LBW that participated?
  - a. One of the main objectives of the project was to address discrimination in the lives of LBW and TGW. Do you think that the program provided support and resources for participants to address discrimination that they face? Why or why not? What are the key changes in the lives of those populations? Please describe those changes.
  - b. Another objectives of the project was to address stigma in the lives of LBW and TGW. Do you think that the program provided support and resources for participants to address stigma that they face? Why or why not? What are the key changes in the lives of those populations? Please describe those changes.
  - c. Another objectives of the project was to address violence in the lives of LBW and TGW. Do you think that the program provided support and resources for participants to address violence that they face? Why or why not? What are the key changes in the lives of those populations? Please describe those changes.
4. We would like to know about your perspective of the factors that contributed to the achievement and/or failure of the project at reaching its objectives.
  - a. First what are the internal factors that you think contributed to the project's success or failure? These are factors having to do with the way the project was structured and/or the way that it was managed by RSAT.
  - b. Second what are the external factors that you think contributed to the project's success or failure? These are factors outside of the project itself, such as community or situational factors.
  - c. Are there any unintended consequences that resulted from the project?
5. What would you say is the most positive aspect of the project?
  - a. Are there any key lessons learned that can be used for future projects for TGW and LBW?

6. Besides the individual women who participated in the project, do you think that the project had an impact in the community where you live? How about for Thai society?

## Online Survey Questionnaire

Questionnaire

(ID 832)

A research project to evaluate the status and empowerment of female sex workers and girls in order to reduce violence, stigma, discrimination, human rights abuses based on sexuality, and gender identity (Master)

### Introduction

This project is intended to evaluate the performance of the project, "The Empowerment and Capacity Building of Lesbian and Transgender Women to Mitigate Violence, Stigma and Discrimination based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity"

We invite you to participate in this research project. Please read the details to understand the purpose of the study. The questionnaire will take about 20 minutes to answer. And all the information from you will be kept secret. This will be used for this study only.

Your opinion is very important to this research. This will be used to evaluate the performance of the project. If you have any questions about this study, you can contact Project Leader (Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kerry Richter) or Project Researcher (Dr. Dusita Phuengsamran or Mr. Niphon Darawuttimaprakorn) at Tel: 0 2441 0201 Ext. 603 and 529 Fax: 0 2441 9333

[Note: This research project has been endorsed by The Research Ethics Committee of the Institute for Population and Social Research The office is at Institute for Population and Social Research Mahidol University, Phuttamonthon 4 Road, Salaya, Phutthamonthon Telephone number 0 2441 0201 to 4 Fax 0 2441 9333 If you have been treated incorrectly, you can contact the chairman or the representative by location and phone number above]

Thank you for taking the time to answer the questions.

Participation in activities with Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand

\* 3.1. Do you know the Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand (RSAT)?

- ☐ (1) Yes
- ☐ (2) No
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 3.2. Have you participated in RSAT activities, e.g. workshops, meetings, trainings, on sexual orientation and gender identity, sexual rights for transwomen and women who love women?

- ☐ (1) Yes
- ☐ (2) No
- ☐ (3) Not sure
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 3.3. If yes, how many times have you participated in RSAT activities?

จำนวน/Number

ครั้ง/Time

\* 3.4. What are the topics you heard, discussed, learned in the RSAT activities?  
เลือกตอบได้หลายคำตอบ

- ☐ (1) Human rights
- ☐ (2) LGBTI's rights
- ☐ (3) Sexual Equity law
- ☐ (4) Sexual orientation
- ☐ (5) Gender identity
- ☐ (6) Stigma and discrimination
- ☐ (7) Gender-based violence

- ☐ (8) Rights to health care services
- ☐ (9) Rights to education
- ☐ (10) Rights to employment
- ☐ (11) Channels for seeking helps
- ☐ (97) Do not know
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 3.5. Apart from the topics in 3.4, what are topics you heard, discussed, learned in the RSAT activities?  
โปรดระบุ หัวข้อ/เรื่องที่ท่านได้ยิน พูดคุย และได้เรียนรู้จากฟ้าสีรุ้ง

\* 3.6. What are the topic you found most relevant to your lifes situations? Select 3 most relevant topics.  
กรุณาเลือกคำตอบจำนวนทั้งสิ้น 3 ข้อ โดยข้อที่คุณเลือกข้อแรกจะเป็นข้อที่เกี่ยวข้องกับชีวิตของคุณมากที่สุด และข้ออื่นๆ ลดลำดับกันลงมา

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Human rights
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2) LGBTI's rights
- \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Sexual Equity law
- \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Sexual orientation
- \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Gender identity
- \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Stigma and discrimination
- \_\_\_\_\_ (7) Gender-based violence
- \_\_\_\_\_ (8) Rights to health care services
- \_\_\_\_\_ (9) Rights to education
- \_\_\_\_\_ (10) Rights to employment
- \_\_\_\_\_ (11) Channels for seeking helps

\* 3.7. Which topic is most applicable to you?

\* 3.8. Other topic is an applicable to you?

เลือกตอบได้หลายคำตอบ

- ☐ (1) Human rights
- ☐ (2) LGBTI's rights
- ☐ (3) Sexual Equity law
- ☐ (4) Sexual orientation
- ☐ (5) Gender identity
- ☐ (6) Stigma and discrimination
- ☐ (7) Gender-based violence
- ☐ (8) Rights to health care services
- ☐ (9) Rights to education
- ☐ (10) Rights to employment
- ☐ (11) Channels for seeking helps
- ☐ (12) Do not know
- ☐ (13) Refused

\* 3.9. Have you very seen any poster about Gender Equality Act 2015 ?

- ☐ (1) Yes
- ☐ (2) No
- ☐ (97) Do not know
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 3.10. (If yes) What did the poster say?

\* 3.11. Have you ever seen this poster before?



- ☐ (1) Yes
- ☐ (2) No
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 3.12. (If yes) Where did you see it?  
เลือกตอบได้หลายคำตอบ

- ☐ (1) Training with RSAT
- ☐ (2) Attend the meeting
- ☐ (3) From RSAT website
- ☐ (4) From Ministry of Social Development and Human Security website
- ☐ (97) Do not know
- ☐ (98) Refused
- ☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 3.13. (If yes) Did you ever use the information on this poster?

- ☐ (1) Yes
- ☐ (2) No
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 3.14. (If yes) How did you use it?

\* 3.15. Have you ever seen any book about the story of LGBTIQ?

- ☐ (1) Yes
- ☐ (2) No
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 3.16. (If yes) What is the book say?





- ☐ (1) Yes
- ☐ (2) No
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 3.18. (If yes) Where did you see it?  
เลือกตอบได้หลายคำตอบ

- ☐ (1) Training with RSAT
- ☐ (2) Attend the meeting
- ☐ (3) From RSAT website
- ☐ (4) From Ministry of Social Development and Human Security website
- ☐ (97) Do not know
- ☐ (98) Refused
- ☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 3.19. (If yes) Did you ever use the information on the book?

- ☐ (1) Yes
- ☐ (2) No
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 3.20. (If yes) How did you use it?

## Basic information

\* 1.1. How old are you?  
กรุณาระบุอายุเต็มปี

ปี/Years

\* 1.2. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- ☐ (1) Never study
- ☐ (2) Not complete primary level
- ☐ (3) Primary level
- ☐ (4) Secondary level
- ☐ (5) High school or equivalent
- ☐ (6) Bachelor degree/ College
- ☐ (7) Above Bachelor
- ☐ (97) Do not know
- ☐ (98) Refused
- ☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 1.3. What is your current occupation?

- ☐ (1) Not being employed or working
- ☐ (2) Student
- ☐ (3) Government officer
- ☐ (4) Private company officer
- ☐ (5) Daily-wage employer
- ☐ (6) Freelance
- ☐ (7) Business owner

☐ (97) Do not know

☐ (98) Refused

☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 1.4. How much your approximately income per month? (From all the sources of income)

☐ (1) Less than 5,000 THB a month

☐ (2) 5,000 - 10,000 THB

☐ (3) 10,001-20,000 THB

☐ (4) 20,001 - 30,000 THB

☐ (5) More than 30,000 THB

☐ (97) Do not know

☐ (98) Refused

☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 1.5. What province is your home town?

☐ (1) Krabi

☐ (2) Bangkok

☐ (3) Kanchanaburi

☐ (4) Kalasin

☐ (5) Kamphaeng Phet

☐ (6) Khon Kaen

☐ (7) Chanthaburi

☐ (8) Chachoengsao

☐ (9) Chonburi

☐ (10) Chainat

☐ (11) Chaiyaphum

☐ (12) Chumphon

- ☐ (13) Chiang Rai
- ☐ (14) Chiang Mai
- ☐ (15) Trang
- ☐ (16) Trat
- ☐ (17) Tak
- ☐ (18) Nakhon Nayok
- ☐ (19) Nakhon Pathom
- ☐ (20) Nakhon Phanom
- ☐ (21) Nakhon Ratchasima
- ☐ (22) Nakhon Si Thammarat
- ☐ (23) Nakhon Sawan
- ☐ (24) Nonthaburi
- ☐ (25) Narathiwat
- ☐ (26) Nan
- ☐ (27) Bueng Kan
- ☐ (28) Buriram
- ☐ (29) Pathum Thani
- ☐ (30) Prachuap Khiri Khan
- ☐ (31) Prachinburi
- ☐ (32) Pattani
- ☐ (33) Ayutthaya
- ☐ (34) Phayao
- ☐ (35) Phang Nga
- ☐ (36) Phattalung
- ☐ (37) Phichit
- ☐ (38) Phitsanulok

- ☐ (39) Phetchaburi
- ☐ (40) Phetchabun
- ☐ (41) Phrae
- ☐ (42) Phuket
- ☐ (43) Maha Sarakham
- ☐ (44) Mokdahan
- ☐ (45) Mae Hong Son
- ☐ (46) Yasothon
- ☐ (47) Yala
- ☐ (48) Roi Et
- ☐ (49) Ranong
- ☐ (50) Rayong
- ☐ (51) Ratchaburi
- ☐ (52) Lopburi
- ☐ (53) Lampang
- ☐ (54) Lamphun
- ☐ (55) Loei
- ☐ (56) Sisaket
- ☐ (57) Sakon Nakhon
- ☐ (58) Songkhla
- ☐ (59) Satun
- ☐ (60) Samut Prakan
- ☐ (61) Samut Songkhram
- ☐ (62) Samut Sakhon
- ☐ (63) Sakaeo
- ☐ (64) Saraburi

- ☐ (65) Sing Buri
- ☐ (66) Sukhothai
- ☐ (67) Suphanburi
- ☐ (68) Surat Thani
- ☐ (69) Surin
- ☐ (70) Nong Khai
- ☐ (71) Nong Bua Lamphu
- ☐ (72) Ang Thong
- ☐ (73) Amnatcharoen
- ☐ (74) Udon Thani
- ☐ (75) Uttaradit
- ☐ (76) Uthaithani
- ☐ (77) Ubon Ratchathani

\* 1.6. What province are you currently living in?

- ☐ (1) Krabi
- ☐ (2) Bangkok
- ☐ (3) Kanchanaburi
- ☐ (4) Kalasin
- ☐ (5) Kamphaeng Phet
- ☐ (6) Khon Kaen
- ☐ (7) Chanthaburi
- ☐ (8) Chachoengsao
- ☐ (9) Chonburi
- ☐ (10) Chainat
- ☐ (11) Chaiyaphum

- ☐ (12) Chumphon
- ☐ (13) Chiang Rai
- ☐ (14) Chiang Mai
- ☐ (15) Trang
- ☐ (16) Trat
- ☐ (17) Tak
- ☐ (18) Nakhon Nayok
- ☐ (19) Nakhon Pathom
- ☐ (20) Nakhon Phanom
- ☐ (21) Nakhon Ratchasima
- ☐ (22) Nakhon Si Thammarat
- ☐ (23) Nakhon Sawan
- ☐ (24) Nonthaburi
- ☐ (25) Narathiwat
- ☐ (26) Nan
- ☐ (27) Bueng Kan
- ☐ (28) Buriram
- ☐ (29) Pathum Thani
- ☐ (30) Prachuap Khiri Khan
- ☐ (31) Prachinburi
- ☐ (32) Pattani
- ☐ (33) Ayutthaya
- ☐ (34) Phayao
- ☐ (35) Phang Nga
- ☐ (36) Phattalung
- ☐ (37) Phichit

- ☐ (38) Phitsanulok
- ☐ (39) Phetchaburi
- ☐ (40) Phetchabun
- ☐ (41) Phrae
- ☐ (42) Phuket
- ☐ (43) Maha Sarakham
- ☐ (44) Mokdahan
- ☐ (45) Mae Hong Son
- ☐ (46) Yasothon
- ☐ (47) Yala
- ☐ (48) Roi Et
- ☐ (49) Ranong
- ☐ (50) Rayong
- ☐ (51) Ratchaburi
- ☐ (52) Lopburi
- ☐ (53) Lampang
- ☐ (54) Lamphun
- ☐ (55) Loei
- ☐ (56) Sisaket
- ☐ (57) Sakon Nakhon
- ☐ (58) Songkhla
- ☐ (59) Satun
- ☐ (60) Samut Prakan
- ☐ (61) Samut Songkhram
- ☐ (62) Samut Sakhon
- ☐ (63) Sakaeo



- ☐ (64) Saraburi
- ☐ (65) Sing Buri
- ☐ (66) Sukhothai
- ☐ (67) Suphanburi
- ☐ (68) Surat Thani
- ☐ (69) Surin
- ☐ (70) Nong Khai
- ☐ (71) Nong Bua Lamphu
- ☐ (72) Ang Thong
- ☐ (73) Amnatcharoen
- ☐ (74) Udon Thani
- ☐ (75) Uttaradit
- ☐ (76) Uthaithani
- ☐ (77) Ubon Ratchathani

\* 1.7. If you are not currently living in your hometown, what are the reasons for moving to this current residency?

- ☐ (1) To study
- ☐ (2) To work
- ☐ (3) To live with my relatives/family
- ☐ (4) To live with my partner
- ☐ (98) Not move from origin
- ☐ (5) Do not know
- ☐ (97) Refused
- ☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

## Sexual identity/sexual orientation

\* 2.1. How do you describe your current physical sex?

- ☐ (1) Man
- ☐ (2) Woman
- ☐ (3) Trans-man
- ☐ (4) Trans-woman
- ☐ (5) Intersexual
- ☐ (97) Do not know
- ☐ (98) Refused
- ☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 2.2. How do you define yourself now, in terms of your gender identity or sexual orientation?

- ☐ (1) Heterosexual
- ☐ (2) Gay man
- ☐ (3) Khateoy
- ☐ (4) Women loving women
- ☐ (5) Bisexual
- ☐ (97) Do not know
- ☐ (98) Refused
- ☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 2.3. Have you ever changed your SOGI from something else?

เลือกตอบได้หลายคำตอบ

- ☐ (1) Heterosexual
- ☐ (2) Gay man
- ☐ (3) Kateoy

- ☐ (4) Women loving women
- ☐ (5) Bisexual
- ☐ (6) Never change SOGI
- ☐ (97) Do not know
- ☐ (98) Refused
- ☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 2.4. What is your current relationship status?

- ☐ (1) Single
- ☐ (2) Having a girlfriend or female partner
- ☐ (98) Not in partnership but in relationship
- ☐ (3) Do not know
- ☐ (97) Refused
- ☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 2.5. How do you describe your partner specified in 2.4

เลือกตอบได้หลายคำตอบ

- ☐ (1) Heterosexual
- ☐ (2) Gay man
- ☐ (3) Kateoy
- ☐ (4) Women loving women
- ☐ (5) Tomboy
- ☐ (6) Lady
- ☐ (7) Bisexual
- ☐ (97) Do not know

☐ (98) Refused

☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 2.6. Are you currently living with the partner specified in 2.5

☐ (1) Yes

☐ (2) No

☐ (97) Do not know

☐ (98) Refused

☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 2.7. Excluding your partner specified in 2.5, are you in relationships with others simultaneously?

☐ (1) Yes

☐ (2) No

☐ (97) Do not know

☐ (98) Refused

\* 2.8. If yes, can you please tell how many people you are currently in relationships with, excluding the one specified in 2.5  
เลือกตอบได้หลายคำตอบ

☐ (1) Heterosexual man

☐ (2) Heterosexual woman

☐ (3) Gay man

☐ (4) Kateoy

☐ (5) Women loving women

☐ (6) Tomboy

☐ (7) Lady

☐ (8) Bisexual

☐ (9) Trans-women

- ☐ (10) Trans-men
- ☐ (97) Do not know
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 2.8.1. Number of Heterosexual man

จำนวน

\* 2.8.2. Number of Heterosexual women

จำนวน

\* 2.8.3. Number of Gay man

จำนวน

\* 2.8.4. Number of Kateoy

จำนวน

\* 2.8.5. Number of women loving women

จำนวน

\* 2.8.6. Number of Tomboy

\* 2.8.7. Number of Lady

จำนวน

\* 2.8.8. Number of Bisexual

จำนวน

\* 2.8.9. Number of Trans-women

จำนวน

\* 2.8.10. Number of Trans-men

จำนวน

\* 2.9. Have you ever concealed your sexual orientation or gender identity with any

- ☐ (1) Yes
- ☐ (2) No
- ☐ (97) Do not know
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 2.10. Please identify whom with you concealed your sexual orientation or gender identity?  
เลือกตอบได้หลายคำตอบ

- ☐ (1) Father
- ☐ (2) Mother
- ☐ (3) Brother
- ☐ (4) Sister
- ☐ (5) Relatives
- ☐ (6) Male friends
- ☐ (7) female friends
- ☐ (8) Teachers
- ☐ (9) Colleagues
- ☐ (10) Refused

☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 2.11. What were the reasons that made you concealing your sexual orientation or gender identity to those people?  
เลือกตอบได้หลายคำตอบ

- ☐ (1) Lack of confidence
- ☐ (2) Not sure about what I was
- ☐ (3) Afraid they couldn't accept
- ☐ (4) Afraid to disappoint them
- ☐ (5) Afraid of being hated
- ☐ (6) Afraid of being discriminated
- ☐ (7) Do not know
- ☐ (8) Refused
- ☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 2.12. Currently, do you still have to conceal your sexual orientation or gender identity with anybody?

- ☐ (1) Yes
- ☐ (2) No
- ☐ (97) Do not know
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 2.13. Please identify whom with you currently conceal your sexual orientation or gender identity?  
เลือกตอบได้หลายคำตอบ

- ☐ (1) Father
- ☐ (2) Mother
- ☐ (3) Brother
- ☐ (4) Sister
- ☐ (5) Relatives
- ☐ (6) Male friends

☐ (7) Female friends

☐ (8) Teachers

☐ (9) Colleagues

☐ (10) Refused

☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 2.14. What are the reasons that made you still concealing your sexual orientation or gender identity to those people?  
เลือกตอบได้หลายคำตอบ

☐ (1) Lack of confidence

☐ (2) Not sure about what I was

☐ (3) Afraid they couldn't accept

☐ (4) Afraid to disappoint them

☐ (5) Afraid of being hated

☐ (6) Afraid of being discriminated

☐ (7) Do not know

☐ (8) Refused

☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

**Stigma and Discrimination Information** The following sections will address questions about stigma and discrimination issues for people who are not heterosexual. We would like to ask about the real experiences that may have happened to you. There may be some questions that affect your feelings. Your personal information will not be released in a manner that identifies the person providing the information. We will report the situation along with the information of other people. This will help to make society understand that stigma and discrimination against people of different sexual identity and orientations still exists, and that it will need work to fix the problem. We would like to thank you for sharing your useful stories with us.

\* 4.1. Have you ever been stigmatized in any aspect of your life because you are an LW/TGW?

☐ (1) Yes



- ☐ (2) No
- ☐ (3) Not sure
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 4.2. If yes or not sure, can you please determine if you ever faced any of this circumstances?

Question	Have you ever been stigmatized			
	(1) Never	(2) Yes, during the past 1 year	(3) Yes, in a lifetime	(4) Not answer
(421) Being punished, physical attacked, hit in family because you are LBGTI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(422) Being punished, physical attacked, hit in school because you are LBGTI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(423) Being punished, physical attacked, hit at work because you are LBGTI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(424) Being punished, physical attacked, hit in community because you are LBGTI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(425) Being bullied in family because you are LBGTI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(426) Being bullied by friends or teachers in school because you are LBGTI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(427) Being bullied at work because you are LBGTI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(428) Being bullied in community because you are LBGTI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(429) Being discriminated in family because you are LBGTI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(4210) Being discriminated in school because you are LBGTI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(4211) Being discriminate at work because you are LBGTI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(4212) Being discriminated in community because you are LBGTI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

\* 4.3. For those who had any form of violence happened during the past 1 year, have you reported or sought for help from any sources?

- ☐ (1) Yes
- ☐ (2) No

- ☐ (3) Not sure
- ☐ (4) Never had any form of violence happened during the past 1 year
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 4.4. If yes, from what sources you sought for helps during the past year?

เลือกตอบได้หลายคำตอบ

- ☐ (1) Rainbow Sky Association
- ☐ (2) Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
- ☐ (3) Hospital
- ☐ (4) Police
- ☐ (5) Parent
- ☐ (6) Siblings
- ☐ (7) Relatives
- ☐ (8) Friends
- ☐ (98) Refused
- ☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 4.5. Do you think you deserve to be treated differently because you are LGBT?

- ☐ (1) Yes
- ☐ (2) No
- ☐ (3) Not sure
- ☐ (97) Do not know
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 4.6. Do you think in case of such violence happened to any LGBTI, they should report or seek for help instead of being tolerated?

- ☐ (1) Yes
- ☐ (2) No
- ☐ (3) Not sure
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 4.7. Do you think LGBTI are equally protected by Thai laws as Thai citizens?

- ☐ (1) Yes
- ☐ (2) No
- ☐ (3) Not sure
- ☐ (98) Refused

\* 4.8. What aspects do you think LGBTI is still not protected by laws or not having equal rights as others?

Rights	Answer			
	(1) Yes	(2) No	(3) Not sure	(4) Not answer
(481) Education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(482) Employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(483) Health care	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(484) Health and life insurance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(485) Property ownerships	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(486) Marriage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(487) Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

คำตอบแทนและการแนะนำเพื่อน

\* 5.1. You will receive 100 THB if you complete this survey.

- ☐ (1) Transfer to bank account
- ☐ (2) Transfer to Prompt pay
- ☐ (3) Donate this money
- ☐ อื่น ๆ โปรดระบุ \_\_\_\_\_

\* 5.2. Please provide details of your account for transferring money

(1) Account name

---

(2) Bank name

---

(3) Account number

---

5.2.1. Please provide your phone number

---

\* 5.3. The project will transfer 100 THB to your account you provide as to compensate for your time spent for this survey.

(1) Account name

---

(2) Prompt Pay number

---

5.3.1. Please provide your phone number

---

\* 5.4. We would like to ask you to introduce some of your friends who are TG or WLW and had chances talking with you about RSAT's activities and messages you obtained, e.g. sexual rights, stigma and discrimination, sexuality, etc.

(1) Your name we can refer to when contacting your friends

---

(2) Name of your friend whom you want us to contact

---

(3) Your friends 'phone number

---

5.4.1. Please provide your friends' email

---

## 7) List of persons and institutions interviewed or consulted

### Key Informant Interviews

#### RSAT:

1. Rapeepun Jommaroeng – Project Director
2. Thipupsorn Sasitrakula – Project Manager
3. Three RSAT provincial coordinators (identity protected)
4. Nopporn Saejung – RSAT Assistant Director for Strategic Information(; Mr. Surasak Sadthaporn – Data Management Officer<sup>32</sup>

#### Government stakeholders

1. Dr. Cheera Thongkrajai – Social Development Officer; Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
2. Praepailin Buppha – Human Rights Officer; National Human Rights Commission.
3. Ms. Kornpin Meecharin – Lampang Provincial Social Development Office
4. Ms. Pimontipa Malahom – Chief of International Health, Ubon Ratchathani Provincial Public Health Office

### In-depth interviews

**Table 6.1: Number of in-depth interviews conducted at baseline and endline**

	Baseline				Endline	
	Leader	Non-leader				
	LBW	TGW	LBW	TGW	LBW	TGW
Bangkok	2	2	2	2	4	4
Songkhla	2	2	2	2	4	4
Chiang Mai	2	2	2	2	4	4
Ubon Ratchathani	2	2	2	2	4	4
Total	16		16		16	16
Grand total	32				32	

<sup>32</sup> For data validation, not KII

**Table 6.2: Profile of in-depth interview respondents**

Number	Group	Location	Age	Current Self identification	Education	Occupation
1	LBW	Bangkok	26	Lesbian	Bachelor's degree	Working in an air cargo company
2	LBW	Bangkok	36	Tomboy	Higher vocational	Private company employee
3	LBW	Bangkok	21	Lady	Now 4th year in University (undergrad)	Student, intending to join the army; now working part time in a hotel
4	LBW	Bangkok	27	Lady	Bachelor's degree	Nutritionist in hospital
5	LBW	Chiang Mai	23	Lady	Bachelor's degree	Hotel front desk officer
6	LBW	Chiang Mai	35	Lady	Bachelor's degree	Own a grocery store
7	LBW	Chiang Mai	24	Tomboy	Bachelor's degree	Own business (mobile phone accessories and computer games)
8	LBW	Chiang Mai	25	Tomboy	Bachelor's degree	Own a seafood shop
9	LBW	Ubon Ratchathani	17	Tomboy	Now 1st year in vocational school	Student
10	LBW	Ubon Ratchathani	20	Lady	Now 2nd year in higher vocational school	Student
11	LBW	Ubon Ratchathani	21	Lady	Higher vocational	Student
12	LBW	Ubon Ratchathani	20	Tomboy	Primary school	Not clear

Number	Group	Location	Age	Current Self identification	Education	Occupation
13	LBW	Yala	32	Tomboy	Informal education (Grade 12)	Cook in a Thai restaurant
14	LBW	Yala	25	Lady	Higher vocational	Still unemployed but not continuing studies
15	LBW	Yala	22	Now married with a man but used to be with Tomboy	Higher vocational	Hired by a supermarket
16	LBW	Yala	21	Tomboy	Now 1st year in University (undergrad)	Student
17	TGW	Bangkok	23	Gay	Higher vocational	Private company employee (admin staff) and freelance dancer
18	TGW	Bangkok	20	TG	Now in 3rd year in university (undergrad)	Student
19	TGW	Bangkok	21	TG	Now in university	Part time employee at commercial bank
20	TGW	Bangkok	27	TG	Bachelor's degree	Accountant
21	Gay	Chiang Mai	24	Gay and occasionally dress as a woman	Bachelor's degree	Beauty salon owner
22	TGW	Chiang Mai	26	TG	Bachelor's degree	Freelance make-up artist, costume
23	Gay sometimes dress as a woman	Chiang Mai	25	Gay and occasionally dress as a woman	Bachelor's degree	Property salesperson
24	TGW	Chiang Mai	20	Gay and occasionally	Vocational	Working in an NGO



Number	Group	Location	Age	Current Self identification	Education	Occupation
				dress as a woman		
25	TGW	Ubon Ratchathani	32	TG	Bachelor's degree	Working at an NGO
26	TGW	Ubon Ratchathani	28	TG	High school	Selling silk
27	TGW	Ubon Ratchathani	27	TG	Bachelor's degree	Working at an NGO
28	TGW	Ubon Ratchathani	26	TG	Secondary	Employed by a cloth shop
29	TGW	Yala	24	TG	Vocational	Primary school teacher; make-up artist as sideline job
30	Gay	Yala	24	Gay	Higher vocational	Running a restaurant co-invested with his current partner
31	TGW	Yala	23	TG but normally dress like a man	Higher vocational	Non-permanent employee of Yala municipality
32	TGW	Yala	23	TG	Now 1st year in University (undergrad)	Student

## 8) List of supporting documents reviewed

Boccagno, J. (2015, December 4). A dream deferred: a look at transgender discrimination in Thailand. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from [https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/transgender-discrimination-thailand\\_us\\_5661b9eae4b072e9d1c5cd78](https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/transgender-discrimination-thailand_us_5661b9eae4b072e9d1c5cd78)

Equitas—International Centre for Human Rights Education and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2011). *Evaluating human rights training activities: A handbook for human rights educators*. Montreal: Equitas. Retrieved from <https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/EvaluationHandbookPT18.pdf>

Institute for Population and Social Research (IPSR). (2015). *External evaluation: Baseline report for The Empowerment and Capacity Building of Lesbian and Transgender Women to Mitigate Violence, Stigma and Discrimination based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity*. Salaya, Thailand.

Mahavongtrakul, M. (2017, February 6). Uniform justice. *Bangkok Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.bangkokpost.com/lifestyle/social-and-lifestyle/1193641/uniform-justice>

Rainbow Sky Association of Thailand (RSAT). (2014). Project proposal: The Empowerment and Capacity Building of Lesbian and Transgender Women to Mitigate Violence, Stigma and Discrimination based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity, submitted to the United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women (UNTF).

— (2015). Annual Report 2015.

— (2016). Annual Report 2016.

— (2017). Progress Report January-June 2017.

— (n.d.). Human Rights Case Management Flow. Powerpoint presentation.

— (2017, June 28). Civil Partnership and Beyond: Prospectives of LGBTI Rights in Thailand. Report of a panel discussion, Alliance Francaise Bangkok.

- Royal Thai Government. (2015). Gender Equality Act B.E.2555 (A.D.2015) Retrieved from <https://www.hrw.org/news/2015/09/21/thailand-gender-equality-act>
- Suriyasarn, B. (2014). *Gender identity and sexual orientation in Thailand*. Bangkok: International Labor Organization (ILO)[http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/---sro-bangkok/documents/publication/wcms\\_356950.pdf](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/---sro-bangkok/documents/publication/wcms_356950.pdf)
- United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence against Women. (n.d.) *Guidelines for baseline/endline data collection and final external project evaluations*.
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP), International Labor Organization (ILO). (2018). *LGBTI people and employment: Discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, and sex characteristics in China, the Philippines and Thailand*. Retrieved from [http://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/rbap/en/home/library/democratic\\_governance/hiv\\_aids/lgbti-people-and-employment--discrimination-based-on-sexual-orie.html](http://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/rbap/en/home/library/democratic_governance/hiv_aids/lgbti-people-and-employment--discrimination-based-on-sexual-orie.html)
- Yala v. Supasri. Yala Provincial Court. (2016, August 26). Retrieved from <https://www.dropbox.com/s/76yx4pircgb3h8g/Police%20Record%20and%20Court%20Verdict%20-%20Original%20Thai%20%2B%20translated%20English%20version.pdf?dl=0>