



Practical tips for addressing cross-cutting objectives in evaluations

The Implementation of the Human Rights–Based Approach; and Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination¹ - including Persons with Disabilities²

This document serves the Ministry and its stakeholders as a generic tool and additional resource for those who either commission or carry out evaluations. It draws on various international sources as well as the experience of evaluation practitioners. The document is also informed by the Ministry's general guidelines on the human rights-based approach and cross-cutting objectives.³ The following tool presents some key considerations during the different phases of the evaluation process especially from the evaluation manager's point of view⁴. It is not meant to be an exclusive one-size-fits-all guidance but to provide **a useful list of considerations and options for evaluation managers to think about and integrate on relevant parts. All items may not be relevant or needed in each evaluation assignment.**

Finland applies the so-called triple track approach to the implementation of the cross-cutting objectives: combining **mainstreaming** (track one) with **targeted action** (track two) and **policy influencing** (track three).⁵ The minimum standard for mainstreaming the cross-cutting objectives is '**Do no harm**'. Do no harm in relation to evaluations means, for instance, that evaluators seek to minimize risks to, and burdens on, anyone participating in the evaluation and reducing any unnecessary harm that might occur from the commission or omission, or negative or critical evaluation outcomes, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation. Evaluators must be aware of the risks faced by informants and stakeholders. Risks can be physical, social (e.g., loss of privacy, loss of status, loss of reputation, stigma) or psychological/emotional (e.g., loss of self-confidence, psychological trauma, stigma, etc.). Similarly, harms can relate to the welfare and security of an individual, institution or group or the natural environment.

This document presents key considerations for each stage of the evaluation process, provides examples of evaluation questions and lists further resources at the end.

Content

I. Practical tips for each stage of the evaluation process

1. Preparation of the Terms of Reference (ToR)
2. Recruitment of evaluators
3. Inception phase and inception report
4. Field phase
5. Analyses
6. Reporting and dissemination
7. Management response

II. Examples of possible evaluation questions that can be included in the ToR

III. Sources and further reading

I Practical tips for each stage of the evaluation process

Preparation of the Terms of Reference (ToR)

Evaluation manager's tasks

- ▣ Check your organisation's evaluation **policy and guidelines**, what do they say about integration of gender equality and non-discrimination as well as human rights?
- ▣ Check what have been the **requirements** by the funder(s) and donors in terms of commissioning evaluations and to what extent are cross-cutting objectives and human rights expected to be integrated.
- ▣ Are there specific **human rights instruments** that the intervention is aligned with and has been aimed to contribute to or that should be considered, referred to, and used to measure progress? E.g. national legislation or policies, regional conventions or international instruments such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, if signed or ratified by the country, and the materials produced by their respective Treaty Bodies, are useful standards and tools). If yes, include in the ToR.
- ▣ Consider which groups of people are those that the intervention aims to target and/or need **specific attention** to ensure inclusion, state that explicitly and provide guidance (e.g. evaluation questions, links to relevant policies or guidelines) in the TOR.
- ▣ Check how human rights, gender equality and non-discrimination have been **addressed in the intervention**: is there any targeted action or is mainstreaming applied, or is there policy influencing?
- ▣ If the cross-cutting objectives have not been integrated so far or the intervention appears human rights blind, the evaluation could examine what the **challenges and constraints to integrating** these issues were/are, or what are the existing capacities/capacity gaps within the organization and among the staff.
- ▣ Check **what is possible** to investigate and what data is available. Consider what data would need to be gathered and what is realistic.
- ▣ Include relevant issues related to human rights, gender equality and non-discrimination, and the inclusion of persons with disabilities into the **policy framework section** of the ToR, with reference to the relevant policies and guidelines of your organisation.
- ▣ Include gender equality and non-discrimination in the **evaluation questions**, where relevant. This can be done by either placing separate questions on them or by integrating them into other evaluation questions. ([See part II below](#)).

Note

- The ToR should spell out the relevant instruments or policies that will guide the evaluation process;
- Remember that the human rights-based approach is closely linked to gender equality, non-discrimination and the inclusion of persons with disabilities.
- Remember to map and identify the relevant duty-bearers and other stakeholders that need to be included in the evaluation process. Consider the extent to which the various duty-bearers should be involved in the evaluation process.
- Some cross-cutting objectives may be more common than others for different organisations. Gender equality is one of the most common ones. It is important to explicitly ensure that the adequate expertise is required on all cross-cutting objectives.
- In relation to gender equality, it is important that there is expertise on non-binary inclusion and considering women, men, girls, boys and other gender identities.

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ❑ Evaluation questions should look at all aspects of the **project/programme cycle**: Design and planning, implementation, results and learning – How were the human rights-based approach, gender equality, non-discrimination, and the inclusion of persons with disabilities addressed? Were all the relevant duty-bearers and right-holders targeted by the intervention? ([See part II below](#)).
 - ❑ Check the **HRBA categorization**: was the intervention initially identified as being human rights sensitive, progressive or transformative? The evaluation can assess whether this categorization has been correct and how the HRBA has been applied.
 - ❑ It is important to highlight both **the extent and the quality** of applying the human rights-based approach and addressing gender equality, non-discrimination and the inclusion of persons with disabilities.
 - ❑ Explicitly state whether you require **specific recommendations** for addressing any barriers to implementation of human rights-based approach, gender equality, non-discrimination, inclusion of persons with disabilities in the future.
 - ❑ State the **expertise required** from the evaluation team on human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination and the inclusion of persons with disabilities in the ToR.
 - ❑ Ensure that **the budget and time frame** for the evaluation are in line with your expectations. Consultations with persons and groups that are in vulnerable situations, face discrimination or are marginalized in their communities may require specific arrangements (e.g. identification and mobilisation, choice of venue, accessibility of venue and communications, translation and communication considerations, considering potential stigma and discriminatory practices, facilitating participation, visiting remote locations etc. - depending on the context at hand)
 - ❑ Ensure that **ethical codes of conduct** and evaluation ethics are stated as a requirement in the ToR (Do no harm as a minimum criterion). For example, evaluation ethics, ethics of research involving young children and persons and groups that are in vulnerable situations, face discrimination or are marginalized in their communities etc.
- Non-discrimination and inclusion issues vary by country and context – such as consideration of caste intersecting with sex, different ethnicities, and attitudes towards sexual orientation. Be aware of power dynamics and forms of discrimination, including multiple and aggravated forms of discrimination, that are relevant to the context and intervention.
 - Remember that there are various types and degrees of disability. Consider/check what disabilities are represented in the context of the intervention for proper inclusion.
 - If you are planning to conduct a thematic evaluation specifically on gender equality or inclusion issues, an evaluability assessment may be advisable to test feasibility.
 - Evaluations can also serve to raise awareness and understanding on the value of including human rights and the cross-cutting objectives.
 - In cases of very low or no integration of human rights or cross-cutting objectives, an evaluability assessment tool can be useful for identifying areas where evaluability is weak and provide recommendations on how it can be improved. (See, for instance, UNEG guidance p. 16-20).

Recruitment of evaluators

Evaluation manager's tasks

- ▣ **Score all team members** for expertise on human rights, gender equality and non-discrimination, including expertise on inclusion of persons with disabilities and/or with lived experience of disability. Ensure that the expertise is evidenced by completion of prior evaluations, research, education or other merits. At least one team member should have expertise in consideration of human rights, gender equality and social inclusion issues, including rights of persons with disabilities. In case of targeted interventions, there must be strong expertise in the human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination and/or disability inclusion topic at hand.
- ▣ Consider how **gender balance and other issues of representation** in the evaluation team should be taken into account in the tendering process, e.g. as a minimum criterion or as a tender evaluation criterion.
- ▣ **Score evaluation methodology** presented in the proposals on how the assessment of the application of HRBA, gender equality, non-discrimination and inclusion of persons with disabilities are proposed to be dealt with.
- ▣ Ensure that the team has experience in **participatory approaches and methods** of data collection; check the CVs.
- ▣ Ensure the team has evaluation, research and relational skills, including **cultural competence**.
- ▣ **Consider including** local persons with disabilities, or women's/women's rights organisations, and organizations of persons with disabilities (OPDs) as members of the evaluation team and/or reference group. Consider using a co-evaluator with lived experience on disability for an inclusive evaluation approach.

Note

- While you should aim for gender balance in the team, remember that just being a woman does not necessarily mean the person is an expert on gender equality or aware of gender issues, and that gender identities are non-binary.
- Where possible, include a Finnish Junior Expert post (at cost). This is important for developing a cadre of new Finnish experts with field experience. It can also be a good way to ensure gender and age balance in the team.
- Consider other opportunities for capacity building during the evaluation assignment on these topics, depending on the evaluation team's profile. These could include interactive workshops or trainings as part of the evaluation, joint development of Theory of Change, conceptualising or defining phenomena together, compiling additional resources, training local evaluators etc.

Inception phase and inception report

Evaluation manager's tasks

- ▣ Give a clear briefing to team on **expectations**; provide full **documentation** (including latest guidelines). Outline what data is available, including the availability of or limitations to sex, age and disability disaggregated data or indicators.
- ▣ Check that the **stakeholder mapping** is done correctly and include gender representation and representation of persons with disabilities and/or their representative organisations, also as potential informants.
- ▣ Check that the **work plan and methodology** described in the inception report sufficiently address the human rights-based approach, actions on gender equality and non-discrimination, including reaching persons with disabilities and any relevant representative organisations.

Note

- Review of the Inception Report is a part of quality control.
- The evaluation scoping exercise or stakeholder mapping can be good opportunities to assess how the evaluation can best cover human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination or disability inclusion.

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Check that the proposed **data collection methods** (e.g. sampling, document review, focus groups, interviews, case studies, surveys, field observation) are designed in child, gender, disability and culturally aware ways that do not perpetuate negative norms or stigma, nor cause distress for respondents. Does the proposed sample frame enable intersectional analysis? Is the sample size sufficient for various types of conclusions? Ask for clarifications and give feedback.
- ▣ Check that the **desk study or literature review**, if done at this stage, includes analysis of the human rights situation and potential challenges pertaining to gender equality and the rights of persons with disabilities.
- ▣ Have initial interviews conducted during scoping revealed any **unexpected issues** not previously considered during the planning phase? Consider adding to the assignment.
- ▣ **Coordinate feedback** on the draft inception report: ensure comments received from relevant staff members or experts on human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination and disability inclusion issues.

- When evaluating change and what results have been achieved by the project/programme, it is important not only to assess indicators and documents but also to hear the first-hand experiences from the persons directly or indirectly affected by the intervention.
- Involve the Embassy in briefing on local issues, or good practices. They should know, for instance, what other donors have done, attitudes of local counterparts and national and local sensitivities to consider.

Field phase

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Allow **sufficient time** for fieldwork, including visits to more remote locations.
- ▣ Ensure that the evaluation explores how the project did or did not implement **any of the tracks** of the triple track approach, where relevant. Sometimes these get mixed-up.
- ▣ Ensure that **informed consent** is secured from all informants and what special arrangements may be needed.
- ▣ Ensure the **voices and feedback** from women, girls, potentially other gender identities, persons with disabilities and their organisations are collected and recorded.
- ▣ Evaluations should collect information and **evidence on the extent of HRBA application and the inclusion of gender equality, non-discrimination and persons with disabilities**; disaggregate data by sex, age and disability whenever possible; and identify the impact of programmes on the (rights of) different people, including different experiences based on sex, age, disability and other background or identity.

- Specific arrangements may be needed to engage in dialogue with persons in vulnerable situations, e.g. translation, respect to cultural behaviour, ensuring easy access (physical, information, communication) for persons with disabilities, ensuring confidentiality and safe environment for presenting views.
- Remember the 'Right to self-determination'. It should be the informants themselves to define themselves. This is especially important in relation to persons with disabilities, gender and indigenous peoples. Questions regarding gender should include the option "other" and the gender data should be analysed in a non-binary manner.

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Ensure that the evaluation identifies and asks questions about the **possible and real barriers** to realization of human rights, inclusion, and equality, how they were (or were not) overcome during the project implementation and what lessons can be learned for future reference.
 - ▣ Ensure **intersectionality** is adequately taken into account in data collection: how gender and disability interacts with other factors such as age, socio-economic status, ethnic, caste, sexual orientation, rural/urban location, marital status, etc. Integrating into the analysis the context, relationships, power dynamics, etc.
 - ▣ **Understand** any constraints and challenges faced by the informants. Ensure that the security and safety of informants can be secured.
- Evaluators should be encouraged to use innovative and multiple methods in data collection and field analyses. Could mobile phones and social media be used to capture contributions from local communities and a broad range of stakeholders?
 - You may check that the assignment is on course by e.g. checking interview schedules, lists of informants, questions used, providing feedback and guidance on tools, asking to participate in debriefings, asking for draft deliverables etc.

Analyses

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ **Ensure that there are necessary analyses and sub-analyses** of the information according to various gender, age and population groups, including persons with disabilities and other groups that might face discrimination, and require that data is **disaggregated** by relevant groups (e.g. sex, age and disability, wherever possible). Request for analyses that take into account **intersecting dynamics**, not just looking at each feature in isolation.
 - ▣ Ensure that the evaluation is considering how **the intervention interacts** with the legislative, economic, political, ecological, religious and socio-cultural environment (at different levels) in order to be better able to interpret different stakeholder experiences and impacts.
 - ▣ Ensure that **equal weight** is given to the **analysis of the outcomes** of the intervention **and the process** in relation to the application of the human rights-based approach, gender equality and non-discrimination, and disability inclusion.
- If such analyses are done, this should be visible in the draft reports as concrete narrative, graphs and figures etc. Ensure that there is adequate evidence to back up any findings or recommendations.
 - Ensure solid crosschecking of information and finding relevant intersections. Consider country-specific studies or data collection by other donors and government departments to back up findings, e.g. censuses, gender and disability statistics, SDG indicators, sector reports and MIS as well as reports and documents provided by the UN human rights system.

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Request for **crosschecking and finding relevant intersections** in gender equality, non-discrimination and disability inclusion-related analyses.
- ▣ Whether to include conclusions/recommendations related to HRBA-application, gender equality or disability inclusion should **logically stem from the analyses** in the finding section, unless specifically requested.
- ▣ Ensure that data and information collected are **validated** by relevant informants or stakeholders, and ensuring their **adequate diversity and representation**. It is important that stakeholders identify any factual errors, omission and misinterpretation of information as well as review the recommendations to ensure that they are realistic and actionable.

- Generic data does not necessarily capture human rights, gender equality and non-discrimination issues – disaggregation of data is necessary to ensure solid analyses on gender equality and non-discrimination. Remember that “gender” does not mean “women” but requires wider analyses. Gender identity and gender expression come in a multitude of forms, and not everyone is unambiguously female or male. Gender minorities include trans and intersexual people.
- In addition to feedback to draft reports, you may e.g. consider organising a workshop or discussion event on preliminary findings after the field phase, have debriefings, feedback sessions, or use interactive tools.

Reporting and dissemination

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Review the **quality of the draft report**, including whether the questions related to the application of the human rights-based approach and the coverage of gender equality, non-discrimination and disability inclusion issues agreed on have been sufficiently addressed. Furthermore, the report should acknowledge how ‘do no harm’ was ensured in the evaluation process itself as well as non-discrimination, inclusion and participation and any limitations thereof.
- ▣ **Findings** should include analysis of **evidence** that explicitly expresses the voices of different people and/or disaggregates quantitative data.
- ▣ Ensure that the report's **narrative** and the recommendations are **inclusive and respectful**, including the language and terminology used. Request for corrections.
- ▣ Ensure that the style of reporting is **simple and clear**. Avoid technical jargon and other language that could marginalize readers.
- ▣ Consider also other **accessibility requirements** when publishing the report.

- Depending on the stakeholders, consider translation of parts of the report into local language. Needs adequate budget.
- Use online tools (e.g. Teams, Zoom) for feedback with institutional stakeholders.
- Consider which dissemination channels reach the targets groups well, e.g. local media, organisations of beneficiaries, etc. and provide information in an easy-to-use format for them.

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Make sure that evaluation results **are shared** widely and transparently to project's stakeholders, including beneficiaries of the project.
- ▣ **Share the evaluation results** with other projects and countries – avoid silos.
- ▣ If you organize a publication or discussion **event**, ensure that you **invite** the relevant organisations that deal with, research, advocate for or decide on human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination or disability inclusion issues.
- ▣ Publish the report on your organization's **website and store in relevant (electronic) archives**.

- For a live dissemination event, consider accessibility requirements such as choice of venue, the potential need of any interpretation including sign language, etc.

Management response

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Consider **gender balance and other issues of representation** among the persons tasked with preparing the management response.
- ▣ Ensure **meaningful participation** in the discussions and decision-making processes by different people.
- ▣ Ensure **clear statement** of what changes and action points are needed in the project/programme to improve the application of the human rights-based approach and the cross-cutting objectives of gender equality and non-discrimination, including persons with disabilities (for those recommendations that are directly dealing with the issues).
- ▣ **Take into consideration** human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination and disability inclusive dimensions in other recommendations and the follow-up action points, where relevant.

- If you are the convener, facilitator or chair in the management response group, you can monitor the levels of participation by different individuals and try to create further opportunities.
- Ensure that there is a plan to follow up on recommendations in your organisation.

II. Examples of possible evaluation questions that can be included in the ToR

All evaluation questions should be selected and tailored to meet the needs of your intervention and the overall evaluation assignment. Cut-and-paste solutions are strongly discouraged. The following are indicative examples of different types of questions, and the categorisation by track or criteria is not meant to be prescriptive nor exclusive. The list below serves the readers in checking which types of questions might be relevant or useful in their own evaluation. More examples can be found in the resources listed below ([part III](#)).

Example questions for the triple track approach:	Related criteria
To what extent has the organisation been successful in mainstreaming the cross-cutting objectives (track one) and the interventions reached the objectives of the targeted actions they have aimed for (track two) and policy influencing (track three)?	Effectiveness
Example questions for mainstreaming:	Related criteria
To what extent was the intervention informed by human rights, gender, non-discrimination and/or disability analyses that identify underlying causes and barriers in a specific context and related to a specific sector? To what extent was the intervention informed by organisational, national or international policies, commitments and instruments on human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination and/or persons with disabilities relevant to the context?	Relevance
How coherent is the intervention in relation to your organisation's policies and practices on human rights and mainstreaming the cross-cutting objectives? How coherent is the intervention in relation to external policy commitments on human rights and mainstreaming the cross-cutting objectives? How coherent is the intervention with other interventions in relation to human rights and mainstreaming the cross-cutting objectives?	Coherence
To what extent does the allocation of resources reflect the varied needs of persons in vulnerable situations and/or who are marginalised in their communities? Was the resourcing adequate for mainstreaming and HRBA implications for the intervention? How efficiently have human rights and the cross-cutting objectives been mainstreamed?	Efficiency
Did the intervention achieve its objectives and expected results in ways that also contribute to human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination or disability inclusion? Who has benefitted from the interventions and their results? Have all genders, age and population groups in the target area benefitted equally, including persons with disabilities and other groups that might face discrimination? To what extent has the mainstreaming of gender equality, non-discrimination and/or worked in the intervention? At what levels has the mainstreaming taken place (objectives/goals/results matrix/indicators/data disaggregation/budget/other) and has it been followed through in the implementation? What potential challenges has the mainstreaming brought about and how have they been tackled? Have project personnel, duty-bearers, stakeholders or community members received knowledge and training on issues related to human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination, rights of persons with disabilities, inclusivity and/or strategies to ensure participation? What has been the level and depth of participation, accessibility by different groups of people throughout the project/programme cycle and was it meaningful? How has the implementation of the human rights-based approach, gender equality, non-discrimination and inclusion of persons with disabilities been monitored and what information has been collected?	Effectiveness

Example questions for mainstreaming:	Related criteria
What was the impact of the intervention from the point of view of different genders, age and population groups, including persons with disabilities and other groups that might face discrimination? Were there any unintended or negative impacts, and if yes, how were these addressed?	Impact
Have the results been sustainable and lasting from the point of view of different genders, age and population groups, including persons with disabilities and other groups that might face discrimination? Have they been socio-culturally, ecologically and economically sustainable? Are project owners, authorities and other stakeholders aware and supportive of the importance of mainstreaming and likely to continue any positive practice? Have processes and mechanisms been set up to support the human rights-based approach and mainstreaming the cross-cutting objectives?	Sustainability
If the human rights-based approach, gender equality, non-discrimination or disability inclusion perspectives were not initially included in the intervention, or no initial assessment was conducted, have steps been taken during implementation to minimise possible negative impacts or any unintended effects on persons with disabilities and/or other groups that might face discrimination?	Integration of 'Do no harm'

Example questions for targeted action:	Related criteria
Did the intervention respond to the identified rights, needs and/or priorities set out in terms of gender equality, non-discrimination and/or the rights of persons with disabilities? Did the intervention identify and adequately address the underlying causes of exclusion, discrimination and inequalities?	Relevance
How coherent is the intervention in relation to your organisation's policies and practices on human rights and targeted action on the cross-cutting objectives? How coherent is the intervention in relation to external policy commitments? How coherent is the intervention with other interventions in relation to human rights and targeted action on the cross-cutting objectives?	Coherence
To what extent does the allocation of resources reflect the varied needs of persons in vulnerable situations and/or who are marginalised in their communities? Did the allocation of resources consider the targeted human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination and/or disability inclusion topic at hand in an adequate manner? Was differential resource allocation appropriate? Do the investment costs per person targeted meet the differentiated needs of people of different genders? How efficiently were the targeted actions implemented?	Efficiency

Example questions for targeted action:**Related criteria**

To what extent did the intervention meet the human rights/gender equality/discrimination/disability inclusion-related objectives it aimed for? Who have benefitted from the intervention? How have the rights of the different genders, age and population groups including persons with disabilities and other groups that might face discrimination improved? Do they have a better understanding of their rights and the duties of the government as well as improved capacities and means to act? To what extent have barriers, discrimination or stigma decreased? How has the intervention increased awareness, increased equality and reduced inequalities? Have perceptions, norms, stereotypes or values been altered during the course of the project? How did gendered norms and barriers within the wider political, economic, religious, legislative and socio-cultural environment affect the outcomes? Did the intervention's Theory of Change and results framework include human rights and gender equality/discrimination/disability inclusion-related objectives, assumptions or other elements? Have strategies to promote gender equality and/or the inclusion of persons with disabilities and other persons facing discrimination in programs been effective? Have mechanisms to monitor the inclusion of women and girls, different gender identities, persons with disabilities and other groups that may face discrimination, been effective?

Effectiveness

To what extent has the intervention contributed to more equal power relations between people and to changing of social norms, structures and systems? Did the intervention contribute to improved gender equality, elimination of discrimination and/or the broader realization of human rights within wider legal, political, economic and social systems? Has the project had any unexpected or unintentional (including gendered, inclusion/exclusion) impacts? To what extent did gender-related impacts intersect with other social barriers such as disability and age to contribute to differential experiences and impacts?

Impact

Have the results been sustainable and lasting for all, without discrimination? Have they been sustainable in terms of socio-cultural, ecological, economic sense? How likely is it that beneficiaries and stakeholders will remain engaged in the long-term? Have the management and substantive capacities duty-bearers and stakeholders been strengthened? Has the intervention contributed into an institutional change which is conducive to systematically addressing human rights and equality concerns? Has the intervention contributed into creating accountability and oversight systems between rights-holders and duty-bearers? How successful has the intervention been in creating an enabling or adaptable environment for real change related to human rights, non-discrimination and gender equality?

Sustainability

Evaluation questions for policy influencing can similarly be derived from the OECD DAC evaluation criteria.

For example:

1. How relevant and adaptive has the implementation of policy influencing activities been to specific development contexts (dealing with external factors), why, and what can be learnt from this experience? (relevance)
2. How coherent have the policy influencing activities been with internal and external policy commitments relevant to the cross-cutting objectives? (coherence)
3. How efficiently have the policy influencing activities been implemented? (efficiency)
4. How successful has the intervention been in implementing policy influencing that advances the cross-cutting objectives? How successful has the intervention been in designing and managing policy influencing, and what can be learnt from this experience? What are the factors internal and external to the intervention that influence the success of policy influencing? (effectiveness)
5. To what extent has the policy influencing contributed to policy change, addressing root causes of discrimination and/or transformational changes for the rights-holders? (impact)
6. How sustainable have the policy influencing efforts been and will such activities and their benefits continue in the long run? (sustainability)

III. Sources and further reading

CBM. Inclusion made easy, A quick program guide to disability in development (Evaluation phase checklist) https://www.cbm.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/cbm_inclusion_made_easy_a_quick_guide_to_disability_in_development.pdf

DIWA (2013) Gender and Disability Mainstreaming Training Manual. (Handout 5) <https://www.womenenabled.org/pdfs/mapping/DIWA%20Gender%20and%20Disability%20Mainstreaming%20Training%20Manual.pdf>

European Commission, Toolkit gender in EU-funded research (2011) (Checklist for gender in research): <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/c17a4eba-49ab-40f1-bb7b-bb6faaf8dec8>

European Commission (2012) Training on the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in EU Development Cooperation. Module 7: Implementation of disability inclusive development in EU cooperation. <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/disability-and-development-network/wiki/training-inclusion-persons-disabilities-eu-development-cooperation-29-30-november-2012>

European Commission Child Rights Mainstreaming in Programme and Project Cycle Management: <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/sites/default/files/learning/Child-rights/6.2.html>

EvalGender (2016) “Evaluating the Sustainable Development Goals With a “No one left behind” lens through equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluations”: <https://www.evalpartners.org/sites/default/files/documents/eval-gender/EN-Evaluating-SDG-web.pdf>

OECD (2023) *Applying a Human Rights and Gender Equality Lens to the OECD Evaluation Criteria*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9aaf2f98-en>.

OECD DAC (2021) *Applying Evaluation Criteria Thoughtfully. Applying a Gender Lens to the Criteria* (Chapter 3). <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/d1aca6d0-en/index.html?itemId=/content/component/d1aca6d0-en#section-d1e1931>

Sally Robinsona, Karen R. Fisherb & Robert Strike (2014) on BetterEvaluation. Participatory and Inclusive Approaches to Disability Program Evaluation: <https://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/paia.pdf>

UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference: <https://www.unicef.org/media/54786/file>

UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards: <https://www.unicef.org/media/54771/file>

UNICEF Guidance on Gender Integration in Evaluation (2019): [https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/media/1226/file/UNICEF%20Guidance%20on%20Gender%20\(Full%20version\).pdf](https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/media/1226/file/UNICEF%20Guidance%20on%20Gender%20(Full%20version).pdf)

UNICEF (2011) How to Design and Manage Equity-focused Evaluations: https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resource/guide/design_manage_equity_focused_evaluation

UNEG (2014) Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations. <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/980>

UNEG (2014) Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations. Determining the evaluability of the HR & GE dimensions of an intervention in the evaluation (Table 1.1): <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/980>

UNEG (2020) Ethical Guidance for Evaluation (Ethics, Do no Harm): <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>

UNDG (2011). Including the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in United Nations Programming at Country Level. A Guidance Note for United Nations Country Teams and Implementing Partners. (Chapter 3, Entry points in Monitoring and Evaluation): https://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/undg_guidance_note.pdf

UNFPA (2020) Guidance on Disability-Inclusive Evaluation: https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/admin-resource/2020_Guidance_on_Disability-Inclusive_Evaluation_FINAL.pdf

UN Women Evaluation Handbook (2015): How to manage gender-responsive evaluation: <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2015/4/un-women-evaluation-handbook-how-to-manage-gender-responsive-evaluation>

USAID (2004) Checklist for inclusion: https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/disinclusion_checklist.pdf

UNDESA. Monitoring and Evaluation of Disability-Inclusive Development: <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/resources/monitoring-and-evaluation-of-inclusive-development.html>

Vammaiskumppanuus: valtavirtaistamistyökalu: https://www.vammaiskumppanuus.fi/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Valtavirtaistamisty%C3%B6kalu_verkkosivuille_2017.pdf

Special thanks to Pamela White and Paul Silfverberg for their contributions to an earlier version from the evaluation practitioners' points of view.

- 1 As per all prohibited grounds of discrimination laid out in United Nations' human rights instruments, looking especially at multiple and aggravated forms of discrimination.
- 2 Based on the principle non-discrimination, Finland supports the autonomy of persons with disabilities and their right to live without discrimination, stigma or violence. Finland supports the capacities of developing countries to implement disability-inclusive legislation and development, promotes the wellbeing of persons with disabilities and strengthens the disability movement's operating capacity. MFA (2021) "Report on Development Policy Across Parliamentary Terms".
- 3 All MFA staff are requested to check the latest versions of the guidelines at the time of use. See: <https://bit.ly/3IcRSpo> ; and <https://bit.ly/3qD5WCM>
- 4 By evaluation managers we mean persons who are commissioning, coordinating and managing the evaluation processes.
- 5 This tool provides some examples of evaluation questions that may be relevant particularly to interventions with targeted action and/or mainstreaming, as well as examples by the various evaluation criteria. These are indicative only, and the categorisation is not meant to be restrictive.