

**5-Year Review of UN Action Against Sexual Violence in Conflict  
MPTF OFFICE GENERIC FINALPROGRAMME<sup>1</sup> NARRATIVE REPORT  
REPORTING PERIOD: FROM 06.2012 TO 03.2013**

<b>Programme Title &amp; Project Number</b>	<b>Country, Locality(s), Priority Area(s) / Strategic Results<sup>2</sup></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme Title:</li> <li>UN Action Against Sexual Violence in Conflict Programme Number (<i>if applicable</i>)</li> <li>MPTF Office Project Reference Number:<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>	<p><i>(if applicable)</i> Country/Region</p>
<b>Participating Organization(s)</b>	<b>Implementing Partners</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme</li> </ul> <p>UNICEF &amp; OCHA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National counterparts (government, private, NGOs &amp; others) and other International Organizations</li> </ul> <p>UNICEF, UN Action &amp; OCHA</p>
<b>Programme/Project Cost (US\$)</b>	<b>Programme Duration</b>
<p>Total approved budget as per project document: \$89,825</p> <p>Percentage of indirect support costs from MDTF contribution: 5,876 (7%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>by Agency (<i>if applicable</i>)</li> </ul> <p>Agency Contribution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>by Agency (<i>if applicable</i>)</li> </ul> <p>Government Contribution (<i>if applicable</i>)</p>	<p>Overall Duration <i>6 months plus a 3 month no-cost extension</i></p> <p>Start Date<sup>4</sup> (<i>06.11.2012</i>)</p> <p>Original End Date<sup>5</sup> (<i>30.11.2012</i>)</p> <p>Actual End date<sup>6</sup> (<i>31 March 2013</i>)</p> <p>Have agency(ies) operationally      Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>

<sup>1</sup> The term “programme” is used for programmes, joint programmes and projects.

<sup>2</sup> Strategic Results, as formulated in the Strategic UN Planning Framework (e.g. UNDAF) or project document;

<sup>3</sup> The MPTF Office Project Reference Number is the same number as the one on the Notification message. It is also referred to as “Project ID” on the project’s factsheet page on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#).

<sup>4</sup> The start date is the date of the first transfer of the funds from the MPTF Office as Administrative Agent. Transfer date is available on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#)

<sup>5</sup> As per approval of the original project document by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee.

<sup>6</sup> If there has been an extension, then the revised, approved end date should be reflected here. If there has been no extension approved, then the current end date is the same as the original end date. The end date is the same as the operational closure date which is when all activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF / JP have been completed. As per the MOU, agencies are to notify the MPTF Office when a programme completes its operational activities. Please see [MPTF Office Closure Guidelines](#).

Other Contributions (donors) (if applicable)	closed the Programme in its(their) system?
<b>TOTAL:</b>	Expected Financial Closure date <sup>7</sup> : 31 March 2013
<b>Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.</b>	<b>Report Submitted By</b>
Evaluation Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Date: dd.mm.yyyy	<input type="checkbox"/> Name: Mendy Marsh & Kate Burns
Evaluation Report - Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Date: dd.mm.yyyy	<input type="checkbox"/> Title: Specialist, GBV in Emergencies, Senior Policy Officer
	<input type="checkbox"/> Participating Organization (Lead): UNICEF & OCHA
	<input type="checkbox"/> Email address: <a href="mailto:mmarsh@unicef.org">mmarsh@unicef.org</a> , burns@un.org

### **FINAL PROGRAMME REPORT FORMAT**

Called for by the Steering Committee of the UN Action Network, the purpose of this Review was to examine the progress made since the establishment of UN Action in 2007, take stock of achievements, lessons learned, good practices and challenges, and make recommendations for future strategic directions and priorities of UN Action Network. The findings of the review will be used by the UN Action Network to inform its future work and priorities.

The Review employed a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches that included a number of different data collection tools from primary and secondary sources, such as documents review, key informant interviews,<sup>8</sup> focus groups and surveys of key stakeholders. A questionnaire was developed in advance by the consultant on issues to be raised during face to face interviews and in order to solicit specific information from UN Action entities and external partners.<sup>9</sup> Visits to New York and Geneva ensured appropriate face-to-face consultation with relevant actors/entities.

The elements of the main report that were most critical included a matrix detailing recommendations, including where responsibility for follow up should lie; a brief chapter on the methodology used and its limitations; analysis of contexts in which UN Action conducts its work that were evaluated; chapters structured around the questions outlined in the ToR (ex. what was the issue evaluated, what evidence was found, what conclusions were drawn, and what lessons were learned) and recommendations that are clearly stated and draw logically from the findings and conclusions, and are actionable); and a document review, including bibliography of documents (e.g. web pages, etc.) relevant to the Review.

## **I. Purpose**

### Introduction of the project:

<sup>7</sup> Financial Closure requires the return of unspent balances and submission of the [Certified Final Financial Statement and Report](#).

<sup>8</sup> UN Action Secretariat, the Office of the SRSG SVC, UN Action entities, members of other relevant parts of the UN (for instance other comparable networks and other SRSGs involved in aspects of the protection of civilians), NGOs, and donors

<sup>9</sup> External partners to be consulted should include SRSGs/RCs in priority countries as well as relevant civil society organizations both national and international.

United Nations Action Against Sexual Violence in Conflict (UN Action) was created in March 2007, in recognition of the importance of system-wide coordination, both in headquarters and at the country level, for the effectiveness of efforts to prevent and address conflict-related sexual violence.

UN Action is a network of 13 entities working to improve system-wide coherence and accountability and to support country-based efforts in prevention and response to the needs of survivors of conflict-related sexual violence (CRSV). The work of UN Action is governed by a Steering Committee consisting of Principals from the 13 UN entities, chaired by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict (SRG-SVC), and supported by a Secretariat (which reports to the SRSG and sits administratively within her Office). UN Action is guided by a biennial Strategic Framework, the day-to-day leadership of the UN Action Focal Points, and funded in part by a Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF), which is governed by a Resource Management Committee.

Called for by the Steering Committee of the UN Action Network, the purpose of this Review was to examine the progress made since the establishment of UN Action in 2007, take stock of the achievements, lessons learned, good practices and challenges, and make recommendations for future strategic directions and priorities of the UN Action Network. The findings of the review will be used by the UN Action Network to inform future work and priorities. The Steering Committee was comprised of focal points from a subset of UN Action member entities and served in an advisory capacity to the Review without management responsibilities including UNICEF, OCHA, UNFPA, OHCHR, DPKO, UN Women and UNDP. While the review was managed by UNICEF and OCHA, UNICEF was identified as the organization to apply for funding for the Review through the RMC, contract the Review consultant, and provide day-to-day support to the consultant. Members of the Steering Group were expected to:

- Assist with the preparation of a proposal to the MPTF to fund the Review
- Review a proposed work-plan;
- Provide relevant material/information requested by the review manager in a timely fashion;
- Provide assistance with templates and technical standards;
- Review and comment on all deliverables of the Review, including the Review Outline and any survey instrument reproduced;
- Provide guidance and offer strategic direction for the Review;
- Ensure access to all stakeholders within their respective organizations and to other key external stakeholders, as necessary;
- Refer the consultants and/or agency to relevant organizations/staff, as required;
- Liaise with all relevant UN Action entities to provide feedback to specific questions/queries; and,
- Consult with all UN Action entities and ensure adequate opportunity for input.

Main objectives: The overall objective of the Review was to take stock of UN Action's achievements and examine past and current challenges and opportunities faced in its action against conflict-related sexual violence. The Review also examined the functions, objectives, and structure of UN Action and its relations with other relevant parts of the UN system, as well as with governments and international and local non-governmental organizations (NGOs). It was based on OECD-DAC criteria, in particular relevance, efficiency, effectiveness (including timeliness), impact and sustainability.

The Review was expected to make forward-looking recommendations for the strategic direction of UN Action for the next 5 years, and specifically toward improving the UN System's coherence, flexibility to address emergency concerns, information-sharing, communication and role in preventing and responding to CRSV.

Expected outcomes: The results for the project included:

- Generated lessons on how successful, effective and efficient UN Action is in ensuring effective coordination and collective action across the participating entities, at both international and national levels, in relation to conflict related sexual violence;
- Assessed the progress made, analyzed good practices and lessons learned, and identified barriers and facilitating factors in achieving UN Action’s main objectives (strengthening advocacy, improving coordination and accountability, and supporting country efforts to prevent CRSV and response effectively to the needs of survivors);
- Examined the changes in the institutional and policy environment, at the global level, since the establishment of UN Action and identified current opportunities and challenges;
- Assessed the effectiveness of UN Action in improving system-wide coordination around the issue of CRSV, and examined determinates for effective inter-agency collaboration, including in the field (as possible);
- Examined the functions, objectives and structure of the UN Action network and its relation with other relevant parts of the UN system, including the OSRSG SVC and related structures such as the Team of Experts;
- Assessed the effectiveness of UN Action’s interaction and cooperation with national governments and non-governmental organization;
- Assessed the role of the MPTF, in facilitating coordination across members, with specific focus on improving joint prevention and response to CRSV in specific country contexts; and
- Assessed the governance arrangement of the fund, whether it is being used optimally for catalytic interventions.

## II. Assessment of Programme Results

### i) Narrative reporting on results:

From January to December 2012, respond to the guiding questions, indicated below to provide a narrative summary of the results achieved. The aim here is to tell the **story of change** that your Programme has achieved over its entire duration. Make reference to the implementation mechanism utilized and key partnerships.

Key stakeholders: The Review was managed by OCHA and UNICEF with support from UN Action Secretariat. The activities of the project were undertaken in coordination with the UN Action network at the global level. Interviews and Focus Groups at the country-level were facilitated by UNICEF and OCHA.

Key beneficiaries: The direct beneficiary of the project was UN Action. The main indirect beneficiaries were the survivors themselves, governments, UN agencies, and service providers operating in health, psychosocial, security and legal support areas. However, it is important to note that in this project, the impact on indirect beneficiaries was both more real and measurable than the term ‘indirect beneficiary’ usually implies, as UN Action has a direct impact on the afore mentioned “indirect beneficiaries”.

**Outcomes and outputs:** Key outputs of the project have been as follows:

- Review Outline: The outline, not exceeding 3000 words, set out a detailed methodological plan during the inception phase and outlined the main issues to be addressed in the Review Report.
- Inception Phase and Report: Bilateral and group telephone meetings were held with the Chair and members of the Steering Group for the Review to agree and define critical areas of approach and coverage by the Review. Documentation was gathered and subject to desk review, outreach was made to focal points and country level focal points for participation in the Review. Some initial interviews/conversations were conducted to cross-reference and test approach. A full inception report was submitted and cleared by the Steering Group.
- Review missions for focus groups and interviews: These missions involved conducting a number of in-person interviews with UN Action Focal Points across most of the 13 entities, principals, donor representatives, NGO representatives, the ORSRG SV, former staff as well as leadership of UN Action. A set of focus groups was also carried out with Focal Points, NGOs, and the OSRSG.
- Preparation of the Meta Questionnaire and Set up of On-Line Survey: During August and following on from the clearance of the Inception Report, a Meta Questionnaire was developed to cover the 8 area of enquiry set out for the Review. This served as the basis for Interviews and Focus Groups. Separately, and on-line survey was created in English that drilled down the area of Country Level Support and was targeted at the 7 focus countries of UN action. Follow up was conducted at country level mobilization through focal points, and feedback was reviewed.
- Mission to New York for UN Action Annual Strategic Planning meeting including presentation on Review and Workshop (Validation Round Table) for initial findings and scoping of recommendations. Additional interviews were conducted during this week including with new SRSG.
- Draft report produced and reviewed by the Review Steering Committee and presented at a Roundtable with UN Action Focal Points. The final report was then produced incorporating comments and feedback, and an Executive Summary that was then finalized and shared.

- **Qualitative assessment:** N/A

## ii) Evaluation, Best Practices and Lessons Learned

- Evaluations and studies:
  - Internal Evaluation: The steering committee (comprised of focal points from a subset of UN Action member entities) served in an advisory capacity to the Review without management responsibilities. Members were expected to:
    - Assist with the preparation of a proposal to the MPTF to fund the Review;
    - Review a proposed workplan;
    - Provide relevant material/information requested by the review manager in a timely fashion;
    - Provide assistance with templates and technical standards;

- Review and comment on all deliverables of the Review, including the Review Outline and any survey instruments produced;
- Provide guidance and offer strategic direction for Review;
- Ensure access to all stakeholders within their respective organizations and to other key external stakeholders, as necessary;
- Refer the consultants and/or agency to relevant organizations/staff, as required;
- Liaise with all relevant UN Action entities to provide feedback to specific questions/queries; and
- Consult with all UN Action entities and ensure adequate opportunities.

➤ External evaluation: N/A

- Challenges and risk mitigation: The project challenges are as follows:

➤ Coordination: Much of the work was done with UN Action Principals, Focal Points, and various field actors at the UN, government and I/NGO levels, as well as various coordination networks which caused some delay. The UNICEF and OCHA worked directly with the Review Steering Committee to ensure that each of the UN Action entities took responsibility to motivate the different individuals, institutions and networks to provide feedback in a timely manner.

➤ Security situation: N/A

- Best Practices and lessons learned: Agree in in the future exactly how the findings of any UN Action Review will be shared. Some agencies such as OCHA, UNPFA and UNICEF wanted the full findings of the Review to be widely shared in a transparent manner, but not UN Action entities have the same view.