OIOS-IED Mainstreaming Guidelines and Checklist for Evaluations

Last updated 15 June 2023

Contents

Statement of Intent

OIOS-IED evaluators are governed by, and required to adhere to, minimum standards for mainstreaming human rights, gender, disability inclusion and environmental issues in all evaluations. OIOS-IED evaluators must ensure that mainstreaming issues are considered in the scope, design, implementation and reporting of evaluations by consulting with this evaluation checklist during the planning and inception phase of each evaluation.

OIOS-IED evaluators must also adhere to the minimum ethical standards in the conduct of evaluation.

---

1. Section 1: OIOS-IED mainstreaming mandate and standard inception paper text

OIOS-IED evaluations must consider issues pertaining to gender, disability inclusion, the environment and human rights at key stages of the evaluation lifecycle (detailed below in section 2). This requirement stems from General Assembly resolutions, Secretary General bulletins and related guidance and is additionally embodied in the ST/AI/2021/3 on evaluation in the Secretariat.[1] Further, OIOS has committed in its budget to considering the extent of UN Secretariat entities' mainstreaming of gender perspectives, disability inclusion, environmental issues and human rights in programming. Mainstreaming focal points in each of the four core areas have been established to support implementation.

OIOS-IED mainstreaming mandate should be clearly articulated in the inception paper. A suggested summary paragraph to include in inception papers is as follows:

> **Standard inception paper text on IED mainstreaming**:
>
> In line with UN Secretariat guidance, OIOS has committed to consider, where feasible, entities' mainstreaming of gender perspectives, disability inclusion, environmental issues and human rights.[2] As mandated by General Assembly resolutions and Secretary-General Bulletins, human rights (A/RES/60/1; A/RES/76/6), gender (A/RES/71/243), disability inclusion (A/RES/75/154) and environment (ST/SGB/2019/7) must be mainstreamed in all UN policies and programmes (A/RES/75/233)[3]. UNEG Norms and Standards further require the explicit inclusion of these considerations in evaluations.[4]
>
> In this regard, standards and issues relating to these four cross-cutting, core areas have been incorporated into both the design and conduct of the present evaluation. This includes conducting the evaluation in adherence to strict ethical standards and ensuring that these four core areas have been considered in the evaluation scope and design of evaluation questions and indicators.

Further details on mainstreaming (also expanded on in section 3.3)

Mainstreaming mandates include, but are not limited to, the following:

- **Gender**: General Assembly resolutions A/RES/53/120 (para 3), A/RES/60/1 (paras 59 and 166), A/RES/70/1 (para 20), A/RES/71/243 (para 13)
- **Disability Inclusion**: A/RES/75/154
- **Environmental Issues:** ST.SGB.2019.7 - Environmental policy for the UNS;
  In paragraph 19 of its resolution 72/219 of 20 December 2017, the General Assembly endorsed the Secretary-General's action plan for integrating sustainable development practices into Secretariat-wide operations.

---

[1] See, in particular, paragraph 5.5(b)

[2] A/76/6 (Sect. 30) Evaluation teams to update with current year budget document as needed

[3] General Assembly Resolution A/RES/75/233, incorporates mandates for all mainstreaming areas.

[4] See UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2017), guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation (2014) and Guidance on Integrating Disability Inclusion in Evaluation (2022)

- **Human Rights**: A/51/950 (A/RES/52/12 A/A/RES/52/12 B); A/RES/60/1; A/RES/60/251; A/RES/70/1; A/RES/76/6
- **All Mainstreaming Areas:** A/RES/70/1 Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; A/RES/75/233 The quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system; A/75/982Our Common Agenda adopted by A/RES/76/6; A/76/6 (Section 30); and the ST/AI/2021/3 on evaluation in the Secretariat[5];

---

[5] See in particular: ST/AI on eval, para 5.5(b).

2. Section 2: Evaluation mainstreaming checklist

As noted above, OIOS-IED evaluators must ensure that mainstreaming issues are considered in the scope, design, implementation and reporting of evaluations by consulting with the following checklist during the planning and implementation phases of all evaluations.

The checklist includes considerations and tasks to be undertaken during the following stages:
   i.   Planning and inception (checklist item 1)
   ii. Scope (checklist item 2)
   iii. EDM design (drafting evaluation questions and indicators) (checklist item 3)
   iv. Data collection (checklist item 4)
   v.   Analysis (checklist item 5)
   vi. Reporting and recommendation drafting (checklist item 6)

The checklist is guided by three principles:

   a) **Consideration of mainstreaming issues at all stages of the evaluation**: The universally recognized values and principles associated with gender equality, disability inclusion, environmental considerations and a human rights-based approach should be considered at all stages of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to "leaving no one behind" (LNOB).
   b) **Adoption of the LNOB principle:** Assessing if the impacts of interventions are experienced equally by the groups in situations of vulnerability and identifying why. (LNOB guidance 2019)
   c) **Twin-track approach to mainstreaming for gender, disability inclusion, environment and human rights**: Mainstreaming should be considered for programmes that target cross-cutting issues directly, and those that do not.[6] The twin track approach means that entities should be following these principles in both the conduct of their day-to-day operations and in the design and implementation of specific interventions/programmes.

Checklist item 1: Planning and inception

☑ **Checklist Item 1: Include mainstreaming considerations in the planning and inception phase:** Ensure that mainstreaming issues are considered in evaluation planning and process, including design and conduct according to professional ethical standards.

Determine if/how the evaluand considers cross-cutting issues (gender equality, disability inclusion, environmental and human rights considerations, as well as issues related to other relevant disadvantaged groups e.g., those economically, socially, spatially and/or politically excluded) in the design of its sub-programme/intervention.

---

[6] The twin track approach is often cited with respect to mainstreaming. For example, the UNDIS technical guidance (2020) on evaluation states "Disability inclusion should be considered in the terms of reference of evaluations, including for those that do not have a specific focus on disability inclusion" (p. 82); and the UNEG guidance on human rights and gender mainstreaming (2014) states that "gender mainstreaming is a 'twin track strategy' that involves (1) integrating women and mens' needs and interests into all development policies, programmes and projects and (2) developing interventions oriented at empowering women" (p.29).

Suggestions on how to implement:

- **Consult UNEG professional standards:** The UNEG Norms and Standards require that evaluations are "conducted with the highest standards of integrity and respect for the beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environment; for human rights and gender equality; and for the 'do no harm' principle for humanitarian assistance".[7] The UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations provide further guidance in conducting evaluations with due consideration of integrity, accountability, respect and beneficence, and provide a useful checklist of ethical issues to be considered at each stage of an evaluation in line with a human rights-based approach to evaluation conduct.[8] The Guidelines should be consulted at the evaluation outset to ensure that an ethical lens informs day-to-day evaluation practice.

- **Augment evaluation teams with relevant expertise**: The evaluation team should include, where necessary, expertise in gender equality, disability inclusion, environment and/or human rights in order to assist in framing questions and preparing sound analysis and findings. Sufficient expertise may be found within OIOS-IED or sourced externally as needed. Chiefs/team leaders should ensure a gender-balanced, culturally diverse and culturally competent team, making use of national evaluation expertise where possible.

- **Consider mainstreaming issues in initial background research:**
  - **Evaluand/programme initial document review**: The initial document review should identify the extent to which the sub-programme/intervention explicitly references and considers the four cross-cutting issues in its programme design[9], planning, budget and policy documents (and any other relevant documentation pertaining to the evaluand/programme under review). If these documents do not exist, ask the evaluand why; this will already provide useful information to frame crosscutting issues in the evaluation.
  - **Stakeholder mapping** should identify all stakeholders involved in and engaged by the evaluand/programme being evaluated, with particular attention to duty-bearers and rights-holders involved. Evaluations responsive to human rights, gender, disability inclusion and the environment should include due consideration of the inequalities, discriminatory practices and unjust power relations that are central to development problems. This includes assessing the extent to which power relations have changed as a result of the intervention. Evaluators must also be sensitive to power dynamics in the conduct of an evaluation.

- **Include crosscutting issues in scoping interviews**: Ask sub-programme/intervention management about their stakeholders and if/how gender, disability inclusion, environment and human rights considerations, as well as issues related to other disadvantaged groups, are considered.

---

[7] Norms and Standards for Evaluation. UNEG. 2017. http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914

[8] UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations. UNEG. 2020. http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866

[9] Programme/intervention design documents may include intervention activities, log frames, indicators, risk registers, monitoring and evaluation systems and reporting mechanisms and documents.

Checklist item 2: Scope

☑ **Checklist Item 2: Prioritize cross-cutting issues during scoping:** Assess the applicability and relative importance of cross-cutting issues of gender, disability inclusion, environment and human rights considerations, as well as issues related to other relevant disadvantaged groups (e.g. economically, socially, spatially and/or politically excluded), to determine which, if any, should have a greater focus in the evaluation. The intention is not to exclude any cross-cutting issue, but rather to determine if any issues are more relevant and would merit greater focus than others, recognizing resource limitations.

Suggestions on how to implement:

- **Ensure consideration of the cross-cutting issues during theory of change design.** When analyzing the results chain, explore how it incorporated groups in situations of vulnerability and/or environmental considerations. Make explicit these considerations or lack thereof, by including them in writing the theory of change.

- **At the stage of outcome selection, review the theory of change** to determine if any of the outcomes could benefit from deeper assessment of one or more particular cross-cutting issue. This will inevitably be informed by the initial document review, stakeholder mapping exercise and scoping interview analysis.

Checklist item 3: EDM design (evaluation questions and indicators)

☑ **Checklist Item 3: EDM design (drafting evaluation questions and indicators)**: At a minimum, at least one evaluation question pertaining to all four mainstreaming issues must be included in all OIOS-IED evaluations. However, the ideal is that evaluations include separate questions and/or indicators on each mainstreaming issue to ensure depth of assessment.

Suggestions on how to implement:

- **Ensure consideration of cross-cutting issues in evaluation question design**: Include at least one evaluation question and indicator that commits the evaluation team to identifying (a) the extent to which cross-cutting issues have been considered in the programme/intervention design (including the extent to which stakeholders have been engaged in the programme/intervention design process) and (b) the extent to which stakeholders have/have not benefitted from the sub-programme/intervention outputs. The evaluation team may consider the following options:

  - **Option 1: Develop specific evaluation questions for cross-cutting issues**: The evaluation team may focus on cross-cutting issues by developing separate evaluation questions and indicators. This may be especially helpful for programmes that do not have a direct focus on these issues. Sample evaluation questions can be found in Section 3.1.

  - **Option 2: Develop an overarching evaluation question:** In lieu of separate evaluation questions and indicators on each cross-cutting issue, teams may draft an overall evaluation question to capture the extent to which cross-cutting issues are considered in programming.

- **Option 3: Embed crosscutting issues in broader questions:** The evaluation team may choose to embed cross-cutting issues into relevant evaluation questions and indicators if breaking these out is duplicative.

Checklist item 4: Data collection

☑ **Checklist Item 4: Inclusive data collection:** The evaluation team should ensure that data collection embeds cross-cutting issues and considers accessibility and inclusion needs of stakeholders in line with the ethical standards for the conduct of evaluations.[10] Inclusive stakeholder engagement modes should be considered when detailing data collection methods (e.g., surveys, case studies, focus groups etc.) to be employed for each question and indicator.

Suggestions on how to implement:

- **Consider inclusive stakeholder engagement modes when selecting data collection methods**: Evaluation teams should detail in the inception paper how stakeholders, including both duty bearers and rights holders, will be engaged in the evaluation process, giving due consideration to participation barriers (for example, including accessibility, language and literacy, time, location and communication modes).

- **Mainstream cross-cutting issues in instrumentation**: Data collection instruments (e.g. surveys, interview guides, document review frameworks and protocols) should include cross-cutting issues where applicable and relevant (in line with EDM questions and indicators).

- **Ensure inclusive consultations:** The evaluation team should ensure that consultations are inclusive, participatory and respectful of all stakeholders, which includes a deliberate effort to consult marginalized and traditionally excluded respondents. This may include women, people with disabilities and minority groups. In the case of evaluations whose main stakeholders are UN Secretariat staff, the evaluation team should make a deliberate effort to include staff who are harder to reach where relevant. For example, this may include staff from field/local offices, staff from administrative categories, staff from countries that are under-represented and staff whose main language is not English.

- **Adhere to ethical standards:** Evaluators must treat all stakeholder groups with integrity, respect and cultural sensitivity. Interviews must be conducted according to the principle of informed consent and evaluators should inform stakeholders about how data will be used.

- **Conduct accessible data collection:** The evaluation team should ensure that evaluation methods and instruments are universally accessible. For example, electronic surveys should be machine readable[11], there should be physical access for in-person focus groups and interviews and translation or interpretation made available for non-English speaking respondents.

---

[10] UNEG Ethical Standards for Evaluators
[11] See guidance from Qualtrics on accessibility

Checklist item 5: Analysis

☑ **Checklist Item 5: Data analysis**: The evaluation team should ensure data disaggregation where relevant and conduct analyses to highlight any important differences in intervention/programme outcomes based on gender, disability inclusion, environment and human rights considerations, as well as related to other relevant disadvantaged groups (e.g. those economically, socially, spatially and/or politically excluded).

Suggestions on how to implement:

- **Conduct power analyses:** The evaluation team could consider conducting a power analysis to identify and document differences in outcomes for women/girls, men/boys, people with disabilities and other disadvantaged groups. This should include consideration of resources, norms, roles and interests associated with the interventions.

- **Ensure data disaggregation:** Wherever possible, data should be disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, age, disability and/or other relevant factors.

- **Triangulate and validate data for inclusion:** Teams should ensure that a diverse range of data sources and processes are employed (i.e. triangulation and validation) to guarantee accuracy and credibility.

Checklist item 6: Reporting and recommendations

☑ **Checklist Item 6: Reporting and recommendations:** Evaluation reports <u>must</u> include at least one result statement or sub-result statement (at least one sentence) that articulates mainstreaming findings. Where deficiencies are identified, evaluation reports should include a recommendation on the incorporation of gender equality, disability inclusion, environment and human rights considerations. Dependent on resource availability, teams are encouraged to develop supplemental products to communicate mainstreaming findings in more detail.

Suggestions on how to implement:

- **Some options for the inclusion of a result of sub-result statement:**

  - **Ensure extent of mainstreaming features in result statement**: If individual cross-cutting issue evaluation questions have been designed (option 1 in checklist item 3 above), the result or sub-result statement should describe the extent to which the cross-cutting issue(s) was prioritized and mainstreamed in programming.

  - **Embed mainstreaming results in broader results statements:** The evaluation team may embed relevant cross-cutting issues in results statements as appropriate. These issues may, for example, be related to programme design and/or outcome gaps for some stakeholders.

- **Include a stand-alone recommendation where relevant:** Consider including a recommendation of the cross-cutting issue(s), if found critical for attaining the outcome or result sought by the intervention.

- **Ensure absence is reported in cases where evidence indicates a lack of mainstreaming in programming:** If there is no data indicating mainstreaming efforts, this is a finding in itself and should be included in the report. If possible, include gaps and limitations found, as well as any effects derived from the lack of mainstreaming these issues.

- **Provide supplemental analyses where useful:** Ideally, an expanded analysis on one or more of these issues could be developed and provided to the evaluand as a supplemental product.

3. Section 3: Additional resources to support mainstreaming

3.1. Evaluation question bank[12]

The question bank below will be updated periodically with questions and indicators from reviewed OIOS-IED inception papers.

3.1.1. Evaluation questions encompassing all cross-cutting issues

Assessing Inclusiveness
- To what extent have interventions/programmes become more participatory and supported the inclusion of the most marginalized rights holders?
- To what extent have evaluands/duty bearers created conditions for the groups in situations of vulnerability/marginalization to be included in intervention/programme design, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and reporting?
- To what extent have groups in situations of vulnerability (for example, women, youth and persons with disabilities), who may have been disproportionally affected by the intervention/programme, been engaged in design, planning and implementation?
- To what extent have all beneficiaries, including those traditionally excluded, benefitted from the intervention/programme?
- To what degree were the outcomes achieved equitably and distributed among the stakeholder groups?

Assessing Results
- What, if any, tangible results have been achieved through the integration of mainstreaming issues into the work of the entity?
- Were there any unintended results on mainstreaming issues in the intervention? Were they positive or negative and in which ways did they affect the different stakeholders?
- To what extent did the intervention/programme enhance national policymaker capacity to integrate gender, disability inclusion, environmental and/or human rights considerations into national policy and programming? What outcomes did they contribute to?[13]
- To what extent, and in what ways, did the groups in situations of vulnerability that were identified in the intervention/programme benefit from the programme?

Assessing Organizational Aspects
- How effectively has the evaluand/programme supported the integration of gender, equity and human rights into the work of the Organization?
- To what extent, and in what ways, has the evaluand/programme worked in partnership with internal and external stakeholders?
- What factors, if any, have affected the evaluand's ability to meaningfully integrate gender, disability inclusion, environmental considerations and human rights into its work?

---

[12] Source: IED Inception Papers; UNEG 2014, Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations.
[13] To the extent that data is available, this analysis will seek to include focus on the evaluand entity support to national governments in the area of SDG implementation.

3.1.2. Environment-related evaluation questions

- Beyond consideration of human systems, to what extent, is this entity factoring in consideration of impacts on natural systems?
- In what ways, if any, has the entity mainstreamed environmental issues into its work planning and/or the operationalization of its mandate?
- In what ways, if any, did the work of X entity positively, or adversely, contribute to environmental issues?
- To what degree, if any, did the work of X entity unintentionally contribute to harming the environment? What lessons can be learned that might be applied in the future to reduce, or eliminate, any harmful environmental outcome?
- To what extent, if any, did X entity plan for positive environmental impact, for example, via environmental assessments?

3.1.3 Human rights-focused and gender-based questions aligned to evaluation criteria[14]

	Assessing design and planning	Assessing implementation	Assessing results
Relevance Extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies	• Was the intervention formulated according to international norms and agreements and to national and local strategies to advance human rights (HR) & gender equality (GE)? • Was the intervention formulated according to the needs and interests of all targeted stakeholder groups? How were these assessed? • Were HR & GE analyses conducted at the design stage? Did they offer good quality information on the underlying causes of human rights violations, inequality and discrimination to inform the intervention?	• Did the activities undertaken operationalize a HR & GE approach? • Did the activities undertaken meet the needs of the various groups of stakeholders, including those who are most likely to have their rights violated?	• Are the intervention results contributing to the realization of international HR and GE norms and agreements (e.g. CEDAW, UDHR, CRPD), as well as national and local strategies to advance HR & GE? • Do the intervention results respond to the needs of all stakeholders, as identified at the design stage?
Effectiveness Extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved	• Did the intervention's theory of change incorporate the HR & GE dimensions? • Are HR & GE objectives clearly stated in the results framework, including short, medium and long-term objectives? • Is the responsibility for ensuring adherence to HR & GE objectives well-articulated in the performance monitoring framework and implementation plans? • Does the intervention have specific quantitative and qualitative indicators and baselines to measure progress on HR & GE?	• During implementation, were there systematic and appropriate efforts to include various groups of stakeholders, including those who are most likely to have their rights violated? • Did the intervention implementation maximize efforts to build the capacity of rights holders and duty bearers? • Was monitoring data collected and disaggregated according to relevant criteria (sex, age, ethnicity, location, income etc.)? • Was sufficient information collected on specific indicators to measure progress on HR & GE? • Was monitoring information adequately shared with stakeholders	• What were the main results achieved by the intervention towards the realization of HR & GE? • Do the results validate the HR & GE dimensions of the intervention's theory of change? • To what degree were the results achieved equitably distributed among the targeted stakeholder groups? • Do the intervention results contribute to changing attitudes and behaviours towards HR & GE? • Do the intervention results contribute to reducing the underlying causes of inequality and discrimination? • Did the intervention contribute to the empowerment of rights holders to

---

[14] Integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluations. UNEG. 2014. http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616

		(duty bearers, rights holders, women, men)? • How was monitoring data on HR & GE used to improve the intervention during its implementation?	demand and duty bearers to fulfil HR & GE norms?
Efficiency Measure of how economically resources / inputs (funds, expertise, time etc.) are converted to results	• Are there sufficient resources (financial, time, people) allocated to integrate HR & GE in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the intervention? • To what extent are HR & GE a priority in the overall intervention budget? • • What are the costs of not addressing HR & GE adequately from the design stage?	• Were the intervention resources used in an efficient way to address HR & GE in the implementation (e.g. participation of targeted stakeholders, collection of disaggregated data, etc.)? • Were there any constraints (e.g. political, practical, bureaucratic) to addressing HR & GE efficiently during implementation? What level of effort was made to overcome these challenges?	• Was the use of intervention resources to address HR & GE in line with the corresponding results achieved? • Would a modest increase in resources to address HR & GE in the intervention have made possible a substantive increase in corresponding results (e.g. a small increase in monitoring budget to collect disaggregated data, instead of general information; allocation of staff time to look at HR & GE aspects of programme activities)?
Sustainability Continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance is completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience of risk of net benefit flows over time	• Did the intervention design include an appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting national/local ownership, use of local capacity, etc.) to support positive changes in HR & GE after the end of the intervention? • To what extent were stakeholders involved in the preparation of the strategy? • Did the planning framework build on an existing institutional and organizational context that is conducive to the advancement of HR & GE? If not, did the intervention design address the institutional and organizational challenges to advancing the HR & GE agenda?	• Were the elements of the intervention exit strategy addressed during implementation? • To what extent were national and local organizations involved in different aspects of the intervention implementation? • Did the intervention activities aim at promoting sustainable changes in attitudes, behaviours and power relations between the different stakeholder groups? • How was monitoring data on HR & GE used to enhance sustainable change on these issues?	• To what extent do stakeholders have confidence that they will be able to build on the HR & GE changes promoted by the intervention? • To what degree did participating organizations change their policies or practices to improve HR & GE fulfilment (e.g. new services, greater responsiveness, resource re-allocation, improved quality etc.)?
Impact Positive and negative, primary and	• Did the intervention envisage any specific impact on HR & GE? Is it clearly articulated in the results framework?	• How did the intervention activities relate to the intended long-term results on HR & GE?	• Did the intervention clearly lead to the realization of targeted HR & GE norms for the stakeholders identified?

secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended	• Did the intervention design consider how impact on HR & GE could be assessed at a later stage? • To what extent were the potential unintended impacts on the various stakeholder groups identified during the design stage?	• Did the intervention monitoring systems capture progress towards long-term results on HR & GE? • Were there any positive or negative unintended effects on HR & GE identified during implementation? How were they addressed?	• Were there any unintended results on HR & GE in the intervention? Were they positive or negative and in which ways did they affect the different stakeholders? • Did the intervention activities and results in HR & GE influence the work of other organizations and programmes?
Participation and inclusion	• Was the intervention designed in a participatory manner, including all relevant stakeholders? • Were there measures to guarantee that women and the most marginalized and/or discriminated against stakeholders had conditions to participate in the intervention design?	• Did the intervention use participatory processes during its implementation? • What has been done to guarantee that women and the most marginalized and/or discriminated against stakeholders had conditions to participate in the activities developed by the intervention? • What was the overall level and quality of participation by different stakeholders during the intervention? • Were there mechanisms in place for stakeholders to present opinions or complaints and were these considered?	• Was the intervention successful in promoting a culture of participation and inclusion? • Did the intervention create the conditions for participation and inclusion among stakeholders in other spheres of social life? • Did the intervention influence participating organizations to become more participatory and to create conditions for the most marginalized and/or discriminated against to be included in their processes?
Equality and non discrimination	• Was the intervention designed in a way that respected all stakeholders, and did not discriminate based on sex, age, origin, disability, etc.?	• Were the processes and activities implemented during the intervention free from discrimination to all stakeholders? • Did the intervention promote processes to tackle discriminatory practices among its stakeholders? • Did the activities address the underlying causes of inequality and discrimination?	• Did the intervention contribute to a change in discriminatory practices among its stakeholders? • Did all stakeholders benefit from the results of the intervention, regardless of their sex, origin, age, disabilities, etc? • Do the results of the intervention point to better conditions for all to enjoy their rights, without discrimination? • Are there any groups excluded from the results of the intervention?
Social transformation	• Was the implementation designed with a view to promoting social transformation within its beneficiary community?	• To what extent did the processes and activities implemented during the intervention focus on promotion	• Do the results of the intervention point to changes in social relations and power structures among its stakeholders?

		changes in social relations and power structures?	Are there clear changes in attitudes and behaviours that demonstrate a fairer distribution of power among the stakeholders of the intervention?
Empowerment	• Did the intervention design contemplate measures to empower its stakeholders, particularly women and individuals from marginalized and/or discriminated groups? • Were different groups of stakeholders part of the decision-making process during the design stage of the intervention?	• Did the processes and activities implemented by the intervention promote the empowerment of different stakeholder groups, particularly women and individuals from marginalized and/or discriminated groups? • Were structures created during the intervention to allow all stakeholders to participate in decision-making? • Were there any particular capacity development activities focusing on stakeholders' capacity to make decisions?	• Are there groups that have become more empowered as a result of the intervention? How can this be demonstrated?

3.2. Sample indicators[15]

Evaluation Question	Indicator(s)	Related Method(s):
To what extent did capacity building activities, meetings and seminars enhance national policymaker abilities to integrate gender, disability inclusion, environmental and human rights considerations? What outcomes, if any, did they contribute toward?	*Extent to which policymakers perceived that their capacities to integrate gender, human rights, environmental and disability considerations were strengthened *Extent to which contributions to outcomes can be identified (e.g. through review of national policies triangulated with other data in case study countries)	*Case studies which include review of national policies geared toward identifying any inclusion of these mainstreaming areas; related analyses *Stakeholder interviews and /or focus groups similarly oriented *Stakeholder survey questions similarly oriented
To what extent do Women, Peace and Security (WPS) activities during elections and political transitions consider and reflect the experiences of those living with disabilities, especially women and girls with disabilities?	*Degree to which projects and activities are inclusive of persons with disabilities to vote, stand for elections, and hold office on an equal basis with others.	*Case studies which include review of project documents, interviews, and data on quotas or other temporary special measures to support candidates and elected officials with disabilities
To what extent do WPS policies and activities engage women in addressing gender-differentiated risks and opportunities of climate change impacts in fragile contexts?	*Presence of assessments on climate-related risks and opportunities for womens' participation and leadership.	*Evidence of gender-responsive conflict analysis conducted by entity *Case studies which include review of project documents and interviews

3.3. Mainstreaming mandates: Expanded references

The following is a list of relevant mandates with details supporting the summary paragraph in Section 1:

Gender	-According to several General Assembly resolutions, including A/RES/53/120 (para 3), A/RES/60/1 (paras 59 and 166), A/RES/70/1 (para 20), and A/RES/71/243 (para 13), gender perspectives must be mainstreamed into all UN policies and programmes.

---

[15] Source: IED Inception Papers

	-Gender mainstreaming is a longstanding UN requirement that was first established as a global strategy for the promotion of gender equality in the 1995 Beijing Platform for Action, as well as being made a UN requirement by ECOSOC (A/52/3 Chapter IV) in 1997. The Millennium Declaration and subsequently the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development also commit the UN to promoting gender equality in its development efforts, including through the gender mainstreaming approach. -The Secretariat Administrative Instruction (ST/AI/2021/3 para. 5.5) requires all Heads of Entities to ensure the integration of respect for gender equality and disability inclusion in evaluation procedures and practices.
Disability Inclusion	-The original mandate comes from the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD, 2006), in which all state parties agree "to take into account the protection and promotion of the human rights of persons with disabilities in all policies and programmes" (article 4, 1c), amongst other general obligations. A/RES/75/154 (16 Dec 2020): Inclusive development for and with persons with disabilities. In paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 the GA specifically urges that all United Nations programmes and policies mainstream disability inclusion. The United Nations Disability Inclusion Strategy (UNDIS) (October 2019) and the Accountability Framework, which applies to all UN system entities, require mainstreaming disability inclusion into programmes and policies in order to support member states in implementation of the CRPD. The UNDIS Strategy and Accountability framework go into further detail that entities are to adopt a twin track approach to mainstreaming disability inclusion. Pg 76 of the Accountability Framework reads: "The twin-track approach combines mainstream programmes and projects that are inclusive of persons with disabilities as well as programmes and projects that are targeted towards persons with disabilities." **For Peacekeeping -** S/RES/2475 (2019): Addresses persons with disabilities in armed conflict. In paragraph 7, the Council "emphasizes the importance of building capacity and knowledge of the rights and specific needs of persons with disabilities across United Nations peacekeeping and peacebuilding actors and urges Member States to play a central role in this regard".
Environment	-A/RES/70/1 - Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development puts significant emphasis on the need for increased Climate Action. For example, a minimum of six Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) include a climate action orientation: SDGs 13, 14, 15, 12, 11 and 7[16].

---

[16] SDGs 13 (Climate Action), 14 (Life Below the Sea), 15 (Life on Land), 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production), 11 (Sustainable Cities), and 7 (Affordable Clean Energy).

	-More specific to IED evaluation work, the following two Secretariat documents address actions which entities are expected to take regarding the "mainstreaming of environmental sustainability considerations into the Secretariat activities worldwide."
	
	    a. S-G bulletin: Environmental policy for the UN Secretariat (ST/SGB/2019/7- 4 September 2019)
	       (see link in IED mainstreaming para at beginning of this document)
	    b. Report of SG: Action Plan for Integrating Sustainable Development Practices into Secretariat-wide Operations and Facilities Management: (un.org) (A/72/82 – 27 April 2017)
	
	-As per the SG bulletin: "The Secretariat commits itself, through [its environmental policy], to five guiding principles: (a) stewardship of the environment with respect to all operations; (b) efficiency in resource use and operations; (c) continuous improvement of environmental performance; (d) stakeholder engagement at all levels; and (e) adaptation and resilience." Related to this, IED staff are expected to mainstream environmental issues into on-going programmatic work.
	
	-Detailed guidance on implementing the Secretariat environmental policy is being developed by DMSPC Sustainability and Resilience Unit in conjunction with DOS. Plans are also in place to develop an accountability/ monitoring framework.

Human Rights	– 1997: A/51/950 (UN Program For Reform) (A/RES/52/12 A/A/RES/52/12 B): In 1997, in the context of the UN organizational reforms, the **Secretary-General called on all entities of the UN system to mainstream human rights into their various activities and programmes and designated human rights as a cross-cutting issue across all pillars of UN work** (peace and security, economic and social affairs, development cooperation and humanitarian affairs).[17] – 2005: A/RES/60/1: 2005 World Summit Outcome: "**We resolve to integrate the promotion and protection of human rights into national policies and to support the further mainstreaming of human rights throughout the United Nations system**."[18] – 2006: A/RES/60/251 established the Human Rights Council to "promote the effective coordination and the **mainstreaming of human rights within the United Nations system**" and address human rights violations, including gross and systematic violations, and make recommendations thereon.[19] – 2015: A/RES/70/1: While no specific mention of mainstreaming as such is made, the Agenda is "grounded in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, international human rights treaties, the Millennium Declaration and the 2005 World Summit Outcome".[20]

---

[17] A/51/950 https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N97/189/79/IMG/N9718979.pdf?OpenElement

[18] A/RES/60/1 https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N05/487/60/PDF/N0548760.pdf?OpenElement

[19] A/RES/60/251 https://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/a.res.60.251_en.pdf

[20] A/RES/70/1 https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_70_1_E.pdf

	– 2021: A/RES/76/6[21] adopts Our Common Agenda (A/75/982) which notes the upholding of human rights as an obligation for all States and calls for the implementation of the full spectrum of human rights.
All Mainstreaming Areas	– A/RES/75/233 The Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) is the mechanism through which the General Assembly (GA) assesses the effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and impact of UN operational activities for development and establishes system-wide policy orientations for the UN development system. The QCPR is the primary policy instrument of the GA to define the way the UN development system operates to support programme countries in their development efforts.

3.4.   Additional resources

- **Gender Mainstreaming in Evaluations**:
    - UN Women 2022, Handbook on Gender Mainstreaming for Gender Equality Results
    - UN Women Evaluation Handbook (2015): How to manage gender-responsive evaluation
    - UN Women 2020, Good practices in gender-responsive evaluations.
    - UNEG 2014, Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations.

- **Disability Inclusion Mainstreaming in Evaluations**:
    - UNEG Guidance on disability inclusion in evaluations (Jan 2022); The guidance contains practical advice and examples for disability inclusion as well as disability inclusion specific evaluation questions, drawn from good practices in other UN and non-UN evaluations.

- **Environmental Mainstreaming in Evaluations:**
    - Action Plan for Integrating Sustainable Development Practices into Secretariat-wide Operations and Facilities Management: (un.org) (A/72/82; April 2017)
    - UNITED NATIONS Secretariat Climate Action Plan 2020-2030
    - UNEG Guidance: Detail of Stock-Taking Exercise on Policies and Guidance of UN Agencies in Support of Evaluation of Social and Environmental Considerations (Main Report and Annex) (uneval.org) (July 2020)
    - UNEG EPE: Integrating Environment into Evaluations http://unevaluation.org/event/detail/570 (Nov 2021) (click on "+" for 4 relevant EPE session documents)
    - Environmental Policy for UN Field Missions in 2009 and the Environment Strategy in January 2017 (https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/171116_dfs_exec_summary_environment_0.pdf)

- **Human rights mainstreaming in evaluations:**
    - UNDP 2012. Mainstreaming Human Rights in Development Policies and Programming: UNDP Experiences.
    - OHCHR 2012. Human Rights Indicators. A Guide to Measurement and Implementation
    - UNEG 2014, Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations.
    - UNDG 2016. Mainstreaming Human Rights in Development
    - UNEG 2017. Norms and Standards for Evaluation
    - UNEG 2020. Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation

---

[21] A/RES/76/6: https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N21/342/14/PDF/N2134214.pdf?OpenElement