EVALUATION OF CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES IMPLEMENTED BY UNICEF MALAYSIA (2011-2015)

SUBMITTED TO
UNICEF MALAYSIA

BY
IDEA INTERNATIONAL
(www.idea-international.org)

October 2016

Wisma UN, Block C, 2nd Floor
Kompleks Pejabat Damansara
Jalan Dungun, Damansara Heights
50490 Kuala Lumpur, MALAYSIA
United Nations Children’s Fund
kualalumpur@unicef.org

October 2016

The purpose of publishing evaluation reports produced by UNICEF Malaysia is to fulfil a corporate commitment to transparency through the publication of all completed evaluations. The reports are designed to stimulate a free exchange of ideas among those interested in the topic and to assure those supporting the work of UNICEF that it rigorously examines its strategies, results and overall effectiveness.

This evaluation was commissioned by UNICEF Malaysia in December 2015. The evaluation was managed by Ms. Erica Mattellone and Ms. Pashmina Naz Ali from UNICEF. The evaluation was conducted by Dr. Frederic Martin, Ms. Ana Maria Fernandez, and Mr. Jacques Lefevre (IDEA International, Canada) with the support of Ms. Santi Periasamy. The evaluation team benefited from the suggestions made by a reference group composed of Pn. Rokiah Haron, Ms. Nurshafenath Shaharuddin, Dr. Goh Chee Leong, Ms. Saira Shameem. Ms. Ada Ocampo, Mr. Riccardo Polastro and Dr. Arunaselam Rasappan. For more details on the evaluation institutional arrangements, please see Annex 7. The evaluation was conducted from January until August 2016.

The purpose of this report is to facilitate the exchange of knowledge among UNICEF personnel and its partners. The contents of the report do not necessarily reflect the policies or views of UNICEF. The text has not been edited to official publication standards and UNICEF accepts no responsibility for error. The designations in this publication do not imply an opinion on the legal status of any country or territory, or of its authorities, or the delimitation of frontiers.

The copyright for this report is held by the United Nations Children’s Fund. Permission is required to reprint/reproduce/photocopy or in any other way to cite or quote from this report in written form. UNICEF has a formal permission policy that requires a written request to be submitted. For non-commercial uses, the permission will normally be granted free of charge. Please write to UNICEF Malaysia to initiate a permission request.
WORD OF APPRECIATION

The evaluation team would like to thank sincerely all the participants to this evaluation, and more specifically:

- The UNICEF Malaysia Country Management Team and programme officers, in particular Ms. Marianne Clark-Hattingh, Country Representative, and Mr. Victor Karunan, Senior Social Policy Specialist, for their precious orientations;

- The evaluation managers, Ms. Erica Mattellone, Evaluation Specialist, and Ms. Pashmina Naz Ali, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, for their superb facilitation and thoughtful comments made during all the evaluation process;

- The members of the reference group, Pn. Rokiah Haron, Ms. Nurshafenath Shaharuddin, Dr. Goh Chee Leong, Ms. Saira Shameem. Ms. Ada Ocampo, Mr. Riccardo Polastro and Dr. Arunaselam Rasappan, for their relevant comments and suggestions made at critical milestones of the evaluation process;

- Two UNICEF colleagues that really helped the logistics of the field work, Ms. Nuha Abdul Halim in Kuala Lumpur, Programme Assistant, and Ms. Jenifer Lasimbang, Programme and Partnership Development, in Kota Kinabalu.

Frederic P. Martin
Ana Maria Fernandez
Jacques Lefevre
Santhi Periasamy
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview of the evaluation object
In December 2015, UNICEF Malaysia contracted the Institute for Development in Economics and Administration (IDEA International) to conduct an independent summative and formative evaluation of capacity development initiatives implemented by UNICEF Malaysia from 2011 until 2015. These initiatives are part of a UNICEF global capacity development response and refer to strategies in a specific domain of capacity development for specific target groups. Initiatives are implemented through capacity development activities, 40 in the case of UNICEF Malaysia over the period 2011-2015, including trainings, workshops, conferences and studies, in particular in the areas of social policy, education, child protection, corporate social responsibility, communication for development, and planning, monitoring and evaluation, to address capacity limits of key staff in key institutions from the public sector, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), civil society organisations (CSOs), and the private sector, as well as contributing to a better enabling environment. The total number of participants identified was nearly 1,300 and their total cost approximately USD 800,000 over the 2011-2015 period.

Evaluation objectives and intended audience
The specific objectives of the evaluation were the following:
- Determine the relevance of UNICEF capacity development strategy;
- Review and assess the efficiency and effectiveness of UNICEF-led capacity development initiatives in the course of the 2011-2015 Country Programme;
- Document existing strengths and opportunities to be explored in the Country Programme for 2016-2020; and
- Identify the factors both within and beyond UNICEF control, which helped or hindered the success or failure of the improvement of capacities for development effectiveness (i.e., enabling environment).

UNICEF Malaysia is the first potential user of this evaluation which provides an opportunity to look at past accomplishments and challenges, draw lessons, and improve capacity development response for 2016-2020. The Government of Malaysia, including Federal and State government institutions involved in planning, budgeting, managing, monitoring and evaluation of actions contributing to the implementation of child rights, is the secondary user of this evaluation which might provide lessons and ideas for improving the outcomes of its policies and programmes. Other users in Malaysia involve the other partners of UNICEF capacity development initiatives in civil society and the private sector who can learn from the experience during the 2011-2015 period and improve the quality of their partnerships with UNICEF and their own performance in terms of capacity development in Malaysia. The UNICEF East-Asia and the Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO) and UNICEF Headquarters expressed their interest in learning from the Malaysia experience to draw lessons and design better capacity development interventions in other countries. Other international organisations and private foundations involved in capacity development could benefit for the same reasons.

Evaluation methodology
The backbone of the data collection and analysis strategy was a methodological process called Assessing for Results (A4R®\(^1\)) which is a structured, participatory, and rapid evaluation approach combining qualitative and quantitative methods (i.e., mixed methods). The master questionnaire of the A4R® process was administered in seven versions, adapted in terms of content to the role and

---

1 A4R® is a trademark and intellectual property of IDEA SOLUTIONS, Canada.
knowledge of various respondents as well as to the format of data collection, i.e., in: i) individual in-depth interviews of actors in nine purposively sampled capacity development case studies; ii) in-depth interviews with relevant stakeholders from the Federal Government and the Government of Sabah; iii) an online survey of participants to six of those case studies; iv) one workshop with UNICEF and partners in Sabah; v) one workshop with UNICEF and partners in Sarawak; vi) one workshop in Kuala Lumpur with the UNICEF Country Management Team (CMT), and vii) one workshop in Kuala Lumpur with UNICEF and partners. A total of 120 respondents participated in the evaluation, out of which 52.5 per cent were women. This primary data collection was completed by a desk review of relevant documentation and an analysis of financial data to assess cost-effectiveness.

**Most important findings and conclusions**

The overall evaluation of UNICEF Malaysia capacity development initiatives over the period 2011-2015 is good with no grade below 1.4 and most of the grades around 2 over a maximum grade of 3, as per A4R® methodology. The best grades were obtained for outcomes and partnerships, the lowest for coherence. The most successful capacity development case studies were: i) DevInfo Users and Administration Training; ii) Language, Education and Social Cohesion: Facilitated Dialogue and Workshop; and iii) Social Work Competency Framework Training of Trainers Workshop.

![Figure: Evaluation of capacity development initiatives in Malaysia (2011-2015)](source: A4R, April 2016)

Capacity development activities could be classified in decreasing order of performance from individual level, to institutional level and then to enabling environment level. Additionally, the performance was better for outputs than for immediate outcomes and even less for final outcomes.

Several good practices were identified in this evaluation. First, UNICEF has succeeded in occupying a niche on the national and sub-national scene. It is perceived as an ‘honest broker’ for child rights and has been able to have some institutional leverage, putting some sensitive issues on the policy agenda, and facilitated the dialogue among national stakeholders. Second, UNICEF has been able to work downstream and upstream, making ‘the big split’ going from very operational support to NGOs or CSOs in the field up to contribution to high level policy making committees. This unique capacity makes UNICEF able to engage credibly high level actors while actors in the field can feel a real support. Third,
a greater presence at State level enabled UNICEF to provide services not provided by other institutions. Having a permanent representative and fielding a number of missions has proven a very efficient strategy to be present, relevant, and react quickly to opportunities and situations. Fourth, UNICEF has brought high level international experts to Malaysia who shared international standards and good practices from other countries and regions. This represented real value added. Fifth, some capacity development initiatives with a clear focus, a sequence of activities to accompany a partner, and enough duration and resources can be categorized as real success stories.

Weaknesses were noted at various stages of the results-based management cycle: at planning level, a weak capacity in assessing capacity development needs during planning capacity development interventions, an underestimation of assumptions made and risks, and the planning of a series of one-off short-term projects without a clear, articulated, programmatic approach and performance measurement framework; at implementation level, rather cumbersome accountability mechanisms and proposal application forms and procedures, a sometime high ratio of operating costs versus service delivery, and visibility limited to Federal Government level, States of Sabah and Sarawak level, and limited grassroots work; and finally, at monitoring and evaluation (M&E) level, insufficient M&E mechanisms.

Various lessons were also learnt from this evaluation. First, the absence of a consistent cross-cutting capacity development strategy has reduced the synergies across capacity development activities conducted by UNICEF and others partners in Malaysia. Second, the elaboration of an ex ante theory of change is needed to provide all stakeholders internally and externally with a clear vision of what UNICEF wants to accomplish in terms of results of capacity development. This would provide a focus on the results and the assumptions that need to be considered to achieve those results. Third, capacity development is as much a demand issue as a supply issue. UNICEF has offered some very interesting capacity development activities, but at times, it did not achieve the desired outcomes because the demand at high level was not necessarily very strong. The identification of champions of change within the partner institutions could be considered a critical condition for giving the green light for a capacity development initiative. Fourth, Malaysia is a complex and evolving country and UNICEF could better address emerging issues, disaggregating among target groups and territories (e.g., sexual exploitation of children associated with business travel and tourism). The value added of UNICEF would be greater with more weight given to capacity development interventions at State level. Fifth, UNICEF Malaysia needs to choose strategically its options, given its limited means and political leverage. Sprinkling money will not result in a critical mass of resources able to make a difference. Various capacity development initiatives could compete among themselves according to a success probability factor and relative contribution to overall capacity development strategy objectives and targets. Finally, partner selection is a crucial issue. There has been insufficient screening of the partners for the presence of institutional fundamentals, in particular in terms of minimum organisation structure, governance rules, management skills, availability of qualified human resources, and financial resources, which resulted in situations where some partners were not able to carry on with service delivery after UNICEF pull-out.

Main recommendations
Seven recommendations of actions to be implemented in the course of one year (2017) are made to the UNICEF Malaysia CMT, in order of priority, as follows:

1. Elaborate a capacity development strategic plan to be executed by the MCO over the remaining period of the Country Programme Action Plan and the Government 11th Malaysia Plan (2016-2020);
2. Tilt the balance towards more institutional capacity development rather than individual capacity development and enabling environment support;
3. Tilt the balance towards more decentralized capacity development at State level rather than at Federal level;
4. Conduct a capacity development gap analysis before designing any capacity development initiatives;
5. Enhance the process of partner selection with a ‘go/no go’ grid;
6. Prepare and sign a performance agreement with key partners involved in the implementation of capacity development initiatives; and
7. Put in place a monitoring, evaluation and reporting plan for the implementation of the capacity development strategic plan and the portfolio of capacity development initiatives.

Beyond recommendations to UNICEF Malaysia, three recommendations are made to UNICEF EAPRO and UNICEF Headquarters. Serious evaluations of capacity development initiatives require a minimum level of effort and budget to be of quality and therefore useful and credible. There is an interest in conducting those evaluations according to a similar approach and methodology first to benefit from past experience and economies of scale and, second, be able to do benchmarking and draw aggregate conclusions. In a context of scarce resources, it is recommended that UNICEF compare various approaches used for different evaluations in this domain and take the best practices to establish a generic approach for UNICEF capacity development evaluations from which all future evaluations designs will be derived to adjust to local contexts, objectives, and constraints. The second recommendation is that UNICEF staff and evaluators involved in such evaluations around the world be trained properly ex ante to make sure that they share the same approach, the same language and possess the minimum skills to carry out those complex evaluations. The third recommendation is that UNICEF take advantage of existing information technology to support a structured, rapid, and participatory approach to capacity development evaluation.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10MP</td>
<td>10th Malaysia Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11MP</td>
<td>11th Malaysia Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4R</td>
<td>Assessing for Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>capacity development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMT</td>
<td>Country Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4D</td>
<td>Communication for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDRE</td>
<td>Center for Development &amp; Research in Evaluation, International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMT</td>
<td>Country Management Team (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAP</td>
<td>Country Programme Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRBP</td>
<td>Children’s Rights and Business Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPD</td>
<td>Convention on rights of persons with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRVS</td>
<td>Civil Registration and Vital Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>civil society organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPM</td>
<td>Department of the Prime Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW</td>
<td>Department of Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAPRO</td>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific Regional Office (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPU</td>
<td>Economic Planning Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCAP</td>
<td>United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>Implementation and Coordination Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td>Institute for Development in Economics and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>information technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASW</td>
<td>Malaysian Association of Social Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCI</td>
<td>Malaysian Child Resource Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCO</td>
<td>Malaysia Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOF</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOH</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWFCD</td>
<td>Ministry of Women, Family, and Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBS</td>
<td>National Capacity Building Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>non-governmental organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD/DAC</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>performance indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFP</td>
<td>Private Fundraising and Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMD</td>
<td>Prime Minister’s Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>planning, monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMF</td>
<td>performance measurement framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Purchasing Power Parity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBM</td>
<td>results-based management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>Royal Malaysian Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROC</td>
<td>reality of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMU</td>
<td>State Implementation Monitoring Unit (State of Sarawak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPU</td>
<td>State Planning Unit (State of Sarawak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>theory of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>terms of reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Fund for Population Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPEN</td>
<td>Unit Perancang Ekonomi (State of Sabah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>United States Dollars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OBJECT OF EVALUATION
Section 1: Object of evaluation

1.1. Introduction

In December 2015, UNICEF Malaysia contracted the Institute for Development in Economics and Administration (IDEA International) to conduct an independent summative and formative evaluation of capacity development initiatives implemented by UNICEF Malaysia from 2011 until 2015.

Capacity development is understood by UNICEF as “a process through which individuals, organisations and societies of a country obtain, strengthen and maintain the capabilities to achieve their own development objectives” (UNICEF 2010b p.2). Because of its centrality to the development process, capacity development is one of the core priorities of UNICEF.

The 2011-2015 Country Programme goal of UNICEF Malaysia was to support the Government in achieving ‘Vision 2020’, which frames its vision of Malaysia becoming a fully developed country, and toward this end, to “create self-sustaining national capacities so that all children in the country will be better able to enjoy their rights for survival, development, protection and participation.” (UNICEF 2010a).

As per the terms of reference (TOR), this evaluation was to inform the 2016-2020 Country Programme through an assessment of UNICEF Malaysia capacity development strategy. The main objectives of the evaluation were to: i) determine the relevance of UNICEF capacity development strategy; ii) review and assess the efficiency and effectiveness of UNICEF-led capacity development initiatives in the course of the 2011-2015 Country Programme; iii) provide a better narrative of present capacities and document existing strengths and opportunities to be explored in the new Country Programme; and iv) identify the factors both within and beyond UNICEF control, which helped or hindered the success or failure of the improvement of capacities for development effectiveness (i.e., enabling environment).

The findings, conclusions and recommendations resulting from this evaluation are to inform UNICEF Malaysia Country Office (MCO) and in particular members of the Country Management Team (CMT). It is also envisioned that the evaluation would be of interest and use to UNICEF East-Asia and the Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO) and UNICEF Headquarters toward learning lessons from UNICEF implementation of capacity development strategies and lessons learnt at country level. The results of this evaluation are to be shared with counterparts within the Government of Malaysia, partners, donors, other United Nations (UN) agencies, the private sector and the development community at large to the extent it is deemed appropriate.

1.2. Object of evaluation

The object of evaluation concerns the capacity development initiatives carried out by UNICEF Malaysia from 2011 until 2015. Initiatives are part of a global capacity development response and refer to strategies in a specific domain of capacity development for specific target groups. Initiatives are implemented through capacity development activities. Forty capacity development activities were identified in the TOR, including trainings, workshops, conferences and studies, in particular in the areas of social policy, education, child protection, corporate social responsibility (CSR), communication for development (C4D), and planning, monitoring and evaluation (PME). UNICEF Malaysia CMT and programme officers designed those activities to address capacity limits of important staff in key institutions from the public sector, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and civil society organisations (CSOs) and the private sector, as well as contributing to a better enabling environment.
Those capacity development activities were based on a clear analysis of the child situation as presented in the UNICEF Country Programme and the Country Programme Action Programme (CPAP) designed jointly by the Government of Malaysia and UNICEF for the period 2011-2015. As of 2009-2010, Malaysia had made significant progress in terms of improvement of the average conditions of children. All Millennium Development Goals (MDG) related to children and women were on the way to be achieved totally or mostly. However, there were significant disparities among children as a function of income status, rural versus urban setting, state, and ethnic status.

One noted bottleneck to the further improvement of the implementation of child rights was the capacity to perform better of a number of key Malaysian institutions that were directly involved in the delivery of services to those target groups, be they from the public sector, the private sector, NGOs, or the CSO sector. This bottleneck depended partly on institutional level factors such as client orientation, service delivery processes, human resources management, and financial resources management, and partly on the individual capacity of important staff within those key institutions. Hence, the need to build up capacity at individual and institutional levels.

Beyond the contribution of UNICEF to the enhancement of capacities of key institutions and staff, the Country Programme and CPAP identified as a priority to contribute to a better enabling environment by influencing policies, the legal framework and budget allocations to make them more conducive to the implementation of child rights in Malaysia.

1.3. Key stakeholders

Figure 1.1 presents the key stakeholders involved in the capacity development response in support to actions for the implementation of child rights.

![Figure 1.1: Capacity development response in Malaysia in support to actions for the implementation of child rights](image)

The actions of those key stakeholders related to capacity development are presented in Sections 1.4 to 1.6.
1.4. Context

Capacity development initiatives led by UNICEF Malaysia need first to be put in the context of key political, economic, social, demographic, and institutional characteristics of Malaysia, in particular (see: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Malaysia and www.devinfo.org/):

- **Politically:** Malaysia is a federation of 13 States operating within a constitutional monarchy under the Westminster parliamentary system and is categorised as a representative democracy;
- **Economically:** Malaysia has rapidly grown into an upper middle economy with a Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita of 25,833.204 Malaysia Ringgit (PPP, 2015 est.) or USD 12,127.206 (nominal, 2015 est.) and improved equality with a Gini coefficient going from 0.46 in 2002 to 0.401 in 2012. It is a market economy with a strong export orientation, but also with strong planning and significant state intervention;
- **Demographically:** The 0-14 age group represented 28.8 per cent of the population in 2014 which points out the importance of children. The country includes various ethnic groups with Malay 50.1 per cent, Chinese 22.6 per cent, Indigenous 11.8 per cent, and Indian 6.7 per cent, with some cultural differences among those groups; and
- **Institutionally:** Malaysia is characterized by relatively strong government organisations, a vibrant private sector, and a more fragmented civil society.

Second, capacity development initiatives led by UNICEF Malaysia are to be evaluated in the context of the strategies and actions led by the other key stakeholders that are directly related to the object of evaluation. Those stakeholders and their actions are presented briefly below.

**Government**

The Federal government’s approach to capacity development for the 2011-2015 period was expressed in two strategic documents:

- ‘Vision 2020’ set as an ultimate objective for Malaysia becoming a fully developed country with an inclusive and caring society that protects the rights of all children by 2020; and
- The 10th Malaysia Plan 2011-2015 (10MP) embraced a commitment to a fully developed country, conducting strategies consistent with an economic model promoting the private sector, supporting innovation-led growth, establishing world-class infrastructure to support growth and enhance productivity, among others.

In terms of the commitment to child rights, the 10MP chapter entitled “Moving Towards Inclusive Socio-Economic Development” established strategies to elevate the livelihoods of the bottom 40 per cent households by assisting children to boost their education and skills attainment (EPU/DPM 2010 p. 158); with equitable access to education opportunities. The chapter entitled “Building a Progressive and More Inclusive Society” outlines the following strategies: i) empower women to enhance their economic contribution (ibid p. 178); ii) mould youth to become dynamic and inspired future leaders (ibid p. 172); iii) ensure the protection and well-being of children strengthening the family institution to overcome challenges of modern living.

At State level, the Sabah Unit Perancang Ekonomi (UPEN) in Sabah and the Sarawak State Planning Unit (SPU) and the State Implementation Monitoring Unit (SIMU) in Sarawak also orient socio-economic development at State level, through planning and monitoring the implementation of policies and programmes that affected directly children and women in the concerned State.

Several public sector ministries and agencies were also important actors in the supervision and funding of the delivery of capacity development activities at local level:
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- At Federal government level: the Ministry of Education (MOE), the Ministry of Health (MOH), the Ministry of Women, Family, and Community Development (MWFCD), and indirectly the Ministry of Finance (MOF);
- At the level of the Government of the State of Sabah: the Ministry of Youth and Sports, and indirectly the Ministry of Finance; and
- At the level of the Government in the State of Sarawak: the Ministry of Welfare, Women and Community Wellbeing; the Ministry of Youth, Sports and Solidarity; the Women and Family Department of Sarawak; Social Welfare Department of Sarawak; and indirectly the Ministry of Finance.

**Private sector**

The private sector, be it national or international companies, supported technically and financially and organized a variety of capacity development activities for their staff. In particular, the Companies Commission of Malaysia’s (known under its acronym in Malay, SSM) Best Business Practice Circular 2/2011 (BBPC 2/2011) stated that its members commit to:

- Contribute towards Malaysia’s strategy for inclusive socio-economic development that will ensure productive and sustainable female workforce participation;
- Support and foster the establishment of a family and child-friendly environment at the workplace that will help achieve women’s economic empowerment;
- Provide a CSR initiative and examples with recommendations for future actions that may be adopted by employers, starting with the establishment of a ‘nursing mothers programme’ at the workplace; and
- Highlight the role that companies and businesses can play in supporting the national promotion of exclusive breastfeeding practices with the aim of achieving optimal child health development.

Additionally in 2010, the Companies Commission of Malaysia and UNICEF signed a Memorandum of Understanding to work in areas of cooperation and conduct joint activities focused on: i) the promotion of awareness of child rights issues; ii) dissemination and monitoring of ‘child-friendly’ business practices; iii) promotion of philanthropic/community activities focusing in marginalised children; and, iv) promotion of research and development to create innovative solutions for children.

**NGOs and CSOs**

A variety of Malaysian and international NGOs and CSOs participated in the design and the delivery of capacity development activities conducted by UNICEF. Those organisations differ widely in terms of size and capacities depending on domain, location, and even ethnic groups considered. However, national NGOs and CSOs tend to be relatively small, with limited human and financial resources and management skills, which limits their capacities for service delivery and make them financially and institutionally vulnerable.

**International organisations**

UNICEF Headquarters, in its Strategic Plan for 2014-17, recognized capacity development as one of main UNICEF implementation strategies in achieving results for children and women. The Plan identified UNICEF focus on training and technical assistance to reform government institutions and improve service provision, strengthening supply chain management, piloting models for scaling up, with attention to quality assurance and using national and local systems.

---

2 A number of national NGOs and CSOs cater to specific ethnic groups.
Among other UN organisations, two agencies contributed directly to capacity development in Malaysia and interacted with UNICEF. UNDP supported training and vocational institutions, as well as the development and commercialization of new environmentally sound technologies. UNFPA contributed in the areas of HIV and AIDS, population ageing, gender based violence and south-south cooperation in reproductive health.

1.5. Components of capacity development led by UNICEF Malaysia

The UNICEF Country Programme for 2011-2015 sought to support capacity development to sustain ‘Vision 2020’ through the generation of evidence and analysis, leveraging resources for children and building systems to strengthen child-centred policies and programmes that are effectively monitored and evaluated. As appropriate for an upper middle-income country, the focus of the programme was to enhance data, national capacities and resources for children, as well as assisting the Government in a selected number of well-defined priority areas where UNICEF could add the highest value (UNICEF 2010a).

The Country Programme identified two Programme Components, i.e., Component 1. Improved data, capacity and resources for children, and Component 2. Reduction of child poverty and quality social services for all. The Country Programme included a results framework for each component, but no specific theory of change (TOC) was developed for capacity development. Capacity development was mainly considered in Component 1 which considered capacity development to address two challenges. The first challenge was to strengthen the Government’s central social data collection and management processes as well as its monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment capacities to ensure excellence in service delivery. The expected programme result was labelled as “key government agencies that develop and implement policies for children undertake regular and rigorous monitoring and evaluation and impact assessments, to ensure excellence in program delivery and design” (UNICEF 2010a p. 9). The second challenge was to build the capacities of national CSOs and influence corporate sector policies to ensure child-friendly business practices and facilitate support for marginalized children. The expected programme result was that “national CSOs have the capacity to advocate for enhanced policies for children and to effectively address gaps in service provision for marginalized children” (UNICEF 2010a p. 9).

Derived from the Country Programme, the CPAP 2011-2015 described the details and targets of the two programme components. The CPAP presented six interrelated strategies, including four related to capacity-building (Government of Malaysia – UNICEF 2010 pp. 12-14):

- **Strategy 1. Engagement in the National Process**: a) Increase government strategic national partnerships, CSO alliance-building, by providing technical expertise aligned to the 10MP; b) Strengthen CSO capacity to play a more active and effective role itself in national policy advocacy for children;

- **Strategy 2. Partnership to Improve Knowledge Generation and Management, Use and Dissemination of Child-Focused Information**: a) Build up national capacities for rigorous analysis, monitoring and evaluation to refine existing policies and assist in developing new evidence-based policies, programme design and improved budget allocation for women, children and young people; b) Promote greater multi-sectoral engagement with partners, including CSOs, to understand and respond to their specific knowledge management needs and build in-house capacity for knowledge management including dissemination, linking to UNICEF programmes globally as well as external sources;

- **Strategy 4. Enhancing Capacity Development and Strengthening Systems for Service Delivery/Monitoring and Evaluation**: a) Support efforts on systems-building and capacity-strengthening; b) Promote planning, programming, monitoring and evaluation from the
community and Division/State levels up to the national level for sustainability as well as local level capacity enhancement; and

- **Strategy 6. Enhancing Coordination, Partnerships, Alliances and Networks**: Well-defined capacity-building of CSO partners to ensure organisations have the skills to play a critical role in national dialogue and policy consultation both with the Government and the private sector.

1.6. **Theory of change for capacity development**

The designers of the evaluated object, i.e., UNICEF Malaysia CMT and programme officers, designed capacity development initiatives as a function of the diagnostic they made of capacity development needs at all three levels: individual, institutional, and enabling environment. They also took into account the specific characteristics of their respective domains of intervention, be it social policy, education, child protection, CSR, C4D, or PME. A number of capacity development activities were also designed to seize opportunities.

The designers had also a focus on results and target groups as indicated in the Country Programme 2010-2015 in line with ‘Vision 2020’ and the strategic directions under the 10MP. Although there was not an explicit and integrated TOC formulated in 2010, there was clearly an implicit one, as presented below.

**For individual capacity development:**

- Individual capacity-building would result in reduced critical capacity gaps (in terms of knowledge, skills, attitudes, experience and behaviour) of important staff in key institutions for the implementation of child rights; and
- Capacitated staff in key institutions for the implementation of child rights would contribute to capacity development in their institutions under the assumptions that this staff would a) remain in their institution long enough and b) be put by their managers in a position to apply the acquired knowledge and skills.

**For institutional capacity development:**

- Institutional capacity-building would result in reduced critical capacity gaps (in terms of client orientation, service delivery processes, human resources management, financial resources management, information systems management) in key institutions for the implementation of child rights; and
- Capacitated key institutions for the implementation of child rights would use in a sustainable way the new management systems and approaches to improve the quantity and quality of services to children and women.

**For enabling environment capacity development:**

- Capacity-building at this level would result in improving the environment in terms of policy changes, legal framework design and implementation and budget reallocations for better implementation of child rights.

The evaluation team constructed a graphical presentation of the TOC from an analysis of the documentation reviewed and inception interviews made (see Annex 9a).
1.7. Implementation status of capacity development led by UNICEF Malaysia

In 2013, UNICEF Malaysia underwent a mid-term review of its Country Programme. As a result, UNICEF Malaysia improved its results framework and re-focused its capacity development strategy to enhance the role of government institutions at all levels and CSOs in the following areas:

- Quality data on children to refine and improve evidence-based policies, programmes and budget allocation for children, youth and women;
- CSO partnerships and capacity-building to play a more effective role in national policy advocacy for children;
- Private-sector fundraising and engagement for children; and
- Systems-building for monitoring and evaluation from the community and State levels up the national level in key programming areas – including social policy, education, child protection, CSR and other cross-cutting areas.

The overall capacity development strategy of UNICEF Malaysia has been implemented through trainings, workshops, conferences and studies, in particular in the areas of social policy, education, child protection, CSR, C4D and PME (see Annex 1 for a list of the 40 capacity development activities over the period 2011-2015 identified in the TOR). The total number of participants identified was nearly 1,300 and the total cost of those activities was approximately USD 800,000 over the 2011-2015 period.

During the fact finding mission to the States of Sarawak and Sabah, stakeholders identified 13 activities that might be considered capacity development activities in addition to the original list of 40. However, doing so would have required further revision by the MCO to make sure each of them fell within the range of what had been defined as capacity development by the UN and UNICEF guides. Additionally, since they were not part of the original TOR, the evaluation managers in agreement with the evaluation team decided that those activities would not be considered as part of this study.
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Section 2: Evaluation purpose, objectives and scope

2.1. Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation was to assess the capacity development response of UNICEF MCO for the period 2011-2015 to help adjust the CPAP for 2016-2020 and orient the elaboration of the capacity development strategy within the CPAP for this period. Consequently, the evaluation was both summative and formative, i.e., to be able to learn from the past experience and provide evidence for accountability purposes, with learning being the primary objective.

By assessing UNICEF capacity development initiatives in Malaysia, this independent evaluation sought to support the development of appropriate and effective strategies and action plans for the 2016-2020 Country Programme, as well as provide an opportunity to assess the strengths and opportunities of UNICEF Malaysia capacity development strategy to improve results for children and women. The timing of the evaluation enabled lessons from the implementation of capacity development initiatives to be identified, considered and fed into the implementation of the CPAP for 2016-2020 and the development of work plans during this period.

UNICEF is the first potential user of this evaluation which provides an opportunity to look at past accomplishments and challenges, draw lessons from Malaysia and other countries to look for innovative ways to improve capacity development response and position UNICEF according to its comparative advantage. The Government of Malaysia, including Federal and State government agencies involved in planning, budgeting, managing, monitoring and evaluation of actions contributing to the implementation of child rights (e.g., EPU/PMD, MOF, ICU, MOE, MOH, MWFCD), is the other direct user of this evaluation which might contribute lessons and ideas for improving the outcomes of its policies and programmes towards the common interests of the child rights agenda.

Other users in Malaysia include the other partners of UNICEF capacity development interventions in civil society and private sector who wish to learn from the experience during the 2011-2015 period and improve the quality of their partnerships with UNICEF and their own performance. UNICEF EAPRO and UNICEF Headquarters expressed their interest in learning from the Malaysia experience and design better capacity development interventions in other countries. Other international organisations and private foundations involved in capacity development could benefit for the same reasons. (See Annex 4 for a detailed Matrix of key stakeholders and their interest in the evaluation).

2.2. Objectives and scope of the evaluation

The specific objectives of the evaluation, as per the TOR validated during the inception mission, were the following:

- Review and assess the efficiency and effectiveness of UNICEF-led capacity development initiatives in the course of the 2011-2015 Country Programme;
- Determine the relevance of UNICEF capacity development strategy given the wider range of possible interventions at the individual, organisational and policy levels with all key stakeholders (i.e., government, NGOs, CSOs, and private sector);
- Identify the factors both within and beyond UNICEF control, which helped or hindered the success or failure of the improvement of capacities for development effectiveness (i.e., enabling environment);
- Provide a better narrative of present capacities and document existing strengths and opportunities to be explored in the new Country Programme.
The evaluation scope included the 40 UNICEF capacity development activities implemented in the course of the 2011-2015 Country Programme and identified in the TOR (see Table 1 in Annex 1). Tables 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 categorize those capacity development activities per domain and budget range, per capacity development level, and per group size respectively.

### Table 2.1: Capacity development activities portfolio per domain and budget range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Budget range</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of the Total (Domain)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20000 and less (USD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,001 to 50,000 (USD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 50,000 (USD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Youth participation)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social policy and PME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the Total (Budget range)</td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NA*: Not available

**Source**: Capacity development activity reference sheets, April 2016.³

Sixty-five per cent of the budget was allocated to capacity development activities in child protection, followed by 10 percent to social policy and 7.5 percent to CSR. The rest of capacity development activities was scattered across all other domains. 27.5 per cent of the capacity development activities had a budget range of USD 20,000 and less, 20 per cent between USD 20,001 and 50,000, and 5 percent more than 50,000. This basic information was not available for 47.5 per cent of capacity development activities.

### Table 2.2: Percentage of capacity development activities by level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Enabling environment</th>
<th>Individual &amp; institutional</th>
<th>Institutional &amp; enabling environment</th>
<th>Individual, institutional &amp; enabling environment</th>
<th>NA*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NA*: Not available

Some activities targeted just one level while others activities targeted two or even three levels. Overall, more than 45 per cent of the portfolio were targeting the institutional level. No information was available for 29 per cent of them, meaning that they were not documented properly during the planning and implementation phase.

### Table 2.3: Percentage of capacity development activities by target group size*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large group</th>
<th>Small group</th>
<th>NA**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Small group: 30 participants and less; large group: more than 30 participants.

**NA**: Not available

³ See Section 3.2 below for more information on those reference sheets.
Forty-eight per cent of capacity development activities targeted large groups and 40 per cent small groups. Twelve per cent of activities had no information available.

2.3. Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation criteria included the classical Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. However, for impacts, it was agreed with the evaluation managers and the reference group that, due to time and budget constraints for this evaluation, immediate outcomes would be assessed rather than long-term impacts. Also, additional criteria were added, i.e., coherence, capacity development management process, and partnerships.

In the context of the complexity and the diversity of Malaysia, the participatory nature of the process of evaluation of those criteria was deemed of paramount importance. The evaluation considered also the following cross-cutting issues:

- **Equity across regions**: The evaluation considered the two extremes in terms of target groups, i.e., activities conducted at national level in Kuala-Lumpur and Putrajaya versus activities conducted in the States of Sabah and Sarawak;

- **Gender equality**: The evaluation analysed to what extent gender issues were considered in the contents of capacity development, whenever relevant, and to what extent the capacity development activities benefited to women and girls; and

- **Human rights**: The evaluation analysed to what extent the capacity development interventions considered access of all children to minimum child rights, in particular birth registration.

Evaluation questions were specified for each evaluation criteria and are presented in Annex 3.
METHODOLOGY
Section 3: Methodology

3.1. Overview of methodology and adequacy to address evaluation criteria

The methodology was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria and respond to the evaluation questions in the context of Malaysia while respecting the time and budget constraints of this evaluation. This was not easy given the challenges of evaluating capacity development initiatives, and the complexity of the Malaysia institutional and political context.

Four principles guided the evaluation team in the choice of the data methodology:

1. Choose a structured and integral approach that would cover all evaluation criteria and cross-cutting issues of equity, gender equality, and human rights;
2. Combine qualitative and quantitative methods to benefit from the value added of each kind of method, overcome the limits of each method, and mutually enrich the analysis of the results of each other. The combination of data sources helps obtain a diversity of perspectives, triangulate results, and contribute to data accuracy;
3. Use a participatory approach to involve in a significant way the stakeholders, both the designers and executing agencies on the supply side, and those who benefitted of the capacity development activities on the demand side; and
4. Use a rapid evaluation approach to respect tight calendar and budget constraints.

The backbone of the data collection and analysis strategy was a methodological process called Assessing for Results (A4R®)⁴. This process was designed by IDEA International to conduct an assessment of a given programme or project while respecting the four principles mentioned above. It encompasses the following characteristics:

- **Structured**: The A4R® process includes three main steps: 1) diagnostic (i.e., filling the master questionnaire); 2) conducting a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis; and then 3) elaboration of a preliminary action plan. The A4R® master questionnaire (see Annex 6c) is structured in sections according to the evaluation criteria considered in the evaluation. In the case of Malaysia, those sections were the following: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, management process, partnerships, immediate and final outcomes, and sustainability. Then the questionnaire was adapted to (i) each type of respondent, i.e., UNICEF and partners in Kuala Lumpur and Putrajaya, UNICEF and partners in the States of Sabah and Sarawak, UNICEF CMT, case study supervising agency and executing agency, or case study participant; and (ii) modality of administration, i.e., individual in-depth interview on a specific activity, workshop on the capacity development response and the portfolio of activities, or online survey.
- **Q² (quantitative and qualitative)**: Each diagnostic section included one or more performance indicators which themselves included several sub-indicators. Each sub-indicator was graded by the respondents on an ordinal scale from 0 to 3, where 3 was the highest grade. Each grade corresponded to specific observed characteristics and was justified by qualitative and quantitative information. The grades from various data sources were first triangulated and then averaged to obtain the grade of the evaluation criteria. There was also a column for inserting qualitative information to justify the grade given by the respondents for each sub-indicator.
- **Participatory**: The A4R® master questionnaire was administered individually or collectively (i.e., workshop). The individual in-depth interview focused either (i) on a specific capacity development activity in the case of a respondent knowledgeable about a specific case study or (ii) on the whole portfolio of capacity development activities in the case of a respondent

⁴ A4R® is a trademark and intellectual property of IDEA SOLUTIONS, Canada.
cognizant about the capacity development response. The objective of in-depth interviews was to obtain the perspective of the capacity development supply side, i.e., the major stakeholders involved in the design, management, and delivery of the activity, mainly the UNICEF programme officers and other knowledgeable professionals, as well as most direct and knowledgeable partners. The A4R workshops put together all the pieces of the puzzle obtained from various methods to obtain the ‘big picture’. The participants were representatives of major stakeholders and knowledgeable experts, from government and the public sector, private sector, NGOs, CSOs, academia, participating associations, etc. This process also facilitated the creation of a large consensus among stakeholders about those evaluation results, which built up the ownership of the evaluation results and increased the probability of implementation of the evaluation recommendations in the future.

- **Rapid**: The in-depth interviews lasted between one and two hours while the workshops, including diagnostic and SWOT analysis, lasted one day. The use of the A4R® web based software in the national workshop in Kuala Lumpur sped up considerably data processing and enabled to present immediately to workshop participants results of their work, whether it was the diagnostic or the SWOT analysis. It also facilitated triangulation of results.

The Evaluation Matrix presented in Annex 8 indicates how each criteria and more specific evaluation questions were addressed by a variety of methods. A quick analysis of this matrix reveals that several methods were used for each question, of course taking into account the capacity of the interviewee to respond to any given question. Whenever relevant, evaluation questions were responded from the macro angle of the capacity development response as well as from the micro angle of a specific case study by participants, who were either on the supply side (activity designers and execution agencies) or on the demand side (participating agencies and individuals).

### 3.2. Data collection methods

Data collection involved both primary and secondary data collection methods.

**Desk review**

The desk review included the review of the most relevant documentation, including UNDG, UNICEF and other UN agencies guidelines on capacity development, Malaysia plans at Federal and State levels, UNICEF MCO planning, monitoring and review documents, and other relevant partners’ documents. UNICEF helped greatly to obtain those documents. Documents from UNICEF, other international organisations, governmental organisations were easy to obtain while some documents from other partners were not necessarily as easy to obtain.

Reference sheets on each of the 40 capacity development activities conducted by UNICEF MCO over the 2011-2015 period were completed. The reference sheet is an Excel template, with basic information on each capacity development activity, including objectives, target participants, costs, outputs, etc. Those reference sheets were filled at the start of the evaluation by the evaluation team on the basis of information shared by MCO staff *(for the format of the reference sheet, see Annex 6a; for a presentation of key characteristics of capacity development activities, see Annex 6b)*. Those reference sheets were very useful to draw the purposive sample of capacity development case studies *(see Section 3.3)*.5

---

5Filled-out reference sheets were too large to be included in this final report, but are part of the data set handed over to MCO and the evaluation managers.
Primary data collection methods

A mixture of qualitative and quantitative methods were used to collect data:

- Qualitative methods enabled the collection of the expertise and opinion of various stakeholders and provided crucial information on the TOC causal relationships, in particular in the questionnaire sections that asked for the justification of the grades given by respondents in the quantitative section of the A4R® master questionnaire; and
- Quantitative methods included the measurement of performance sub-indicators using a pre-defined grading grid on an ordinal scale, which were then aggregated to provide a quantitative assessment of evaluation criteria. The online survey of participants to capacity development initiatives enabled to measure their perceptions of the level of achievement of outputs and their satisfaction level.

Primary data collection tool

The primary data collection tool, i.e. the master questionnaire of the A4R® process (see Annex 6c), was administered in seven versions, i.e., in:

1. Individual in-depth interviews of sampled capacity development activities, using a sub-set of the master questionnaire;
2. In-depth interviews with relevant stakeholders in Kuala Lumpur, Putrajaya, and the State of Sabah;
3. An online survey of participants of selected capacity development case studies, using a sub-set of the master questionnaire, focusing on relevance, effectiveness, immediate and final outcomes, and sustainability evaluation criteria;
4. In a workshop in Kota Kinabalu, Sabah with key stakeholders at State level;
5. In a workshop in Kuching, Sarawak with key stakeholders at State level;
6. In an internal workshop in Kuala Lumpur with the UNICEF CMT;
7. In a workshop in Kuala Lumpur with UNICEF and partners to conduct the diagnostic and then a SWOT analysis.

Each version was adapted in terms of contents to the role and knowledge of various respondents as well as to the format of data collection. For example, in the version applied to case studies stakeholders, all eight criteria questions were included while in the online participant assessment, only four criteria were considered. The wording of some questions was adapted to be relevant to the case studies context.

The master questionnaire had a set of performance indicators (main evaluation question) per criteria, which had related sub-indicators (sub-questions) to assess more in detail each criteria. Each main evaluation question and sub-question was assessed by the respondent, graded on an ordinal scale from 0 to 3. The meaning of each grade was specified to the respondent before she or he answered. There was also a column for the respondent to justify the grade given. Each performance indicator had an average grade calculated with the average of the grades assigned to the sub-indicators.

3.3. Data sources, sampling frame, and sampling

Purposive sampling of case studies

In order to assess capacity development efforts in a strategic and efficient manner (i.e., without attempting to analyse all capacity development efforts in all projects), some case studies were selected for a more in-depth assessment in the areas of social policy, education, child protection, CSR, C4D, and PME.
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Purposive sampling was used to identify a representative subset of the capacity development activities. The sampling criteria for the sampling were identified on the basis of the initial information collected during the inception interviews conducted with key knowledgeable UNICEF staff and partners; and the review of the reference sheets of the 40 capacity development activities in the UNICEF capacity development portfolio (see Annex 6b). The selected sample includes:

- Activities for all existing UNICEF MCO domains;
- Activities at the three levels of capacity development;
- Various target groups of participating agencies or individuals;
- Various levels of target groups within the institutions supported by capacity development activities;
- Various sizes of target groups;
- Various locations, notably to include Sabah and Sarawak;
- Various ranges of budget spent on the capacity development activity.

*Table 3.1* presents the full sampling criteria used to draw the purposive sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1: Sampling criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 Domain | 1. Social policy  
2. Education  
3. Child protection  
4. Other (Youth participation)  
5. CSR  
6. C4D  
7. PME  
8. Fundraising and partnership |
| 2 Level of capacity development | 1. Individual  
2. Institutional  
3. Enabling environment |
| 3 Target group (participating agencies or individuals) | 1. Public sector  
2. NGOs and CSOs  
3. Private sector managers  
4. International organisations, donors and foundations  
5. UNICEF professionals  
6. Other individuals |
| 4 Level of the participants | 1. Management  
2. Professional staff  
3. Administrative and clerical staff |
| 5 Target group size | 1. Large group (more than 31)  
2. Small group (30 and less) |
| 6 Location | 1. Kuala Lumpur  
2. Putrajaya  
3. Kota Kinabalu  
4 Kuching  
5. Overseas  
6. Other |
| 7 Range of budget spent | 1. More than USD50,000  
2. USD50,000 to 20,001  
3. USD20000 and less |
Sample of case studies

The sample of capacity development studies included nine case studies and is presented in Table 3.2. These case studies are a combination of all the possible options for each criterion to be able to have a representation of each category at least once in the sample.

Table 3.2: Sample of capacity development case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*</th>
<th>Case studies per domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Child Well-being Workshop, Putrajaya, 30 January, 2013 (65 participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Language, Education and Social Cohesion: Facilitated Dialogue and Workshop, Kuala Lumpur, Kota Kinabalu and Kuching (multiple dates) (99 participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child protection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pilot Capacity-Building Programme run by Malaysia Child Resource Institute in the form of four workshops conducted between April and June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>High Level Meeting on Child Rights (HLM), New Delhi, 23-25 October, 2013 (3 participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C4D</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>C4D Workshop for Programming Partners and UNICEF Staff, Kuala Lumpur and Kota Kinabalu (multiple dates) (84 participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PME</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>DevInfo Users and Administration Training, Putrajaya (multiple dates) (74 participants)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The numbers refer to the numbers of the 40 capacity development activities in Table 1 of the TOR (see Annex 1).

Online survey sample

The contact information of the participants of six out of nine case studies could be retrieved. A total of 358 participants could be contacted using the IDEA International e-survey platform, out of which 53 responded after three trials, i.e., a 15 per cent response rate. This rate corresponds to the high end of the range of expected response rates for external surveys which typically vary between 10 and 15 per cent (see: [www.surveygizmo.com/survey-blog/survey-response-rates](http://www.surveygizmo.com/survey-blog/survey-response-rates)).

Total number of respondents

A total of 120 respondents were interviewed, surveyed, or participated in the workshops. Table 3.3 presents the breakdown by primary data collection source and stakeholder category.
Table 3.3: Number of respondents by primary data collection source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection source</th>
<th>Total # of respondents</th>
<th>CSO/NGO/Private sector</th>
<th>Public sector</th>
<th>UNICEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-depth interviews for nine capacity development case studies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day workshop in Sabah and ½ workshop in Sarawak with UNICEF and partners</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ½ day workshops in Kuala Lumpur with UNICEF CMT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day workshop in Kuala Lumpur with UNICEF and partners</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online survey of participants assessment for six case studies</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Data analysis methods

Primary data analysis

The levels of analysis in this evaluation included:

- The capacity development response as designed and implemented by the MCO;
- The portfolio of capacity development activities conducted, more specifically a subset of nine case studies out of 40 conducted;
- The field perspective from actors at national level, but also in two States, Sabah and Sarawak;
- The perspective of different types of actors: UNICEF, Federal Government central ministries, Federal Government line ministries, State Government departments and agencies, NGOs, CSOs, academia, private sector, and international partners, and;
- The perspective of target groups (participating agencies and individuals), supervising agencies, and executing agencies.

The A4R® questionnaire software helped calculate grades for performance indicators and evaluation criteria and compare grades across data sources. It also helped calculate live the results in the national workshop to provide a direct feedback to workshop participants before the end of the workshop.

Cost-effectiveness data analysis

Cost–effectiveness analysis includes a number of conceptual and methodological issues. A full cost-effectiveness analysis is a full study in itself requiring significant data collection, level of effort, time, and budget. The evaluation team was faced with the unavailability of many cost data at programme level, due to poor documentation in the past and staff rotation. The Operations Department of UNICEF MCO was very useful in providing financial data on costs on sampled capacity development case studies. The other source of information was the assessment by respondents in A4R® in-depth interviews or workshops of efficiency, including questions on cost-effectiveness.

3.5 Evaluation institutional arrangements

The evaluation was commissioned and managed by UNICEF Malaysia, with two evaluation managers: the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist and the Evaluation Specialist in the MCO. The evaluation team was composed of three professionals of IDEA International (including one at a distance for data analysis) and one national consultant. Finally, to further enhance the quality of the evaluation, a reference group including representatives of UNICEF EAPRO, UNICEF Headquarters,
UNDP, Malaysia Government, and a national NGO involved in capacity development, CeDRE, was put in place (for more information, see Annex 7).

3.6. Ethical standards

The evaluation team followed the ethical standards as indicated in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2009) and applied the UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis (2015). Among others, this meant that the evaluators exercised their independence and impartiality of judgement. They had no conflict of interest with the object of study of this evaluation. The evaluation results presented were based on reliable data and observations and conclusions were only drawn on that basis. The evaluators conducted honestly data collection and analysis and ensured the integrity of the entire evaluation process. They completed the evaluation deliverables within the budget agreed, even if that meant additional level of effort. The time frame was marginally revised to account for the availability of respondents, reference group members, and evaluators. All evidence generating activities were conducted with ensured respect to respondents, stakeholders, and participants to capacity development initiatives. Finally, data analysis and results presentation were done respecting the confidentiality of respondents.

3.7. Consideration of equity, gender equality and human rights

Specific sub-performance indicators in the A4R® master questionnaire dealt with the consideration of equity, gender equality and human rights in capacity development initiatives. Explicit mention to specific UN guidelines was made when relevant to avoid vague and confusing appreciation of what was meant by those words. There was gender balance in the respondents to this evaluation (and in the evaluation team) as can be seen in Table 3.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection method</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online survey</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8. Data quality strategy

The data quality strategy involved a number of actions in the design of the evaluation, during data collection, and during data analysis and report writing.

First, using the UNICEF evaluation process and guidelines helped guide the evaluation design, execution, and report writing to make them up to UNICEF standards. Second, regular interaction with UNICEF Malaysia CMT, programme officers, and evaluation managers, as well as comments made by the reference group, helped provide focus for this evaluation scope, objectives, methodology, and results interpretation to make the evaluation most relevant and valid. For example, deciding to collect data on the global MCO capacity development response as well as on a carefully chosen sample of capacity development case studies contributed to a more comprehensive, yet cost-effective evaluation strategy. Another example of this excellent and productive collaboration was the fact that one evaluation manager could participate in the field data collection as an observer.

Third, using the A4R® process as the major data collection instrument facilitated: i) a structured, participatory, yet rapid evaluation; ii) the quantitative measurement of evaluation criteria; and iii) the
triangulation of results by comparing grades and justifications across information sources. The mixed methods approach also allowed effective triangulation of data collected from different data collection instruments (including both primary and secondary data), thus enhancing the internal coherence between any given quantitative result and the justification provided by each data collection instrument; and the external coherence crosschecking results among different partners and UNICEF responses. The evaluation team also was able to provide explanations when results were not fully consistent among the different data sources results.

Fourth, usual measures during data collection and validation were used, including testing and adjusting the data collection instruments, interview protocols indicating proper behaviour to minimize non sampling errors during data collection coaching of the evaluation team, cross-checking results for inconsistencies and errors, etc.

3.9. Methodology limitations

Triangulation of results across data sources was good to very good in most cases. The few cases when there were somewhat different assessments of an evaluation criteria, those differences could be explained, either because of the different perspective of the respondent (e.g., public sector versus civil society, central level vs state level), a different focus (e.g., immediate vs final outcomes), or a different level of information (e.g., the lack of specific expectations in terms of outcomes could lead to different expectations across actors).

Table 3.5 presents the major limitations of this evaluation as well as mitigation measures adopted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absence of an integrated TOC for capacity development</td>
<td>This meant that there was not necessarily clarity and consensus on the expected results of capacity development activities and the causal relationships leading to those results.</td>
<td>• A more explicit integrated TOC covering the three levels of capacity development was elaborated by the evaluation team in the inception report and validated by the CMT, evaluation managers, and the reference group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Time and budget constraints               | This was a rapid evaluation conducted over eight months part time and with limited budget. This limited the scope and depth of the evaluation. | • The inception report created realistic expectations among all stakeholders.  
• The A4R® process and software helped a lot produce comparable information and come up with aggregate quantitative measurement of the evaluation criteria. |
| Existence and availability of data        | Some information on past capacity development activities could not be found, e.g., on costs, contact information on participants and professionals that conducted the capacity development activity. | • The evaluation tried to consider multiple sources of information and adjust methods, e.g., sample of case studies.  
• The evaluation focused on capacity development activities on which a minimum amount of data was available. |
| Availability of respondents               | The field mission coincided with the preparation of elections in the State of Sarawak, limiting the availability of some officials. | • The UNICEF Programme and Partnership Development Officer for the States of Sabah and Sarawak could arrange an informal meeting with key stakeholders in this State, including resource persons occupying or having occupied official positions. |
4 FINDINGS
Section 4: Findings

Findings are presented per evaluation criteria, as elements of response to each evaluation question. As a reminder on the methodology, both quantitative and qualitative information is presented. The quantitative result for a given evaluation question takes the form of the average grade on an ordinal scale of 0 to 3, calculated as the average of all relevant performance indicators, themselves the average of all sub-performance indicators over all relevant data sources. Qualitative information sheds light on this quantitative result, on the basis of the justification given by respondents in all versions of the A4R® master questionnaire administered with different data collection methods as well as relevant secondary data and documentation reviewed. Finally, this section concludes with a discussion of overall results. Annex 6d presents more detailed results.

4.1. Relevance

To what extent were the objectives of the UNICEF capacity development activities aligned with the strategic and operational plans and guidelines during 2011-2015?

The objectives of the UNICEF capacity development activities were on average partially, but directly aligned (average grade 2.1) with major planning instruments, including UNICEF MCO Country Programme and CPAP; the 10MP; sectoral policies and institutional plans; State government policies, and UNICEF guidelines on crosscutting issues (i.e., equity, gender equality and human rights).

The reason to have a direct alignment of objectives was that the CP had been designed in terms of the objectives of the social policy and MDG, and all the domains were prioritised based on the CPAP, e.g., Child Well-Being Index and indicators; data generation, consolidation, utilisation of high quality disaggregated data; strengthening child protection system to prevent abuse and exploitation of children. Partners considered it was an explicit strategy of UNICEF MCO to design capacity development corresponding to the CPAP focus. The objectives of many capacity development activities were chosen to respond to the CPAP objectives and expected results. So the connection was explicit and straightforward.

However, the objectives were partially aligned because the choice of capacity development activities was also made taking into account the multiple demands from partners, UNICEF EAPRO and UNICEF Headquarters, as well as staff preferences. As to the alignment of capacity development activities with the 10MP, it was difficult to identify since the scope of this plan was perceived as very broad, and there was not necessarily alignment of capacity development vision, concepts and frameworks between the Federal Government, State Governments, NGOs and CSOs. Also, the alignment of capacity development activity objectives with UNICEF guidelines on crosscutting issues could have been better on how to take into account equity, gender equality and human rights objectives. In some cases like education and language studies, the alignment was better because all actors shared the importance and vision of these domains; in others like child welfare, the alignment was only partial and indirect because not all partners had the same understanding of child rights.

To what extent were the UNICEF capacity development activities responding to the most important capacity gaps for child rights implementation in Malaysia during 2011-2015?

The UNICEF capacity development activities were a partial, but direct response to address the capacity gaps and their causal factors for child rights implementation in Malaysia (average grade 2.0). They were successful in cases like child well-being, social work competency, Malaysia Child Resource Institute training and C4D. However, they were not totally successful in cases like the Royal Malaysia Child Police and Children’s Rights and Business Principles. This is related to the complexity and
sensitivity of some issues in the context of Malaysia. The adequacy of the response varied depending on the level of awareness of the partner and willingness to work directly on the major capacity gaps. Also the response was considered partial because the activities were designed to solve a capacity issue, but not necessarily to address the causal factors. In some cases like social cohesion, the capacity development activity was found useful to address issues related to language problems in Sabah and Sarawak which are critical issues within these communities. In cases like social work competency, causal factors were diverse and there was no information available about an in-depth analysis of causal factors.

In terms of the combination of individual, institutional and policy environment capacity development activities that enabled to address the major capacity gaps, most of the capacity development activities conducted were considered to be at the right level. However, individual capacity development (training) which was often privileged was not necessarily enough to close the capacity gap when there were important and/or sensitive institutional issues. Working at several capacity development levels in an articulated way was found a challenge, especially when that involved partners at both extremes, i.e., policy-making bodies and grassroots organisations.

The right target groups were identified and addressed. However, not all the people considered for some individual capacity development activities were able to attend, especially at high level, thereby limiting the awareness and buy-in of some decision-makers, resulting in limited policy or programmatic changes. The reasons mentioned were that UNICEF is not a big player in Malaysia and some top level officials might have more pressing priorities than long-term and strategic capacity development. At the other end of the spectrum, it was also hard to reach a significant number of grassroots organisations since UNICEF was not directly involved in service delivery.

The approaches and processes used during workshops and trainings were relevant and allowed for fruitful discussions and knowledge acquisition. However, the sequence of activities could have been improved so that capacity development activities build up upon the results of the previous ones. Some facilitators or trainers could have had better knowledge of the local conditions and situations to be more effective and relevant in giving advice and consultancy to the actors.

The success factors to address capacity gaps included the following: 1) UNICEF brought knowledge to partners and sharing good practices in certain areas; 2) UNICEF could provide skills and tools in certain areas such as disabilities, justice, birth registration, child rights; and, 3) UNICEF could help reduce work in silos by supporting coalitions and networks such as the Child Rights Coalition of Malaysia, Malaysia Partnerships for Children with Disabilities, and an NGO coalition on birth registration in Sabah. Another consideration which affected the ability to address capacity gaps was related to the management process, and more specifically the absence of systematic and comprehensive situational analysis, full capacity needs assessment, and consultation with partners for all capacity development initiatives. When this was the case, this prevented from knowing exactly what the major capacity gaps were. In some cases, there was also a difference in appreciation between UNICEF and CSOs on what should be the role of UNICEF: some CSOs would have liked to see more support at grassroots level while UNICEF respondents considered that this did not fit neither its mandate, nor its resources in a country like Malaysia.

Geographically, the bulk of capacity development activities were conducted in Kuala Lumpur and to some extent overseas. However, during the 2011-2015 period, more and more activities were conducted in the States of Sabah and Sarawak, regions where major capacity gaps in terms of implementation of child rights exist. The activities conducted by UNICEF over there are very relevant.
Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives Implemented by UNICEF Malaysia (2011 to 2015)

and contribute significantly to equity, gender empowerment and child rights. Very little was done in other states of Peninsular Malaysia.

To what extent were the UNICEF capacity development activities incorporating cross-cutting issues related to child rights such as human rights, gender equality, and equity in Malaysia during 2011-2015?

UNICEF capacity development activities incorporated cross-cutting issues related to child rights such as human rights, gender equality, and equity in Malaysia to a large extent. According to the revision of reference sheets and documentation desk review, the capacity development activities were designed following the UN guidelines on how to take into account human rights and gender equality as well as on how to take into account equity. The cross-cutting issues were addressed implicitly and to varying degrees, depending on the capacity development activity. Equity was considered in the case of Sarawak with specific reference to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and the Convention on Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). Human rights were considered in the case of the discussion on rights, inclusion and equity initiated via a case study exercise in the C4D Workshop, or in the Training of Trainers for the Royal Malaysian Police on Child Interviewing Skills. For gender equality, the consideration in the capacity development activities does not seem as strong and generalized.

Several other frameworks and guidelines were also addressed in the design and implementation of the capacity development activities, including: i) the MDG; ii) the Children’s Rights and Business Principles (CRBP); iii) the Civil Registration and Vital Statistics (CRVS) regional framework developed by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP); iv) Corporate engagement and CSR working with extractive industries; v) the Media and Children’s Rights; and vi) the Ethical Guidelines on Working with Children.

4.2. Coherence

To what extent were the UNICEF capacity development activities coherent (internally and externally)?

The UNICEF capacity development activities were on average somewhat coherent (average grade 1.4) internally and externally in terms of objectives, approach and modalities.

Internal coherence was higher than external coherence which is to be expected. Internally, there was an alignment of objectives of capacity development activities with the CPAP and crosscutting issues when identifying the domains and main training needs. Those activities were also entry points for discussions with partners on themes like child well-being. Internal coherence with other activities in terms of approach and modalities, including timing/sequencing, was somewhat coherent. When working with partners, time sequencing was largely beyond the control of UNICEF programme officers and they tended to avoid clashes in time tables as much as possible, but also use whatever opportunities that come by.

External coherence in terms of objectives and approach and modalities, including timing and sequencing, was limited. UNICEF interacts with a variety of actors who do not have necessarily the same objectives, strategies, and constraints, and do not share the same information. There are several

---

6 Coherence means that activities contribute to the same common overall objectives, and are not duplicating or conflicting in terms of approach and modalities, including their timing and sequencing. Internal means between UNICEF capacity development activities. External means between UNICEF capacity developments activities with capacity development activities conducted by other actors.
reasons for this: i) UNICEF may not know the partners’ plans in some work areas; ii) the national priorities agenda may vary depending on emerging issues; iii) partners do not have necessarily the capacity to disseminate their information; iv) the partner’s willingness to share information may be limited; v) the approach to access the partner information may not be adequate; and vi) there may be limited information to understand their partner’s profile, among others.

Some respondents had difficulty to answer this question, either because they did not have complete information or because UNICEF MCO was not doing stakeholders mapping at that time.

4.3. Effectiveness

To what extent were the UNICEF capacity development activities effective in reducing the critical capacity gaps?

The UNICEF capacity development activities were somewhat effective (average score 1.5) in reducing the critical capacity gaps. Even if there is no doubt that UNICEF contributed to increasing technical capacity, the size and duration of capacity development activities were not always enough to bring about a change in the substantive problem areas identified. Even if during the design phase, the intention and scope were broad, in practice the budget size limited the scope of the activity and its continuity, which raises the issue of how to allocate a limited budget to address numerous capacity gaps. The attendance was also not always ideal in terms of number of participants, inclusion of key actors in a position to make changes in their institutions or in policies, and continuity of their participation in a given activity (e.g., the same participant taking part to the whole capacity development activity). Another limiting factor was the limited human and financial capacity of UNICEF to follow up and keep the momentum beyond awareness raising activities into capacity development activities for programme or project implementation. Finally, some of those activities were new to the country or addressing sensitive and complex issues for which UNICEF and partners might still be ‘at a learning stage’ which would require bigger efforts to raise awareness and make a substantive change.

In comparison, capacity development activities at individual level have been more effective than activities at institutional level and even more than activities at policy level. There have been positive changes at individual level within the organisations which received training. A number of participants realized they were lacking the specific expertise and so were genuinely interested in the development of their own capacities. However, those increased individual capacities did not necessarily translate into institutional change since many other elements have to be in place to build up institutional capacities like frameworks, coordination, leadership commitment, incentive structure, and willingness to change. Even working directly at building capacities at institutional level might not make a big difference if the focus is too specialized and too technical and does not use a holistic technical and organisational approach.

Reducing the critical capacity gaps in terms of formulation of policies, legal framework, and budget reallocations was the least effective. Even if the capacity development activities were useful to raise awareness among some government officers on important child related issues and the collaboration of UNICEF with EPU and MOF was quite effective, it was difficult for UNICEF to engage into a quality dialogue at upper decision-making level, especially with agencies that can really bring about a change on child issues. While UNICEF is bringing value added to the policy table and its contribution is recognized and appreciated, its leverage is quite limited.

\[7\] Effectiveness meant that the capacity development initiative: 1) was big enough in terms of size and duration to bring about a change in the substantive problem area(s) identified; and 2) was able to reduce the critical capacity gaps of important staff in key institutions (individual level), of key institutions (institutional level), and in the formulation of policies, legal framework, and budget reallocations (enabling environment level).
Finally, another constraining factor on effectiveness was the limited geographic coverage of capacity development activities which were mainly confined to Kuala Lumpur and Putrajaya. A small but growing number of capacity development initiatives have taken place in the States of Sabah and Sarawak over the period 2011–2015, including activities that were not classified as capacity development in the TOR, but identified during the fact-finding mission. Much less was done in the rest of Peninsular Malaysia.

**To what extent did the UNICEF capacity development activities achieve their targets in terms of budget execution, physical implementation of activities, outputs and outcomes?**

Targets set for UNICEF capacity development initiatives for budget execution, physical implementation, outputs and outcomes were achieved on average in a significant way (average score 2.3). The achievement rates for budget execution, physical implementation of activities, and output targets were above 80 per cent. However, the achievement rates for outcomes were lower, between 21 and 50 per cent. This difference can be explained by a variety of reasons: i) the lack of systematic identification of outcome indicators, baselines and targets because the results framework (or performance measurement framework – PMF)\(^8\) was not developed during this period; ii) outcomes require more time to take place; iii) the complexity of outcomes such as legal changes which depend on many factors out of the scope of UNICEF actions; and iv) the partial information on outcomes as a result of limited outcome monitoring during implementation.

The information available for baselines, targets and sources of information for indicators were not systematically found in the documentation used by MCO or by partners, and they were not all available explicitly in the ‘justification’ section filled up by the respondents. Some of the targets were identified ex post and upon request (even during this evaluation process). There was no evidence to demonstrate that there was a management culture to systematically incorporate measurements of target achievement during the implementation of capacity development activities. The respondents were knowledgeable of some targets, but their achievement or lack of was not necessarily used during the decision making process of the Country Programme during 2009-2010.

Finally, for the capacity development activities at individual level, outputs were sometimes reduced by the non-continuous participation of the same participants throughout the training. A variety of reasons were mentioned: in the case of a number of CSOs, most staff were working only part-time for the CSO and sometimes had other priority commitments; in the case of public sector institutions, participants were commonly named by their department heads on the basis of their profile, but also sometimes on their availability in a context of multiple actions to perform.

**What were the major factors that contributed positively to the achievement of capacity development initiative objectives?**

Three major factors contributed positively to the achievement of capacity development initiative objectives. First, the presence of champions of change within partner institutions, and preferably at their head, made a positive contribution. However, champions at technical level alone were not sufficient enough to influence policy change. Political influence was needed to make a difference. Second, a participatory approach from the start, awareness raising activities, and capacity

---

\(^8\) A results framework, also called in a wider sense a performance measurement framework (PMF), is a management tool intended to provide decision-makers and management with clear measures of performance desired. The PMF includes indicators at planning, programming and budgeting, and M&E and reporting; i.e., all phases of the results-based management cycle. The PMF also presents the articulation ‘map’ that connects the contribution of each level of planning (i.e., strategic, programmatic, and operational). It explains how performance will be measured and assessed at the three planning levels, making sure that there is consistency of objectives, indicators, and targets set across levels.
development activities per se helped in reducing resistance to change in a number of cases, e.g., education for undocumented children. Finally, the stability in national political orientations contributed to the objectives. For example, the continuity in Malaysia development plans and in policy reforms helped.

4.4. Efficiency

**To what extent was the portfolio of capacity development activities efficient?**

*The portfolio of capacity development activities was considered to be somewhat efficient (average grade 1.9).* UNICEF capacity development annual budget was around USD 800,000 for the period 2011-2015, which is not a lot, especially in the context of resources available in Malaysia. However, UNICEF brought expertise and services that were not present before, bringing high returns on this investment. Partners appreciated the value added of UNICEF led capacity development activities and its position as an ‘honest broker’ and dialogue facilitator among national actors, especially between the Government and the civil society, including on sensitive issues.

Empirical evidence on costs was sketchy and 44 per cent of respondents were unable to answer, which reflects a potential enhancement area for the future portfolio. UNICEF and government public procurement procedures were followed. An analysis of available financial information provided by UNICEF Operations Department on the costs of capacity development case studies (see Annex 6e) concluded that *unit costs were in the range of national and international standards* in most cases, based on the experience of IDEA International in 65 countries over 19 years. Some capacity development activities were more costly as a result of international expertise brought in, when such expertise did not exist at national level.

While *outputs quantity were considered to be close to the maximum that could be obtained given the level of budget, the output quality and outcome quantity and quality could have been slightly improved* with a better choice of i) trainers having not only technical competencies, but also more pedagogical skills and cultural awareness; ii) more local partners whenever possible, resulting in lower costs and enabling to use more money to enlarge access of participants; and iii) more carefully selected participants focusing on the key actors for a given capacity development activity. In some cases, the benefits would also have been greater with a longer duration of the capacity development initiative and activities within this initiative. Also a more strategic choice of partners, with a focus on NGOs whose voices are strong enough to influence change, might result in more outputs and especially outcomes with the same amount of money in the future portfolio.

*The use of innovations, be it new technologies or innovative approaches, was considered a potential area for improvement.* The only success case was the DevInfo intervention with the Department of Statistics. The delivery modalities of the other capacity development activities remained largely traditional and based on face to face interactions between a facilitator and participants.
4.5. Capacity development management process

To what extent was the management process\(^9\) of the UNICEF capacity development activities a quality process?

*Overall the management process used by UNICEF for its capacity development activities and, when relevant, by its partners, was considered of moderate quality (average grade 1.8).* On one hand, those activities were *sufficiently budgeted* to achieve their objectives and targets. The *logistics* (e.g., venue) and *inputs* (e.g., support systems and tools, trainers and experts, training material, facilitating material etc.) for capacity development activities were also *highly appreciated*. But on the other hand, respondents noted the *absence of a clear cross-sectoral capacity development strategic plan, the limited use of capacity needs assessments, and the limited monitoring, evaluation and reporting practices on capacity development activities.*

Elements of a capacity development strategy existed in several documents. Also, the participatory approach used in the design of the country programme and the yearly reviews of the implementation of the programme were well appreciated by partners. However, there was no explicit and unique capacity development strategic plan with a sequence of capacity development initiatives over time as well as their horizontal articulation across sectors.

In terms of problem analysis and capacity needs assessment to formulate the capacity development activities as an initial step of the strategic planning process, there was an effort to identify the capacity development needs of target groups with the stakeholders, but not necessarily a comprehensive need assessment as a systematic step before deciding to go for a capacity development initiative and design it. Also, a risk analysis and the preparation of a risk mitigation plan were not systematically considered in the design of a capacity development intervention.

As for monitoring, evaluation and reporting, UNICEF MCO met its monitoring and reporting requirements for accountability on capacity development initiatives during the period. An annual review of activities was conducted internally by the CMT as well as with partners, an activity which was highly appreciated. However, the documentation on capacity development activities varied a lot from one activity to the next. There was no systematic documentation of those activities, hence the evaluation team had to start with the filling up of a standard reference sheet per activity. In spite of the strong help of UNICEF managers and programme officers, filling up those sheets was quite a challenge and, in some cases, some basic information was missing. Also, during the fact-finding mission, partners identified more capacity development activities than the ones identified by UNICEF in the TOR, i.e., the identification of 13 new activities during the field visit to Sabah and Sarawak from the original list of six activities in those two States. Also there is no comprehensive monitoring, evaluation and reporting plan for capacity development activities based on a clear TOC and a focus on outcomes of those activities. Finally, some partners noted the limited access to updated data on capacity development interventions, which limits the possibility of conducting an evidence-based dialogue between UNICEF and its partners.

---

\(^9\) The benchmark to assess the UNICEF management process was the UNDP capacity development process which considers five-steps: 1) Engage stakeholders on capacity development; 2) Assess capacity assets and needs; 3) Formulate a capacity development response; 4) Implement a capacity development response; and 5) Evaluate capacity development (see Annex 2).
4.6. Partnerships

Did UNICEF MCO develop any partnership(s) for its UNICEF capacity development activities? If yes, with whom and how?

UNICEF MCO developed partnerships for its capacity development activities with a variety of partners from the public sector at Federal and at State level, NGOs, CSOs, academia, the private sector, and other international organisations (see Annex 6f). Partners played the role of supervising agency, executing agency or participants of the capacity development intervention. In some cases, the executing agency was UNICEF. The selection of the partner was made by UNICEF based on the domain of expertise and willingness of the partner to deliver the capacity development activity for the type of participants involved.

To what extent were those partnership(s) of quality?

Partnerships were assessed of average quality (average grade 2.1). UNICEF had a strategic positioning as it occupied a niche that very few other organisations had in its areas of work. UNICEF also contributed to bridging the gap between the public sector, the private sector and CSOs. Some of those partnerships worked well. However, others were faced with different challenges, depending on the type of partner: i) with some partners in the public sector: how to deal with the political agenda and bureaucratic processes; ii) with some CSO partners: how to find partners with adequate human resources and maintain continuity, even after UNICEF pulls out, and; iii) with some private sector corporations: how to reconcile capacity development objectives with short term profitability objectives.

There is room for improvement in terms of improving the selection process of the partner, designing the partnership and contractual arrangements for mutual obligations over the medium run and leveraging of the partnership, so that it translates into sustainable capacities of the partner to lead and conduct service delivery after the end of the capacity development initiative. Partnerships with NGOs could have been more strategic, focusing on NGOs whose voices are strong enough to influence change.

4.7. Outcomes

To what extent did the outputs of the portfolio of UNICEF capacity development activities lead to substantial outcomes?

Overall, capacity development initiatives had significant outcomes10 (2.1 average grade). However this grade decreased depending on the level of capacity development: significant outcomes at individual level; some outcomes at institutional level; and low outcomes at policy level. This pattern is to be expected since there was generally a loss of signal going from individual capacity development to institutional capacity development, then to policy-making capacity development, as capacity development became more and more complicated and involved more and more actors and issues, most of them outside of range of UNICEF. However other factors also contributed, in particular, the limits of the existing results framework for capacity-building initiatives, the absence of an explicit TOC, and the time needed to obtain outcomes should not be underestimated.

At individual level, the satisfaction of the participants vis-a-vis the outputs scored the highest, revealing that respondents appreciated the trainings, workshops and capacity-building efforts.

10 As mentioned in the methodology section, the focus was put on immediate outcomes.
However, there were suggested improvements in terms of less intensive training, more follow up and support to partners after the activity, and more continuity in capacity development activities. At institutional level, the application by the participating institutions of new knowledge and tools acquired was in some cases real and positive. However, those immediate outcomes did not necessarily translate into final outcomes in terms of scaling up, new policy, new bill or reallocations. In other cases, the outcomes were low because of the limited buy-in and capacity of the partner to use the knowledge acquired in the capacity development activity. There is a need for UNICEF to better appreciate the organisational preconditions for the partner to be autonomous after the capacity development intervention finishes and there is a need for some partners to understand that the role of UNICEF is not service delivery and that they should take advantage of UNICEF support while it lasts to build up their organisation capacity to manage and deliver services. At policy-making level, the outcome was less obvious given the sometimes limited information sharing across agencies and the marginal position of UNICEF in the country, making it difficult to engage top decision makers.

The immediate outcomes also varied depending on the type of capacity development initiatives. Significant outcomes were noted for i) initiatives which increased hands-on skills and competency development (tools); and ii) initiatives related to various programming areas – e.g., education, child protection, CSR, etc. Meanwhile, the immediate outcomes of initiatives working on conceptual frameworks, policy formulation, advocacy, knowledge management, or cross-sectoral outcomes were much more limited.

Finally, the importance of the outcome also depended on the level of effort and duration of the capacity development intervention. Logically, outcomes for one-off activities are lower than for longer interventions with a sequence of activities and replication over a certain period of time.

This assessment was not necessarily the same among respondents and several respondents were not able to answer because the outcomes were not clearly identified at the beginning, there was no clear performance agreement, and there was no M&E plan that could help measure outcomes. People did not have enough information to clearly justify their responses because M&E analysis and information was not systematically generated through the management process cycle. So even if the evaluation was able to reach knowledgeable partners and staff from UNICEF, people were lacking the instruments to provide sufficient evidence to establish for sure if individuals and institutions scale up the new knowledge acquired by capacity development activities.

What were the major factors influencing positively the achievement of outcomes?

Among the factors influencing positively the achievement of outcomes, some were within UNICEF control, in particular its human resources (i.e., the specific skills and field experience in their domain of UNICEF MCO staff, their mastery of results-based management approach, especially strategic planning and M&E, and their commitment to UNICEF), a crosscutting perspective across all sectors to avoid silo thinking and action, the adequate staffing and level of effort given to M&E, the selection of the better performing CSO partners, and the ability to draw upon a network of national and international partners. Some other success factors were beyond UNICEF control such as limited staff rotation and resistance to change in partner institutions, or still high performance of the government partner organisation with which UNICEF had to work and its political willingness to address sensitive issues.

---

11 Examples of success include: a) the DOS which benefited from UN manuals, technical and financial support in producing internationally comparable official statistics on a modern IT platform which helped modernize the national statistical system; b) the Malaysian Council for Child Welfare, that has gone ahead looking at the newer/emerging issues of child abuse and exploitation, e.g., sexual exploitation of children in travel and tourism.
To what extent have the UNICEF capacity development activities outputs and preliminary outcomes been analysed and used by UNICEF to adjust UNICEF implementation strategy during the last strategic plan period?

The capacity development activities, outputs, and preliminary outcomes were analysed to a limited extent to adjust UNICEF implementation strategy. On an ad hoc basis, the programme managers received feedback, but it was not systematic and well documented, e.g., through surveys at the end of the trainings or workshops. Also the follow up was limited so more could have been done to take advantage of the awareness and ‘momentum’ created by these capacity development activities to move to the next step.

Also the monitoring activities conducted by UNICEF were not sufficiently disseminated internally with the staff to create synergies on crosscutting issues, or to feedback management with lessons learnt. Even if the monitoring information was available, it was scattered and based on individual knowledge, but not as a collective knowledge supported by an integrated monitoring information system to make evidence based decisions.

4.8. Sustainability

To what extent had the UNICEF capacity development activities sustainable effects?

Answers for this evaluation criteria are affected by the lack of precision on expected outcomes and the caveats mentioned earlier apply as well here.

The UNICEF capacity development activities had sustainable effects for a few outcomes (average grade 1.9). Sustainability and continuity were considered in the design of the capacity development initiatives to a significant degree. While a number of immediate outcomes were considered sustainable, only few final outcomes were maintained over the medium run after UNICEF pull-out in a number of capacity development initiatives. One main reason is that there was no agreed plan of action on the short, medium and long-term, which would contribute to sustainability of the outcomes when UNICEF stops its support. A number of UNICEF partners expected UNICEF to keep taking the lead and continue their support. Sustainability of outcomes is too dependent on the continuity of UNICEF support. There is a need to be more strategic in terms of choosing partners, identify prerequisites in terms of partner organisational strengths for a successful pull-out of UNICEF before going ahead with a capacity development initiative, and take more time to plan the phasing out.

4.9. Overall diagnostic results

Overall grades per evaluation dimension on an ordinal scale from 0 to 3 are presented in Figure 4.1.
The overall evaluation of UNICEF MCO capacity development initiatives over the period 2011-2015 is good with no grade below 1.4 and most of the grades around 2 over a maximum grade of 3. The best grades were obtained for outcomes and partnerships, the lowest for coherence.

Capacity development activities can also be classified in decreasing order of performance from individual level, to institutional level to enabling environment level. Additionally, the performance was better for inputs, activities and outputs than for immediate outcomes and even less for final outcomes. This reality of change (ROC - see Annex 9b) as opposed to the theory of change (TOC - see Annex 9a) make sense, and point out to possible improvement in the way UNICEF could better plan strategically, select its partners, establish clear and more sustainable partnership agreements, monitor and evaluate outcomes.
4.10. SWOT analysis

What were the strengths of the MCO capacity development response 2011-2015?
What were the weaknesses of the MCO capacity development response 2011-2015?
What are the opportunities to be sized in the MCO capacity development response 2016-2020?
What are the threats to be considered in the MCO capacity development response 2016-2020?

*Figure 4.2* includes the responses to those questions.
Figure 4.2: SWOT analysis of UNICEF capacity development initiatives as of end of 2015-early 2016

**Strengths**
- Leverage of UNICEF with the Government and the UN network. This support is key for NGOs.
- Brand awareness that can boost confidence from members of the public and the Government. The subject matter (children) creates positive feelings.
- Ethical values and standards, contributing to quality work and credibility.
- Contribution to sharing best practices from various countries. National and international staff help in cross-fertilization. Ability to bring in high quality experts.
- Capacity to work on sensitive issues. Perceived as 'honest broker' without hidden political agenda.
- Strong capacity for fund-raising which could be more used to fund capacity development initiatives in Malaysia.

**Weaknesses**
- Weak capacity in assessing capacity development needs during planning capacity development initiatives.
- Underestimating assumptions and risks during planning phase.
- Too many one-off short term projects without a clear articulated programmatic approach and performance measurement framework.
- Cumbersome accountability mechanisms and proposal application forms and procedures.
- Ratio of operating costs versus service delivery could be improved in some cases.
- Limited visibility at State level, except for Sabah and Sarawak.
- Limited grassroots work.
- Insufficient monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

**Opportunities**
- The 11th Malaysia Plan and sectoral and thematic plans, which provide opportunities for further collaboration between partners and UNICEF.
- Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) represent also a new potential area for collaboration between partners and UNICEF to provide technical support in monitoring and reporting on SDGs.
- State planning and reporting obligations creating opportunities to address the recommendations on capacity gaps.
- Openness of state authorities.
- Medium term growth perspectives of Malaysia and wealth of the private entrepreneurs.

**Threats**
- Diversity of the country which complicates the definition of overall interventions.
- Complexity of the political situation which complicates work.
- Language barrier.
- NGOs and government organizations increasingly unable to retain staff after the capacity development activity.
- Dealing with a diversity of actors with different interests and capacities.
- Growing pressure of Malaysian donors to see some concrete results of their contributions in Malaysia.
- World economy volatility and local economy which many impacting funding of UNICEF activities.
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CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNT
Section 5: Conclusions and lessons learnt

5.1. Relevance

UNICEF MCO capacity development initiatives were adequately aligned to the programmatic priorities of the UNICEF 2011-2015 Country Programme and Country Programme Action Plan. The choice of initiatives was aligned with the demand from partners, UNICEF Headquarters and EAPRO, and staff preferences. They were also globally aligned with the 10PM even if the specific articulation of desired results of the capacity development interventions and the 10MP was not easy to prove, given the macro nature of the 10MP and the micro nature of interventions and in the absence of an explicit performance measurement framework (PFM) for capacity development initiatives.

UNICEF played a useful contribution in reducing capacity gaps for child rights implementation in Malaysia. Both the Federal Government and the Governments of Sabah and Sarawak appreciated the UNICEF contribution in terms of bringing various stakeholders together and making them start working together for a concrete output; as well as making Malaysia benefit from international skills which were not easily available locally. NGOs/CSOs appreciated the unique technical and financial support provided by UNICEF, the advocacy work and the bridging between them and the Government. The private sector appreciated the technical skills provided to help them fulfil their CSR obligations.

UNICEF initiatives were focused in areas where other partners could hardly intervene (e.g., engaging the Government at various levels) or fell outside the agencies mandate or scope. UNICEF had a crosscutting approach and built a reputation to be able to work with a variety of actors from the public sector, NGOs and CSOs, the private sector, and international organisations.

However, the analysis of the causal factors behind capacity gaps was often limited and there is a need for better articulation in the future between: (i) the strategic objectives and the TOC underlying each capacity development intervention; (ii) individual, organisational, and policy-making capacity development levels; (iii) capacity development activities within a given initiative for a better programming of the sequence of such activities; and (iv) capacity development interventions as building blocks within a capacity development strategy to be part of a bigger TOC.

Geographically, most capacity development activities took place in Kuala Lumpur and, in a minor but growing proportion, in the States of Sabah and Sarawak. Much more could be done in those states as well as in other states of Peninsular Malaysia. UNICEF Malaysia could consider a territorial approach, distinguishing Kuala Lumpur and Putrajaya, other states in Peninsular Malaysia, and Sabah and Sarawak to make capacity development initiatives more relevant to local characteristics and enabling a prompter response to emerging issues.

In terms of SWOT analysis to orient the 2016-2020 CPAP in terms of capacity development initiatives, there is also a window of opportunity in terms of the awareness and alignment of the 11th Malaysia Plan (11MP) and sector plans to child protection and well-being. SDGs represent a new potential area for collaboration between partners and UNICEF to provide technical support in monitoring, evaluation, and reporting on SDGs. State planning and reporting obligations also create opportunities to address capacity gaps at their level. Finally, Malaysia growth prospects and the vibrancy of its private sector represent significant funding opportunities for capacity development activities in this country.
5.2. Coherence

Overall, there was coherence among capacity development initiatives conducted during the 2011-2015 period, more so internally than externally, which could be expected. UNICEF interacted with a number and a variety of partners who had their own missions, objectives and institutional arrangements.

One complicating factor was the lack of clarity of the definition of capacity development for all UNICEF staff and partners. Some actors missed a comprehensive picture of capacity development and did not perceive it as an integral part of policy and programme development, with the result that they sometimes had different definitions of capacity development and could not identify clearly all capacity development initiatives. The role of UNICEF was also not clear to all partners, in particular for some CSOs who wanted UNICEF to deliver services on the ground.

5.3. Effectiveness

Capacity development initiatives conducted between 2011 and 2015 were generally effective in achieving their targets in terms of inputs, activities, and outputs. UNICEF definitely contributed in increasing awareness and technical capacity in the supported institutions on addressing child related issues. UNICEF main contributions were: i) sharing best practices from various countries and its ability to bring in high quality experts; ii) a capacity to work on sensitive issues and its perception by national actors as an ‘honest broker’ without hidden political agenda. However, the size and duration of capacity development activities were not always enough to bring about a change in the substantive problem areas identified, so the achievement rates for outcome targets were lower.

Overall, the magnitude of change brought by UNICEF capacity development initiatives was quite high at individual level, but lower at institutional level, and even more so at policy-making level and the trend applies for all actors, e.g., initiatives aimed at Government, CSOs or with private sector. The increase in awareness and skills from individual training did not necessarily translate in a change of the same magnitude in the capacity of institutions to implement those new directions and skills.

It is important to put this mixed evidence in the context of realistic expectations in terms of change that could be brought by UNICEF, taking into consideration the complexity and sensitivity of some of those issues, and the limited institutional and financial leverage of UNICEF in a complex institutional landscape. UNICEF was still a minor player in some of those arenas in Malaysia and both UNICEF and its partners were at a learning stage in terms of developing effective capacity development activities.

Finally the limited geographic coverage of capacity development activities which were mainly confined to Kuala Lumpur and Putrajaya. A growing number of capacity development activities have taken place in and the States of Sabah and Sarawak over the period 2011-2015. Much less was done in the rest of Peninsular Malaysia.

5.4. Efficiency

It is important to start with a word of caution on the analysis of efficiency. Data on cost-effectiveness was sketchy and future capacity development initiatives need to be better documented in this domain. One also has to analyse efficiency considering the capacity development activity, the kind of partner, and the context of intervention. So one has to conduct a careful analysis comparing costs and benefits for similar kinds of capacity development activities, partners, quality of services provided, and contexts of intervention.
On the basis of the limited empirical evidence available, one can conclude that UNICEF was able to produce significant and valuable outputs in spite of a limited budget for capacity development initiatives. The sampled capacity development case studies were conducted with costs on a par with national and international standards. There was also efficiency in terms of outcomes although it could be improved by a better selection of executing agencies and participants.

One positive strategy adopted by UNICEF was to position a focal point in Kota Kinabalu to cover the States of Sabah and Sarawak. Given the important differences between Peninsular Malaysia and those States, this has proven a very efficient way of identifying opportunities for capacity development and potential local partners, developing privileged relationships with state governments, and supporting the execution of capacity development activities in the field. Further expansion of this strategy should be seriously considered in the 2016-2020 period.

5.5. Capacity development management process

Several elements of a good quality management process were used in a number of capacity development initiatives, but it was neither comprehensive nor systematic across all initiatives. Two strengths were identified in the management process of capacity development initiatives during the 2011-2015 period. First, there was extensive use of the participatory approach between UNICEF and its partners. Second, each individual capacity development activity benefited from serious programming and budgeting which facilitated its operational delivery.

Three weaker areas of the management process were noted. First, there was limited global analysis of capacity needs and gaps to guide an overall capacity development strategic plan. Also, no detailed capacity gap assessment was systematically conducted before designing any capacity development intervention.

Second, the elaboration of a clear PFM, in particular to clarify and measure outcomes, and a risk analysis and mitigation plan were not systematically designed for each capacity development intervention.

Third, there was no monitoring, evaluation and reporting plan for capacity development initiatives prepared at the outset of the 2011-2015 period to keep a simple, but updated documentation of those initiatives and to specify how results-based monitoring and evaluation, and reporting should be carried out. Opportunely, there was a mid-term review in 2013 of the 2011-2015 Country Programme that led to its adjustment for the reminder of the period.

5.6. Partnerships

During the 2011-2015 period, UNICEF was able to conduct capacity development initiatives with a wide range of partners with some success, but with challenges in terms of results sustainability. This conclusion has important implications. First, in terms of selection of partnerships, UNICEF should better select its partners, using a grid of criteria to justify a theoretical decision.

Second, in terms of the design of the capacity development initiative, UNICEF should allow for enough time and resources to invest in the fundamentals of the partner as a prerequisite before starting to help it build its capacity to deliver any desired child related service. These fundamentals include management skills, organisation and leadership. UNICEF should use a stepwise approach with low initial expectations. It should work with champions and conduct pilots with them to test and showcase new types of capacity development initiatives that can be later scaled up by the partner or replicated by other partners. The sequence of capacity development activities needs to be well thought off, e.g.,
starting with awareness activities to boost the demand side before conducting a capacity need assessment.

5.7. Outcomes

The conclusions on outcomes are less crystal clear than for outputs. Various factors explain this: the absence of the systematic elaboration of a theory of change linking outputs of capacity development activities to clearly defined outcomes; the limited use of setting targets in terms of immediate and intermediate outcomes; the time needed to achieve final outcome targets, the classical attribution problem of assigning the change in the value of a final outcome indicator back to a specific capacity development initiative; and the scarcity of credible data on outcomes due to insufficiencies in the M&E system.

The evidence that could be gathered suggests that immediate outcomes were higher in the case of capacity development at individual level than at institutional level, and even more enabling environment level. They also were higher for initiatives which increased hands-on skills and competency development (i.e., tools); and initiatives related to various programming areas than for initiatives working on conceptual frameworks, policy development, advocacy, knowledge management, cross-sectoral outcomes were much more limited. Finally, they were higher for longer and bigger activities than for one-off activities.

Those findings have two implications. First, more importance should be given to outcomes in designing and planning a capacity development intervention, linking them to higher level strategic objectives and targets. Second, the modalities of collaboration with partners should include provisions on commitments to achieve not only outputs, but also some immediate outcomes.

5.8. Sustainability

The significant difference between the sustainability of immediate outcomes and final outcomes of capacity development initiatives reveals the fragility of a number of partners and their dependence on UNICEF. UNICEF has to consider how to increase the sustainability of the final outcomes and reinforce its partners, e.g., by working on the partner fundamentals, and establishing a performance agreement or any other mechanism that may work in the UNICEF and Malaysian context with each partner.

5.9. Good practices

Several good practices were identified in this evaluation. First, UNICEF has succeeded in occupying a niche on the national and sub-national scene. It is perceived as an ‘honest broker’ for child rights and has been able to have some institutional leverage, putting some sensitive issues on the policy agenda, and facilitated the dialogue among national stakeholders that have difficulty communicating among themselves.

Second, UNICEF has been able to work upstream and downstream, making ‘the big split’ going from very operational support to CSOs in the field up to contribution to high level policy making committees. This unique capacity makes UNICEF able to engage credibly high level actors while actors in the field can feel a real support.

Third, a greater presence at State level enabled UNICEF to provide services not provided by other institutions. Having a permanent representative and fielding a number of missions has proven a very efficient strategy to be present, relevant, and react quickly to opportunities and situations.
Fourth, UNICEF has brought high level international experts to Malaysia who shared international standards and good practices from other countries and regions. This represented real value added.

Table 5.1 provides three examples of success stories in terms of capacity-building activities and identifies good practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Good practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DevInfo Users and Administration Training | ✓ Alignment of activity objectives aligned with CPAP objectives and improved data  
   ✓ High level of applicability to solve children data for decision making  
   ✓ Adequate use of the momentum to increase the effects for the agencies involved in the provision of services  
   ✓ Adequate combination of approach and methodologies for maximum level of outputs given resources availability (highly efficient) |
| Language, Education and Social Cohesion: Facilitated Dialogue and Workshop | ✓ Fully and directly aligned as it was already recognised as part of the action plan for 2011-2015  
   ✓ Critical gap addressed because not much work was done by any NGOs in the area of language policy and social cohesion  
   ✓ Coherence in time and adequate sequence because it was implemented side by side with other initiatives in Sabah and Sarawak and highly coordinated with MOE (work plan agreed by all actors) |
   ✓ Directly related to the mandate of UNICEF to strengthen the capacity of office bearers ruling government to monitor child rights  
   ✓ Highly valued from the perspective of the participants  
   ✓ Adequate experts for the trainings from the perspective of participants |

5.10. Weaknesses

Weaknesses were noted at various stages of the results-based management cycle: i) at planning level, a weak capacity in assessing capacity development needs during planning capacity development interventions, an underestimation of assumptions made and risks, and the planning of a series of one-off short term projects without a clear, articulated, programmatic approach and PFM; ii) at implementation level, rather cumbersome accountability mechanisms and proposal application forms and procedures, a sometime high ratio of operating costs versus service delivery, and visibility limited to Federal Government level, States of Sabah and Sarawak level, and limited grassroots work; and finally iii) at M&E level, insufficient monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

5.11. Lessons learnt

Various lessons were learnt from this evaluation. First, the absence of a consistent cross-cutting capacity development strategy has reduced the synergies across capacity development activities conducted by UNICEF MCO. Even though cost-effective, those activities were not necessarily well articulated with other capacity development initiatives from partners, and even to some extent with other MCO capacity development activities. A capacity development strategy would articulate better the three levels of capacity development (individual, institutional, and enabling policy environment), the sequencing of activities so that they build upon each other, and the different work areas and programmes of MCO.

Second, the elaboration of an ex ante TOC is needed to provide all stakeholders internally and externally with a clear vision of what UNICEF wants to accomplish in terms of results of capacity development. This would provide a focus on the results and the assumptions that need to be considered to achieve those results. The probability of achieving outcomes would also increase if the outcomes were agreed upon by partners involved in the capacity development and their commitments obtained before starting any initiative.
Third, capacity development is as much a demand issue as a supply issue. UNICEF has offered some very interesting capacity development activities, but at times, it did not achieve the desired outcomes because the demand at high level was not necessarily very strong. The identification of champions of change within the partner institutions could be considered a critical condition for giving the green light for a capacity development initiative.

Fourth, Malaysia is a complex and evolving country and UNICEF could better address emerging issues, disaggregating among target groups and territories. The value added of UNICEF would be greater with more weight given to capacity development interventions at State level.

Fifth, UNICEF Malaysia needs to ‘choose its battles’ and assess its options, given its limited means and political leverage. Sprinkling money will not result in a critical mass of resources to make a difference. Various capacity development initiatives could compete among themselves according to a success probability factor and relative contribution to overall capacity development strategy objectives and targets.

Finally, partner selection is a crucial issue. There has been insufficient screening of the partners for the presence of institutional fundamentals, in particular in terms of minimum organisation structure, governance rules, managing skills, leadership, and availability of qualified human resources and financial resources, which resulted in some partners not able to carry on with service delivery after UNICEF pull-out.
RECOMMENDATIONS
Section 6: Recommendations

Seven recommendations of actions to be implemented in the course of one year (2017) are made to the UNICEF CMT and ten outputs are identified to assess progress on the implementation of those recommendations.

Recommendation 1: Elaborate a capacity development strategy, within the country programme, to be executed by MCO over the remaining period of CPAP and 11MP (2017-2020), articulating all types and levels of capacity development initiatives considered as building blocks to implement a bigger theory of change. It would consider the following steps: i) introduction of new concepts and approaches; ii) discussing strategy; iii) rollout of strategy; and iv) M&E and adjustment. This plan would include: i) a country and partners analysis, positioning UNICEF capacity development in Malaysia’s context; ii) objectives explicitly linked to the CPAP, including the TOC with critical assumptions; iii) results framework (or PMF) with their corresponding performance indicators and targets; iv) capacity development strategies and means across sectors; v) a proposed set of capacity development initiatives with a tentative calendar; vi) possible partners and indicative roles and responsibilities; vi) risk analysis and possible mitigation measures for each target; and vii) a tentative budget for each year over the planning period.

Suggested Output 1: Capacity development strategy, within the Country Programme, elaborated, validated, and disseminated internally and externally.

Recommendation 2: Tilt the balance towards more institutional capacity development. The portfolio of capacity development initiatives could be potentially more effective if the initiatives were more at institutional level, because working at this level provides for more sustainable results than individual capacity development activities and, at the same time, where UNICEF can make a bigger impact over the medium run than policy-making capacity development. This will involve tilting the prioritization of capacity development initiatives toward those that consider enhancements/strengthening of frameworks, procedures, management systems among others at key institutions. This would apply at Federal, State, and local levels.

Suggested Output 2: Increased percentage of the budget allocated for institutional capacity development initiatives.

Recommendation 3: Tilt the balance towards more decentralized capacity development, i.e. tilt the balance between Federal level and State level capacity development initiatives towards the latter to adjust to various capacity development needs and have more relationships with the grassroots level organisations and emerging local issues. This will also involve using a territorial approach, distinguishing Kuala Lumpur - Putrajaya, States of Sabah and Sarawak, and other states in Peninsular Malaysia; but also considering the areas that are far apart from the urban areas, and where target groups are concentrated. More local presence would facilitate the definition of relevant capacity development initiatives for the local context, increase the rapidity and flexibility in the implementation of those initiatives, and foster the collaboration with State and other local partners benefiting from grassroots anchorage and able to conduct more cost effective activities. The option suggested to UNICEF by both State authorities (i.e., offices in Sabah and Sarawak), might not be feasible financially or institutionally for UNICEF, but more field presence and resources are required.

Suggested Output 3: Increased percentage of budget allocated for capacity development initiatives executed at State level (disaggregated by target states and by target population).

Recommendation 4: Conduct a capacity development capacity gap analysis before designing any capacity development initiative. This would help establish the baseline from which progress should be measured, through the identification of existing capacity assets as well as the desired level of capacity anticipated to achieve development or organisational objectives. This should be a mandatory
requirement in the design process and could be carried out by the knowledgeable domain experts at MCO supported, when needed, by external specialists. This analysis would also help identify specific target groups, and capacity development strategies to build up their desired capacities, and the implications for the design of appropriate capacity development initiatives in terms of size, coverage, budget, timeframe, etc. Several methodologies exist to conduct such a capacity assessment, e.g., UNDP 2009, so there is no need to ‘reinvent the wheel’.

**Suggested Output 4:** *Increased percentage of capacity development initiatives which are designed based on a capacity development gap analysis.*

**Recommendation 5:** *Enhance the process of partner selection with a ‘go/no go’ grid.* This grid of criteria with weights to justify the ‘go/no go’ decision would include among others: i) willingness on the part of the partner leaders to build up capacity and collaborate with UNICEF; ii) human and organisational capacities, and financial capacities to share the cost; iii) grassroots anchorage for implementation; iv) ownership of expected outcomes by the benefiting partner; v) propitious environment; and vi) manageable risks. This will also facilitate the process to take the time to plan and invest on the fundamentals (prerequisites) with the partner before starting to deliver the service, in particular management skills, organisation and leadership of selected partners, whenever relevant.

**Suggested Output 5:** ‘Go/no go’ grid elaborated and validated.

**Suggested Output 6:** *Increased percentage of the partners for capacity development initiatives that were selected using the ‘go/no go’ grid.*

**Recommendation 6:** *Prepare and sign a performance agreement with key partners involved in the implementation of capacity development initiatives.* An explicit document that defines the results at outcome level for the initiative target groups would be systematically formulated. This could also involve the definition of conditionality to trigger the next phase of the initiative. Apart from the usual clauses on objectives, roles and responsibilities, calendar, and budget, the agreement would: i) make sure that the initiative is clearly related to a programme of the partner; ii) identify clearly outcomes; iii) establish what are the strategies of the partner to ensure sustainability of service delivery and possible scaling up after UNICEF pull-out.

**Suggested Output 7:** Performance agreement model elaborated and validated.

**Suggested Output 8:** *Increased percentage of partners for capacity development activities that have a performance agreement signed with UNICEF MCO.*

**Recommendation 7:** *Put in place a monitoring, evaluation and reporting plan for the implementation of the capacity development strategy within the Country Programme at macro level, and the management of the portfolio of capacity development initiatives at micro level.* It is important that the plan to be elaborated by MCO considers both macro (global) and micro (activity) perspectives. In addition to the standard sections of any M&E plan, this plan should: i) specify monitoring, evaluation and reporting processes and methodologies; ii) clarify the roles and responsibilities in conducting key monitoring, evaluation and reporting activities and coordination mechanisms; iii) define the relevant monitoring, evaluation and reporting outputs and their use for evidence-based decision making and accountability; and, iv) propose a global design of the necessary information systems to support the operation of this monitoring, evaluation and reporting plan.

**Suggested Output 9:** Monitoring, evaluation and reporting plan for the implementation of the capacity development strategy within the Country Programme, and the portfolio of capacity development initiatives elaborated and validated.

**Suggested Output 10:** Monitoring, evaluation and reporting information system in place to support the monitoring, evaluation and reporting plan.

Beyond recommendations to UNICEF MCO, three recommendations are made to UNICEF EAPRO and UNICEF Headquarters. Serious evaluations of capacity development initiatives require a minimum
level of effort and budget to be of quality and therefore useful and credible. There is an interest in conducting those evaluations according to a similar approach and methodology first to benefit from past experience and economies of scale and, second, be able to do benchmarking and draw aggregate conclusions. In a context of scarce resources, it is recommended that UNICEF compares various approaches used for different evaluations in this domain and take the best practices to establish a generic approach for UNICEF capacity development evaluations from which all future evaluations designs will be derived to adjust to local contexts, objectives, and constraints. The second recommendation is that UNICEF staff and evaluators involved in such evaluations around the world be trained properly ex ante to make sure that they share the same approach, the same language and possess the minimum skills to carry out those complex evaluations. The third recommendation is that UNICEF take advantage of existing information technology to support a structured, rapid, and participatory approach to capacity development evaluation.
Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of reference

UNICEF Malaysia
Terms of Reference

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The 2011-2015 Country Programme goal of UNICEF Malaysia was to support the Government in achieving ‘Vision 2020’, which frames its vision of Malaysia becoming a fully developed country, and toward this end to “create self-sustaining national capacities so that all children in the country will be better able to enjoy their rights for survival, development, protection and participation.” This evaluation at the end of the Country Programme cycle serves to inform the next Country Programme 2016-2020, through an assessment of UNICEF Malaysia capacity development strategy. The main objectives of the evaluation are to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of capacity development interventions of in the areas of social policy, education, child protection, corporate-social responsibility (CSR), planning, communication for development (C4D), planning, monitoring and evaluation (PME), as well as the relevance of the activities carried out given the wider range of possible interventions, impact and likely sustainability in light of the defined results for children (2011-2015). The evaluation will also provide an assessment of the capacity development strategy within the Country Programme design, it will look at the enabling environment for capacity development, and document strengths and opportunities for the future Country Programme. These terms of reference (TOR) have been prepared by the UNICEF Malaysia Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Section, together with the Evaluation Specialist supporting the Country Office. They outline the proposed methodology and the principal evaluation questions to be explored in the exercise.

2 BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE OF THE EVALUATION

2.1 The United Nations Development Group (UNDG) has recognized capacity development as one of five key principles for United Nations country programming – alongside a human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability and results-based management. The United Nations General Assembly has emphasized that capacity development is a key strategy to achieving internationally agreed goals, including the Millennium Development Goals and more recently the Sustainable Development Goals, where the importance of supporting the efforts to maintain effective national institutions and “to support the implementation of national development strategies.” In the same way, the international community has repeatedly underscored the need for a high-level of commitment for sustainable capacity development. For instance, the Busan Partnership on Aid Effectiveness commits partner countries to “strengthen national institutions under the leadership of developing countries” through country-led capacity development strategies where needed.

13 “Keeping the promise: a forward-looking review to promote an agreed action agenda to achieve the Millennium Development Goals by 2015”. Report of the Secretary-General, 12 February 2010 (A/64/665).
2.2 Because of its centrality to the development process, together with national goals and strategies, and to achieving the Millennium Development Goals with equity, capacity development is one of the core priorities of UNICEF. To this end the UNICEF Strategic Plan for 2014-2017 recognizes capacity development as one of main UNICEF implementation strategies in achieving results for children and women.\(^\text{15}\) The Plan identifies UNICEF’s focus on training and technical assistance to reform government institutions and improve service provision, strengthening supply chain management, piloting models for scaling up, with attention to quality assurance and using national and local systems.

2.3 In framing capacity development at the country level, the UNDG has identified three interrelated levels of capacity in the country context (see Figure 1). These levels are: individual capacities in a particular area of expertise, for example, the competencies of system managers, planners, decision makers, at both national and sub-national level; the capacities of relevant government institutions at all levels, the capacity of and role of non-governmental organisations (NGOs), civil society organisations (CSO) and the quality and inclusiveness of community level organisations; as well as the enabling environment, which includes the policy framework, allocation of public resources and social norms to achieving progress in development.

**Figure 1: Levels of Capacity**

Source: Adapted from “A collective Approach to Capacity Development” (UNDG, 2009).

2.4 The approach of UNICEF to capacity development at national and local levels has focused on “strengthening the process of assessing, analysing and taking action to promote the realization of the rights of children and women.”\(^\text{16}\) In Malaysia, the UNICEF-Government of Malaysia Country Programme for 2011-2015 has sought to support capacity development to sustain ‘Vision 2020’ through the generation of evidence and analysis, leveraging resources for children and building

\(^{15}\) See the UNICEF strategic plan, 2014-2017 (E/ICEF/2013/21).

\(^{16}\) See the UNICEF approach to capacity development, 2010 (E/ICEF/2010/CRP.20).
systems to strengthen child-centered policies and programmes that are effectively monitored and evaluated. In 2013, UNICEF Malaysia underwent a mid-term review of its Country Programme. As a result, UNICEF Malaysia has improved its results framework and re-focused its capacity development strategy to enhance the role of government institutions at all levels and CSOs in the following areas:

- Quality data on children to refine and improve evidence-based policies, programmes and budget allocation for children, youth and women;
- CSO partnerships and capacity-building to play a more effective role in national policy advocacy for children;
- Private-sector fundraising and engagement for children; and
- Systems-building for monitoring and evaluation from the community and sub-national levels up the national level in key programming areas – including social policy, education, child protection, CSR and other cross-cutting areas.

The overall capacity development strategy of UNICEF Malaysia has been implemented through trainings, workshops, conferences and studies, in particular in the areas of social policy, education, child protection, CSR, C4D, and PME. The table below illustrates capacity development activities led by UNICEF Malaysia between 2011 and 2015, and number of participants (when data are available). The total cost of capacity development activities is approximately USD 800,000.

Table 1: Illustration of UNICEF Malaysia Capacity Development Activities, 2011-2015 and Participants (numbers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social policy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Child Well-being Workshop, Putrajaya, 30 January, 2013 (65 participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Marginal Bottleneck Budget (MBB) Workshop, Putrajaya, 2-4 April, 2013 (30 participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MICS Design and Planning Workshop, Panama, October 23-29, 2014 (4 participants)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>National Conference on Early Childhood Care &amp; Education, 2-4 November, 2012 – NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Language, Education and Social Cohesion: Facilitated Dialogue and Workshop, Kuala Lumpur, Kota Kinabalu and Kuching (multiple dates) (99 participants)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pilot Capacity-Building Programme run by Malaysia Child Resource Institute in the form of four workshops conducted between April and June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tertiary Child Protection Services Training Of Trainers Workshop, Kuala Lumpur, 4-8 June, 2012 – NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 11                | Children’s Media Workshop (Children for Child Protection Campaign), 26-27 October, 2012 (24 participants) |
| 12                | Child Protection Conference, Kuala Lumpur, 20-22 November, 2012 (165 participants) |
| 13                | High Level Meeting on Child Rights (HLM), Beijing, 13-14 May, 2013 (1 participant) |
| 14                | Round Table on Children with Disabilities, 3 June, 2013 (54 participants) |
| 15                | Promoting Diversion of Children in Conflict with the Law Seminar, Kuala Lumpur, 6 June, 2013 (23 participants) |
3 EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE

3.1 By assessing UNICEF’s capacity development interventions in Malaysia, this independent evaluation seeks to support the development of appropriate and effective strategies and action plans for the new Country Programme, as well as provide an opportunity to assess the strengths and opportunities of UNICEF’s Malaysia’s capacity development strategy to improve results for children and women. The present evaluation will be primarily summative and it will focus on capacity development interventions at the individual, organisational and policy (enabling environment) levels. The timing of the evaluation will enable lessons from the implementation of capacity development
initiatives to be identified, considered and fed into the development of the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for 2016-2020\(^{17}\) and workplans in subsequent years.

3.2 The exercise will correspondingly pursue the following objectives:
- Determine the relevance of UNICEF’s capacity development strategy given the wider range of possible interventions at the individual, organisational and policy levels with all key stakeholders (government, NGOs, CSOs and private sector);
- Review and assess the efficiency and effectiveness of UNICEF-led capacity development initiatives in the course of the 2011-2015 Country Programme;
- Provide a better narrative of present capacities and document existing strengths and opportunities to be explored in the future Country Programme;
- Identify the factors both within and beyond UNICEF’s control, which helped or hindered the success or failure of the improvement of capacities for development effectiveness (enabling environment).

3.3 The findings, conclusions and recommendations resulting from this evaluation will inform UNICEF Malaysia Country Office and in particular members of the Country Management Team. It is also envisioned that the evaluation will be of interest and use to UNICEF East-Asia and Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO) and UNCEF Headquarters toward learning lessons from UNICEF’s implementation of capacity development strategies and lessons learnt at country level. The results of this evaluation will be shared with counterparts within the Government of Malaysia, partners, donors, other UN agencies, the private sector and the development community at large to the extent it is deemed appropriate.

4 EVALUATION SCOPE

4.1 The evaluation scope will include UNICEF’s capacity development activities implemented in the course of the 2011-2015 Country Programme (see Table 1) at the individual, organisational and policy levels. In order to assess capacity development efforts in a strategic and efficient manner (i.e., without attempting to analyse all capacity development efforts in all projects), some case studies will be selected for a more in depth assessment in the areas of social policy, education, child protection, corporate-social responsibility, planning, monitoring and evaluation and C4D.

4.2 Sample selection of case studies for an in-depth assessment will be based on the following considerations:
- Sample include activities on three levels (enabling environment, institutional, community);
- Sample include various implementing partners (government, NGOs, CSOs, etc.);
- Sample include activities implemented at the central level in Kuala Lumpur, as well as activities implemented in the eastern part of Malaysia, notably Sabah and Sarawak;
- Sample involve training activities but also other dimensions of capacity development;
- Sample include activities that have been ongoing for some time, and there is an interest in having them being evaluated.

The period under review will be from 2011 to 2015.

\(^{17}\) Subject to timely completion of the evaluation. CPAP expected to be signed between November 2015 and January 2016.
5 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY QUESTIONS

5.1 The proposed guiding questions below, based on the criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, represent a provisional list of questions to be refined in the inception phase of the evaluation.

- **Relevance**
  - To what extent is UNICEF’s capacity development strategy relevant and appropriate to achieve the results stated in the Country Programme?
  - Were the choices of interventions and methods appropriate given the arena for capacity development (i.e., in relation to other capacity gaps, and in relation to resources available and time frame for action)?
  - Did capacity development activities target the appropriate individuals, organisations or policies?
  - Were the interventions relevant according to UNICEF overall strategic priorities (i.e., 2006-2013 MTSP, 2014-2017 strategic plan)?
  - Did capacity development interventions encourage considerations in relation to human rights, gender equality and equity?

- **Effectiveness**
  - Did capacity development interventions contribute to achieving the outcomes of the Country Programme results framework?
  - What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

- **Efficiency**
  - Were activities efficient (i.e., cost related to outreach)?
  - Were capacity development objectives achieved on time?
  - Were the activities implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

- **Impact**
  - Did capacity development activities have an impact on the performance of the participating individuals, organisations or institutions?
  - Did the change in capacity contribute to a change in the policy that is expected to improve the situation of children, youth and women?

- **Sustainability**
  - Did capacity development interventions result in sustainable change in individual behaviour or practice?
  - Did the process contribute to other sustainable organisational or policy changes?

5.2 At the core of capacity development is learning as an individual or institutional capacity. Therefore, for each activity sampled for a more in-depth assessment, a search for the “capacity gaps” will be carried out in order to provide useful recommendations for the formulation of a capacity development strategy. Another focus will be documenting existing strengths and opportunities to be grasped for the future Country Programme.
6 EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

6.1 The evaluation will use a balanced approach combining accountability and lesson-learning considerations. The Evaluation is expected to produce a report that reflects the independent judgement of the external evaluators fully informed by triangulated evidence.

6.2 The evaluation will focus on perceptions of participants that benefited from UNICEF’s capacity development activities. Additionally, there will be a systematic review of studies, reports and other written documentation.

6.3 By using a mixed-method approach, the evaluation will employ qualitative and quantitative methods and triangulate data to compile a robust and credible evidence-based in order to assess the effectiveness of UNICEF’s capacity development strategy. It is expected that the evaluation will use the following methods:

- Preliminary review of basic information: Collection of basic information, study of relevant documents, inventory of capacity development activities and participants to be contacted.
- Comprehensive review of all relevant documents: In-depth document review of country situational analyses, relevant documents from capacity development activities, annual plans, annual reports, reviews, studies, M&E reports and other documents.
- Cost-effectiveness analysis: A cost-effectiveness analysis through the collection of financial data to calculate cost-effectiveness of capacity development activities.
- Key informants interviews: Face-to-face interviews with former participants and programme managers.
- Survey: Among participants to capacity development activities as well as UNICEF programme managers concerned.
- In country direct-observations: By directly observing capacity development activities planned for the second half of 2015 to capture a great variety of interactions.
- Participatory workshop: A workshop may be conducted with key stakeholders to obtain increased clarity regarding the role of organisations and institutions involved in capacity development activities in question in the larger picture of ‘Vision 2020’. The workshop will contribute to increased understanding among partners of capacity development as a development strategy.

6.4 In conducting the evaluation, the external evaluators will adhere to the UN Norms and Standards for Evaluation, as well as to the UNICEF’s revised Evaluation Policy, UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluations and Data Collection and Analysis and UNICEF’s Evaluation Reporting Standards.

7 MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

7.1 UNICEF Malaysia will commission the evaluation to an external evaluators. The evaluation process will be managed by the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, with the support of the Evaluation Specialist covering Cambodia, Malaysia and Myanmar.
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7.2 A reference group will be established to input into the TOR development and to review and comment on the main evaluation outputs (i.e., the inception report, report on preliminary findings, draft and final reports).

8 EVALUATION PROCESS, SCHEDULE AND KEY OUTPUTS

8.1 The expected duration of the evaluation is 60 working days, between September to December 2015 and it will be implemented in four tentative phases as follows:

- **Phase I – Inception (October 2015):** Preliminary review of basic information, consultations with key stakeholders concerning the purpose and essential elements of the evaluation, sampling of capacity development interventions for in-depth analysis and initial mission to Malaysia (5 days).

  The main outputs from this phase will include:
  - An inception report (approximately 20 pages not including Annexes);
  - An evaluation summary (maximum 2 pages), summarizing the purpose, key questions and process for the evaluation.

- **Phase II – Data collection and preliminary findings (November 2015):** Comprehensive review of all relevant documents, data collection in country (15 days), roll out of the survey, observations, participatory workshop and other data collection techniques, preparation of a presentation on the preliminary findings and writing of a preliminary findings report to inform plans for the future Country Programme.

  The main outputs from this phase will include:
  - An presentation on the preliminary findings;
  - A preliminary findings report (approximately 10 pages).

- **Phase III – Analysis and report writing (November 2015):** Review and analysis of key findings, cross-checking and validation, including additional interviews as necessary, review the results of the survey, write draft and final report.

  The main outputs from this phase will include:
  - A draft and final evaluation report (approximately 40 pages, plus Annexes);
  - A sharp and well-written evaluation brief (maximum 4 pages), summarizing the findings, conclusion and recommendations. It is expected that info-graphics will be used to exemplify the main finding of the report.

- **Phase IV – Dissemination (December 2015):** This will include a well-facilitated strategic moment of reflection on strengths and opportunities of further investment in capacity development and it will lead to the formulation of a capacity development strategy for the future Country Programme. This is subject to further discussion with the Country Management Team.
8.2 The table below provides an overview of the tentative schedule for the evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Output/Deliverable</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commence inception work, incl. preliminary document review</td>
<td>Draft inception report</td>
<td>9 October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct inception mission</td>
<td>Final inception report (incl. data collection tool-kit) and evaluation brief</td>
<td>23 October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct data collection mission</td>
<td>Presentation on preliminary findings</td>
<td>13 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit preliminary findings report</td>
<td>Preliminary findings report</td>
<td>27 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit first draft report for comment</td>
<td>First draft evaluation report</td>
<td>4 December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit second draft report for comment</td>
<td>Second draft evaluation report</td>
<td>18 December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit final report for management response and publication</td>
<td>Final evaluation report</td>
<td>28 December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate dissemination, strategic reflection and uptake</td>
<td>Presentation on evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations, strengths and opportunities, capacity development strategy</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 EVALUATION TEAM

9.1 An external evaluation team of tentatively two people is envisaged. This will be made up as follows:

- An international **Senior Team Leader** responsible for the overall delivery of the evaluation according to the TOR and inception report. This person will have an Advanced Degree in Social Sciences, International Development, or similar, a minimum of 15 years’ experience in implementing capacity development initiatives, including previous experience of leading major, multi-disciplinary evaluations. S/he should be conversant with UNICEF, its mission and working methodologies, and should have an in depth knowledge of development effectiveness. By preference s/he should have previous experience of managing capacity development evaluations. S/he will have primary responsibility for producing, compiling, editing, writing of the evaluation reports and deliverables indicated in this TOR. Fluent in English with excellent verbal and writing skills.

- One **Evaluation Specialist**, with at least 5 years’ experience of working in research or evaluation, capable of organizing and analysing large quantities of data, including experience in designing and managing surveys. Fluent in Malay and English with excellent verbal and writing skills.

10 SELECTION PROCESS

10.1 This TOR will be the basis for a Request for Proposal of Services (RFPS) for institutional responses. The tentative schedule presented in this TOR is approximate and subject to change.
Annex 2: Concept of capacity development

Evaluating capacity development initiatives involves significant conceptual and methodological issues since it deals with a largely immaterial public good. While direct outputs of individual training are easy to assess, measuring their outcomes and the articulation of capacity development levels, i.e., individual, institutional and enabling environment, is far from easy and requires the use of multiple data collection methods and triangulation of results.

It is of fundamental importance to agree on a clear definition of capacity development and related concepts. Otherwise, quasi all development actions could be potentially labelled capacity development. As indicated by UNDP, “for some, capacity development can be any effort to teach someone to do something, or to do it better. For others, it may be about creating new institutions or strengthening old ones. Some see capacity development as a focus on education and training, while others take a broad view of it as improving individual rights, access or freedoms” (UNDP 2009 p. 9).

Definition of capacity development

The current UNDP approach for capacity development is that developing countries should own, design, direct, implement and sustain the process themselves, so the focus is to empower and strengthen endogenous capabilities (UNDP 2009, p.8). UNICEF defines capacity development as “a process through which individuals, organisations and societies obtain, strengthen and maintain the capabilities to achieve their own development objectives” (UNICEF 2010 p. 2), in the case of UNICEF with the purpose of implementing child rights.

Types of capacity development interventions

The first typology is based on the scope of the capacity development intervention: capacity development strategy, capacity development initiative, and capacity development activities. A capacity development strategy sets goals in terms of capacity development and explain how those goals are going to be achieved, usually over the medium to long run. A capacity development initiative corresponds to one or more strategies in a specific domain of capacity development for one or more target groups. It is a component of the capacity development strategy. And finally, a capacity development activity is a set of tasks supporting the accomplishment of a capacity development initiative. Some examples to better illustrate these are provided in Table A2.1.
Table A2.1: Scope of capacity development interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity development strategy</td>
<td>Document at institutional level, setting goals in terms of capacity development for UNICEF and its partners, and specifying broad strategies to achieve those goals.</td>
<td>Supporting capacity development of national and sub-national public institutions, private sector, NGOs and CSOs which conduct actions contributing to the implementation of child rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity development initiative</td>
<td>One (or more) strategies in a specific domain of capacity development for one (or more) target group. It is a component of the capacity development strategy.</td>
<td>Sensitizing policemen on child rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity development activity</td>
<td>Set of tasks related to capacity development conducted with a specific target group in a specific capacity development area over a period of time. It is a component of a capacity development initiative.</td>
<td>Series of 3 workshops of 2 days for 30 policemen each, in Kuala Lumpur, Sabah, and Sarawak.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted by IDEA.

A capacity development intervention at a higher level may involve capacity development activities at a lower level, e.g., working at enabling environment level may entail supporting a specific institution and, in the end, training some of its staff. The criteria of distinction is that the final objective of the capacity development intervention is at a different level.

The second typology is related to the fact that capacity development involves “policy makers, national institutions, civil society organisations, communities, families and individuals’ capacities in order to plan, manage and utilize services, make decisions and take actions that support the realization of the rights of children and women” (UNICEF 2010b p. 3). Hence the capacity development initiative can be designed to potentially generate effects (change) at different levels: individually, a group or the environment. According to the UNDG framework, UNICEF defines the capacity development at three levels (UNICEF 2010b p. 3):

- **Individual level**: skills, knowledge, experience, attitudes and beliefs in a particular area of expertise, for example, the competencies of system managers, planners, decision makers, at both national and sub-national levels;
- **Organisational/institutional/community level**: (i) the capacities of relevant government institutions (procedures, frameworks, management systems ) at all levels, (ii) the capacities and roles of CSOs and NGOs, and (iii) the quality and inclusiveness of community level organisations; and
- **Enabling environment level**: the policy framework, allocation of public resources and social norms to achieving progress in development.
Finally, the focus is not put on any capacity development intervention, but on the ones that contribute directly to the implementation of child rights, which corresponds to UNICEF core mandate. This focus also implies taking into cross-cutting issues of human rights, gender equality, and equity. UNICEF supports capacity development at these three levels through advocacy and advice, methods and tools; knowledge services, programme support, and partnerships.

Capacity development management process

UNDP suggests a five-step capacity development process (see in Figure A2.2) (UNDP 2009 p. 21). The specific circumstances of a given situation determine the prominence of each step in the process.

• **Step 1. Engage stakeholders on capacity development:** Get a dialogue going among all those who stand to benefit from the enhanced capacity. The aim should be to get everyone committed to the process, and personally invested in its success.

• **Step 2. Assess capacity assets and needs:** This step should help establish the baseline from which that progress should be measured, through identifying existing capacity assets as well as the desired level of capacity anticipated to achieve development or organisational objectives. Determine which capacities to prioritize and how to incorporate them into national
and local development strategies, sector and thematic programmes and projects, and budgets.

• **Step 3. Formulate a capacity development response:** the effectiveness of the response will increase if it combines actions across core issues and levels of capacity based on the local situation. For instance, an assessment of the procurement office of a ministry of health (organisational level) may need to be complemented by a revision of the government’s procurement guidelines (enabling environment). Similarly, procurement officers may need to be trained in applying these guidelines and an incentive system put in place to encourage procurement officers to use the new system and guidelines.

• **Step 4. Implement a capacity development response:** where activities are conducted. This is the point where all the thinking, planning, assessing, analysing and designing are tested. For the most sustainable long-term results, implementation should be managed through national systems and processes rather than through the parallel systems of external partners. The very fact of using national systems can help strengthen essential capacities such as project management and procurement. Partner countries feel a strong sense of ownership of initiatives when their own systems and procedures are used for implementing programmes and projects. It is therefore important to help strengthen these systems.

• **Step 5. Evaluate capacity development:** Performance should be based on clear evidence of change in an institution’s performance, adaptability and stability to meet its goals. The design of a PFM requires an integral approach of capacities and resources to use it or to be able to have the quality data available. Progress and results are reflected by changes in performance, which can be measured in terms of improved efficiency and effectiveness.
Annex 3: Evaluation questions

Questions for Criteria 1: Relevance
• To what extent were the objectives of the UNICEF capacity development activities aligned with the strategic and operational plans and guidelines during 2011-2015?
• To what extent were the UNICEF capacity development activities responding to most important capacity gaps for child rights implementation in Malaysia during 2011-2015?
• To what extent were the UNICEF capacity development activities incorporating cross-cutting issues related to child rights such as human rights, gender equality, and equity in Malaysia during 2011-2015?

Questions for Criteria 2: Coherence
• To what extent were the UNICEF capacity development activities coherent (internally and externally)?

Questions for Criteria 3: Effectiveness
• To what extent were the UNICEF capacity development activities effective in reducing the critical capacity gaps?
• To what extent did the UNICEF capacity development activities achieve their targets in terms of budget execution, physical implementation, outputs and outcomes?
• What were the major factors influencing the degree of achievement of the objectives and targets?

Questions for Criteria 4: Efficiency
• To what extent was the portfolio of capacity development activities efficient?

Questions for Criteria 5: Capacity development management process
• To what extent was the management process of the UNICEF capacity development activities a quality process?

Questions for Criteria 6: Partnerships
• Did UNICEF MCO develop any partnership(s) for its UNICEF capacity development activities? If yes, with whom and how?
• To what extent were those partnership(s) of quality?

Questions for Criteria 7: Outcomes
• To what extent did the outputs of the portfolio of UNICEF capacity development activities lead to substantial outcomes?
• What were the major factors influencing positively the achievement of outcomes?
• To what extent were the UNICEF capacity development activities, outputs, and preliminary outcomes analysed and used by UNICEF to adjust UNICEF implementation strategy during the last strategic plan period?

Questions for Criteria 8: Sustainability
• To what extent did the UNICEF capacity development activities have sustainable effects?

[The next two sets of questions deal with how to orient better the new Country Programme and have therefore a formative focus.]
Questions for the SWOT analysis

- What were the strengths of the MCO capacity development response 2011-2015?
- What were the weaknesses of the MCO capacity development response 2011-2015?
- What are the opportunities to be sized in the MCO capacity development response 2016-2020?
- What are the threats to be considered in the MCO capacity development response 2016-2020?

Question on the MCO capacity development response 2016-2020

- What are the suggested orientations of the MCO capacity development response 2016-2020?
## Annex 4: Matrix of key stakeholders and their interest in the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Interest in the evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNICEF MCO Country Management Team</strong></td>
<td>Lessons learnt from 2011-2015 capacity development activities and future orientations for 2016-2020 to guide: 1) The capacity development response in the 2016-2020 CPAP; 2) The approval of the proposed capacity development activities in the MCO yearly work plans and budgets; 3) The management and M&amp;E of selected capacity development activities; 4) Identification of continuing challenges with programme efficiency and effectiveness and identification of innovative ways for policy and delivery strategies; 5) Identifying prevailing gaps in the issue areas in comparison with government efforts in the same areas and potential partnership/collaborative options for capacity development towards improving outcomes and impact; and 6) Identify possible partnership and collaboration options for capacity development and outcome areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNICEF MCO Programme Officers</strong></td>
<td>Lessons learnt from 2011-2015 capacity development activities and future orientations for 2016-2020 to: 1) Guide the capacity development initiatives in their domain in the 2016-2020 CPAP and work plan; 2) Manage and monitor better more specific activities in 2016-2020; and 3) Provide evidence to guide redesign and approve new approaches and methods to apply capacity development towards outcome achievement in issue areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal government institutions involved in planning, budgeting, managing, monitoring and evaluation of actions contributing to the implementation of child rights (EPU/PMD, MOF, ICU, MOE, MOH, MWFCD)</strong></td>
<td>Lessons learnt from 2011-2015 capacity development activities and future orientations for 2016-2020 to guide: 1) The capacity development response in the implementation of the programme and activities to be implemented under the 2016-2020 11th Malaysia Plan and sector strategic plans towards Vision 2020 and 2030 Sustainable Development Goals targets; 2) The selection of proposed capacity development activities in action plans and yearly budgets; 3) The management and M&amp;E of selected capacity development activities; 4) Identification of prevailing/continuing gaps in capacity development and desired outcomes that complement the government’s efforts; 5) Information to guide government’s medium term, annual strategies and risks plan for capacity development incorporated into the implementing entities’ performance plans and budget allocations; and 6) Evidence to demonstrate outcomes from UNICEF capacity development activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State institutions involved in planning, budgeting, managing, monitoring and evaluation of actions contributing to the implementation of child rights</strong></td>
<td>Lessons learnt from 2011-2015 capacity development activities and future orientations for 2016-2020 to guide: 1) The capacity development strategies in the implementation of State plans; 2) The selection of proposed activities in action plans and yearly budgets; 3) The management and M&amp;E of selected capacity development activities; 4) Identification of prevailing/continuing gaps in capacity development and desired outcomes that complement the government’s efforts; and 5) Information to guide government’s medium term and annual strategies for capacity development incorporated into the implementing entities’ performance plans and budget allocations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5: Data sources

5a List of persons met for interviews and workshop sessions/sites visited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Gender (F/M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada Ocampo</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altaf Ismail</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anuar Mthalib</td>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arunaselam Rasappan</td>
<td>CeDRE</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azlina Ahmad</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict Sakunil Mansul</td>
<td>Jaringan Orang Asal SeMalaysia (JOAS)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Choon</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement Loo</td>
<td>Yayasan Sabah</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayang Selha ibrahim</td>
<td>KPWHEP</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie Lee</td>
<td>MASW</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Mattellone</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ester Abai</td>
<td>Sabah Education Department</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora Fung</td>
<td>Sabah State Library</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Johen Anak Adam</td>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goh Chee Leong</td>
<td>HELP University College</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwendolen Vu</td>
<td>State Economic Planning Unit</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan Ibaim</td>
<td>Habib</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris Soh</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Lingham</td>
<td>Persatuan C.H.I.L.D. Sabah</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamal Kastari</td>
<td>Humana Child Aid Society</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Arritt</td>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenifer Lasimbang</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Nuriyano</td>
<td>DII, J&amp;J</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josak Siam</td>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun Faredda A Jabar</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Vishnutharan Kalimuthu</td>
<td>S.A.D Federal Immigration Department</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kher Ching</td>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koshy Tomas</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance of Malaysia</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Yee Ling</td>
<td>CAM, APPCO</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lendiana Chia</td>
<td>Rural Development (KEMAS)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maini Sabait</td>
<td>Sabah State Health Department</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Clark-Hattingh</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maya Fachrani Faisal</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohamad Shukov Mat Lszim</td>
<td>DOSM</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Safari Abdul Manan</td>
<td>Special Olympic</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohd Shakor</td>
<td>DOSM</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norsairin Adeliah</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance of Malaysia</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nour Lunar</td>
<td>EPU</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurfarhna Lee Mohd Zulkiflee Lee</td>
<td>National Population and Family Development Malaysia Sabah</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurshafenath Shaharuuddin</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashmina Ali</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phang Thaw Moi</td>
<td>S.A.D Federal Immigration Department</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phangthoo Moi</td>
<td>Phamp</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheny Kakama</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce Woy Swcs</td>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Chen</td>
<td>APPCO</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renuka Devi Logarajan</td>
<td>EPU</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riccardo Polastro</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Beighton</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riyanti Shari</td>
<td>DOSM</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rokiah Haron</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saira Shameem</td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha Surandran</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahidan Abdullah</td>
<td>Asst. Secretary, NSC Sabah</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shazia Iqabal Hashmi</td>
<td>Lecturer in University</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry M Zahabar</td>
<td>APPCO</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shubasini Sivapregasam</td>
<td>DOSM</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid Munan</td>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivaselvi Supramaniam</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soraya Bermejo</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teoh Ai Hua</td>
<td>MASW</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrence Too</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Karunan</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Raymond</td>
<td>Sabah Labour Department</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildinah Benji</td>
<td>Ministry of Community Development and Consumer Affairs</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wivina Belmont</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yum Maren Basri</td>
<td>Ministry of Youth and Sport of Sabah</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A5.2: Sites visited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Number of visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kota Kinabalu, Sabah</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuching, Sarawak</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuala Lumpur</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5b List of documents consulted


Websites:
Malaysia <en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Malaysia>, accessed 1 April 2016
Annex 6: Methodology annexes

6a. Capacity development activity reference template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data name</th>
<th>Data value (To be filled)</th>
<th>Addition explanations</th>
<th>Observations (To be filled)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of capacity development initiative</td>
<td>Please indicate the number and exact name as indicated in &quot;Annex 1: Capacity development initiative list&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Domain**
  - 1. Social Policy
  - 2. Education
  - 3. Child Protection
  - 4. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)
  - 5. Communication for Development (C4D)
  - 6. Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME)
  - 7. Private Fundraising and Partnership (PFP)
  - 8. Other (specify)

- **Main objectives**
  - List the objectives available for the capacity development initiative.

- **Main activities conducted**
  - Do a short list of the most relevant activities conducted. If there are many workshops/trainings, etc. related to the same capacity development initiative, please list them too. The objective is to obtain more information on what was done under the umbrella of the capacity development initiative (activities) and what kind of capacity development approach and methods were used, without getting into the details.

---

18 The filled out reference sheets with the 40 capacity development activities are large; so they have been provided to the MCO in excel files as part of this final report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data name</th>
<th>Data value (To be filled)</th>
<th>Addition explanations</th>
<th>Observations (To be filled)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Training 2. Workshop 3. Conference 4. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational setup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of supervising institution</td>
<td></td>
<td>The supervising agency is the client who requests the capacity development initiative, e.g., EPU, MOF, MOH, etc. In some cases, the supervising agency and the executing agency can be the same organisation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of supervising institution</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Public sector 2. NGO or CSO 3. Private sector 4. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name(s) of executing agency(ies)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The executing agency is the one delivering the capacity development initiative, e.g., the consulting firm that delivered the training. In some cases, the supervising agency and the executing agency can be the same organisation. It is possible to have more than one executing agency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual start date</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify the overall initiation day of capacity development initiative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year/Month/Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual end date</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify the finalization of the overall capacity development initiative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year/Month/Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data name</td>
<td>Data value</td>
<td>Addition explanations</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target group</td>
<td>(To be filled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description (Category)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Public sector 2. NGOs and CSOs 3. Private sector managers, 4. International organisations, donors and foundations, 5. UNICEF professionals, 6. other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual number reached during the</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specify the number per target group if possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2015 period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Management 2. Professional staff 3. Administrative and clerical staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector(s) concerned by the activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>List the sectors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual cost (USD)</td>
<td>US Dollars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key outputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output description</td>
<td></td>
<td>The objective is to know what have been the major output(s) of a given capacity development initiative. Please add as many lines you see fit for the major output(s). E.g., number of public sector professionals and staff trained in RBM; number of research papers produced; new act implemented, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output unit</td>
<td></td>
<td>E.g., number, percentage, rate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual value for the 2011-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>This should be the achieved value in the period. It should be a numeric value. E.g. 5, 5 per cent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives Implemented by UNICEF Malaysia (2011 to 2015)

#### 6b. Capacity development activity reference sheets summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Child Well-being Workshop</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Social policy</td>
<td>Institutional Enabling environment</td>
<td>Public sector, NGOs and CSOs International organisation (UNICEF)</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Large group</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Putrajaya</td>
<td>50,000 to 20,001 (USD)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Marginal Bottleneck Budget (MBB Workshop)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Social policy</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Large group</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Putrajaya</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MICS Design and Planning Workshop</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Social policy</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Small group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>National Consultation on Public Finance for Children in Malaysia : Building Capacity and Identifying Opportunities</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Social policy</td>
<td>Institutional Enabling environment</td>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Large group</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Putrajaya</td>
<td>50,000 to 20,001 (USD)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>National Conference on Early Childhood Care &amp; Education</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Social Work Competency Framework Training of Trainers Workshop</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Individual Institutional</td>
<td>Public sector, NGOs and CSOs International organisation (UNICEF)</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>KL</td>
<td>More than 50,000 (USD)</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives Implemented by UNICEF Malaysia (2011 to 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Audience Size</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pilot Capacity-Building Programme run by Malaysia Child Resource Institute in the form of four workshops</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Participating NGOs and CSOs</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Large group</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur, Penang, Kota Kinabalu, Kuching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tertiary Child Protection Services Training Of Trainers Workshop</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Enabling environment</td>
<td>Public sector NGOs and CSOs</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>National Baseline Study on Violence Against Children (VAC) Preparatory Workshop</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Enabling environment</td>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Children’s Media Workshop</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Child Protection Conference</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Public sector NGOs and CSOs Private sector</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Large group</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>High Level Meeting on Child Rights (HLM)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Overseas (Beijing)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Round Table on Children with Disabilities</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Enabling Environment</td>
<td>Public sector NGOs and CSOs Private sector International organisation UNICEF professionals</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Large group</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Promoting Diversion of Children in Conflict with the Law Seminar</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>KL</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific Regional Meeting: Research on Violence Against Children: Building the Evidence Base for Action</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Enabling Environment</td>
<td>International organisations</td>
<td>Professional staff</td>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overseas (Bangkok)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives Implemented by UNICEF Malaysia (2011 to 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Type of Initiative</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Budget (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Media Workshop: Reporting on Children with Disabilities</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>NGOs and CSOs</td>
<td>Professional staff</td>
<td>Large group</td>
<td>KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Training of Trainers (from the Royal Malaysian Police) on Child Interviewing Skills</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>Administrative and clerical</td>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>High Level Meeting on Child Rights (HLM)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>Overseas (New Deli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Diversion Workshops, Kuala Lumpur</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>NGOs and CSOs International organisations</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Large group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Policy Advocacy Training with Civil Society</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>NGOs and CSOs International organisations</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Birth Registration Conference</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Large group</td>
<td>KL</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific Civil Registrars Meeting</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>Overseas (Thailand)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific Civil Society Forum on CRVS</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>Overseas (Bangkok)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Malaysian Partnership for Children with Disabilities Forum</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Large group</td>
<td>KL</td>
<td>50,000 to 20,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Voices of Youths on Digital Participation</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Large group</td>
<td>Petaling Jaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Regional Workshop on Juvenile Justice</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>KL</td>
<td>20,000 and less</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Group Size</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ASEAN Consultation on Cultural and Religious Practices Impacting on the Rights of Children</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Individual Institutional</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Large group</td>
<td>Overseas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Regional Consultation on Children with Disabilities</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Others - Child participation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The World We Want – Children's Photography Workshop</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>Small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Children's Forum – Children for a Better Internet</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>Small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Media Training for CSOs (24/7 News: Get it Right)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Competency-Based Child Protection Practice for Non-Government Welfare Workers, ongoing (23 participants)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Target Group</td>
<td>Group Size</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Cost (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Companies Commission Malaysia - United Nations Children's Fund Pilot Corporate Social Responsibility Training for the Corporate Sector</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Institutional Enabling environment</td>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Large group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>CRBP Pilot Training of Trainers for SSM</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Individual Institutional</td>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>CRBP Training, Ara Damansara, Kuala Lumpur and Kota Kinabalu</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>Management Professional staff</td>
<td>Large group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>C4D Workshop for Programming Partners and UNICEF Staff, Kuala Lumpur and Kota Kinabalu</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>C4D</td>
<td>Individual Institutional</td>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>UNICEF professionals</td>
<td>Large group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>M &amp; E Workshop</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>PME</td>
<td>Institutional Enabling environment</td>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>NGOs and CSOs UNICEF professionals</td>
<td>Large group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>DevInfo Users and Administration Training</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Social policy PME</td>
<td>Individual Institutional Enabling environment</td>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>NGOs and CSOs UNICEF professionals</td>
<td>Large group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis of capacity development activities portfolio per budget range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row labels</th>
<th>20000 and less (USD)</th>
<th>20,001 to 50,000 (USD)</th>
<th>More than 50,000 (USD)</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Youth participation)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Policy and PME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis of capacity development activities portfolio per target group size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row labels</th>
<th>Large group (&gt;30)</th>
<th>Small group (30 and less)</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Youth participation)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Policy and PME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Analysis of capacity development activities portfolio per level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Enabling environment</th>
<th>Individual &amp; institutional</th>
<th>Institutional &amp; enabling environment</th>
<th>Individual, institutional &amp; enabling environment</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Youth participation)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Policy and PME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6c. A4R® master questionnaire

Evaluation Dimension: Relevance (01)

011 To what extent were the objectives of the UNICEF capacity development activities aligned with the following documents

Grading:
0 No alignment
1 Partial and indirect alignment
2 Partial, but direct alignment
3 Full and direct alignment
NA Not able to answer

01101 UNICEF Malaysia Country Programme 2011-2015
01102 Malaysia Government 2011-2015
01103 Federal Government sectoral strategic plans during 2011-2015
01104 Your institutional strategic plans from 2011 to 2015
01105 UN guidelines on how to take into account human rights and gender equality
01106 UN guidelines on how to take into account equity
01107 Other relevant plans and guidelines

012 To what extent were the UNICEF capacity development activities responding to most important capacity gaps for child rights implementation in Malaysia during 2011-2015?

Grading:
0 Not at all
1 Partially and indirectly
2 Partially, but directly
3 Fully and directly
NA Not able to answer

01201 Addressing major capacity gaps for the implementation of child rights
01202 Addressing the causal factors of those capacity gaps
01203 Combination of individual, institutional and policy environment capacity development activities that enabled to address the major capacity gaps
01204 Addressing the right target groups
01205 Addressing the capacity gaps with the right type of intervention
01206 Addressing the capacity gaps with the right approach and process

013 Do you have any other comments on the relevance of the UNICEF capacity development activities? Open question. No scale and no grade.

Evaluation Dimension: Coherence (02)

021 To what extent were the UNICEF capacity development activities coherent?

Grading:
0 Not at all coherent
1 Somewhat coherent
2 Significantly coherent
3 Completely coherent
NA Not able to answer

Internal coherence (between UNICEF capacity development activities)

02111 To what extent were the UNICEF capacity development activities coherent with each other in terms of objectives?

Grading:
0 Not at all coherent
1 Somewhat coherent
2 Significantly coherent
3 Fully coherent
NA Not able to answer

02112 To what extent were the capacity development activities conducted coherent with each other in terms of approach and modalities, including timing/sequencing?

Grading:
0 Not at all articulated
1 Somewhat articulated
2 Significantly articulated
3 Fully articulated
NA Not able to answer

External coherence (between UNICEF capacity development activities with capacity development activities conducted by other actors)

02113 Were the UNICEF capacity development activities articulated with other capacity development activities conducted in Malaysia in terms of objectives?

Grading:
0 Not at all articulated
1 Somewhat articulated
2 Significantly articulated
3 Fully articulated
NA Not able to answer

02114 Were the UNICEF capacity development activities articulated with the other capacity development activities conducted in Malaysia in terms of approach and modalities, including timing/sequencing?

Grading:
0 Not at all articulated
1 Somewhat articulated
2 Significantly articulated
3 Fully consistent
NA Not able to answer

022 Do you have any other comments on the coherence of the UNICEF capacity development activities? Open question. No scale and no grade. Put response in Justification
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Evaluation Dimension: Effectiveness (03)

031 To what extent have the UNICEF capacity development activities been effective in the following?

Grading:
0 Not at all effective
1 Somewhat effective
2 Significantly effective
3 Fully effective
NA Not able to answer

03101 Big enough in terms of size and duration to bring about a change in the substantive problem area/s identified
03102 Reducing the critical capacity gaps of key staff in key institutions
03103 Reducing the critical capacity gaps of key institutions
03104 Reducing the critical capacity gaps in terms of formulation of policies, legal framework, and budget reallocations

032 To what extent have the UNICEF capacity development activities achieved the following targets?

Note: This question supposes that targets were set. If no targets were set, please indicate NT for No targets set. If targets were set, please respond considering the degree of achievement of those targets by the end of the capacity development activity. It is possible that one target might have been fully achieved while another one was not achieved at all. This is why you have several sub-questions. % are indicative and just there to help you choose the appropriate grade.

Grading:
0 In a very limited way (less than 20%)
1 In a limited way (21 to 50%)
2 In a significant way (51 to 80%)
3 Completely (higher than 80%)
NA Not able to answer
NT No targets set

03201 Budget execution targets
03202 Physical implementation (activities) targets
03203 Output targets
03204 Outcome targets
03205 Other targets (specify in Justification column)

033 What are the major challenges to the achievement of objectives/targets?
The grade to this question will be automatically calculated. Do not respond. You are presented with some examples of possible factors that might have influenced the observed achievement of objectives/targets that you indicated in the previous question. Feel free to add others in the final performance sub-indicator (03208). Please indicate in the Justification column if the influence was positive or negative on the degree of achievement of objectives/targets.

Grading:
0 Not a challenge
3 A Challenge

03301 Fund availability for capacity development activities
03302 Limited rotation of UNICEF staff involved in the capacity development activities
03303 Working partnerships for capacity development activities
03304 Limited rotation of key staff in institutions benefiting from capacity development activities
03305 Existence of champions of change in institutions benefiting from capacity development activities
03306 Limited resistance to change in the institutions benefiting from the capacity development activities
03307 National political stability
03208 Other factors. Please specify in the Justification column of other factors influencing the degree of achievement of objectives/targets
034 Do you have any other comments on the effectiveness of the UNICEF capacity development activities?

Evaluation Dimension: Efficiency (04)

Evaluation Dimension: Efficiency (04)

041 To what extent were the UNICEF capacity development activities efficient as defined below?

Grading:
0 Not at all efficient
1 Somewhat efficient
2 Significantly efficient
3 Fully efficient
NA Not able to answer

04101 Could better results in terms of outputs quantity have been achieved with the same level of budget?

Grading:
0 Much more
1 More
2 Somewhat
3 Not at all
NA Not able to answer

04102 Could better results in terms of outputs quality have been achieved with the same level of budget?

Grading:
0 Much more
1 More
2 Somewhat
3 Not at all
NA Not able to answer

04103 Could better results in terms of outcomes quantity have been achieved with the same level of budget?

Grading:
0 Much more
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1 More
2 Somewhat
3 Not at all
NA Not able to answer

04104 Could better results in terms of outcomes quality have been achieved with the same level of budget?
Grading:
0 Much more
1 More
2 Somewhat
3 Not at all
NA Not able to answer

04105 Could the same results in terms of target coverage rate have been achieved at lower cost?
Grading:
0 Much more
1 More
2 Somewhat
3 Not at all
NA Not able to answer

04106 Could better results in terms of target coverage rate have been achieved with the same level of budget?
Grading:
0 Much more
1 More
2 Somewhat
3 Not at all
NA Not able to answer

04107 To what extent did the capacity development activities make use of new technologies?
Grading:
0 Not at all
1 A little
2 To a significant degree
3 A lot
NA Not able to answer

042 Do you have any other comments on the efficiency of the UNICEF capacity development activities? Open question. No scale and no grade. Put response in Justification

Evaluation Dimension: Capacity development management process (05)

051 To what extent the management process of the UNICEF capacity development activities was a quality process?
Grading:
0 Very low quality
1 Low quality
2 Average quality
3 High quality
05101 To what extent a capacity development specific management process, such as the UNDP Process, was used to design and implement the UNICEF capacity development activities? If yes, specify the process used

Note: The UNDP capacity development process considers five-steps: 1) Engage stakeholders on capacity development; 2) Assess capacity assets and needs; 3) Formulate a capacity development response; 4) Implement a capacity development response; and, 5) Evaluate capacity development.

Grading:
0 Not at all
1 Some elements
2 To a large extent
3 All steps used
NA Not able to answer

05102 To what extent was there a problem analysis and capacity needs assessment to formulate the capacity development activities?

Grading:
0 Not at all
1 Some elements
2 To a large extent
3 All steps used
NA Not able to answer

05103 To what extent was a capacity development Strategy formulated?

Grading:
0 Not at all (ad hoc activities)
1 Informal strategy (no documented, but implemented)
2 Elements of capacity development formulated in several documents
3 Complete capacity development strategy formulated in one document
NA Not able to answer

05104 To what extent were all the relevant stakeholders involved in the design of the capacity development activities?

Grading:
0 Not at all
1 Partially
2 To a large extent
3 Totally
NA Not able to answer

05105 To what extent were the capacity development activities sufficiently budgeted to achieve their objectives/targets?

Grading:
0 Not at all
1 Partially
2 To a large extent
3 Totally
NA Not able to answer

05106 To what extent were inputs adequate? E.g., support systems and tools, trainers and experts, training material, facilitating material etc.

Grading:
0 Not at all
1 Partially  
2 To a large extent  
3 Totally  
NA Not able to answer

05107 To what extent were the logistics adequate?  
Grading:  
0 Not at all  
1 Partially  
2 To a large extent  
3 Totally  
NA Not able to answer

05108 To what extent were the capacity development activities managed in coordination with other relevant stakeholders? Relevant stakeholders: Internal actors and Implementing partners  
Grading:  
0 Not at all  
1 Partially  
2 To a large extent  
3 Totally  
NA Not able to answer

05109 Was a Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting (MER) plan prepared for the capacity development activities?  
Grading:  
0 Not at all  
1 Partially  
2 To a large extent  
3 Totally  
NA Not able to answer

05110 To what extent was monitoring of capacity development activities implemented?  
Grading:  
0 Not at all  
1 Partially  
2 To a large extent  
3 Totally  
NA Not able to answer  
NP No plan was prepared

05111 To what extent was evaluation of capacity development activities implemented?  
Grading:  
0 Not at all  
1 Partially  
2 To a large extent  
3 Totally  
NA Not able to answer  
NP No plan was prepared

05112 To what extent did MCO Country Management Team and Programme Officers take into account monitoring, evaluation and reporting (MER) outputs to adjust the capacity development activities?
Grading:
- 0 Not at all
- 1 Partially
- 2 To a large extent
- 3 Totally
- NA Not able to answer
- NP No plan was prepared

052 Do you have any other comments on the capacity development management process? Open question. No scale and no grade. Put response in Justification

**Evaluation Dimension: Partnerships (06)**

061 Has UNICEF developed any partnerships for its capacity development activities? If yes, with whom and how? Open question. No scale and no grade. List the partners and describe the partnerships in the Justification column. If no partnership was developed, skip to Question 071.

062 To what extent were those partnerships of quality according to the criteria below?

Grading:
- 0 Very low quality
- 1 Low quality
- 2 Average quality
- 3 High quality
- NA Not able to answer

06201 To what extent has the choice of partner(s) been strategic?

Note: Strategic means that the partnership was consistent with UNICEF capacity development Strategy and used the comparative advantage of UNICEF and the partner.

Grading:
- 0 Not at all
- 1 Somewhat
- 2 To a significant extent
- 3 Totally
- NA Not able to answer

06202 To what extent was there discussion of strategic positioning of UNICEF vis-a-vis other actors when defining capacity development activities?

Note: Strategic positioning; offering services that UNICEF can do better than other actors

Grading:
- 0 Not at all
- 1 Somewhat
- 2 To a significant extent
- 3 Totally
- NA Not able to answer

06203 To what extent was there discussion of leveraging of UNICEF with other actors when defining capacity development activities?

Note: Leveraging: making arrangements with other actors either contracting them or combining initiatives for greater results

Grading:
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0 Not at all
1 Somewhat
2 To a significant extent
3 Totally
NA Not able to answer

06204 How efficient those partners have been working together on the capacity development activities?

Grading:
0 Not at all
1 Somewhat
2 To a significant extent
3 Totally
NA Not able to answer

063 Do you have any other comments on the capacity development partnerships?

Open question. No scale and no grade. Put response in Justification

Evaluation Dimension: Outcomes (07)

071 To what extent did the outputs of the UNICEF capacity development activities lead to substantial outcomes?

Grading:
0 Very low outcomes
1 Some outcomes
2 Significant outcomes
3 High outcomes
NA Not able to respond

07101 For all capacity development activities: Satisfaction of the direct participants vis-a-vis the outputs of UNICEF capacity development activities

07102 For all capacity development activities: Satisfaction of the direct participants vis-a-vis the process and modalities of the UNICEF capacity development activities

07103 For capacity development activities at individual level: Individual participant ownership of new knowledge and skills (understanding and capacity to apply concretely)

07104 For capacity development activities at individual level: Individual participant actual application of new knowledge and skills in their position at that time

07105 For capacity development activities at individual level: Individual participant degree of replication of new knowledge and skills for other colleagues /institutions (teaching of others)

07106 For capacity development activities at individual level: Institutional application of new knowledge and tools acquired during the CD activities at individual level

07107 For capacity development activities at institutional level: Application by the participant institutions of new knowledge and tools acquired during the CD activities at institutional level

07108 For capacity development activities at institutional level: Scaling up by the participant institutions of the application of knowledge and tools acquired
07109  For capacity development activities at institutional level: Any new policy prepared as an indirect result of CD at institutional level

07110  For capacity development activities at institutional level: Any new bill passed as an indirect result of CD institutional level

07111  For capacity development activities at institutional level: Any budget reallocations as an indirect result of capacity development at institutional level

07112  For capacity development activities at policy level: Any new policy prepared as a direct result of the capacity development at policy level

07113  For capacity development activities at policy level: Any new bill passed as a direct result of capacity development at policy level

07114  For capacity development activities at policy level: Any budget reallocations as a direct result of the capacity development at policy level

072  What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of outcomes? Open question. No scale and no grade. List the factors in the Justification column

### Evaluation Dimension: Sustainability (08)

081  To what extent had the UNICEF capacity development activities sustainable effects?

Sustainability refers to the extent to which the outcomes of the capacity development activities are maintained in the medium run

Grading:
0 Very low sustainability of most outcomes
1 Sustainability of a few outcomes
2 Sustainability of a significant number of outcomes
3 Sustainability of most outcomes

08101  Was sustainability considered in the design of the capacity development activities?

Grading:
0 Not at all
1 A little
2 To a significant degree
3 A lot
NA Not able to answer

08102  Was continuity considered in the design of the capacity development activities?

Continuity means that activities build upon each other

Grading:
0 Not at all
1 A little
2 To a significant degree
3 A lot
NA Not able to answer

08103  To what extent were the outcomes of the capacity development activities maintained over the medium run (more than one year)?

Grading:
0 Very few
1 A few
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2 A significant number
3 Nearly all
NA Not able to answer

082 What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability? Open question. No scale and no grade.

083 Do you have any other comments on the sustainability of UNICEF capacity development activities? Open question. No scale and no grade.

6d. Selected diagnostic results tables

Table A6d1: Grades per evaluation criterion and per data source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria/ Sub-performance indicators</th>
<th>Case studies in-depth interviews</th>
<th>Case studies participants online survey</th>
<th>Sabah &amp; Sarawak States</th>
<th>UNICEF &amp; Partners (KL)</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI 01 Relevance</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 011 Alignment</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 012 Capacity gap response</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 02 Coherence</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 03 Effectiveness</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 031 Capacity gap response</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 032 Targets achievement</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 04 Efficiency</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 05 Capacity development management process</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 06 Partnerships</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 07 Immediate and Final Outcomes</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 08 Sustainability</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The weight of each source is 20% when 5 data sources are available, 25% when 4 sources are available, and 33% when 3 sources are available.

Source: A4R, April 2016.

Relevance

Table A6d.2: Average results by data collection method for relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation grid</th>
<th>Case studies in-depth interviews</th>
<th>Case studies participants online survey</th>
<th>State, UNICEF &amp; Partners (KL)</th>
<th>UNICEF &amp; Partners (KL)</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Not at all</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Partially and indirectly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Partially, but directly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Fully and directly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Average results for the evaluation criterion are calculated as the average of two sub-performance indicators
Coherence

**Table A6d.3: Average results by data collection method for coherence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation grid</th>
<th>Case studies in-depth interviews</th>
<th>State, UNICEF &amp; partners</th>
<th>Internal UNICEF (KL)</th>
<th>UNICEF &amp; Partners (KL)</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Not at all coherent</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Somewhat coherent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Significantly coherent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Completely coherent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness

**Table A6d.4: Average results by data collection method for effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation grid</th>
<th>Case studies in-depth interviews</th>
<th>Case studies participants online survey</th>
<th>State, UNICEF &amp; partners</th>
<th>Internal UNICEF (KL)</th>
<th>UNICEF &amp; Partners (KL)</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Not at all effective</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Somewhat effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Significantly effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Fully effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Average results for the evaluation criterion are calculated as the average of two sub-performance indicators.

Efficiency

**Table A6d.5: Average results by data collection method for efficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation grid</th>
<th>Case studies in-depth interviews</th>
<th>State, UNICEF &amp; partners</th>
<th>Internal UNICEF (KL)</th>
<th>UNICEF &amp; Partners (KL)</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Not at all efficient</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Somewhat efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Significantly efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Fully efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Capacity development management process

**Table A6d.6: Average results by data collection method for capacity development management process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation grid</th>
<th>Case studies in-depth interviews</th>
<th>Internal UNICEF (KL)</th>
<th>UNICEF &amp; Partners (KL)</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Very low quality</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Low quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Average quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 High quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Partnerships

**Table A6d.7: Average results by data collection method for partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation grid</th>
<th>Case studies in-depth interviews</th>
<th>State, UNICEF &amp; partners</th>
<th>Internal UNICEF (KL)</th>
<th>UNICEF &amp; Partners (KL)</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Very low quality</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Low quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Average quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 High quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcomes

**Table A6d.8: Average results by data collection method for outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation grid</th>
<th>Case studies in-depth interviews</th>
<th>Case studies participants online survey</th>
<th>State, UNICEF &amp; partners</th>
<th>Internal UNICEF (KL)</th>
<th>UNICEF &amp; Partners (KL)</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Very low outcomes</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Some outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Significant outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 High outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sustainability

**Table A6d.9: Average results by data collection method for sustainability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation grid</th>
<th>Case studies in-depth interviews</th>
<th>Case studies participants online survey</th>
<th>State, UNICEF &amp; partners</th>
<th>Internal UNICEF (KL)</th>
<th>UNICEF &amp; Partners (KL)</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Very low sustainability of most outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sustainability of a few outcomes</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sustainability of a significant number of outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sustainability of most outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6e. Cost effectiveness administrative and financial data on case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cost (USD)</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number and type of activity</th>
<th># of participants</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type of venue</th>
<th>Cost for venue (USD)</th>
<th>Trainers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Child Well-Being Workshop</td>
<td>USD 50,000</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>1 Workshop</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Putrajaya</td>
<td>Government Link (Putrajaya International Convention Centre - PICC)</td>
<td>USD3,500</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Language, Education and Social Cohesion</td>
<td>USD 15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Workshops</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1) KL 2) Sabah 3) Sarawak</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1. USD 3,311.95 2.USD 3,151.27 3. USD 3,299.18 Total 9,762.40</td>
<td>Local &amp; International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Social Work Competency Framework-Training of Trainers Workshop</td>
<td>USD230,000</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>1 Workshops</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>USD5,265.51</td>
<td>International Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pilot Capacity-Building Programme run by Malaysian Child Resource Institute</td>
<td>USD 70,923 (Funded by UNICEF to MCRI)</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>4 workshops</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1. KL 2. Penang 3. Kota Kinabalu 4. Kuching</td>
<td>Commercial hall</td>
<td>1. USD1,663 2. USD1,450 3. USD1,780 4. USD1,790 Total US$6,683</td>
<td>Managed by MCRI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives Implemented by UNICEF Malaysia (2011 to 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cost (USD)</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number and type of activity</th>
<th># of participants</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type of venue</th>
<th>Cost for venue (USD)</th>
<th>Trainers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Training of Trainers (From the Royal Malaysian Police) on Child Interviewing Skills</td>
<td>USD 25 000</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>1 Training</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur</td>
<td>Govt. - RMP Training Centre</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>Local &amp; International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 19 | High Level Meeting on Child Rights                                   | ?            | 3 days   | 3 Discussions               | 10 Public Sector  | New Delhi               | Only travel cost to attending the meeting in Delhi. | 1. USD2367  
2. USD2094  
3. USD2837  
Total 7,298 | 1. Representative (travel cost)  
2. Programme officer  
3. Govt. Official |
| 36 | CRBP Pilot Training of Trainers for SSM                               | USD 10 000   | 3 days   | 3 trainings                 | 69                | 1. KL  
2. Kota Kinabalu  
3. Kuching | 1. Partners’ office  
2. Hotel  
3. Hotel | 1. Sponsored by SSM  
2. USD 1,588.50  
3. USD 1,706.74  
Total USD 3,295.24 | UNICEF        |
## Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives Implemented by UNICEF Malaysia (2011 to 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cost (USD)</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number and type of activity</th>
<th># of participants</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type of venue</th>
<th>Cost for venue (USD)</th>
<th>Trainers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>C4D Workshop for Programming Partners and UNICEF Staff</td>
<td>USD 50,800</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>2 workshops</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur, Kota Kinabalu</td>
<td>1. Hotel, 2. Hotel</td>
<td>1. USD 8,411.53, 2. USD 7,560.41, Total USD 15,971.94</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Devinfo</td>
<td>USD 11,500</td>
<td>Multiple dates</td>
<td>(Multiple Workshops, setting up of a database, by DOSM, in terms of organizing, collecting information, analysis, input into database, hosting and maintaining the database online, etc.)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Putrajaya</td>
<td>Government (Dept. of Statistics)</td>
<td>Paid by DOSM also equipment (computer labs), infrastructure (servers) and etc.</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6f. Partners for case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity development initiative</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Supervising institution</th>
<th>Executing institution</th>
<th>Category executing institution</th>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Level of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Well-being Workshop</td>
<td>Social Policy</td>
<td>Key line Ministries and departments from Federal Government of Malaysia</td>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>International Organisation</td>
<td>Management Professional Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public sector, NGOs and CSOs International Organisation (UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public sector, NGOs and CSOs International Organisation (UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Competency Framework Training of Trainers Workshop</td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>Department of Social Welfare (DSW) and the Malaysian Association of Social Workers (MASW)</td>
<td>Public Sector (Federal)</td>
<td>Dr Pauline Meemeduma</td>
<td>International Consultant</td>
<td>Management Professional Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public sector, NGOs and CSOs International Organisation (UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Capacity-Building Programme run by Malaysia Child Resource Institute in the form of four workshops</td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>MCRI (Malaysian Child Resource Institute)</td>
<td>NGO, CSO</td>
<td>Dr Goh Chee Leong - MCRI; Brian Lariche – Lariche Community</td>
<td>NGO, CSO</td>
<td>Management Professional Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants, NGOs and CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives Implemented by UNICEF Malaysia (2011 to 2015)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity development initiative</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Supervising institution</th>
<th>Category supervising Institution</th>
<th>Executing institution</th>
<th>Category executing institution</th>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Level of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training of Trainers (from the Royal Malaysian Police) on Child Interviewing Skills</td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>Royal Malaysian Police Officers</td>
<td>Public Sector (Federal)</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>International Organisation</td>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>Administrative and Clerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4D Workshop for Programming Partners and UNICEF Staff, Kuala Lumpur and Kota Kinabalu</td>
<td>C4D</td>
<td>UNICEF partners, government officials and staff</td>
<td>Public Sector (State), International Organisations</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>International Organisation</td>
<td>Public sector UNICEF professionals</td>
<td>Management Professional Staff Administrative and clerical staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DevInfo Users and Administration Training</td>
<td>Social Policy Planning, M&amp;E</td>
<td>Department of Statistics</td>
<td>Public Sector (Federal)</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>International Organisation</td>
<td>Public sector NGOs and CSOs UNICEF professionals</td>
<td>Management Professional Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 7: Evaluation institutional arrangements

Evaluation managers

The evaluation managers from UNICEF oversaw the conduct of the evaluation, ensuring impartiality and transparency throughout the process, with responsibilities to:

- Provide institutional support to the external evaluation team including an orientation on UNICEF and the subject of the evaluation;
- Facilitate the external evaluation team’s access to key UNICEF staff, as well as to specific information needed to carry out the evaluation;
- Ensure that a reference group is formed and provides technical support through planned meetings and participation;
- Monitor and assess the quality of the evaluation deliverables to ensure they meet UNEG and UNICEF quality standards;
- Ensure that all stakeholders, particularly the primary stakeholders internal to UNICEF and partners, are kept informed throughout the evaluation;
- Recommend approval of inception report and final evaluation report;
- Disseminate the evaluation products and the final report;
- Help organize and facilitate virtual and in-person briefings and meetings for the purpose of gathering input and feedback from members of the Reference Group (e.g., draft evaluation deliverables); and
- Solicit (through the UNICEF Representative) the inputs needed from UNICEF stakeholders to compile a Management Response to the evaluation.

The evaluation managers also provided logistical support to the evaluation team to the extent possible, assist in gathering background information, setting up relevant appointments – particularly during the inception phase – and assist with coordinating their field-based visits.

UNICEF evaluation managers:
- Ms. Erica Mattellone, Evaluation Specialist (Cambodia, Malaysia and Myanmar);

External evaluation team

The external evaluation team (IDEA International) was responsible for the delivery of the evaluation. The team had to meet UNICEF expectations in terms of quality of evaluation processes and deliverables as set out in the UNEG and UNICEF guidance, including:

- Ensuring the quality of data collected and integrity of analysis reflected in the evaluation deliverables.
- Ensuring that the data collection processes adhere to UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation and Data Collection and Analysis.
- Ensuring that the qualitative and quantitative evidence gathered is comprehensive and robust enough to make an informed assessment in line with the evaluation’s objectives, and in support of the conclusion and recommendations put forward by the evaluation.
- Managing all data collection, including interview processes, focus group discussions, survey, participatory workshop, and review of documentary sources relating to the subject of the evaluation.
• Finalizing travel arrangements, accommodation and equipment to be used during the evaluation (subject to discussion with the Evaluation Managers).

The team retains the final authorship of the deliverables submitted to the evaluation managers. The team was composed of the following IDEA International experts:

Frederic P. Martin, Ph.D.
Team leader
Frederic Martin is the Co-President of the Institute for Development in Economics and Administration (IDEA International) and IDEA network coordinator. He has 33 years of professional experience in 42 industrialized and developing countries. His work relates to supporting governments and the public sector in implementing results-based management, in particular through strategic planning, budgeting for results, public finance reform, and results-based monitoring and evaluation. He has worked with a variety of Ministries, Departments and Agencies, and international organisations. He taught 18 years at University Laval, Quebec where he was Professor and Chair, International development. He also served as a Board member of the International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS) from 2008 to 2013. He is the author or co-author of around 115 publications and 55 presentations. He holds a Diploma from the École Supérieure de Commerce in Lyon, France, a M.Sc. in Economics from the University of Montreal, Canada, and a Ph.D. in Agricultural Economics from Michigan State University, USA.

Ana Maria Fernandez, M.Sc
M&E Specialist
Ana Maria Fernandez is a senior economist and IDEA network coordinator’s assistant at the Institute for Development in Economics and Administration (IDEA International) since 2011. She has 14 years of professional experience in 15 countries of America, Asia and, Europe. Before 2010 she taught at Universidad de los Andes and worked for several ministries and agencies in Colombia. She coordinated the monitoring system overseeing the performance of national government and culminated as part of the Office of the President working on planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation of ministries. From 2010 up to now, she has worked supporting governments and inter-governmental agencies in implementing results-based management, and M&E, focused in building capacity to strengthen public sector management capacities. She has provided training and delivered Masters Certificates in M&E to civil servants under the University of Laval and IDEA International partnership; and she has participated in conducting evaluations. She is an economist and holds a Master’s degree (M.Sc.) in Economics from the Universidad de los Andes, Colombia.

Jacques Lefevre, M.Sc.
Database Management and Information Systems Senior Specialist
Jacques Lefevre joined IDEA in 2009 as Computer Systems Manager. Since 2010, Mr. Lefèvre has been leading the IDEA-Solutions ICT team in charge of designing, implementing, and supporting the Assessing for Results (A4R®), Budgeting for Results (B4R®), Projects for Results (P4R®) and Monitoring for Results (M4R®) software that support the corresponding management processes. Jacques Lefevre has experience as IT consultant both for the public and private sector, with a focus
on assessing ICT information systems; designing information system architecture and data warehouse for decision support tools for planning, budgeting, and monitoring and evaluation; developing and management of on-line training platforms; and training on the management and use of tailor-made information systems. He has over 25 years of professional experience in 18 countries. He holds a Master’s degree (M.Sc.) in Computer Science from the Institut d’Informatique des Facultés universitaires Notre- Dame de la Paix in Namur (Belgium).

National consultant:

Santi Periasamy, M.Sc.
Data collection specialist

Santi Periasamy started off her career as an educator in 1988. She holds a degree in Science with Education Hons (Universiti Sains Malaysia), a Masters in Education (University of Houston, United States) and is currently pursuing her PhD in Educational Leadership. She has led teams in conducting programme evaluations, impact and tracer studies for various programmes conducted by her institution and the Ministry of Education. She has experience in research and with school curriculum development at the Educational Research and Welfare Foundation (EWRF) an NGO that concentrates on building the potentials of underachievers in schools. She is now the General Secretary of EWRF. She is also the Honorary Secretary of Malaysian Evaluation Society and is actively involved in all activities pertaining to measurement and evaluation conducted by the organisation.

Reference group

A reference group was established with membership composed of representatives of the Ministry of Finance, Help Education Services, UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF. Its members were identified based on their institutional role in developing and implementing capacity development strategies and policies. They represented their respective offices or organisations.

Members of the reference group had the following roles and responsibilities:

- Participate in the review of technical proposals for the evaluation;
- Provide suggestions to ensure that adequate support is provided in each phase of the evaluation;
- Review and comment on the evaluation deliverables (i.e., Inception Report and Data Collection Tool-kit, Draft Report and Final Report);
- Participate in the validation workshop of preliminary findings and conclusions, provide feedback and necessary technical input as needed.

Members of the reference group:

- Pn. Rokiah Haron, Head of Unit of Corporate Strategy, Corporate Strategy and Communication Division, Treasury, Ministry of Finance of Malaysia.
- Ms. Nurshafenath Shaharuddin, Monitoring & Evaluation Analyst, UNDP
- Dr. Goh Chee Leong, Dean, HELP University College
- Ms. Saira Shameem, Programme Adviser, UNFPA
- Mr. Riccardo Polastro, Regional Evaluation Adviser, Regional Office for East Asia and Pacific, UNICEF Bangkok
- Dr. Arunaselam Rasappan, Senior Advisor, Center for Development & Research in Evaluation (CeDRE) International.
### Annex 8: Evaluation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Desk review</th>
<th>CD Portfolio documentation with reference sheets</th>
<th>Capacity development (CD) case studies</th>
<th>Capacity development (CD) response evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In-depth interviews with case study direct stakeholders</td>
<td>On line participant assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent were the objectives of the capacity development activities aligned with the strategic and operational plans and guidelines during 2011-2015?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was the capacity development activities responding to most important capacity gaps for child rights implementation in Malaysia during 2011-2015?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was the capacity development activities incorporating cross-cutting issues related to child rights such as human rights, gender equality, and equity in Malaysia during 2011-2015?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was the capacity development activities coherent (internally and externally)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the capacity development initiatives been effective?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the portfolio of capacity development activities achieved the targets (budget execution, physical implementation, outputs and outcomes)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the major factors influencing the degree of achievement of the objectives/targets?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was the portfolio of capacity development initiatives efficient?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives Implemented by UNICEF Malaysia (2011 to 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desk review</th>
<th>CD Portfolio documentation with reference sheets</th>
<th>Capacity development (CD) case studies</th>
<th>Capacity development (CD) response evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-depth interviews with case study direct stakeholders</td>
<td>On line participant assessment</td>
<td>Cost-Effectiveness analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD management process</td>
<td>To what extent the management process of the capacity development activities was a quality process?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has UNICEF developed any partnership(s) for its capacity development activities? If yes, with whom and how?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent those partnership(s) were of quality?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>To what extent did the outputs of the portfolio of capacity development activities lead to substantial outcomes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of outcomes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate and final outcomes</td>
<td>To what extent have the portfolio of capacity development activities outputs and preliminary outcomes been analysed and used by UNICEF to adjust UNICEF implementation strategy during the last strategic plan period?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Desk review</th>
<th>CD Portfolio documentation with reference sheets</th>
<th>Capacity development (CD) case studies</th>
<th>Capacity development (CD) response evaluation</th>
<th>Identification of Elements of CD response for 2016-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent had the portfolio of capacity development activities sustainable effects?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the strengths and weaknesses of the MCO capacity development response 2011-2015?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the opportunities to be sized in the MCO capacity development response 2016-2020?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the threats to be considered in the MCO capacity development response 2016-2020?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What could be the objectives of the MCO capacity development response 2016-2020 based on lessons learnt from the evaluation of the MCO response 2011-2015, the results of the SWOT analysis, and the mandate and comparative advantage of UNICEF?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What could be the means to achieve those objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 9: Results framework

9a. The theory of change

**Figure 9A.1: Implicit theory of change for capacity development response at individual level in Component 1. Improved data, capacity and resources for children of the Country Programme 2011-2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNICEF MCO capacity development activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Immediate outcomes</th>
<th>Final outcomes</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical and financial support with right:</td>
<td>Reduced critical capacity gaps of key staff in key institutions for the implementation of child rights in terms of knowledge, skills, attitudes, experience and behavior, in particular in building up national capacities for rigorous analysis, monitoring and evaluation (CPAP Strategy 2a)</td>
<td>Sustained application in their job of new capacities by key staff in key institutions for the implementation of child rights</td>
<td>Contribution to improved performance of key institutions for the implementation of child rights in terms of quantity and quality of services provided to children and women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Target groups (institutions, participants)</td>
<td>• Cross cutting issues related to child rights such as human rights, gender equality, and equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training areas corresponding to critical capacity gaps of key staff in key institutions and to comparative advantage of UNICEF</td>
<td>• Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cross cutting issues related to child rights such as human rights, gender equality, and equity</td>
<td>• Training institutions and trainers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partner</td>
<td>• Training material and approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Venue and logistics</td>
<td>• Duration and timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sequencing and articulation with other CD activities</td>
<td>• Adequate funding of CD activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adequate management of CD activities (planning, support during execution, monitoring)</td>
<td>• Adequate management of CD activities (planning, support during execution, monitoring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions/Risk factors**

- Fund availability
- Limited UNICEF staff rotation
- Working partnerships
- Limited key staff rotation in key institutions
- Existence of champions of change in key institutions
- Limited resistance to change in key institutions
- National political stability
- Existence of champions of change in national key institutions
- Enabling environment

**Institutional level**

**Individual level**

**Contribution to the achievement of objectives of 2011-2015 CPAP and 10MP in terms of results for final target group: children and women**
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Figure 9A.2: Implicit theory of change for capacity development response at institutional level in Component 1. Improved data, capacity and resources for children of the Country Programme 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNICEF MCO capacity development activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Immediate outcomes</th>
<th>Final outcomes</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical and financial support with right:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Target groups (institutions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support areas corresponding to critical capacity gaps in key institutions and to comparative advantage of UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cross cutting issues related to child rights such as human rights, gender equality, and equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support institutions and experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support systems and tools as well as approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Duration and timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sequencing and articulation with other CD activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adequate funding of CD activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adequate management of CD activities (planning, support during execution, monitoring and adjustment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced critical capacity gaps of key institutions for the implementation of child rights in terms of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HR and FR systems (CPAP Strategy 4a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planning, programming, monitoring and evaluation (CPAP Strategy 4b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information systems and knowledge management (CPAP Strategy 2b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- skills to play a critical role in national dialogue and policy consultation both with the Government and the private sector (CPAP Strategy 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained application of new systems and tools by key institutions for the implementation of child rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to improved performance of key institutions for the implementation of child rights in terms of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- client orientation, service delivery processes, HR management, FR management, Information systems management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to improved performance of key institutions for the implementation of child rights in terms of quantity and quality of services provided to children and women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions /Risk factors

- Fund availability
- Limited UNICEF staff rotation
- Working partnerships
- Limited key staff rotation in key institutions
- Existence of champions of change in key institutions
- Limited resistance to change in key institutions
- National political stability
- Existence of champions of change in national key institutions for the implementation of child rights
- Enabling environment
Figure 9A.3: Implicit theory of change for capacity development response at enabling environment level in Component 1. Improved data, capacity and resources for children of the Country Programme 2011-2015

**UNICEF MCO capacity development activities**

- Technical and financial support and advocacy with right:
  - Target groups (institutions, committees, forums, etc.)
  - Support areas corresponding to critical capacity gaps in policies, legal framework, and budget allocations, and to comparative advantage of UNICEF
  - Cross-cutting issues related to child rights such as human rights, gender equality, and equity
  - Choice of support institutions and experts
  - Choice of support systems and tools as well as approach
  - Duration and timing
  - Sequencing and articulation with other CD activities
  - Adequate funding of CD activities
  - Adequate management of CD activities (planning, support during execution, monitoring and adjustment)

**Outputs**

- Reduced critical capacity gaps in terms of the formulation of policies, legal framework, and budget allocations promoting the implementation of child rights, in particular for:
  - Government strategic national partnerships and CSO alliance-building (CPAP strategy 1a)
  - Strengthened CSO capacity to play a more active and effective role itself in national policy advocacy for children (CPAP strategy 1b)

**Immediate outcomes**

- Contribution to the elaboration and adoption of new policies, legal framework, and budget allocations promoting the implementation of child rights

**Final outcomes**

- Contribution to the effective and sustainable implementation of new policies, legal framework, and budget allocations promoting the implementation of child rights

**Impacts**

- Contribution to the achievement of objectives of 2011-2015 CPAP and 10MP in terms of results for final target group: children and women

**Assumptions /Risk factors**

- Fund availability
- Limited UNICEF staff rotation working strategic alliances

- National political stability
- Existence of champions of change in national key institutions for the implementation of child rights
- Limited resistance to change in national key institutions
9b. The reality of change

The following graphs indicate to what extent the intended theory of change did take place, i.e. the reality of change, using a colour code. Green indicates it took place to a large extent, blue to a significant extent, red to a small extent.

**Figure 9A.4: Reality of Change for capacity development response at individual level in Component 1. Improved data, capacity and resources for children of the Country Programme 2011-2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNICEF MCO capacity development activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Immediate outcomes</th>
<th>Final outcomes</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical and financial support with right:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target groups (institutions, participants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training areas corresponding to critical capacity gaps of key staff in key institutions and to comparative advantage of UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross cutting issues related to child rights such as human rights, gender equality, and equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training institutions and trainers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training material and approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue and logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration and timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequencing and articulation with other CD activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate funding of CD activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate management of CD activities (planning, support during execution, monitoring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced critical capacity gaps of key staff in key institutions for the implementation of child rights in terms of knowledge, skills, attitudes, experience and behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustained application in their job of new capacities by key staff in key institutions for the implementation of child rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to improved performance of key institutions for the implementation of child rights in terms of client orientation, service delivery processes, HR management, Information systems management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the achievement of objectives of 2011-2015 CPAP and 10MP in terms of results for final target group: children and women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions/ Risk factors**

- Fund availability
- Limited UNICEF staff rotation
- Working partnerships
- Limited key staff rotation in key institutions
- Existence of champions of change in key institutions
- Limited resistance to change in key institutions
- National political stability
- Existence of champions of change in national key institutions for the implementation of child rights
- Enabling environment
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Figure 9A.5: Reality of Change for capacity development response at institutional level in Component 1. Improved data, capacity and resources for children of the Country Programme 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNICEF MCO capacity development activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Immediate outcomes</th>
<th>Final outcomes</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical and financial support with right selection of:</td>
<td>Reduced critical capacity gaps of key institutions for the implementation of child rights in terms of client orientation, service delivery processes, HR management, FR management, Information systems</td>
<td>Sustained application of new systems and tools by key institutions for the implementation of child rights</td>
<td>Contribution to improved performance of key institutions for the implementation of child rights in terms of client orientation, service delivery processes, HR management, FR management, Information systems management</td>
<td>Contribution to the achievement of objectives of 2011-2015 CPAP and 10MP in terms of results for final target group: children and women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target groups (institutions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support areas corresponding to critical capacity gaps in key institutions and to comparative advantage of UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross cutting issues related to child rights such as human rights, gender equality, and equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support institutions and experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support systems and tools as well as approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration and timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequencing and articulation with other CD activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate funding of CD activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate management of CD activities (planning, support during execution, monitoring and adjustment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional level

Assumptions /Risk factors

- Fund availability
- Limited UNICEF staff rotation
- Working partnerships
- Limited key staff rotation in key institutions
- Existence of champions of change in key institutions
- Limited resistance to change in key institutions
- National political stability
- Existence of champions of change in national key institutions for the implementation of child rights
- Enabling environment
**Figure 9A.6: Reality of Change for capacity development response at enabling environment level in Component 1. Improved data, capacity and resources for children of the Country Programme 2011-2015**

**UNICEF MCO capacity development activities**
- Technical and financial support and advocacy with right:
  - Target groups (institutions, committees, forums, etc.)
  - Support areas corresponding to critical capacity gaps in policies, legal framework, and budget allocations and to comparative advantage of UNICEF
  - Cross cutting issues related to child rights such as human rights, gender equality, and equity
  - Strategic alliances
  - Support institutions and experts
  - Support systems and tools as well as approach
  - Duration and timing
  - Sequencing and articulation with other CD activities
  - Adequate funding of CD activities
  - Adequate management of CD activities (planning, support during execution, monitoring and adjustment)

**Outputs**
- Reduced critical capacity gaps in terms of the formulation of policies, legal framework, and budget allocations promoting the implementation of child rights

**Immediate outcomes**
- Contribution to the elaboration and adoption of new policies, legal framework, and budget allocations promoting the implementation of child rights

**Final outcomes**
- Contribution to the effective and sustainable implementation of new policies, legal framework, and budget allocations promoting the implementation of child rights

**Enabling environment level**

**Assumptions /Risk factors**
- Fund availability
- Limited UNICEF staff rotation
- Working strategic alliances

- National political stability
- Existence of champions of change in national key institutions for the implementation of child rights
- Limited resistance to change in national key institutions

- Contribution to the achievement of objectives of 2011-2015 CPAP and 10MP in terms of results for final target group: children and women