Annex 2 Technical Proposal (amended after briefing in Bern)

External Evaluation of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)'s Multilateral Contributions to UNHCR in Georgia (including Abkhazia and South Ossetia) 2004 - 2007

Programme: SDC's Multilateral Contributions to UNHCR in Georgia 2004 - 2007

Short Methodological Approach

The evaluation of Humanitarian Action is a type of evaluation with some distinct characteristics. Evaluations of humanitarian action are often undertaken during periods of severe disruption. This has certain implications on how to carry out the evaluation and on how to apply the evaluation criteria[1].

- High staff turnover among aid workers involved in the humanitarian action, making it difficult to interview key informants
- Humanitarian action takes places in disordered conditions, leading to rapidly changing circumstances, making data collection a difficult task
- Conflicts polarize perceptions, making an "objective" evaluation and to judge what are "normal" social and physical conditions more difficult
- Baseline data, objective statements and indicators are missing, as humanitarian action by its nature is often planned and implemented quickly.

1 Methodology

Evaluation Criteria and Questions:

We propose to group the questions set out in the ToR around the five standard evaluation criteria plus the three criteria addressed below. We have also added a few questions which we deem relevant in the context of this evaluation (in italic). The list is preliminary and will be completed in course of the desk phase.

Relevance

- Have specific needs / issues been prioritised by UNHCR in Georgia and to what extent was this prioritisation appropriate?
- How significant is the role of UNHCR in the IDP/refugee sector? Are priorities set on those areas/approaches where UNHCR has a real added value?

Efficiency

- Was the use of financial and human resources appropriate in relation to the outcome of the UNHCR programme? Determine whether (or not) the money/services reached the beneficiaries. (Efficiency, effectiveness)
- What is the added value of SDC-HA secondment to UNHCR? (Efficiency, effectiveness)
- Was UNHCR's selection / coordination of implementing partners in this instance effective and appropriate? To what extent were the selected implementing partners qualified to implement the programme according to standards? (Efficiency and coordination)

Effectiveness

- To what extent did UNHCR's programmes contribute to cover the prioritised needs?

[1] Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD-DAC criteria; ALNAP, ODI March 2006

- *Is planning and implementation taking into account the real needs and interest of the beneficiaries, the IDPs?*
- *How is the dialogue with the IDPs established and kept?*

Impact

- *Are the initiatives of UNHCR and SDC embedded into wider National Programs? (Impact and sustainability)*
- *Has the program implementation reached the intended target groups?*
- *Is the overall framework set by the IDP strategy, with its implications especially related to local authorities' involvement, actually valid at local level?*

Sustainability

- o *Is UNHCR's strategy contributing to long-term sustainable solutions or is it more geared to ad hoc reactions (development and self reliance versus humanitarian relief)?*
- o What is the perception of the various stakeholders and actors towards "The New Approach"?
- o Is there a consolidated strategy and vision about IDPs of government and development agencies and which are the core pillars?

Coordination, Complementarity and Coherence

- What are complementarities between the UNHCR programme and SDC's bilateral programme in Georgia and how were they achieved?
- What are the added values of these complementarities?
- *In how far is the UNHRC strategy and its implementation in Georgia aligned with the Swiss Development Cooperation Humanitarian Aid Section's (SDC-HA's) Strategy for the South Caucasus 2002-2007 and its three action lines?*
- *What is the level of cooperation/coordination with local and international partners? Were beneficiaries, municipalities and other authorities involved satisfied with the solutions provided and the implementation modalities?*

Coverage

The funds invested by SDC-HA in cofinancing activities of UNHCR in Georgia are meant to reach a major part of the target group IDPs. Coverage was specifically added to the DAC guidelines on humanitarian evaluation[2]. We propose to include the criterion to this evaluation framework as well.

Cross cutting issues

Within the evaluation criteria, also cross cutting issues should be addressed . The four horizontal issues to be considered in this evaluation are gender equality, protection, advocacy for vulnerable and/or marginalized groups as well as good governance..

2 Phased Approach

This evaluation will be carried out in three phases: Desk Phase, Field Phase in Georgia and Reporting Phase.

[2] Guidance for evaluating humanitarian assistance in complex emergencies; OECD/DAC, 1999

Desk Phase

During this period of a week approximately, the following tasks will be performed by the evaluation team.
Activities:

- Joint UNHCR-SDC briefing Berne.
- In-depth literature review of all programme documentation, country strategic plans, and other periodic reports.
- First series of interviews on the programme with key stakeholders as the SDC head of division Europe&CIS and the desk officer in charge at SDC HQ.
- Interview on the programme with the head of UNHCR Regional Bureau and the desk officer in charge at UNHCR in Geneva.
- Fine-tuning of methodology and evaluation tools for the implementation of the field phase.
- Development of questionnaires (not as tick boxing exercise, but more a guideline for semi-structured and structured interviews) for the field phase; these questionnaires could also be disseminated also those partners which have meanwhile left Georgia and returned to their home bases.
- A detailed work plan and travel schedule will be prepared for the field phase and project visits pre-arranged.

Outputs:

- Detailed Evaluation Work Plan
  - Methodology and evaluation tool mix
  - Evaluation questions, criteria and indicators
  - Draft questionnaires for semi structured and structured interviews
  - Indicative selection of programme sites to be visited

Field phase

The field visit to Georgia shall encompass the following:

Activities:

- Joint briefing and debriefing on the evaluation to the concerned staff of UNHCR and the Swiss Cooperation Office.
- Interviews on the programme with concerned staff of UNHCR and SDC, concerned authorities on the central and local levels.
- Interviews on the programme with the beneficiaries (men, women, girls and boys) and representatives of civil society.
- Interviews with partner organizations of UNHCR and SDC/HA, for example NGOs as implementation partners of the programme, and other international organizations working in the same objective.
- Interviews with local authorities.
- Focus group discussions and stakeholder interviews using a semi-structured interview guide to include questions common across all projects.
- A final debriefing meeting/workshop is proposed, to review preliminary results of the evaluation, and consider how to ensure that conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt can be fed back into the planning cycle.
- Drafting Evaluation Report.

In particular, it will be important to spend substantial time on field visits, e.g. to visit IDPs in their current accommodations, as collective centres and private housing and to gain an impression not only on the housing, but also on the social conditions and educational set up, and the health status including trauma and stress related situation. The UNHCR offices in Tblisi and the four field offices in Gali, Sukhumi, Zugdidi and Akhmeta (Pankisi Valley) shall be visited if actual security situation allows and if relevant for the purposes of this evaluation.

Outputs:
- Inputs to the Draft Evaluation Report, including preliminary findings and recommendations
- Refined evaluation report structure

Reporting phase

Upon completion of the Field Phase, the whole evaluation team will analyse the results of the field phase and draw preliminary findings and recommendations. A Draft Evaluation Report will also integrate evaluation elements produced during the earlier stages of the evaluation.

After receipt of the Draft Evaluation Report SDC-HA will provide written comments on the report to the evaluation team, represented by the evaluation team leader, ideally within a maximum of two weeks. Immediately thereafter, a one day workshop is set aside to discuss the Draft Evaluation Report. The Final Evaluation Report will be submitted as the last delivery of the evaluation, duly taking into consideration the comments received by the client.

Activities:
- Draft Evaluation Report
- Receive comments on the Draft Evaluation Report
- Debriefing HQ Bern
- Finalize Evaluation Report

Outputs:
- Draft Evaluation Report
- Final Evaluation Report

The Evaluation Report will also provide conclusions and recommendations related to the following questions:

- What needs to be done to improve the outcome/impact of the UNHCR programme in Georgia?
- To what extent has the UNHCR programme benefited (or not) from SDC's bilateral activities in Georgia and vice versa?

The evaluation conclusions and recommendations will be structured around the relevant subjects to facilitate its use as a knowledge management tool.