

Process Evaluation of Medium-Term Emergency Assistance in Global Project 1

Report | July 2021



German Red Cross



ICRC

P.O : ALL19CH/AMM19/023913: طلب الشراء

Item	Qty	الكمية	محتويات
Burghul - wheat	5KG	5 كغ	
Beans, dried	4KG	4 كغ	لبيا بيضاء
Chickpeas. raw	4KG	4 كغ	
Lentils	2KG	2 كغ	سود
Split lentils	2KG	2 كغ	س أحمر مجروش
Pasta	4 X 500 g	500 X 4 غ	رونة

Net Weight : 19 Kg

Table of content

<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>i</i>
1. <i>Executive Summary</i>	<i>ii</i>
2. <i>Introduction</i>	1
2.1. <i>Background</i>	1
2.2. <i>Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation</i>	1
2.3. <i>The GPI Framework</i>	2
2.4. <i>RCRC Movement Coordination</i>	3
3. <i>Methodology</i>	4
4. <i>Description of selected GPI-project case studies</i>	6
4.1. <i>Bangladesh</i>	6
4.2. <i>Colombia</i>	7
4.3. <i>Lebanon</i>	8
4.4. <i>South Sudan</i>	9
4.5. <i>Yemen</i>	10
5. <i>Findings</i>	11
5.1. <i>Coordination & Relevance</i>	11
5.2. <i>Complementarity & Coherence</i>	15
5.3. <i>Quality & Effectiveness</i>	20
5.4. <i>The GPI Model & Efficiency</i>	23
6. <i>Conclusions</i>	27
7. <i>Recommendations</i>	30
Annex 1 – Terms of Reference (ToR)	32
Annex 2 – Inception Report	42
Annex 3 – List of Medium-Term Assistance Projects	48
Annex 4 – Evaluation Framework	54
Annex 5 – List of Evaluation Questions	56
Annex 6 – List of Key Informants	57
Annex 7 – Factsheet	59

List of Abbreviations

ARC	American Red Cross
BDRCS	Bangladesh Red Crescent Society
BTS	Blood Transfusion Services
CRCS	Colombian Red Cross Society
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
GFFO	German Federal Foreign Office
GP	Global Projects
GRC	German Red Cross
HNS	Host National Society
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
LRC	Lebanese Red Cross
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MEAL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning
MOCG	Movement Operations Coordination Group
MSP	Movement Strategic Platform
NRC	Norwegian Red Cross
NS	National Societies
NSD	National Society Development
PMO	Population Movement Operation
PNS	Partner National Society
PPI	Prepared International
RCRC	Red Cross Red Crescent
RFL	Restoring of Family Links
SMCC	Strengthening Movement Coordination and Cooperation
SpRC	Spanish Red Cross
SRC	Swiss Red Cross
SSRC	South Sudan Red Cross
TWG	Technical Working Group
YRCS	Yemen Red Crescent Society

List of Figures

Figure 1: Global Project I Framework	3
Figure 2: Map of Selected Case-Studies for this evaluation	5
Figure 3: Rohingya Refugee Crisis Response: ISCG 4W Dashboard by Camp, June 2020	6
Figure 4: Map showing estimated location and number of Venezuelan migrants.	7
Figure 5: LRC's GPI Operational Presence	8
Figure 6: Yemen: Movement Activities per Sector 2019-July 2020	10
Figure 7: Project Area of the GPI Project in Colombia	12
Figure 8: Division of labour in Norte de Santander and Arauca in Colombia under Appeal.....	16
Figure 9: Current RCRC MVT Coordination Structure in Yemen.....	19

considered a requirement when a sufficient number of Partners participated. The involvement of the HNS, and possibly other Partners, into the project design phase added to the relevance of the project. The coordination process directly influenced the content of the project.

FINDING 2 – Another good practice is for projects to be in line with HNS strategies or country plans, however, these elaborated plans do not exist in every context.

This assessment reconfirms the importance for PNS and IFRC to be in line with the priorities and capacities of the HNS in order to ensure the overall relevance of the activities of the RCRC Movement, and the prospect of the RCRC response to be effective. The existence of such plans and strategies depends on the context and the capacities of the HNS; even when plans were made, room for improvement was identified to make them stronger and to provide clearer guidance to PNS active in a certain crisis situations. Such plans assisted the PNS and IFRC in identifying the best possible ways to support the overall RCRC response in a given country.

FINDING 3 - Project adaptation took place as a result of coordination mechanisms, however it appears to be the result of ad-hoc decision-making by GRC and other Partners rather than an outcome of regular reviews regarding project relevance.

Projects were often adapted throughout the implementation to meet arising needs. This flexibility was important to keep activities relevant. Across the different case-studies, adaptations were made in response to the COVID-crisis or the Beirut blast, or changing needs of the target population, such as increased movement in Colombia or fires in the camps in Cox's Bazar. Of course, many of these changing needs could not be foreseen and in these cases, quick action was needed. However, other adaptations might be required to respond to slower change processes, and therefore regular reviews, possibly through repeated needs assessments or the sharing of updates amongst Movement Partners, were deemed essential to keep projects relevant and to apply a forward-looking approach. A closer cooperation with activities under GPII could be considered.

2. Complementarity & Coherence

FINDING 4 - Coordination resulted in the avoidance of duplication of efforts and in a clear division of labour between RCRC Movement Partners in the five case-studies.

Coordination and the resulting division of activities can take various forms. In the case of GPI projects, the division of labour mostly took the form of a geographical division, whereby one Movement Partner operated in one specific area or with one dedicated RC branch only. This can automatically lead to a separation of duties and responsibilities which makes duplication unlikely. Whereas this form of complementarity has advantages in terms of clear responsibilities and the avoidance of the need to cooperate closely at activity-level, geographical division of labour can also have disadvantages, such as the duplication of support services as identified in South Sudan. In the worst case, this might lead to an inefficient use of resources or a missed potential for cost-efficient savings.

FINDING 5 - The role of the HNS is the key contributing factor for the division of labour between Movement Partners. Appropriate leadership of the NS, fostered by a supportive environment from other Movement Partners is the best recipe for a coherent RCRC response.

In addition to the existence of coordination mechanisms, a key contributing factor for complementarity and also effectiveness at a later stage, is the degree to which the HNS takes on a leading role. Across the five case-studies, there were clear differences in the role of the HNS for Movement Coordination, from the HNS having the lead role in Colombia, South Sudan and Lebanon, over ICRC in the lead role in Yemen, to a shared leadership between HNS and IFRC in Bangladesh. In

this regard, the division of coordination responsibilities between HNS, ICRC and IFRC was a recurring topic in the discussions. On paper, the situation is clear: the 1997 Seville Agreement defined the ICRC as the lead agency in situations of international and non-international armed conflicts, and the IFRC in situations of natural or technological disasters and other emergency and disaster situations in peacetime, requiring resources exceeding those of the operating NS. This theoretical understanding was noted throughout the assessment. Overall, there was agreement that IFRC had the task to support the HNS in the execution of their coordination responsibilities. Recent initiatives and developments within the RCRC Movement, such as NSD and SMCC, can be observed in the field. Yet this evaluation has demonstrated that this has remained a work in progress since the actual realization of the HNS lead role and the IFRC or ICRC's supporting role differed in the case-studies.

FINDING 6 – Effective coordination requires complementary levels, formats, and mechanisms. Bilateral and multilateral coordination between HNS and PNS represent two sides of the same coin.

The five case-studies demonstrated that there was not one coordination model, and in fact effective coordination required multiple formats and levels. Too much of a focus on one form of coordination, for example bilateral coordination in Colombia, might have had a negative effect on the overall cooperation climate. When too many PNS operate in the country, as in Lebanon, smaller coordination formats might be required to discuss matters in more detail. As such, it is not only projects that need to be flexible, but coordination formats also.

3. Quality & Effectiveness

FINDING 7 - Real coordination has the potential to lead to more than avoidance of duplication only. A step further is the integration of projects or joint projects building on comparative advantages which maximize the possibilities of every Movement Partner. The case-studies provide us with several good examples.

The geographical division of labour might be one way to approach coordination and ensure a complementary response. However, there are equally other degrees of coordination with more intense cooperation formats, for example joint projects, RCRC consortia, pooled resources, shared staffing or secondments. These find themselves higher up on the spectrum to intensify working relationships, but also come with advantages and disadvantages, and a decision to which degree of coordination is desirable needs to be based on a proper analysis of the context and understanding of the stakeholders' interests and capacities.

FINDING 8 – A clear added value of coordination for effectiveness of projects is the possibility to offer consistent levels of assistance, however, the implementation of such common standards is not yet finalized.

An additional potential outcome of coordination is to harmonize the levels of assistance of various actors. This has several advantages, including in terms of accountability to affected populations and in presenting a coherent picture of the RCRC Movement externally. The examples of consistent levels of assistance are not yet very common and are mainly to be found in Cox's Bazar and Lebanon, whereas in other case-studies, such as Yemen, challenges were experienced in this regard. In South Sudan, harmonization was not necessarily discussed for assistance, but instead for indirect aspects, such as salaries.

FINDING 9 – Effectiveness and impact benefit from information-sharing, knowledge exchange and transparency. Coordination mechanisms have not yet been fully delivered in this regard.

The identified case-studies have demonstrated that the mere existence of coordination mechanisms was not sufficient to lead to effectiveness if no proper communication was in place. Important aspects of coordination identified were information-sharing and exchange of updates, not only within coordination mechanisms themselves, but also between the different levels of coordination. The case-studies have clearly demonstrated just where coordination has been more effective if two-way and inclusive communication was present. An additional complication, as also perceived during the COVID-19 pandemic, was the influence of crisis on communication and transparency. Crisis communication today requires additional efforts to overcome challenges and limitations, such as the replacement of physical meetings with virtual discussions. It could be interesting to explore lessons learned from situations where remote management is common practice, such as Yemen, for other contexts.

4. The GPI Model & Efficiency

FINDING 10 - The GPI model brings the advantage of flexibility in terms of speed and decision-making, but the mechanism is still a burden in terms of bureaucracy. The possibility of financial top-ups and shifting of funding are very much welcomed.

The Global Projects model provides GRC with a higher degree of flexibility since funding can be moved internally and between country projects and allows it to respond to immediate needs. An example of such immediate needs occurred during the project implementation phase of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, where the flexibility of the GPI model could fully be made use of. Decision-making has proven to be easier and the speed in which changes and adaptations to projects can be made is faster. Both the possibility of financial top-ups and also the possibility to shift funding has supported the ability to be efficient and targeted to the needs on the ground. By this, in several scenarios, the influence and importance of GRC for the country-wide response of the RCRC Movement has grown. The ability to move funds not only within one country context, but also within the overall GPI programme can be seen as a particularly strong factor in improving efficiency. The longer-term planning horizon (2-3 years, thus aiming for predictability of funding) is also very much welcomed and provides GRC with the possibility to appear as a reliable and serious partner of choice. GRC is not the only NS able to work with the flexibility that is provided by GPI. Many other NS have similar funding mechanisms with a similar degree of flexibility. If GRC would not be able to display such a high level of flexibility, it would hamper the coordination efforts in the field.

FINDING 11 - The RCRC Movement has the necessary capacities, structures, and resources to apply coordination processes. Security constraints and the unclear role of the IFRC can limit the efficiency of coordination.

The example of Lebanon shows how a strong HNS can establish efficient coordination mechanisms under the given framework of the RCRC Movement . The comparably high capacity of the HNS can make use of the flexibility of the coordination mechanisms in the RCRC Movement and provide for an efficient response. On the contrary, a lack of capacity on the side of the HNS will limit the efficiency of the implementation. Another limiting factor for coordination is security constraints, as for example in Yemen. As each of the scenarios is vastly different in terms of how the RCRC Movement coordinates between the global level (IFRC, ICRC), the national PNS and HNS, a more static and more predefined structure of coordination would not necessarily lead to more efficiency, sometimes in fact to the contrary. Whereas interviewees did indicate some room for improvement as regards coordination, the request always referred to the mechanics, rather than questioning the need for coordination overall.

FINDING 12 - Inclusion of capacity strengthening of HNS in projects supported by PNS is important, but it should happen in a coordinated manner and be based on a joint assessment of the needs of the HNS. It is good practice for GPI projects to allow for this capacity-building aspect in projects.

The evaluation has clearly shown the importance of the ability of HNS to coordinate the response of the RCRC Movement. But the HNSs in all five case-studies displayed different levels of capacity to do so. While, as mentioned, the IFRC showed quite a different appetite to support the HNSs in their role of coordinator within the RCRC Movement, the importance of including capacity-building and development of HNS in projects were both key for the quality, efficiency and in the end, also the success of RCRC Movement operations in a given country.

Conclusions

The evaluation confirms that Movement Coordination enables complementarity resulting in the effectiveness of projects. However, there remain substantial hurdles at every step. Coordination is relevant for each phase of the project cycle, but can only be successful if there is an overall strategic framework in which projects can be placed. A complementary response is more than combining individual pieces of the puzzle, but only when the pieces are matched and integrated through a variety of connectors can the overall RCRC response have real impact. Transparency, trust and willingness to engage are essential building blocks to oil the separate parts of the coordination machinery. The GPI model supports coordination efforts through its possibilities for flexibility and predictability, but should be guided by a clear strategic reflection on the added value and potential niche of GRC assistance not only in relation to the needs of the affected population, but also within the overall needs for capacity-building of HNS and the RCRC Movement at large.

The evaluation made the following **recommendations for GRC** to increase the overall effectiveness of coordination processes and to use the advantages of GPI in this context:

1. Further strengthen the inclusion of Movement Coordination as an indicator of quality for the GPI funding framework and reflect on possible further improvements;
2. Standardize regular reflection moments to ensure projects remain relevant throughout;
3. Offer additional hand-over, training or mentoring to staff with substantial coordination capacities;
4. Enable a strategic reflection of the possible niche and added value of GPI funding;
5. Aim for a strategic targeting of NS to be a part of the next GPI;
6. Strengthen the overview and understanding of staff in HQ about field coordination to further foster quick decision-making;
7. Take this evaluation as the start of a continuous learning exchange.

The evaluation identified the following **Movement-wide considerations and good practices**:

1. Match bilateral and multilateral coordination mechanisms;
2. Recognize roles and responsibilities of all Movement Partners within the overall RCRC response;
3. Better understand the different degrees of coordination;
4. Strengthen the abilities of HNS to coordinate;
5. Ensure that the Movement Partner in the lead of the response in a given country or situation has the required capacities and mandate.