

Evaluation Service



Evaluation of UNHCR's implementation of three of its protection strategies: the Global Education Strategy, the Updated SGBV Strategy, and the Child Protection Framework

July 2017

Annexes

ES/2017/02

Commissioned by UNHCR Evaluation Service and
Conducted by Oxford Policy Management



Oxford Policy Management

UNHCR Evaluation Service

UNHCR's Evaluation Policy confirms UNHCR's commitment to support accountability, learning and continual improvement through the systematic examination and analysis of organisational strategies, policies, and programmes. Evaluations are guided by the principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility, and are undertaken to enhance the organization's performance in addressing the protection, assistance and solution needs of refugees, stateless people and other persons of concern.

Evaluation Service
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
Case Postale 2500
1211 Genève 2
Switzerland
www.unhcr.org

Published by UNHCR
Evaluation Service Copyright © 2017 UNHCR

This document is issued by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for general distribution. All rights are reserved. Reproduction is authorized, except for commercial purposes, provided UNHCR is acknowledged.

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed in this Evaluation Report are those of the Evaluation Team, and do not necessarily represent the views of UNHCR, the United Nations or its Member States. The depiction and use of boundaries, geographic names and related data shown on maps and included in lists, tables, and documents in this Evaluation Report are not warranted to be error free, nor do they necessarily imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNHCR or the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Table of contents

List of abbreviations	iv
Annex A Terms of Reference	5
Annex B Evaluation Matrix	18
Annex C Document Review Process	21
Annex D Guide on Ethics Protocol for National Researchers	26
Annex E Country Visit Details – Bangladesh	31
Annex F Country Visit Details – Egypt	34
Annex G Country Visit Details – Iran	39
Annex H Country Visit Details – Mexico	44
Annex I Country Visit Details – Rwanda	48
Annex J List of stakeholders interviewed beyond country visits	52

List of abbreviations

AGD	Age, Gender and Diversity
AoR	Area of Responsibility
BIA	Best Interests Assessment
BID	Best Interests Determination
BPRM	US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration
COP	Country Operations Plan
DIP	Division of International Protection
DPSM	Division of Programme Support and Management
EMI	Education Management Information
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
GSPs	Global Strategic Priorities
IDP	Internally Displaced Person(s)
KII	Key Informant Interview
LGBTI	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex
LSHTM	London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MFT	Multi-Functional Team
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
OPM	Oxford Policy Management
PEER	Participatory Ethnographic Evaluation and Research
POC/s	Person/People of Concern
PPG	Population Planning Group
RBM	Results-Based Management
RSD	Refugee Status Determination
SGBV	Sexual and Gender-Based Violence
ToR	Terms of Reference
UASC	Unaccompanied and Separated Children
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	UN Children's Fund
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

Annex A Terms of Reference

Evaluation of UNHCR's Implementation of Three of its Protection Strategies: the Global Education Strategy, the Updated Strategy on SGBV, and, the Child Protection Framework

28 August 2015

Reference: RFP/2015/705

Introduction

Background

This Terms of Reference (ToR) is the initial document guiding an evaluation that is being undertaken by UNHCR's Division of International Protection (DIP) and Policy Development and Evaluation Service (PDES). The evaluation seeks to assess the quality and degree of implementation of UNHCR's three related, yet stand-alone, protection strategies: the Global Education Strategy, the Updated Strategy on Sexual Gender Based Violence (SGBV), and the Child Protection Framework (hereinafter referred to as the three strategies).

The objective of this ToR is to provide information on the scope and purpose of the evaluation for all concerned stakeholders, including consultants interested in undertaking the exercise, UNHCR staff and partners who will be contacted during the data collection process, and members of the evaluation steering committee. This document also serves as the basis for the inception report that will be submitted by the evaluation team in which a detailed methodology and timeline will be provided.

Statement of Purpose & Objectives

Introduction to the subject of the evaluation. This evaluation is primarily a policy evaluation that examines:

- 1) The quality of the three strategies in relationship to good practice and comparable frameworks in use by relevant organizations;
- 2) The absorption and delivery, including the monitoring processes, of the three strategies in the countries that were selected as "priority" countries for the introduction of the strategies; and
- 3) The overall results of the implementation of the strategies. These lines of inquiry are intended to inform UNHCR's policy approaches and assumptions underpinning the promulgation of the three strategies and to gauge the efficacy of the strategies in selected countries (hereafter referred to as the priority countries).

In 2011-12, UNHCR formulated a new global Framework for the Protection of Children and two global strategies on Education and Sexual Gender Based Violence (SGBV) with initial five-year timeframes for implementation. The three strategies define organizational objectives and provide a policy framework and guidance for country level strategies. Although independently formulated, the three distinct strategies address crosscutting protection challenges and require interventions that need to be tackled through a joint approach in order to maximize protection outcomes. At the global level, the strategies are monitored through an integrated approach to strengthen these linkages. All three strategies are protection priorities of UNHCR.

Evaluation of UNHCR's Implementation of Three of its Protection Strategies: the Global Education Strategy, the Updated Strategy on SGBV and, the Child Protection Framework Terms of Reference.

Priority countries for the strategies play a central role in the implementation of the three strategies. Albeit the strategies are global, they have been specifically implemented in a number of countries. For the child protection and education strategies, different countries were selected for different strategies from the start. The Updated SGBV Strategy was rolled out globally and reinforced through workshops for a number of countries. As of 2014, 31 priority countries were implementing at least one of the three strategies (Table 1.).

The strategies have been adapted and implemented in priority countries through a combination of interventions ranging from prioritizing country selection for specific strategies according to performance against specific indicators, roll-out workshops, capacity-building measures, deployment of experts, on-demand technical and advisory services, and guidance on information management and monitoring. Members of DIP's leadership team selected priority countries on the basis of the expressed needs for support or a specific operational context that required particular attention. In addition to receiving dedicated technical support, the selected countries were expected to draft and implement a country-specific strategy in that area.

Twelve of the 31 countries were selected as priority countries for the introduction of the Child Protection Framework. As mentioned above, the roll out for the Updated Strategy on SGBV was global but monitoring focused on nineteen countries that had developed a country based SGBV strategy. Twenty-five countries were selected for the Global Education Strategy. Please see the chart below for the countries selected for each strategy and the overlaps.

Priority Countries	Child Protection	SGBV	Education
Chad	X	X	X
Egypt	X	X	X
Ethiopia	X	X	X
Kenya	X	X	X
Rwanda	X	X	X
Uganda	X	X	X
Sudan	X	X	X
Yemen	X	X	X
Bangladesh		X	X
Burkina Faso		X	X
Burundi		X	X
Jordan		X	X
Lebanon		X	X
Malaysia		X	X
Niger		X	X
Pakistan		X	X
India	X	X	
Colombia		X	
Ecuador		X	
Democratic Republic of Congo			X
Djibouti			X
Iraq			X
Islamic Republic of Iran			X
South Sudan			X
Syrian Arab Republic			X
Tanzania			X
Turkey			X
Zambia			X
Mauritania	X		
Mexico	X		
Thailand	X		

The following chart maps the six objectives of each strategy. Crosscutting themes of safety, access and engagement can be observed amongst the objectives.

Objectives	Child Protection	SGBV	Education
1.	Girls and boys are safe where they live, learn and play .	Children of concern are protected against SGBV .	Learning achievements in primary school improved
2.	Children's participation and capacity are integral to their protection.	Survival sex as a coping mechanism in situations of displacement is addressed .	Safe learning environments in school ensured
3.	Girls and boys have access to child friendly procedures .	Men and boys are engaged in the prevention of SGBV	Access to formal secondary education opportunities improved
4.	Children obtain legal documentation .	Safe environments and safe access to domestic energy and natural resources are provided.	Access to higher education for refugee young people improved
5.	Girls and boys with special needs receive targeted support .	LGBTI persons of concern are protected against SGBV .	Opportunities for lifelong education are available according to need
6	Girls and boys achieve durable solutions in their best interest.	Persons of concern with disabilities are protected against SGBV .	Access to education opportunities is provided during emergencies

1.2.2 Country Contexts

In all five of UNHCR's geographic regions -Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe and the Middle East and North Africa - at least one of the strategies has been rolled out. Fifteen of the priority countries are in Africa, six are in Asia, six are in the Middle East, and three are in the Americas. Turkey is the only country in the Europe region that was selected as a priority country.

In general, most of the countries in Africa, the Americas and Europe are signatories to the 1951 Refugee Convention; almost all the countries in Asia and the Middle East are not signatories. Some of the priority countries have well developed national laws regarding the status and social protection services available to refugees and others do not. The number of displaced persons hosted by the priority country and the duration of the hosting of refugees will also be factored into the analysis. Turkey retains a geographical limitation to the Convention stating that they only accept refugees from Europe

Moreover, reflections on the relative success of strategy implementation according to the presence or absence of conflict, stability of state systems and strength of the economy of each priority country is expected to have a bearing on the analysis of the implementation and results of the three strategies. The variety of country contexts can be manifold and complex: some countries may be managing both stabilized but protracted populations as well as emergency inflows while others may be managing urban refugee populations who can be highly transient. The country context strongly informs performance against indicators in refugee contexts, and observations on how variables interact in each context are an expected outcome of the evaluation.

Africa Priority Countries

Priority Countries	Child Protection	SGBV	Education
Chad	X	X	X
Ethiopia	X	X	X
Kenya	X	X	X
Rwanda	X	X	X
Uganda	X	X	X
Sudan	X	X	X
Burkina Faso		X	X
Burundi		X	X
Niger		X	X
Democratic Republic of Congo			X
Djibouti			X
South Sudan			X
Tanzania			X
Zambia			X
Mauritania	X		

Asia Priority Countries

Priority Countries	Child Protection	SGBV	Education
Bangladesh		X	X
Malaysia		X	X
Pakistan		X	X
India	X	X	
Islamic Republic of Iran			X
Thailand	X		

MENA Priority Countries

Priority Countries	Child Protection	SGBV	Education
Egypt	X	X	X
Yemen	X	X	X
Jordan		X	X
Lebanon		X	X
Iraq			X
Syrian Arab Republic			X

Americas Priority Countries

Priority Countries	Child Protection	SGBV	Education
Colombia		X	
Ecuador		X	
Mexico	X		

Europe Priority Countries

Priority Countries	Child Protection	SGBV	Education
Turkey			X

Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to glean insights into the applicability, delivery, and absorption of the implementation of the three strategies. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation will inform subsequent phases of strategy development in these three areas as well as other protection strategies. The evaluation is also expected to provide qualitative and quantitative evidence that can be used by UNHCR for advocacy efforts at the global, regional and country levels.

The evaluation will be participatory and collaborative in approach with an emphasis on informing future global strategy design and strategy implementation in UNHCR. Persons of Concern (PoC) who the strategies targeted need to be included in the research methods, e.g. focus groups, individual interviews, and, where possible, informed of the findings and recommendations of the evaluation. The evaluators should also seek to contact local stakeholders who may not be PoC for UNHCR but are also affected by the programming linked to the three strategies. The evaluation is also intended to model methods and approaches that will enable future evaluations to improve upon the analysis and measurement of protection impacts.

Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation are the following:

- 1) to assess the quality of the design of the three strategies as individual entities as well as a set of strategies, to achieve improved protection for UNHCR's people of concern and;
- 2) to measure and describe the implementation of the strategies, including the quality, appropriateness, the monitoring processes in place, the extent to which they have been implemented in an integrated manner, and the data they have yielded to date, and;
- 3) to measure the overall results of the implementation of the three protection strategies for UNHCR's persons of concern that can be attributed to the formulation and implementation of the strategies at different organizational levels.

Persons of Concern for UNHCR include: Refugees, as defined in relevant international and regional legal instruments; Asylum-seekers, on the basis that they may be in need of international protection, pending the determination of their claims; Returnees, that is, persons of concern who have returned voluntarily to their countries and/or places of origin or habitual residence; Stateless persons and – under the mandate to prevent statelessness – persons at risk of becoming stateless; Internally displaced persons in certain circumstances and as part of broader cluster responsibilities, and, Persons threatened with displacement or otherwise at risk in certain circumstances (including on a “good offices” basis).

The learning from these three lines of inquiry will inform subsequent protection strategies, policies and advocacy efforts.

Users and stakeholders

The primary users of the evaluation within UNHCR include the policy makers in the Division of International Protection, the Division of Programme Support and Management, and the Regional Bureaus. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation should enable them not only to revise the current strategies, but to also consider modalities for developing, implementing and measuring the results of future strategies. The evaluation will also provide insights to UNHCR’s field based operations on how to apply global strategies to country specific situations. The evaluation should also yield recommendations on monitoring data collection and utilization.

Since the three strategies cover priority protection issues in displacement and humanitarian settings, many readers beyond UNHCR are expected to reference this evaluation. It is anticipated that UNHCR’s operational partners and its allied agencies in Protection Working Groups and other collaborative entities, as well as thematic groups of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee, will be informed by the findings and recommendations of this evaluation. The evaluation will also be shared with national agencies that address child protection, education, and SGBV. Community based organizations, faith based organizations and refugee support groups who also address these issues will be encouraged to read the evaluation. As is the norm in UNHCR, the evaluation will be placed in the public domain and donors, member states, academic institutions will all have access to the final publication.

Focus of the evaluation

The focus of the evaluation will be on the quality, implementation modalities, and impact of the three strategies in different contexts. As stated above, the country and regional context and the phase of displacement in each country will have bearing on the implementation and results of the strategies. Thus, the evaluation will seek to acknowledge how these factors contributed to the implementation and delivery of programming. More importantly, the evaluation will focus on what actions taken by UNHCR and its partners, including refugee-led organizations, can be attributed to the successful influence and implementation of the strategies. The availability of human, technical and financial resources will also be assessed in the report as important contributory factors to the recorded outcomes.

Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will review strategy quality, implementation modalities, and impact across the priority countries. A sample of six selected priority countries will be selected for in-depth reviews. The sample will include three countries that are implementing three of the strategies, two countries that are implementing two of the strategies and one country that is only implementing one of the strategies. This selection of six countries will take geographic analysis as well as the phase of displacement into account. Chad, Rwanda, Bangladesh, India, Egypt and Mexico are the preliminary country choices. However, the final countries selected for the sample will be decided in the final inception report.

The timeframe examined will be from when the strategy(s) were introduced until present.

Evaluation questions

The three overarching evaluation questions will address quality, implementation and results of the three strategies. This evaluation will assess the processes and means established for monitoring the progress of the different strategies. The evaluation will also describe any baselines that have been created especially for complex and difficult to attain information on individuals and population groups.

1) Quality - In their current form, are the three strategies effective, relevant, and coherent, and do they enhance efficiency, consistency and coordination, in UNHCR operations? a) Has the design of each strategy enabled it to be “fit for purpose” in refugee and relevant IDP contexts? b) How do the three strategies compare to similar international protection frameworks? c) Were national frameworks on child protection, education and sexual gender based violence from refugee hosting countries referenced in the inception of the strategies? d) Were refugees, other key stakeholders, and partners, e.g. teachers, child-care workers, consulted in each strategy’s design process? e) What was the consultative process in UNHCR and how has it impacted the implementation and support for the strategies? f) Are the objectives of each strategy achievable, relevant and measurable?

2) Implementation -Have the strategies been appropriately chosen and sufficiently supported to enable their absorption in the countries that were chosen as priority countries? a) Did the process for choosing the priority countries have any bearing on the implementation of the strategy(s)? b) What was the impact of the existing capacity (knowledge, skills and attitudes) of the UNHCR staff and partners in a country’s ability to implement the strategy(s)? c) How effective have interventions from UNHCR HQ and Regional Offices been, e.g. expert technical missions and capacity building measures, in the implementation of the strategy(s)? d) What can be observed about the depth of the implementation of the strategy(s) and associated factors such as the country operational contexts and the availability of human and financial resources? e) What were the external factors beyond UNHCR’s control that enhanced or impeded the implementation of the strategy? f) Were the monitoring and data collection processes in place adequate and appropriate to credibly measure results? g) Did the monitoring mechanisms examine whether or not the project was executed in alignment with programming specifications designed at the country level? h) What effect did the selection and quality of government and non-governmental partners have on the implementation of the strategies? Have the policies and institutional arrangements of selected partners had a direct impact on the implementation of the strategies? Has UNHCR selected the most effective partners available?

3) Results – What have been the impacts of the strategies on the lives of refugees and displaced persons in the priority countries and on the 31 country operations and on UNHCR at a corporate level? a) What evidence of positive or negative change on the lives of the strategy’s target populations can be identified as a result of the implementation of the strategy? Did the implementation of the strategy impact people other than the target population? Quantitative and qualitative results should be examined as well as anticipated and unanticipated consequences. b) Has the implementation of the strategy(s) resulted in building advocacy platforms with both internal and external colleagues? c) How has the implementation of the strategy(s) enhanced inclusion and integration of PoCs into national or local systems for education or child protection or SGBV? In particular, how have UNHCR programmes supported governments in this inclusion? d) Has there been any impact on UNHCR’s ability to leverage funding for education, child protection and SGBV through the rollout of the strategies? e) Have the roll out and implementation of the strategies strengthened partnerships locally and globally, i.e. cluster and/or interagency relations, as well as expanded national or other government level relationships with non-traditional UNHCR partners (i.e. social welfare ministries, education ministries)? f) Is there a measurable improvement in the capacity (knowledge, skills and attitudes) of UNHCR and partners due to the activities associated with the strategy(s) rollout? g) Have strategy(s) implementation results influenced or informed UNHCR corporate practices, i.e. Country

Operations Planning, the formulation of the Results Based Management system and its indicators (Focus).

Evaluability

SGBV, Child Protection and Education are protection priorities for UNHCR. This evaluation needs to provide clear evidence and findings in a way that captures the complexity of protection concerns. The most salient element of the evaluability of the three strategies pertains to the quality and availability of reliable data and access to stakeholders while maintaining a protection sensitive approach. Moreover, the ability to establish reliable baselines and a coherent theory of change in rapidly evolving situations or amongst fragile communities of recently displaced people can make it hard to measure impact against a set point. If the country operations have not kept statistics and other data to measure against since the roll out of the strategy(s), it will be difficult to appraise the impact of the strategy(s). Amplified reporting due to real or perceived incentives for reporting is another concern in attempting to measure efficacy. Also of concern is the presence of state or local statistics from law enforcement, health care, child protection services, and education institutions to triangulate data generated by UNHCR and partners against.

The implementation and results of the strategy(s) will be more readily evaluated in some countries than others, e.g. Yemen, Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic, due to access and security issues. The small number of priority countries in the Americas and Europe and their adoption of only one or two strategies will also impact comparability with those regions. One of the complexities in this evaluation is that different countries used different approaches in implementing the three different strategies.

Methodology

The evaluation will employ a “mixed-methods approach” in answering the three overarching questions of this evaluation, including qualitative and quantitative methods. Suggested evaluation methods include an extensive document and literature review to address the first question regarding the quality of the strategies. Mapping of the current monitoring data, multiple case study analysis and other comparative qualitative analysis techniques are suggested in order to review implementation and results. Key informant interviews will be key component throughout the evaluation.

Interviews and focus group discussions with key stakeholders including relevant UNHCR staff, national authorities, NGOs, refugee organizations, affected populations and host communities are encouraged as a data source. Consultations will ensure that diverse groups of refugees are included, including men, women, boys, girls, and persons with vulnerabilities. Data from the different sources will be triangulated against secondary data to ensure rigor in the findings.

The evaluation will use the Global Education Strategy, the Updated SGBV Strategy, the Global Child Protection Framework and the evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) key questions as the analytical reference points against which to draw conclusions about the performance and outcomes of the global strategies. The evaluation team will further refine the methodology and evaluation questions following the initial desk review and key informant interviews in an inception report. The inception report will specify the evaluation methodology, the refined focus and scope of the evaluation, including the evaluation questions, the sampling strategy and the data collection instruments.

The evaluation team will be expected to travel to up to six priority countries. The selection of the countries will be based on regional balance and size and type of operations (emergency, protracted). The final selection of the sample countries will be decided in the inception report and may include Chad, Rwanda, Bangladesh, India, Egypt and Mexico. The evaluation team will be expected to crossreference amongst the geographic regions and include countries that are inaccessible for travel by engaging them in surveys, phone interviews and the document review process.

Oversight and quality assurance

This evaluation will be managed jointly and equally by UNHCR's Division of International Protection and its Policy Development and Evaluation Service. The two work units will be responsible for the recruitment of the evaluation team. An internal steering committee will review interim deliverables of the evaluation, i.e. the inception report, research tools, draft reports. The internal stakeholders will include members of the Regional Bureaus and the Division of Programme Support and Management. The final draft of the evaluation report will be circulated to a selection of members of UNHCR's senior management team for comments.

UNHCR's Evaluation Policy emphasizes independence, transparency and relevance. These values will be safeguarded throughout the evaluation process. The Evaluation Managers from PDES and DIP will also be responsible for steering the process toward a result that ensures utilization for learning and future policy development.

The conduct of this evaluation exercise shall conform to UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System. The evaluators must be independent of the creation and implementation of the three strategies and to be evaluated and have no stake in the outcome of the evaluation.

Timeline, and Deliverables

The proposed timeline for the deliverables for this evaluation is as follows:

- 1) Country selection and travel schedule finalized by 16 October 2015
- 2) Inception report submitted 23 October 2015: The inception report should elaborate a detailed plan for the conduct of the evaluation, and provide an opportunity for the evaluation team to clarify any issues arising from the TOR. The inception report should include:
 - a) A preliminary analysis of the context, intervention and stakeholders
 - b) Detailed evaluation methodology, including, if necessary, sampling strategy and qualitative comparative methods and any quantitative methods
 - c) A refined set of evaluation questions, if necessary
 - d) An evaluation matrix, setting out how each of the evaluation questions will be answered (criteria, proposed methods and data sources)
 - e) A detailed schedule of activities and deliverables, designating who has responsibility for each.
- 3) Finalization of the data collection tools (including interview and focus group discussion guides, question sets and ranking systems for qualitative comparative analysis, survey questionnaires, etc.) submitted by 31 October 2015
- 4) Finalized Document and Literature Review on Comparative Frameworks submitted by 30 November 2015
- 5) Draft preliminary findings and evidence chain matrix submitted by 23 December 2015
- 6) Draft preliminary report for comments submitted by 28 February 2016
- 7) Debriefings on preliminary findings in the field and HQ by 15 March 2016

8) Final evaluation report³ issued by 25 March 2016

9) Evaluation brief submitted by 31 March 2016,

The final report should include an executive summary that briefly describes the subject, purpose and methods of the evaluation, and summarizes the main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The report's data collection and analysis should be sensitive to age, gender and diversity considerations, and the report should highlight whether there were differences in results for different beneficiary groups, as relevant. Findings should be based on analysis of the data, and must be relevant to the evaluation questions. Conclusions should be evidence-based, logically connected to the findings, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. Recommendations should be limited in number, actionable and directed to relevant actors. Annexes should include final TORs, data collection tools, the three strategies and other supporting documents.

Requirements

Evaluation of UNHCR's Implementation of the Global Education Strategy, Updated Strategy on SGBV and Child Protection Framework

UNHCR's Evaluation Policy emphasizes independence, transparency and relevance. These values will be safeguarded throughout the evaluation process. The Evaluation Managers from PDES and DIP will also be responsible for steering the process toward a result that ensures utilization for learning and future policy development.

The conduct of this evaluation exercise shall conform to UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System. The evaluators must be independent of the creation and implementation of the three strategies and to be evaluated and have no stake in the outcome of the evaluation.

Functional Requirements Include:

- Knowledge of UNHCR's mandate and refugee and protection issues;
- Key team members should have advanced degrees in the social sciences and supporting team members should have demonstrated skills in data analysis or other relevant skills;
- Ability to travel in all of the selected countries and UNHCR HQ in Geneva;
- Consistently ensures timeliness and quality of deliverables;
- Demonstrates strong oral and written communication skills;
- Evidence of ability to express ideas clearly; to work as a team and in collaboration with UNHCR teams;
- Ability to summarize and systematize complex information and identify priorities for follow up activities;
- Shares knowledge and experience;
- Focuses on results and responds positively to feedback.

Corporate Requirements include:

- Published evaluations that cover similar social issues and proven ability to carry out research in multiple countries;
- Ability to commit a research team to this evaluation for up to six months;
- Proven ability to gather, compare and translate complex data through mixed methods;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling ethical standards.

Other services, required for the performance of the key requirements

Ability to provide systematic project management reports and deliverables based invoices.

Customer Responsibilities

UNHCR expects to provide

- Letters of invitation for visas
- DSA (per diem) and/or travel reimbursements
- On-site transportation
- Facilitation of access to UNHCR and partner projects in the field

Add any additional relevant sections for the specific project

None

Content of the Technical Offer

Your Technical proposal should be concisely presented and structured in the following order to include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following information:

Company Qualifications

A description of your company with evidence of your company's capacity to perform this evaluation, including:

- Samples of other evaluations or research that pertains to forcibly displaced populations, refugee protection, children, education, SGBV and related topics;
- Company profile, registration certificate and last audit reports
- If a multi-location company, please specify the location of the company's headquarters, and the branches that will be involved in the project work with founding dates
- Three or more letters of reference, with contact information

Proposed Services

Respondents to this call for proposals should submit a technical proposal emphasizing: 1. their general strategy and approach, 2. the proposed evaluation methods and tools, and, 3. how they plan to organize the evaluation.

There is no minimum or maximum length for the technical proposal. However, sufficient detail and clarity are required. The proposal should stipulate the level of effort to be committed by the different team members in each phase of the deliverables referred to in the timeline. The same information should be featured in the financial proposal – costs should be clearly associated with the deliverable. Bidders may be asked to provide additional information at the proposal assessment stage.

Specific requirements: In addition to whatever other approaches and methods are proposed, the following specific items must be present in the bidding documents:

- Presentation of a work plan in all phases along the time lines presented above.
- Details on the overall design and data gathering methods to be used.
- Details of team members' relevant qualifications and the basic information about the organization submitting the bid.
- The level of effort for all team members in both the technical (without price) and financial proposals (with costs).

Personnel Qualifications

The technical proposal will evaluation needs to include the evaluation team. The team will be assessed on their suitability and experience for evaluating the three, key refugee protection strategies. Please provide CVs of all proposed team members for this evaluation. Personnel working on this evaluation should have at minimum the following:

- a) Master's degree in social sciences, statistics or another quantitative field;
- b) 3-8 years of junior to mid experience in applying research, evidence and data-driven decision making to medium and large-scale programs with an appreciation for practical and logistical constraints;
- c) Strong familiarity with various research and evaluation design concerns, including experimental and quasi-experimental methods;
- d) Strong familiarity with a range of data processing, statistical, and qualitative analysis software packages such as nVivo, Excel, etc., with the ability to discover, learn and apply new technologies that increase the efficiency of data analysis and learnings;
- e) Strong interpersonal and communications skills to work effectively with UNHCR teams in many locations;
- f) Willingness and ability to travel to the selected countries; and as needed to meet the demands of the programme, and,
- g) Fluency and strong writing skills in English are required. Fluency and strong writing skills in French is also useful.

Vendor Registration Form

If your company is not already registered with UNHCR, please complete, sign, and submit with your Technical Proposal the Vendor Registration Form (Annex C).

Applicable General Conditions

Please indicate your acknowledgement of the UNHCR General Conditions of Contract for the Provision of Services by signing this document (Annex D) and including it in your submitted Technical Proposal.

Evaluation

Technical Evaluation

The Technical offer will be evaluated using inter alia the following criteria and percentage distribution: 70% from the total score.

Company Qualifications

- Capacity to undertake contract
- References
- Proven track record of providing evaluations and evaluation services on complex social issues

Proposed Services

- General strategy and approach to the evaluation
- Proposed evaluation methodology and tools to be used
- Proposed organization of work

Personnel Qualifications

- Suitability and experience of the proposed team

Some technical criteria will be subject to minimum passing scores; if a bid does not meet these minimums it will be deemed technically non-compliant and will not proceed to the financial evaluation.

Key Performance Indicators

Performance Evaluation

UNHCR will monitor the performance of the contractor by reviewing the deliverables outlined in this ToR: the inception report, the data collection tools, preliminary drafts and findings reports and mission reports. In addition to the Evaluation Managers in UNHCR's Division of International Protection and the Policy Development and Evaluation Service, UNHCR will set up a steering committee of stakeholders to assess the progress and findings of the consultancy company. The UNHCR Evaluation Managers or steering committee members will travel to the selected locations with the consultants and will monitor their performance through observation and discussions on site.

Annex B Evaluation Matrix

Development of Evaluation Matrix

1. An initial evaluation matrix was developed during inception phase. Following the first round of data collection, it was determined that the initial set of evaluation sub-questions had not elicited sufficient information to answer the three key evaluation questions. The evaluation team reviewed the evidence available and the lines of inquiry still unanswered. Based on this assessment, the team revised the evaluation questions and broadened the research approach, which included additional rounds of data collection at the country office and headquarter levels. The evaluation matrix was revised in line with the changes to the evaluation questions, in January 2017.

2.

3. A final evaluation matrix is provided below. This summarises the data sources used to answer each set of the evaluation sub-questions, which in turn provide the basis to answer the detailed and headline evaluation questions.

4.

Table 1: Evaluation Matrix

	Detailed Evaluation Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources
Quality Are the three Strategies relevant, coherent, informed by evidence and adequately designed?	A.1 To what extent are the Strategies relevant to the needs of UNHCR [the organisation] and the context of implementation [people of concern, countries of operation?]?	<p>A 1.1 What was the (rationale) purpose of the Strategies?</p> <p>A 1.2 How were the Strategies developed? How consultative was this process? How did this process influence the Strategies?</p> <p>A.1.3 What evidence was used to design the Strategies?</p> <p>A.1.4 How was evidence used in the design of the Strategies?</p> <p>A.1.5 To what extent are the Strategies and their objectives appropriate in light of the evidence available?</p> <p>A.1.6 How relevant are the Strategies to the needs of key stakeholders, such as the needs of partners, and governments and Persons of Concern?</p> <p>A.1.7 How relevant are the Strategies to the global and country-level contexts of implementation? [particularly the fact that they will be implemented in vastly differing contexts]</p>	<p>Document review of HQ-level documents</p> <p>Detailed sector expert reviews of global strategies</p> <p>Interviews with HQ staff</p> <p>Interviews with staff from 15 country offices</p>
	A.2 To what extent are the three strategies coherent (internally and externally)?	<p>A.2.1 To what extent are terminology and structure consistent between the Strategies?</p> <p>A.2.2 To what extent are the Strategies coherent with each other and with other UNHCR policies and strategies? (How relevant are the Strategies to the needs, processes and operating environment of UNHCR?)</p> <p>A.2.3 To what extent are the Strategies coherent with global frameworks and commitments?</p>	<p>Detailed sector expert reviews of global strategies</p> <p>Document review of HQ-level documents</p> <p>Interviews with HQ staff</p>
	A.3 To what extent are the Strategies adequately designed to achieve their purpose?	<p>A.3.1 Do the Strategies provide a clear framework to guide key interventions and prioritisations at global and country level?</p> <p>A.3.2 Do the Strategies have clear, appropriate, and measurable objectives?</p> <p>A.3.3 What is the availability and clarity of support, advice and guidance accompanying the roll-out of the strategies at country level? Was it clear, user friendly?</p>	<p>Detailed sector expert reviews of global strategies</p> <p>Document review of HQ-level documents</p> <p>Interviews with HQ staff</p> <p>Interviews with staff from 15 country offices</p>
	A.4 How were the Strategies rolled out from HQ to Country Offices?	<p>A.4.1 To what extent was the roll-out process implemented as envisioned? What factors may have affected this? How well did it work?</p> <p>A.4.2 How were the countries selected for the roll-out? What were the criteria?</p> <p>A.4.3 To what extent was the roll-out adequately resourced and supported?</p> <p>A.4.4 To what extent has there been a process of lesson-learning and sharing during rollout?</p>	<p>Document review of HQ-level documents</p> <p>Interviews with HQ staff</p> <p>Interviews with staff from 15 country offices</p>

Headline evaluation questions	Detailed Evaluation Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources
Implementation To what extent have the Strategies been implemented?	B.1 To what extent have the global strategies been reflected /incorporated into stand-alone and /or overall protection and solutions strategies, and COP at country level?	B.1.1 How have country offices adapted the global strategy to local context and priority needs? B.1.2 How have Country Office engaged with other stakeholders in this process? B.1.3 Which factors supported or constrained implementation of the strategies at country level?	Document review of 15 country operations Interviews with staff from 15 country offices Interviews with government, partners and People of Concern (PoCs) from 5 case study country offices
	B.2 How did monitoring of the Strategies take place and was it adequate?	B.2.1. How was the implementation of the strategies monitored and reported on at the global and country level? B.2.2. How adequate and appropriate was this to credibly measure results?	Document review of HQ-level documents Document review of 15 country operations Interviews with HQ staff Interviews with staff from 15 country offices
Results What were the results of the Strategies?	C.1 To what extent have the Strategies contributed to achieving results at the institutional level?	C1.1 To what extent have the strategies improved core protection services? C1.2 To what extent have the strategies contributed to the enabling environment? C1.3 To what extent have the strategies strengthened partnerships?	Document review of 15 country operations Interviews with staff from 15 country offices Interviews with government, partners and People of Concern (PoCs) from 5 case study country offices
	C2. To what extent have the Strategies contributed to improving protection results for UNHCR's people of concern?	C.2.1 To what extent have the objectives of the Strategies been achieved? C.2.2 To what extent and how has this resulted in improved protection for people of concern? C.2.3 What factors have influenced the extent to which protection results have been achieved?	Interviews with staff from 5 case study country offices Document review of 5 country operations Interviews with government, partners and People of Concern (PoCs)

Annex C Document Review Process

The document review process aimed to answer the key questions and sub-questions defined in the evaluation matrix. In order to systematically present evidence from the document review, analytical annexes were prepared by the evaluation team. These annexes can be found in Volume I.

There were two sets of annexes. The first one focused on an analysis of the strategies, while the second one focused on an analysis of the adaptation and implementation experiences of the country offices. The second set of annexes was developed in detail for the case-study countries (i.e. Bangladesh, Egypt, Iran, Mexico and Rwanda), while the analysis on the additional 10 countries focused on targeted questions. This is further explained below.

C1. Instructions for completing strategy analytical annexes

The evaluation questions answered for each strategy were those falling under “Quality”:

A.1 To what extent are the Strategies relevant to the needs of UNHCR [the organisation] and the context of implementation [people of concern, countries of operation]?

A.1.1 What was the (rationale) purpose of the Strategies?

A.1.2 How were the Strategies developed? How consultative was this process? How did this process influence the Strategies?

A.1.3 What evidence was used to design the Strategies?

A.1.4 How was evidence used in the design of the Strategies?

A.1.5 To what extent are the Strategies and their objectives appropriate in light of the evidence available?

A.1.6 How relevant are the Strategies to the needs of key stakeholders, such as the needs of partners, and governments and Persons of Concern?

A.1.7 How relevant are the Strategies to the global and country-level contexts of implementation? [particularly the fact that they will be implemented in vastly differing contexts]

A.2 To what extent are the three strategies coherent (internally and externally)?

A.2.1 To what extent are terminology and structure consistent between the Strategies?

A.2.2 To what extent are the Strategies coherent with each other and with other UNHCR policies and strategies? (How relevant are the Strategies to the needs, processes and operating environment of UNHCR?)

A.2.3 To what extent are the Strategies coherent with global frameworks and commitments?

A.3 To what extent are the Strategies adequately designed to achieve their purpose?

A.3.1 Do the Strategies provide a clear framework to guide key interventions and prioritisations at global and country level?

A.3.2 Do the Strategies have clear, appropriate, and measurable objectives?

A.3.3 What is the availability and clarity of support, advice and guidance accompanying the roll-out of the strategies at country level? Was it clear, user friendly?

A.4 How were the Strategies rolled out?

A.4.1 To what extent was the roll-out process implemented as envisioned? What factors may have affected this? How well did it work?

A.4.2 How were the countries selected for the roll-out? What were the criteria?

A.4.3 To what extent was the roll-out adequately resourced and supported?

A.4.4 To what extent has there been a process of lesson-learning and sharing during rollout?

In order to complete the annexes for the strategies, the following documents were analysed:

- Global strategy documents
- Monitoring and reporting frameworks and data
- Monitoring material
- Reporting documents
- Meeting agendas
- Presentation material
- UNHCR policy documents
- Inter-agency policy documents and frameworks.

C2. Instructions for completing country annexes

The evaluation questions answered for each strategy were those falling under “Implementation” and “Results”:

B.1 To what extent have the global strategies been reflected /incorporated into stand-alone and /or overall protection and solutions strategies, and COP at country level?

B.1.1 How have country offices adapted the global strategy to local context and priority needs?

B.1.2 What factors influenced the ability to reflect/incorporate the global strategies at country level?

B.1.3 Which factors supported or constrained implementation of the strategies at country level?

B.2 How did monitoring of the Strategies take place and was it adequate?

B.2.1. How were the implementation of the strategies monitored and reported on at the global and country level?

B.2.2. How adequate and appropriate was this to credibly measure results?

C.1 To what extent have the Strategies contributed to achieving results at the institutional level?

C1.1 To what extent have the strategies improved core protection services?

C1.2 To what extent have the strategies contributed to an enabling environment?

C1.3 To what extent have the strategies strengthened partnerships?

C2. To what extent have the Strategies contributed to improving protection results for UNHCR’s people of concern?

C.2.1 To what extent have the objectives of the Strategies been achieved?

C.2.2 To what extent and how has this resulted in improved protection for people of concern?

C.2.3 What factors have influenced the extent to which protection results have been achieved?

These questions were answered in full for the 5 case-study countries. The annexes for the 10 additional countries focused on questions B.1 and C.1. Given the difficulty in attributing any change in reported indicators to the strategies, this level of in-depth analysis was reserved for the 5 case-

study countries, for which the evaluation team had more extensive detail arising from interviews conducted during fieldwork. Given that questions B.2 and C.2 relied on an analysis and comparison of reported indicators, these do not figure in the implementation and results annexes focusing on the 10 additional countries studied.

Below are the steps followed in order to complete the country annexes. In particular, these steps detail how the evaluation team searched for and compared indicators.

Step 1: Global Strategies

- Go through the global strategy documents and any annexes to the documents, in order to identify any potential keywords. Keywords must be specific to the goals and action areas of the strategies.
- Borrow keywords from the language already used in the global strategies – focus on specific terms/concepts in order to avoid lengthy keyword lists.

Step 2: Country-Level Strategies

- If country-level (CL) strategies are available, go through them.
- See whether you would add any additional keywords (e.g. do they speak about “survival sex” as “transactional sex”? If so, use both when you search in the COP)
- See whether the goals/action areas of the global strategy are reflected in it, explicitly or implicitly **and add them to the Implementation Table** (under Level of Adaptation)
 - o Explicitly or implicitly: Some CL strategies will explicitly say that they address AA1 and AA2 but then they mention aspects of AA6, even if they do not list it as an action area they are focusing on.
- Do they mention specific activities they want to implement (e.g. bridge training, SGBV campaigns)? Add these to the keywords to search for.

Step 3: COP 2016 (data at mid-year point)

- Go through the keywords for the goals/action areas to see which are reflected in the COP 2016 **and add to the implementation table** (under level of Adaptation)
- Do a quick search for keywords in COP 2012 to **fill in the contribution analysis** (i.e. are these goals only in COP 2016 or also in COP 2012)

Step 4: Comparison of COP 2012 and COP 2016 (data at mid-year point)

- Start with COP 2016
- Go through the keywords you have collected in the COPs (including those on activities)
 - o Are there activities/key concepts mentioned in COP 2016 not mentioned in COP 2012? For example, LGBTI would be one of those words. **Add any observations to the implementation table** (under Level of Implementation)
 - Indicate the goal or action area that they correspond to
 - Ex. G1: Creation of youth clubs as safe spaces for children
 - Ex. AA3: GBV campaigns targeting boys and men
 - o **Add general observations to the contribution analysis:** If LGBTI is mentioned in COP 2016 but not COP 2012, and it is additionally mentioned in the CL strategy, we could say that there is confirmatory evidence that the global strategy was a contributor to the inclusion of focus on LGBTI issues in the COP. If, additionally we have learned through the KIIs that the office did not deal with LGBTI issues until after the strategy, add this. On the other hand, if child-friendly procedures and interviews were in both COP 2012 and COP 2016, then we can infer these are issues/programming that were not motivated by the strategy.

Step 5: Indicators

- Start with COP 2016
- Go through all indicators (literally, scroll down and stop when you see a pertinent indicator)

- Copy-paste the indicators (along with basic information) where they belong. There are only 2 spaces where we will add indicators:
 - o Implementation: add input indicators
 - o Results: add output and outcome indicators
- **Be careful** not to add output/outcome indicators to input. Essentially, some of the goals and action areas are framed as concrete activities: Ex. “AA3 – Engaging men and boys.” If the indicator is on community campaigns and engagement, then add this to the results section, as this is an indicator that the UNHCR is meeting objective/action area 3 of the SGBV global strategy. Although this indicator could be seen as measuring an input (the output being more SGBV-aware men and boys, and the outcome potentially being changed attitudes and behaviour), this is considered an output for our purposes.
- Another example: “G3: Girls and boys have access to child-friendly procedures”. The indicator could be “Number of UNHCR staff trained in child-friendly procedures”. In this case, the indicator is an input, measuring an activity that can help achieve objective/goal 3 of the global CP framework.
- After you have a good sense of the indicators in COP 2016, go through the indicators in COP 2012.
 - o Which ones are only in COP 2016? Which goals/action areas do they refer to?
- Information to add on indicators:
 - o For 2012: Operational Target and Year-End
 - o For 2016: Operational Target and Mid-Year
 - o Off-track/on-track for 2016 figures (essentially, if MYR is less than half of OP target, off-track. Careful with indicators like “Number of children in detention” where being under half is actually on-track as objective is to have less children in detention)

Step 6: Institutional Results

- Keyword search: partners, partnerships, consultation, coordination, etc. (i.e. the words in the questions provided in the template)
- Add this information without providing too much detail
- Again, add to contribution analysis: E.g. What seems to have prompted more partnerships?

Step 7: Factors

- These will come from the CL strategy and the COP 2016 (not COP 2012)
- You can add these in the relevant sections as you read through the documents – I found this was the easiest
- For CL strategy on CP, read the chart on opportunities and challenges. For other CL strategies, it will depend on the structure and detail they provide.
- For COP 2016, read mainly the following sections:
 - o Unmet Needs
 - o Management Plan
 - o Partners
 - o Overview of Protection Situation
 - o Favourable Protection Environment
- You will note that many factors speak to all strategies rolled out. You can describe the factor more in full in the first strategy you evaluate, and for following ones say “As mentioned on page X, ...”. If there are examples that you could give for the same factor per strategy, include that.
- Adaptation factors: factors that facilitated or limited ability to adapt the strategy (political environment, policy framework) – focus here is on feasibility and enabling environment factors
- Operationalization factors: factors that facilitated or limited ability to implement an already adapted strategy/chosen programming – number of refugees increased without increase in funding, large staff turnover, emergency/crisis
- Results factors: factors that facilitate or prevent access of some POCs to the programming that is being rolled out by the UNHCR

Step 8: KII Tables

Go through KII tables and add any information that complements the data gathered through the document review (in particular around process questions, which will likely not be answered through the COPs and CL strategies).

Annex D Guide on Ethics Protocol for National Researchers

The following ethics protocol was designed in collaboration with the team leaders at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM). This protocol accompanied an ethics application, approved by LSHTM prior to starting fieldwork, and was followed at each stage of the training and data collection process.

Following advice by the ethics committee and the team leaders at LSHTM, children sampled in the study were older than 14 (inclusive). It was deemed that children under the age of 14 were at higher risk to be triggered by the topics that may be raised in focus group discussions (FGDs). They were thus excluded from this research. However, the evaluation team was exposed to their experiences through conversations with older children, who were able to speak anecdotally about other children in the detention centres or camps.

D1. During Researcher Training

Reflexivity: Research team concerns

Training sessions offer the opportunity for research team members to:

- Identify whether there are any concerns for the use of research tools in a particular cultural or local context. Concerns should be promptly communicated to the Team Leader to foster any necessary adaptations to approaches, study instruments, resources or team formation.
- Express (either privately to research managers or among the research group) any concerns for their safety, psychological well-being and any past experiences (e.g., disturbing events, similar current or past exposures) that might affect their desire or capacity to fulfil their role and their possible need for support or a different role within the research team.
- Recognize and talk about biases and their own prejudices and how any preconceptions or past experiences might influence their work.¹ Research managers can help determine the appropriate support or role for individuals.
- Be aware of the limits of the researcher's role and what researchers can achieve,² and establish professional boundaries.³
- Discuss the types of support they might need in conducting this research (e.g., de-briefing, breaks, capacity, etc.)
- Discuss which questions might be most sensitive to determine if they can be asked in safe and supportive ways and when during the interview these are best be posed.
- Discussions about these topics will be part of the training of researchers.

D2. During Researcher Training

- At the start of the interview (whether it is a KII, an FGD or a HHCS), the interviewer must inform respondents of the name, the commissioning organization, the purpose of the study, the subject of the questions that will be asked, especially if there will be some potentially sensitive or distressing subjects, and the use of the findings, including the participant's potential access to access the findings.. For instance, the questions that will be asked during adolescent FGDs in Rwanda focus on youth's experience with and perception of services on safety and protection. These questions are asked for the purpose of informing future protection activities by UNHCR. *More information on this is provided in the Information and Consent Form* (different form for different respondents to be developed in country).
- Second, researchers must inform respondents that:

¹ World Health Organization (2007). *Ethical and safety recommendations for researching, documenting and monitoring sexual violence in emergencies*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

² Laws, S., and Mann, G. (2004). *So you want to involve children in research? A toolkit supporting children's meaningful and ethical participation in research relating to violence against children*. Stockholm: Save the Children Sweden.

³ World Health Organization (2011). *Ethical and safety guidelines for sexual and reproductive health research and data collection with adolescents – DRAFT*. World Health Organization, Department of Reproductive Health and Research.

- The information they share will be kept confidential and will not be shared with anyone.
- One of the researchers will take notes of what is discussed during the interview, but the information they provide will remain anonymous (they will be assigned pseudonyms so their names will not appear on any records).
- Their decision to participate in the interview is voluntary, and that they may rescind from their decision to partake in the interview at any time (and may consequently end it at any time).
- They may choose to take a break and come back to the interview at any time, and as needed.
- They may refuse to participate in the interview, and that their refusal will not affect the services they are accessing now or may access in the future, nor will it influence the attitudes those offering those services have towards them.
- They can ask questions at any time to clarify information or if they don't understand something or if they want to know about possible resources for assistance.
- There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions.
- After explaining all of this, the interviewer must ask if the participant has any questions.
- Once the interviewer has ensured respondents understand what consent entails, the interviewer can proceed to handing out consent forms to be signed by each participant.
- If participants refuse to participate in the interview, ensure that you:
 - Reiterate that no consequences will result from their refusal
 - Take basic demographic information on gender, age, education level)(so that we understand if there are patterns to who is missing from the study responses)
 - Ask for reasons of refusal and document them.

Confidentiality and privacy

- Respect respondents' right to privacy and ensure that information remains confidential. This entails conducting interviews in locations that are private and using pseudonyms in the notes taken during the interview.
- Ask participants about the location/time selected for the interview, whether they feel safe and confident to have a conversation in the location selected (are they too close to others that might not allow them to speak freely). If not, the research team may need to discuss where to relocate.
- To ensure confidentiality in a group setting, researchers are required to seek agreement within the group from the outset, and explain the need for non-disclosure.⁴
- Nothing discussed during the interview should be disclosed with family or friends. The information should be stored safely and only communicated to the Team Leader.
- Researchers should also not talk about details of the interviews with others outside the research team or with one another in public spaces.
- It is specifically important that PEER (Participatory Ethnographic Evaluation and Research) researchers understand and commit to confidentiality. Given that PEER researchers are members of the community, they will have to maintain the anonymity and confidentiality of anything disclosed by other members. The proximity of the researchers to the interviewees puts the latter at higher risk.

Asking difficult questions

- Start by asking easy, non-threatening factual questions and icebreakers in order to establish rapport and assess the emotional readiness of the group. Sensitive questions should be asked after both participant and the interviewer feel comfortable.
- Sometimes what will be a sensitive subject can be difficult to predict. For example, sometimes asking a displaced person what may seem like a simple demographic question, such as about their family composition, might elicit memories about the family members they lost to violence or illness or who they have left behind. Or, asking parents about their child's highest level of education might remind them of their current worries about their children's future and how they

⁴ United Nations Children's Fund (2013). *Ethical Research Involving Children*. Florence: UNICEF.

will take proper care of them. This is worth discussing during the training as the team goes through the study topic guides.

- The interviewer must also be aware of cultural factors surrounding specific topics, and implement any safeguards discussed during training to avoid causing harm or getting misleading answers by using these questions in their current form.
- The impact of asking difficult questions can be softened by:
 - o Reminding respondents of confidentiality
 - o Using common language rather than technical terms
 - o Reminding respondents that they do not have to answer the questions should they not want to (i.e. right to be free from intrusion) or that they can take a break and come back to that question later.
 - o Showing sensitivity and sympathy, when needed, but not over-reacting or acting ashamed or uncomfortable if responses are surprising or upsetting.
 - o If needed, re-assuring the individual that there are resources to which they might be referred, if they want.
- It is important that PEER researchers ask difficult questions without excessively probing, or probing in a way that can be triggering for the interviewees. Given that gender-based violence may arise in PEER interviews, it is particularly important that probing does not focus on the event of violence, but rather on how interviewees responded to the event. Further, it is important to bring out the conversation from a focus on a singular interviewee's experience to the experience of young women in the community. By making the conversation more general, we reduce the risk of the interviewee being further triggered by the discussion, also preventing putting the interviewee in a position where they feel they need to continue disclosing. Of course, if the interviewee wants to tell the story, it is important not to cut them off and offer them the platform to speak.

Responding to emotional reactions

- Interviewers should be alert to potential distress throughout the interview. Given that the Team Leader or an additional researcher (aside from the main interviewer and note-taker) will be present in every FGD and HHCS, they should pay special attention to any verbal and non-verbal signs of distress.
- If a member of the research team spots signs of distress in an individual or within the group, respond compassionately, and pause the interview (as well as audio device), as needed. This might be a good time to take a water, fresh air or toilet break.
- Further, give the participant time to recover and ask if it is OK to continue talking about the issue. It may be useful or necessary to speak with the participant outside the venue where the interview is taking place (especially in a FGD).
- Have the TL (or additional researcher) speak with that person in private if the person wishes to leave the group
 - o Bring the participant in distress to an area where their confidentiality can be maintained, and where they can offer the participant support
 - o The TL should not attempt to provide counselling, but instead simply listen sympathetically and be attentive to any disclosure of abuse, suicidal ideation, or situation of imminent danger.
 - o Ask if they want to continue to discuss any aspect of the interview now.
 - o Ask if they want to be connected to any advice or support services that are available and then name the relevant options.
 - o Have some tissues and water to offer
 - o At this point, the researcher must show empathy to the rest of the group, acknowledge how difficult it must be to recall events and negative experiences, and ask the other participants whether they feel ready to continue the interview, whether they should have a break altogether, and whether anyone would like to withdraw from the interview
- If a particular topic or question is upsetting the respondents, change the subject and do not return to it.
- Try to finish the interview in a positive note.
- When you finish, thank the participant for their time and insights and tell them about the available options for information and support.

- These points are also important for PEER research. Although PEER research will be in more intimate settings, ensuring that the interviewee feels supported and heard is indispensable. Making sure not to switch topics too quickly if the respondent has had an emotional reaction, will show empathy, understanding and care. Further, it is important to ask whether the respondent is OK and whether they require anything at that moment (e.g. some water, tissue, or time), and in the long term (e.g. medical support).

Medical, support and information needs

- Who should be informed about medical care needs?
- Who should be informed about suicidal ideation?
- What services are available for medical care needs?
- What referral procedures need to be implemented?
- Other needs related to education, asylum registration, SGBV services, psychosocial support, etc. which persons of concern may ask

OPM will work with UNHCR in the first days of the visit to understand the appropriate protocols for medical referrals. In the rare event that it becomes clear that a respondent may have medical and support needs, the researcher should ask the respondent if they would like to be referred to a UNHCR-supported medical facility (to be followed up and case managed by UNHCR).

Researcher Safety

- Researchers need to consider their own safety from harm, placing this above completion of the research tasks at all times.⁵
- The OPM team will determine safe locations for the fieldwork, team oversight and check-in procedures, as needed.
- In addition to physical safety, it is important that researchers give thought to attending to their own feelings and reactions to what they hear or feel while conducting this research. If interviewers/note-takers become upset, feels distressed or feels like they need to take a break, talk to someone about what they may have heard, they can ask the Team Leader to continue the interview and arrange a time to discuss these feelings and their own care needs. The Team Leader must be ready to take on the responsibilities of the interviewer/note-taker.⁶ The Team Leader must also be prepared to discuss and assess the team member's care and support needs.
- Ensure that all data collection activities are in pairs at a minimum
- OPM national researchers will carry a small emergency card with key phone numbers for their UNHCR case manager focal point and the national research lead

D3. Post-interview

Confidentiality, Reporting and Referrals

- Respondents may recall upsetting, distressing, frightening, humiliating, or painful experiences. Any of these can cause an emotional response that requires a potential referral offer to support resources.
- Additionally, respondents could be currently experiencing violence, threats, coercion, deprivation or fear of future abuse and want immediate assistance with the situation and/or counselling.
- Offers of assistance should be offered freely, and uptake should be voluntary. Participants should be allowed to make decisions about the support they wish to accept and how they want to pursue the options.

⁵ Laws, S., and Mann, G. (2004). *So you want to involve children in research? A toolkit supporting children's meaningful and ethical participation in research relating to violence against children*. Stockholm: Save the Children Sweden.

⁶ United Nations Children's Fund (2013). *Ethical Research Involving Children*. Florence: UNICEF.

- In response to these needs, the team developed multiple ways to link respondents to support⁷
 - o First --> respondents were provided with a list of services, reflecting programs, services, and amenities currently offered near the research site, including but not limited to services for violence (to be provided by UNHCR)
 - o Free direct referrals were offered to those who:
 - Became upset during the interview
 - Felt unsafe in his or her current living situation, including his or her home or community, and was likely to experience recurrent violence
 - Experienced physical, emotional or sexual abuse in the past 12 months
 - Requested help for past or current experiences of violence
 - Requested help or information about other concerns (that may *seem* less urgent).
 - o If respondent indicated that they wanted a direct referral, the interviewer recorded contact information separately from survey responses and offered contact with a social worker
 - o In the instance of an acute case, defined as any respondent who self-identified as being in immediate danger, the interviewer immediately alerted their team lead, who then immediately called the point of contact at the Centre for Social Research
 - Appropriate actions for acute cases will be conducted on a case-by-case basis in order to best respond to the individual situation and to ensure that the respondent is not placed in any additional danger
- Reporting obligations (Ex. For child abuse and sex abuse). UNHCR should provide OPM researchers with a clear understanding of any local laws that might govern reporting and a referral form that corresponds to UNHCR case management procedures, in addition to other local NGOs who can provide services (if the respondent prefers). As per UNHCR guidelines for research protocols, UNHCR is responsible for ensuring follow-up with research for their persons of concern.
- Secure a safe management of the information

Researcher Support

- Debriefing sessions to be facilitated by the TEAM LEADER need to include discussions on how the interviews went and how researchers felt conducting them
- Talk about their feelings while they did the interviews or after fieldwork
 - o Where there any upsetting moments?
 - o DO NOT discuss participant comments with family or others outside the research

⁷ The Ministry of Gender, Children, Disability and Social Welfare, Republic of Malawi (2014). *Report: Violence Against Children and Young Women in Malawi – Findings from a National Survey 2013*.

Annex E Country Visit Details – Bangladesh

Bangladesh has been a priority roll-out country for the SGBV and Education strategies.

Overview on data collection activities

The country visit took place between 5 and 21 June 2016 and aimed to gather primary data for the evaluation using four main methods:

- Key informant interviews (KIIs) with 1) UNHCR staff in various roles, government officials and operational partners, and 2) service providers;
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with caregivers of children exposed to education intervention in the camps;
- Household Case Studies (HHCSs) with households with children in school;
- Participatory Ethnographic Evaluation and Research (PEER) particularly with women.

Five members of the Bangladeshi research firms Development Research Initiative (dRi) were trained over a period of 3.5 days on the use of the different data collection methods, the evaluation purpose and scope, and field work procedures.

Method	Sampling	Challenges	Response / mitigation
KII with UNHCR and partners	Purposive sampling and selection of every partner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The country-level strategies had only recently been finalised, which limited the information about strategy implementation. • Some KIIs asked for the interview not to be audio recorded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased sample to ensure adequate triangulation around strategy adaptation and implementation. • Only notes were taken. The interviewer stressed confidentiality and tried to establish rapport with KI.
KII with service providers	Purposive sampling, stratified random sampling, and selection of single provider*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several interviews needed to take place at the same time in the same location, which posed some challenges in terms of disrupting partners' daily work routine, and ensuring privacy during the interviews. • Some key informants were new in their positions, which limited the information they could provide. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partner was very cooperative in facilitating the KIIs.
FGD with caregivers	--	Access to the camps was not provided.	FGD were not conducted. More KIIs with service providers conducted.
HHCS			
PEER			

* In case only one service provider position was available in the camp, this person was selected for a KI. In the case of teachers and head teachers, a list of teachers and head teachers stratified by sex and camp was provided by the partner. The evaluation team randomly selected one person per stratum. In the case of SGBV case managers, the most experienced person was purposively sampled.

Workplan / Mission agenda

Dates	Activity	People involved	Location
5-6 June 2016	Arrival and introduction at UNHCR Country Office Introduction and training of local research team on evaluation and strategies	Tom Pellens (OPM) meets Mrs. Stina Ljungdell and Mr. Khaled Fansa. Tom Pellens meets dRI team members: Mamun-Ur-Rashid, Omar Faruque Siddiki, Sharmin Akhter, Shakila Sharmin and Md. Kutub Uddin	Dhaka
7-9 June 2016	Training of local research team in qualitative research methods	Tom Pellens, Max Izenberg [in replacement of Sourovi De] (OPM) and local research team members	Dhaka
10 June 2016	Travel from Dhaka to Cox's Bazar (CXB)	Tom Pellens, Max Izenberg, Mamun-Ur-Rashid and Omar Faruque Siddiki	Dhaka/CXB
12 June 2016	Introduction at UNHCR CXB Key informant interviews (KIIs) with UNHCR staff KII with SCI staff	Two interview teams: • Tom Pellens and Mamun-Ur-Rashid • Max Izenberg and Omar Faruque Siddiki	CXB
13-16 June 2016	KIIs with partners and stakeholders	Two interview teams: • Tom Pellens and Mamun-Ur-Rashid • Max Izenberg and Omar Faruque Siddiki	CXB/Ukhiya
18-21 June 2016	KIIs with service providers	Local research team under supervision of Mamun-Ur-Rashid	CXB/Ukhiya

Selected country-specific documents reviewed

Zeus, B. (2016) *Report of the Bangladesh Education Technical Support Mission April 17th to 21st 2016*, UNHCR Geneva

UNHCR Bangladesh (2016) *Rohingya Refugees Education strategy – Global Education Strategy 2012-2016 – Bangladesh joint strategy 2016-2017*, UNHCR internal document.

UNHCR Bangladesh (2016) *Gender Equality Study 2016*, document prepared by Maria Gabriela Espinosa Serrano.

UNHCR Bangladesh (2016) *Updated GBV Strategy – Kutupalong and Nayapara Camps*, UNHCR internal document.

UNHCR Bangladesh (2016) *Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh – Protection Strategy 2016, first draft March 2016*, UNHCR internal document.

List of stakeholders interviewed / covered by data collection activities

KIIs with UNHCR, Government and Partners

Organisation	Name	Position
UNHCR Dhaka office	Khaled Fansa (introduction meeting)	Senior Protection Officer
	Stina Ljungdell (Introduction meeting)	Country Representative
UNHCR Cox's Bazar office	Maria Gabriela Espinosa	Gender Advisor
	Nurul Huda	Community Services Associate
	Mai Terawaki	Programme Officer
	Shirin Aktar	Protection Associate
	Dr. M.M. Taimur Hasan	Assistant Public Health Officer
	John McKissick	Head of Sub Office
Save the Children International	Sujit Newar	Senior Officer Monitoring & Documentation
Technical Assistance Inc.	G.M. Khan	Director (Program & Operation)
UNFPA	Suman Chakma	Field Officer - Gender
Village Education Resource Center	Moniruzzaman Khan	Project Coordinator
Refugee Relief and Repatriation Commissioner	Rejoan Hossain	Joint Secretary
WFP	Karim Elguindi	Head of Sub Office

KII with service providers

Strategy	Type of service provider	Organisation
Education	Assistant Project Coordinators, of 1) Nayapara camp and 2) Kutupalong camp	Village Education Resource Center
	Head teachers of primary schools in 1) Nayapara camp and 2) Kutupalong camp	Village Education Resource Center
	Bangladesh teachers (male and female) at primary schools in 1) Nayapara camp and 2) Kutupalong camp	Village Education Resource Center
	Bangladesh teacher at junior secondary school in Kutupalong camp	Village Education Resource Center
SGBV	Community Service Coordinator of Nayapara and Kutupalong camps	Technical Assistance Inc
	Case managers of 1) Nayapara camp and 2) Kutupalong camp	Technical Assistance Inc
	Legal associate at Kutupalong camp	Technical Assistance Inc

Annex F Country Visit Details – Egypt

Egypt has been a priority roll-out country for all three protection strategies included in this evaluation: Child Protection, Education, SGBV.

Overview on data collection activities

The country visit took place between 15 and 21 May 2016 and aimed to gather primary data for the evaluation using four main methods:

- Key informant interviews (KIIs) with UNHCR staff in various roles, government officials and other partners, and service providers;
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with caregivers of children exposed to education intervention in the camps;
- Household Case Studies (HHCSs) with households with children in school;
- Participatory Ethnographic Evaluation and Research (PEER) with women in particular.

Four national researchers (2 Syrian, 1 Egyptian, 1 French-Syrian) were trained over a period of 4 days on the use of different data collection methods, the evaluation purpose and scope, and field work procedures.

Method	Sampling	Challenges	Response / mitigation
KII with UNHCR	Purposive sampling and selection of staff in programme and protection units at various roles in Zamalek offices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The education strategy had only recently been finalised, which limited the information about strategy implementation. • High staff turnover affected organisational memory particularly around CP and SGBV. • Some KIIs asked for the interview not to be audio recorded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased sample to ensure adequate triangulation around strategy adaptation and implementation. • Only notes were taken when appropriate. The interviewer stressed confidentiality and tried to establish rapport with KIIs.
KII with partners and service providers	Purposive sampling, stratified random sampling, and selection of single provider*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For education, service providers e.g. teachers were often unavailable since data collection occurred in summer. 	Partners were very accessible and eager to speak with the evaluation team
FGDs (CP and Education)	Purposive sampling – OPM staff developed criteria for selection, partners returned with lists of individuals who fit selection criteria, and OPM did stratified random sampling from list.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sampling was affected by some partners: (a) providing lists of respondents (from insufficiently diverse socio-economic groups); and (b) insisting in using their own facilities for the FGDs which carries the risk of Hawthorne effect bias / respondent bias. • Transportation around Greater Cairo became very difficult to identify a venue for FGDs that 	<p>OPM worked with partners to further convey the purpose of evaluation, and to re-sample from the initial list provided.</p> <p>OPM rented venues and hired transportation from convenient location.</p>

		would not be difficult for respondents.	
HHCS (CP and Education)	Purposive sampling – OPM staff developed criteria for selection, partners returned with lists of individuals who fit selection criteria, and OPM did stratified random sampling from list.	One of the partners cherry-picked respondents, often from insufficiently diverse socioeconomic group.	OPM worked with partners further convey purpose of evaluation and to resample from the initial list provided.
PEER (SGBV)	OPM worked with CARE to identify two community leaders who are in a community with survivors of SGBV (both African and Syrian). These are often case managers or survivors themselves.	PEER research as a method came with its own challenges. Respondents often felt lost with the limited structure with PEER. Some respondents even wanted to tell their own stories directly, with even less anonymity than how PEER is designed.	OPM worked with the partner and the community leaders (PEER researchers) to build rapport and to jointly structure the nature of the PEER research to best capture survivors' experiences with needs and services in Egypt.

* In case only one service provider position was available in the community school, this person was selected for a KI. In the case of teachers and head teachers, a list of teachers and head teachers stratified by sex and community school was provided by the partner. The evaluation team randomly selected one person per stratum. In the case of SGBV case managers, the most experienced person was purposively sampled.

Workplan / Mission agenda

Dates	Activity	People involved	Location
15 May 2016	Introduction at UNHCR Zamalek Office Key informant interviews (KIs) with UNHCR staff OPM spent the afternoon with internal planning.	Max Izenberg (MI) (OPM) and Karin Seyfert (KS) (OPM) met Maria Bances del Rey, Elsa Bousquet (joined later), Mohamed Shawky, Helen Hayford, Gina Bylang, Marios Buga, Sherif Fetouh, Yasmine Serry, Mohamed Ismail, and Esraa Mohamed. The national researchers for the evaluation team (Yasmine Rifaat and Felicie Dhont) joined later. KS facilitated internal training.	Cairo (Zamalek)
16 May 2016	Introduction at UNHCR 6 th of October Office KII with UNHCR staff Meeting with the Country Representative, Elizabeth Tan and Dep. Rep Bernadette Castel	MI and KS met with Danielle Beasley, Menna Elsabbagh and Nesreen El Sady. MI and KS met with Elizabeth Tan, Bernadette Castel, and Maria Bances del Rey. The remaining OPM internal planning and trainings involved 1	Cairo (Zamalek)

	OPM internal planning and training	OPM staff and the entire national research team – Yasmine Rifaat, Laura Abaza, Randa Bashlah, and Felicie Dhont. MI hosted internal training.	
17 May 2016	KII with community school staff and Ministry of Education OPM internal training. OPM attended UNHCR-hosted health working group	OPM research team, Mohamad Shawkey, partner, MoE. MI hosted internal training.	Cairo
18 May 2016	KII with SCI and CRS staff KII with NCCM OPM internal training.	OPM research team, CRS, SCI MI hosted internal training.	Cairo
19 May 2016	KII with UNICEF KII with CARE OPM internal training	Two interview teams: - Max Izenberg to UNICEF - Karin Seyfert and researchers to CARE KS/MI facilitated internal training.	Cairo
22-26 May 2016	Ongoing HHCS and FGDs with support from SCI and CRS. KII with St. Andrews Relief Services Followup with UNHCR KIIs Coordination with CARE for PEER OPM internal training (outstanding items) Debrief with Representative joined by Bernadette Castel, and Maria Bances del Rey	OPM research team, CRS, SCI, CARE, UNHCR Zamalek, St. Andrews Relief Services.	Cairo
26 May – early July 2016	Ongoing FGDs, HHCS, PEER	National research team under the supervision of Felicie Dhont with close coordination with Karin Seyfert and Max Izenberg	Cairo

Selected country-specific documents reviewed

UNHCR (2016) *SGBV multi-country programme review*, internal UNHCR document prepared by an independent consultant.

UNHCR (2014) *Child Protection Mission Report – Egypt*, UNHCR internal document.

Egypt SGBV Subworking group (2014) *Egypt interagency strategy on SGBV*, working document for subworking group.

UNHCR Egypt (2016) *Logframe for Live, Learn, Play Safe 2014-2016*, UNHCR internal document.

UNHCR Egypt (2016) *Overview of UNHCR Egypt*, UNHCR internal document.

UNHCR Egypt (2016?) *Revised education strategy*, internal UNHCR document.

UNHCR Egypt (2015) *Child Protection Strategy – Egypt*, UNHCR internal document.

UNHCR Egypt (2013) *Draft- Education Strategy*, UNHCR internal document.

UNHCR Egypt (2013) *Monitoring Note – September 2013*, UNHCR internal document.

UNHCR Egypt (2013) *Review Strategy Checklist – September 2013*, UNHCR internal document.

UNHCR Egypt (2013) *SOPs for non-Syrian Cairo Operation – November 2013*, UNHCR internal document.

UNHCR Egypt (2013) *SOPs for Syria operation – April 2013*, UNHCR internal document.

List of stakeholders interviewed / covered by data collection activities

KII with UNHCR, Government, and Partners

Organisation	Name	Position
UNHCR	Elizabeth Tan	Representative
	Bernadette Castel	Deputy Representative
	Maria Bances de Rey	Senior Protection Officer
	Elsa Bousquet	Protection Officer
	Marius Buga	Programme Officer
	Danielle Beasley	CP Officer
	Daniele Tessandori	Protection Officer
	Mohammed Shawky	Asst. Education Officer/Head of Unit
	Israa Mohammed	Education Assistant
	Mohammed Ismail	Education Associate
	Helen Hayford	Associate CP Officer
	Gina Bylang	Technical Advisor on case management and CP/SGBV
	Menna Elsabbagh	SGBV Case Manager
Save the Children	Heba El Azzazy	Child Protection Project Manager
	Nohier Nashaat	Child Protection Programme Manager
CARE	Sandra Azmy	Initiative Manager – Women’s Rights Programme
National Council for Childhood and Motherhood	Ahmed Mohammed Hanafy	NCCM Child Helpline Coordinator and Child Labour Specialist
Ministry of Education	Inas Ragab	Director of Cultural Relations and Foreign Student Dept.
Catholic Relief Services	Dina Refaat	Project Manager
UNICEF	Elisa Calpona	Child Protection Specialist
	Hind Omar	Education Specialist
	Javier Aguilar	Chief, Child Protection and Adolescent Development

St. Andrews Refugee Services	Pamela Groder	Head of Programming
------------------------------	---------------	---------------------

KII with service providers

Strategy	Type of service provider	Organisation
Child Protection	Case Worker (2), Facilitator (1), Psychologist (1)	SCI
Education	Case Worker (1), Project Asst. for Quality Education	CRS
	Education Officer/Board Member	Fard Foundation
	Head of school and head teacher	Massaken Osam Community School
SGBV	Case workers (4)	CARE

Annex G Country Visit Details – Iran

Iran has been a priority roll-out country for the education strategy.

Overview on data collection activities

The country visit took place in Tehran, Isfahan, and Shiraz between 21-30 June, 2016 and aimed to gather primary data for the evaluation using three main methods:

- Key informant interviews (KIIs) with 1) UNHCR staff in various roles, government officials and operational partners, and 2) service providers;
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with caregivers of children enrolled in public and NGO-provided educational services, as well as with service providers (teachers);
- Household Case Studies (HHCSs) with households with Afghan children (in and out of school).

Method	Sampling	Challenges	Response / mitigation
KII with UNHCR and partners	Purposive sampling and selection of every partner. UNHCR identified the partners that OPM should meet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The country-level strategy has not been finalised, which limited the information about strategy implementation. • Some observation bias from UNHCR facilitating the KIIs with government partners. • Some reluctance in sharing information with the evaluation team from some partners. • Some KIIs asked for the interview not to be audio recorded because they considered the topic sensitive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased sample to ensure adequate triangulation around strategy adaptation. • The evaluation team conveyed and reiterated the scope and purpose of the evaluation. • Only notes were taken. The interviewer stressed confidentiality and tried to establish rapport with KII.
KII and FGDs with service providers	Purposive sampling – OPM provided UNHCR Iran with specifications for respondent type to schedule interviews.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several interviews needed to take place at the same time in the same location, which posed some challenges in disrupting partners' daily work routine, and ensuring privacy during the interviews. • Some key informants were new in their positions, which limited the information they could provide. • Some service providers sampled had little connection to UNHCR. • Observation and respondents bias affected some of the interview data from FGDs. • In some instances, FGDs ended earlier in response to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partner was often very cooperative in facilitating the KIIs. • Clarification on the purpose of the evaluation and sampling requirements. • Clarification on the risks that biases pose to the evaluation findings. • Clarification on the risks that biases pose to the evaluation findings, and joint review with the CO of possible options to gather data from service providers minimising bias and external influence

		participants feedback / reactions.	during data collection activities.
FGD with caregivers/ persons of concern	Purposive sampling – OPM provided UNHCR Iran with specifications for respondent type to schedule FGDs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In one of the sites visited, the observation bias significantly affected the reliability of data gathered. • In some instances, FGDs ended earlier in response to participants feedback / reactions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification on the risks that biases pose to the evaluation findings, and joint review with the CO of possible options to gather data from service providers minimising bias and external influence during data collection activities.
HHCS	Purposive sampling – OPM identified Afghan households within concentrated Afghan neighborhoods who likely attend UNHCR-supported schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The composition of the evaluation team – accompanied by a UNHCR staff could have affected the HHCS process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller team sizes among HHCS perhaps led the respondents to feel more comfortable. When possible, female researchers would speak to female members of the household (including out of school girls).

Workplan / Mission agenda

Dates	Activity	People involved	Location
21 June 2016	OPM research team arrives in Tehran/welcome dinner with UNHCR	Karin Seyfert (OPM), Max Izenberg (OPM), Matin Mortazavi (UNHCR), Marat Atamuradov, UNHCR (and his family)	Tehran
22 June 2016	OPM meets with UNHCR for introduction, introduction to BAFIA, and KII with MoE	UNHCR country representative, UNHCR deputy representative, programme officer, programme associate, BAFIA, MoE, LMO, OPM	Tehran
23 June 2016	OPM meets with UNHCR programme unit and INGO/UN partners	DRC, NRC, Relief International, UNESCO, UNICEF; UNHCR health officer, UNHCR livelihoods staff), OPM	Tehran
25 June 2016	OPM visits NGO school which provides non-formal education to Afghans and Iranians. FGD with service providers and FGD with parents of schoolchildren (all Afghan). Introduction to Tehran BAFIA.	BAFIA, ILIA (NGO), OPM, UNHCR, PoC	Tehran
26 June 2016	Meetings with BAFIA/local MOE/local LMO	BAFIA, MOE, LMO, OPM, UNHCR, NGO (Sahife Sajadieh), PoC	Isfahan

	Meeting with a local NGO which provides livelihoods opportunities to Afghans FGD with parents of students attending government school supported by UNHCR		
28 June 2016	Meet with UNHCR Shiraz suboffice staff Meet with BAFIA/MOE/LMO Visit UNHCR constructed school, and FGD with service providers	BAFIA, MOE, LMO, OPM, UNHCR, Shah Dayi Allah school staff	Shiraz
29 June 2016	HHCS, FGD with parents of school-aged children, FGD with students of LMO courses, FGD with DAFI scholarship recipients	UNHCR, OPM, PoC	Shiraz

Selected country-specific documents reviewed

UNHCR (2016). *Draft education strategy for the Islamic Republic of Iran: 2012-2016*, internal UNHCR document.

UNHCR (2015). *Education a Child proposal: UNHCR Iran, final draft*, internal UNHCR document.

UNHCR (2015), *Implementation plan and logframe for Educate a Child, Iran*, internal UNHCR document.

UNHCR (2015), *Project summary: Improving access to quality education for refugees in Iran*, internal UNHCR document.

UNHCR/DAFI (2014?). Report summarizing the DAFI scholarship programme in Iran (exact title unspecified).

UNHCR (2012) *Education Strategy 2012-2016*, UNHCR Division of International Protection.

List of stakeholders interviewed/covered by data collection activities

KIIs with UNHCR, Government and Partners

Organisation	Name	Position
UNHCR Tehran office (ORT)	Marat Atamuradov	Programme Officer
	Matin Murtazavi	Programme Associate
	Sivanka Dhanapala	Country Representative
	Fathia Abdalla	Deputy Representative
	Abdou Djuma Habimana	Senior Administrative/Finance Officer
	Arjun Jain	Senior Protection Officer (Outgoing)

	Tomoko Fukumura	Senior Protection Officer (Incoming)
	Gelareh Hooshyar	Programme Associate
	Hamid Poshtyar	Field Safety Associate
	Sanaz Jahanshahi	Programme Associate
	Sara Karami	Sr. Community Services Associate
	Trine Korsholm Jensen	Associate Community Services Officer
	Wonjae Lee	Associate Programme Officer
UNHCR Tehran (Field Office)	Abdulaziz Ashoori	Assistant Field Officer
	Arash Behazin	Field Officer
	Ladan Moshari	Programme Associate
	Roya Zargarbashi	Programme Associate
	Siavash Maghsoudi	Field Associate
UNHCR Isfahan (Field Office)	Rana Ebrahimi	Head of Field Unit
	Mina Kalantari	Senior Field Assistant
UNHCR Shiraz (Suboffice)	Azadeh Gishani	Senior Programme Assistant
	Alex Kishara	Head of Suboffice
	Danial Koupi	Programme Associate
	Marzieh Khodadad	Senior Programme Assistant
	Shiva Farzin	Community Services Associate
Central BAFIA	Farrokh Sasani	Dept. general of international dept.
	Mr. Farahmand	
BAFIA Tehran	Ms. Basir	Education specialists
	Ms. Ahmadi	
BAFIA Isfahan	Mr. Soleimani	
	Mr. Naal Bandi	
BAFIA Shiraz	Mr. Vesaali	Deputy General for Fars Province
Central MoE	Mr. Asgari	International Section of MoE
	Ms. Movahed	International Section of MoE
MoE Tehran	Mr. Ghorbani	
MoE Isfahan	Ms. Fatehi	
MoE Shiraz	Mr. Goodarzi	
Central LMO	Mr. Jamshidi	Head of Budget and Finance
	Mr. Mirkamali	Unknown
	Hassan Nedjad	International Department
LMO Isfahan	Mr. Narimani	
	Mr. Barenji Zadeh	

LMO Shiraz	Mr. Isa Malek Pour	Deputy of LMO Shiraz
	Mr. Alireza Torabi	Head of Office for Literacy Courses and Deputy Head of LMO-Fars Province
	Mr. Khosh Nazar	Office of the Evaluation
	Mr. Momeni	
	Mr. Kharman Daar	Evaluation Expert
UNICEF	Christine Weigard	Education Staff
	Sara Yasan	
UNESCO	Mary Anne Theresa Manuson	Education Staff
DRC	Matt Byrne	Education Staff
	Mona Hadisi	
NRC	Olivier Vandecasteele	Education Staff
	Zahra Khedri	
Relief International	Varinda Dar	Education Staff
	Rana Bahramali	

KII with service providers

Strategy	Type of service provider	Organisation
Education	Meeting with school principal, ethics teacher, English teacher, technology and vocational teacher, office assistant, and deputy principal	Aftab School, government school (Tehran)
	Meeting with school director and board member, social worker, and volunteer	Ilia NGO School (Tehran)
	Meeting with school principal, 4 th grade teacher, deputy principal, ethics teacher, 1 st grade teacher	Shaah Dayi Allah area, government school (Shiraz)

Annex H Country Visit Details – Mexico

Mexico has been a priority roll-out country for the Child Protection strategy.

Overview on data collection activities

The country visit took place in the two locations of Mexico City and Tapachula from 6 to 23 June 2016 and aimed to gather primary data for the evaluation using three main methods:

- Key informant interviews (KIIs) with 1) UNHCR staff in various roles, government officials and operational partners, and 2) service providers;
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with 1) caregivers of children exposed to child protection interventions in detention centres, and 2) children exposed to child protection interventions in shelters and detention centres; and
- Household Case Studies (HHCSs) with households with school-aged children.

Refugees were interviewed in detention centres, shelters or in their homes in Tapachula. No interviews with refugees were conducted in Mexico City. Access to detention centres in Mexico City and Tapachula was granted by the National Migration Institute (INM).

Two members of the Mexican research firm Empatitit were trained over a period of 2 days on the use of different data collection methods, the evaluation purpose, scope, and field work procedures.

Method	Sampling	Challenges	Response /mitigation
KII with UNHCR and partners	Purposive sampling and selection of every partner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No challenges identified. Interviews conducted as planned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country office staff cooperative in facilitating KIIs. • Purpose of evaluation stressed to ensure respondents understood evaluation was not on the quality of their work, in order to encourage sharing of information.
KII and FGDs with service providers	Purposive sampling – OPM provided UNHCR Mexico with specifications for respondent type to schedule interviews.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No challenges. UNHCR Mexico had communicated the purpose of the evaluation well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the country and field offices were very cooperative in facilitating the KIIs. • Purpose of evaluation stressed to ensure respondents understood evaluation was not on the quality of their work, in order to encourage sharing of information.
FGD with caregivers and adolescents	Purposive sampling – OPM provided UNHCR Mexico with specifications for respondent type to schedule FGDs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, no problem with access. • The low number of adolescents (higher numbers of children under age 14) resulted in smaller than expected focus groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPM consultants accompanied local research teams to FGDs. Where more interviewers were needed, Daniella Dávila Aquije (OPM) conducted interviews in Spanish. • Research team was in constant communication with local team leader to discuss progress of

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On one occasion, the girls preferred to be interviewed one-to-one rather than as a group. • OPM attempted to speak with a group of adolescents in detention in Tapachula, the group convened by the detention centre staff did not include any youth intending to file an asylum claim. 	fieldwork in absence of OPM consultants.
HHCS	Purposive sampling – OPM provided UNHCR Mexico with specifications for respondent type to schedule HHCSs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific challenges identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research team was in constant communication with local team leader to discuss progress of fieldwork in absence of OPM consultants.

Workplan / Mission agenda

Dates	Activity	People involved	Location
5 June 2016	Arrival OPM consultants in Mexico	Daniella Dávila Aquije (OPM) Sope Otulana	Mexico City
6 June 2016	Introductory Meeting with Protection Unit at UNHCR Mexico KII with Protection Officer, Protection Assistant Officer, Protection Associate, and Child Protection Assistant KII with COMAR	Daniella Dávila Aquije and Sope Otulana	Mexico City
7 June 2016	KII with DIF	Daniella Dávila Aquije and Sope Otulana	Mexico City
8 June 2016	Visit to Migrant Detention Centre “Las Agujas” KII with Sin Fronteras KII with INM	Daniella Dávila Aquije and Sope Otulana	Mexico City
9 June 2016	KII with CAFEMIN and PCR KII with Programme Staff	Daniella Dávila Aquije and Sope Otulana	Mexico City
10 June 2016	KIIs with Casa Alianza Validation Workshop Introductory Meeting with local research team Empatitís	Daniella Dávila Aquije and Sope Otulana Empatitís researchers, Mónica Orozco and Inji El Abd	Mexico City
12 June 2016	Arrival of OPM consultants and Empatitís researchers in Tapachula	Daniella Dávila Aquije, Sope Otulana, Mónica Orozco and Inji El Abd	Travel

13 – 14 June	Training of local research team in qualitative methods and evaluation instruments	Daniella Dávila Aquije, Sope Otulana, Mónica Orozco and Inji El Abd	Tapachula, Chiapas
15 – 17 June 2016	Presentation by protection staff in Tapachula field office Ongoing FGDs and HHCSs in shelters and migrant detention centres	Daniella Dávila Aquije, Sope Otulana, Mónica Orozco and Inji El Abd	Tapachula, Chiapas
20 – 21 June 2016	Ongoing FGDs and HHCSs in shelters	National research team under the supervision of Mónica Orozco, with close coordination with Daniella Dávila Aquije and Sope Otulana	Tapachula, Chiapas

Selected country-specific documents reviewed

UNHCR Mexico (2014) *Mexico CP Framework*, UNHCR internal document.

UNHCR Mexico (2014) *Mexico CP Framework Strategy Logframe*, UNHCR internal document.

UNHCR Mexico (2013) *Monitoring Note*, UNHCR internal document

UNHCR Mexico (2014) *Monitoring Note*, UNHCR internal document

List of stakeholders interviewed/covered by data collection activities

KII with UNHCR, Government and Partners

Organisation	Name	Position
UNHCR Mexico City Office	Anya Victoria	Protection Associate
	Jose Francisco Sieber	Protection Officer
	Maria Isabel Remolina	Child Protection Assistant
	Sofia Lascurain	Protection Assistant Officer
	Unknown	Programme Officer
UNHCR Tapachula Field Office	Claudia Aceves	Protection Associate
	Perrine Leclerc	Head of Office
Mexican Refugee Commission (COMAR)	Cinthia Pérez	Director, Interagency Affairs and Protection
Child Welfare System (DIF)	Fernando Negrete	Director, Unit of Restitution of Protection Measures
National Migration Institute (INM)	Héctor Hugo Alemán	Director, Migratory Resolutions
Programa Casa Refugiados (PCR)	José Luis Loera	Director
	Gerardo Talavera	Program Coordinator
Sin Fronteras	Carolina Carreno	Director

CAFEMIN	Sister Sol	Manager of shelter
Casa Alianza (Covenant House)	Unknown	Director

KII with service providers

Strategy	Type of service provider	Organisations
Child Protection	Shelter staff	CAFEMIN, Covenant House, Tapachula-based shelters (“3 Angeles,” “Albergue Temporal del Menor Migrante,” “Albergue Municipal para Ninas Migrantes,” “Daily Centre for Migrant Children,” and “Jesús el Buen Pastor del Pobre y el Migrante”). Interviews in Tapachula-based shelters were ad-hoc, with staff present.

Annex I Country Visit Details – Rwanda

Rwanda has been a for priority roll-out country for all three protection strategies included in this evaluation: Child Protection, Education, SGBV.

Overview on data collection activities

The country visit took place in the three locations of Kigali, Byumba and Kirehe from 16 May to 3 June 2016 and aimed to gather primary data for the evaluation using three main methods:

- Key informant interviews (KIIs) with 1) UNHCR staff in various roles, government officials and operational partners, and 2) service providers;
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with 1) caregivers of children exposed to education and child protection interventions in the camps, and 2) children exposed to child protection interventions in the camps, 3) service providers;
- Household Case Studies (HHCSs) with households with school-aged children

Five days of access were granted for interviews in the camps. Access was provided by the Government of Rwanda, through the Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee Affairs (MIDIMAR). KIIs with UNHCR, partners and government were mostly conducted in person in the period of May 23rd-27th, 2016.

Eleven members of the Rwandan research firm Centre for Economic and Social Studies (CESS) were trained over a period of 5 days on the use of different data collection methods, the evaluation background and field work procedures.

Method	Sampling	Challenges	Response / mitigation
KII with UNHCR and partners	Purposive sampling and selection of every partner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only the country-level CP strategy had been recently finalized, which limited the information about strategy implementation. • Some KIIs asked for the interview not to be audio recorded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased sample to ensure adequate triangulation around strategy adaptation and implementation. • Only notes were taken when KIIs declined being recorded. The interviewer stressed confidentiality and tried to establish rapport with KI.
KII and FGDs with service providers	Purposive sampling – OPM provided UNHCR Rwanda with specifications for respondent type to schedule interviews.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several interviews needed to take place at the same time in the same location, which posed some challenges in terms of disrupting partners' daily work routine, and ensuring privacy during the interviews. • Some service providers sampled, such as the volunteers, had little connection to UNHCR Rwanda. They were mainly in touch with the partners who had hired them for the provision of services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the country and field offices were very cooperative in facilitating the KIIs. • Clarification on the purpose of the evaluation and ideal sampling approach, as well as constant check-ins with field offices to ensure sampling approach met minimum requirements.

FGD with caregivers and adolescents	Purposive sampling – OPM provided UNHCR Rwanda with specifications for respondent type to schedule FGDs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response bias and some external influence during data collection activities impacted on the reliability of data gathered through FGDs. • At Mahama camp, UNHCR field officers attended all FGDs with caregivers and adolescents. • Timing and scheduling issues affected the participation in some FGDs particularly in Gihembe camp. • The composition of some of the caregivers groups convened in Gihembe camp affected the usability of some of the data gathered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sampling requirements were communicated and discussed with UNHCR field offices to adjust and correct as feasible the shortcomings identified in the Gihembe camp. • As shortcomings persisted, repeated discussions with CO were held regarding the need to maintain the integrity of the data collection process for the evaluation. • OPM was in constant communication with local research team leader to discuss ways to mitigate bias – particularly response bias and influence during FGDs.
HHCS	Purposive sampling – OPM provided UNHCR Rwanda with specifications for respondent type to schedule HHCSs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At Mahama camp, UNHCR staff attended all HHCSs with caregivers and adolescents, which carries the risk of bias – and in turn affects the reliability of data gathered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research team was in constant communication with OPM to discuss ways to mitigate response bias and improve the quality of and acceptability of FGDs activities.
PEER	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to perception of response fatigues, no access was provided to SGBV survivors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGBV-related issues were only discussed in FGDs with SGBV volunteers.

Workplan / Mission agenda

Dates	Activity	People involved	Location
16 May 2016	Arrival OPM consultants in Rwanda	Daniella Dávila Aquije (OPM) Katie McKintosh (from 21 May), in replacement of Sope Otulana (due to medical reasons).	Kigali
17-21 May 2016	Training of local research team in qualitative research methods	Daniella Dávila Aquije and CESS local research team members	Kigali
23 May 2016	Introductory Meeting with Protection Unit at UNHCR Rwanda Meeting with UNHCR Rwanda's Deputy Representative KIIs with UNHCR Staff	Daniella Dávila Aquije and Katie McKintosh (OPM)	Kigali
24 May 2016	KII with UNHCR CO's Senior Protection Assistant	Daniella Dávila Aquije and Katie McKintosh	Kigali

	KII with UNHCR CO's External Relations Officer		
25 May 2016	KII with MIDIMAR KII with Save the Children	Two interview teams: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daniella Dávila Aquije interviewed MIDIMAR in Byumba Katie McKintosh interviewed Save the Children in Kigali 	Byumba/ Kigali
26 May 2016	KIIs with partners (Handicap International, LAF and ADRA)	Daniella Dávila Aquije and Katie McKintosh	Kigali
27 May 2016	KIIs with UNHCR CO's Programme Unit Validation Workshop	Daniella Dávila Aquije and Katie McKintosh	Kigali
24 May – 27 May	Ongoing KIIs, FGDs and HHCSs in Gihembe Camp	National research team under the supervision of Athanasie Kabagwira, with close coordination with Daniella Dávila Aquije	Byumba
30 May – 3 June 2016	Ongoing KIIs, FGDs and HHCSs in Mahama Camp	National research team under the supervision of Athanasie Kabagwira, with close coordination with Daniella Dávila Aquije	Kirehe

Selected country-specific documents reviewed

UNHCR Rwanda (2013) *Rwanda Education Strategy (Draft)*, UNHCR internal document.

UNHCR Rwanda (2015) *Rwanda Three-Year EAC Proposal (Final)*, UNHCR internal document.

UNHCR Rwanda (n.d.) *CP Strategy M&E Logframe*, UNHCR internal document.

List of stakeholders interviewed / covered by data collection activities

KII with UNHCR, Government and Partners

Organisation	Name	Position
UNHCR Kigali Office	Machtelt De Vriese	Senior Protection Officer
	Florian Hopfner	Protection Officer
	Nathalie Bussien	Child Protection Officer
	Matthew Crentsil	Deputy Representative
	Charles Munyaneza	Senior Protection Assistant
	Adele Man-Ho Guidita	Programme Officer
	Said Osman	Senior Programme Officer
	Martina Pomeroy	External Relations Officer

MIDIMAR	Jean Claude Rwahama	Director, Refugee Affairs
Plan International	Anne Toussaint	Project Manager, Child Protection and SGBV
Save the Children	Edwin Kuria	Director, Program Operations
Handicap International	Emmanuel Gashema	Manager, Rights and Protection
Legal Aid Forum (LAF)	Frank Mugisha	Programme Manager
Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA)	Samuel Ndayambaje	Project Manager, Education
UNICEF	Ramatou Toure-Merlo	Chief, Child Protection Programme

KII with service providers

Strategy	Type of service provider	Organisation
Child Protection	Child Protection community volunteers	Refugee volunteers recruited by Plan International and Legal Aid Forum
	Plan International camp staff	Plan International
	Save the Children camp staff	Save the Children
	LAF camp staff	LAF
Education	Teachers	Refugee volunteers recruited by ADRA
	ADRA camp staff	ADRA
SGBV	SGBV community volunteers	Refugee volunteers – unclear who recruited them

Annex J List of stakeholders interviewed beyond country visits

All interviews and meetings were carried out between January and July 2016, and between January and February 2017. The details indicated in the following lists reflect the position held at the time of the interview / meeting with the evaluation team – several UNHCR staff interviewed for the purpose of the evaluation have left / moved position since.

Stakeholders interviewed during the inception visit to Geneva

The mission to Geneva took place between January 18th and 20th, 2016.

Division /Unit	Name	Position
AHC-Protection	Volker Turk	Assistant High Commissioner, Protection
PDES / ES	Ewen MacLeod	Head of Service
DIP	Preeta Law	Deputy Director
	Gita Swamy Meier-Ewert	Senior Planning and Monitoring Specialist
	Monika Sandvik-Nylund	Senior Advisor, Child Protection
	Arne Treves	(former) Associate Protection Officer (protection management)
	Ita Sheehy	Senior Advisor, Education
	Margriet Veenma	Senior Advisor, SGBV
	Louise Aubin	Deputy Director
	Janice Marshall	Deputy Director
	Blanche Tax	Chief, Refugee Status Determination
DPSM	Paul Spiegel	Deputy Director
	Hendrik Nordentoft	Deputy Director
	Matthew Brook	Chief of Section and Programme Analysis and Support Section
DESS	Terry Morel	Director
	Roberto Mignone	Principal Emergency Coordinator
	Ana de Vega	Emergency Community-Based Protection Officer

List of stakeholders interviewed during follow up visit to Geneva

The mission to Geneva took place between July 4th and 5th, 2016.

Division/ Unit	Name	Position (in 2016)
DIP	Preeta Law	Deputy Director

	Gita Swamy Meier-Ewert	Senior Planning and Monitoring Specialist
	Greg Garras	Senior Protection Coordinator
	Karen Whiting	Senior Advisor, Child Protection
	Steinunn Bjorgvinsdottir	Child Protection Officer
	Margriet Veenma	Senior Advisor, SGBV
	Ita Sheehy	Senior Education Officer
	Ellen Maree Al Daqqa	Senior Capacity Building Officer
	Marie Maier-Metz	Associate Education Officer
	Jacqueline Strecker	Innovation Lab Coordinator, Regional Support Hub, Nairobi (Innovation / DIP Education team)
DPSM	Steve Corliss	Director
	Betsy Lippman	Chief of Section, Operations Solutions and Transitions Section
	Marina Aksakalova	Senior Programme Analyst
Europe Regional Bureau	Diane Goodman	Deputy Director
African Regional Bureau	Ann Encontre	Deputy Director, East and Horn of Africa
	Millicent Mutuli	Deputy Director, West and Central Africa
	Noriko Yoshida	Deputy Director, Great Lakes and Southern Africa
	Nagette Belgacem	Senior Legal Officer and focal point for Mixed Migration
Asia Regional Bureau	Josefa Ojano	Deputy Director
	Liv Fejen	Senior Legal Officer

List of stakeholders interviewed (tel. interviews)

Telephone interviews were carried out in July 2016, and between January and February 2017.

Organisation/ Office	Name	Position
DIP	Carol Batchelor	Director
MENA Regional Bureau	Lachin Hasanova	Senior Regional Protection Officer, SGBV, Amman
UNHCR Chad	Bi Chenge Malaika Balikwisha	Community Services Officer
	Hector Malonga	Senior Protection Officer
	Jean Bosco Nimubona	Community Based Protection Officer
UNICEF	Katy Barnett	Global Coordinator / Child Protection Area of Responsibility
UNHCR Canada	Jean Nicolas Beuze	UNHCR Representative [former Assistant Representative (Protection) Lebanon until December 2016]
UNHCR Jordan	Daniela Cicchella	Assistant Representative (Protection)

UNHCR Malaysia	Brian Gorlick	Deputy Representative
	Mimi Zarina Azmin	Protection Officer (Education)
	Thulasi Munisamy	Protection Officer (SGBV and Child Protection)
UNHCR India	Kavita Belani	Senior Protection Officer
UNHCR Syria	Jeanette Zuefle	Assistant Representative (Protection) [previously held position as Assistant Representative (Protection) in Pakistan]
UNHCR Kenya	Catherine Hamon Sharpe	Assistant Representative (Protection)
UNHCR Uganda	Esther Kiragu	Assistant Representative (Protection)
UNHCR Zambia	Marta Bellini	Senior Protection Officer

Evaluation Advisory Group members

	Position (in 2016)
Alexander Mundt	Assistant Representative (Protection) Afghanistan
Ann Encontre	Deputy Director and Regional Refugee Coordinator for South Sudan
Ann Maymann	Senior Policy Advisor, MENA Regional Bureau
Annika Sandlund	Senior Interagency Coordinator, DER
Ayaki Ito	Deputy Director, Regional Asian Bureau
Djamal Zamoum	Senior Emergency Protection Officer, DESS
Gregory Garras	Senior Protection Coordinator, DIP
Jean-Nicolas Beuze	UNHCR Representative [former Assistant Representative (Protection) Lebanon until December 2016]
Marina Aksakalova	Senior Programme Analyst, DPSM/PASS
Mathijs Le Rutte	Representative, Bulgaria
Paul Spiegel	Deputy Director, DPSM
Tayyar Sukru Cansizoglu	Senior Regional Protection Coordinator, MENA Regional Bureau