



External Monitoring and Evaluation for the European Union Regional Trust Fund in response to the Syrian Crisis, the "EUTF Syria"

Service Contract N. TF-MADAD/2017/T04.63

Evaluation of EUTF Syria-funded Programmes and Projects for Livelihoods

Final Evaluation Report

July 2019

This project is funded by
the European Union



A project implemented by
Particip Consortium



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	8
1.1. Background.....	8
1.2. Key findings.....	8
1.3. Key conclusions.....	12
1.4. Recommendations to inform future LLH support funded by the EUTF.....	13
2. STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT.....	17
3. MAIN REPORT.....	18
3.1. Introduction.....	18
3.2. Response to Evaluation Questions.....	19
3.3. Conclusions and Lessons Learned.....	64
3.4. Recommendations.....	73
4. ANNEX A1: TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	80
4.1. Evaluation of Madad-Funded Programmes/Projects for Livelihood – Final Terms of Reference.....	80
4.2. Objective, Purpose & Expected Results.....	87
4.3. Assumptions & Risks.....	89
4.4. Scope of the Work.....	90
4.5. Logistics and Timing.....	94
4.6. Requirements.....	96
4.7. Reports.....	99
5. ANNEX A2: METHODOLOGY, EVALUATION MATRIX AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION	105



5.1. Description of the Methodology.....	105
5.2. Data collection and analysis.....	105
5.3. Evaluation questions, judgement criteria and indicators (Evaluation Matrix).....	107
5.4. Scope of the Evaluation	112
6. ANNEX A3: EVALUATION DETAILS.....	122
6.1. Evaluation of the Programme: Regional Context.....	122
6.2. Current Situation in the Target Countries.....	124
6.3. Evaluation Grids covering projects under the EUTF LLH portfolio.....	137
7. ANNEX A4: OPTIONS FOR FUTURE EUTF SUPPORT	316
7.1. Basic Assumptions.....	316
7.2. Key Lessons Learned	317
7.3. Possible options to address observed weaknesses	319
8. ANNEX A5: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES	324
9. ANNEX A6: DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE & CONSULTED.....	337



LIST OF ACRONYMS

3RP	Regional Refugee & Resilience Plan
AECID	Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional al Desarrollo
ACTED	Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development
AFD	Agence Francaise de Developpement
AFAD	Disaster and Emergency Management Authority
ASAM	Association for Solidarity with Asylum Seekers and Migrants
BMZ	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
CAC	Country Advisory Committee
CAFOD	Caritas England and Wales (Catholic Agency for Overseas Development)
Care	Care International
CBO	Community-based Organisation
CD	Capacity Development
CFP	Country Focal Point
Concern	CONCERN Worldwide (Ireland)
COSV	Coordinamento delle Organizzazioni per il Servizio Volontario
C&V	Communication and Visibility
DA	Delegation Agreement
DAC	Development assistance committee OECD
DCU	Development Coordination Unit
DG DEVCO	Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development
DGMM	Directorate General of Migration Management
DG NEAR	Directorate-General for Neighbourhood and Enlargement Negotiations
DoA	Description of Action
Danish RC	Danish Red Cross Society
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
EEAS	European Union External Action Service
EC	European Commission
ECHO	European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
EF	Expertise France
ENI	European Neighbourhood Instrument



EQ	Evaluation Question
EU	European Union
EUD	EU Delegation
EUMSA	EU Member State Agencies
EUTF	European Union Regional Trust Fund in response to the Syrian Crisis
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FIIAPP	Fundación Internacional y Para Iberoamérica de Administración y Políticas Públicas
FRC	French Red Cross Society
FRIT	Facility for Refugees in Turkey
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
HIA	Hungarian Interchurch Aid
IB	Internationaler Bund (NGO)
IcSP	Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross & Red Crescent Societies
ILO	International Labour Organisation
INGO	International non-Government Organisation
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
IPA	Instrument for Pre-Accession
IP	Implementing Agency / Partner
IR	Islamic Relief Worldwide
IRCS	Iraq Red Crescent Society
İŞKUR	State Employment Agency (Turkey)
JC	Judgement criteria
JCC	Joint Crisis Coordination Centre, KRI
JHDF	Joint Humanitarian Development Framework in Response to the Syrian crisis Joint humanitarian and development framework
JORISS	Jordan Response Information System for the Syria Crisis
KfW	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau
KoM	Kick-off-meeting
KRI	Kurdish Region in Iraq (Kurdistan)



KRG	Kurdistan Regional Government
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
MoFLSS	Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Services (Turkey)
MoL	Ministry of Labour
MoNE	Ministry of National Education (Turkey)
MSME	Micro, small and medium enterprises
MoPIC	Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (Jordan)
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NOVACT	International Institute for Nonviolent Action
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OECD DAC	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee
OPM	Office of the President (Turkey)
PMO	Project Management Office
ProVET	Technical Assistance for a more practice oriented VTE in Lebanon (GIZ)
QIN	Quarterly Information Note
RDPP	Regional Development and Protection Programme
SFCG	Search for Common Ground
SME	Small and medium sized enterprises
TOBB	The Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey
ToRs	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers / Multipliers
TVET / VET	Technical vocational and educational training
UNDP	United Nation Development Organisation
UN Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
USD	US Dollar
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
VNG	International Cooperation Agency of the Association of Netherlands Municipalities
VC	Video Conference



WFP	World Food Programme
WP	Work permit
WVi	World Vision Deutschland e.V.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Time frame allocated for Vulnerable refugee and host community beneficiaries addressed by LLH components under the project sample

Table 2: State of Implementation of Projects under the Sample and key LLH activities

Table 3: Delays in implementation of LLH activities attributed to internal and external risks

Table 4: Percentage share of costs for human resources (HR) on the total costs of the projects

Table 5: Evaluation Matrix (A2)

Table 6: Portfolio of EUTF LLH Projects covered by the Report (A2)

Table 7: Sample of Non-EUTF-funded LLH Projects (A2)

Table 8: Timetable & Workplan (A2)

LIST OF BOXES

Box 1: Examples of recent non-EUTF funded initiatives

Box 2: Examples for attempts to achieve sustainability applied under non-EUTF funded actions

Box 3: Institutional sustainability addressed by other non-EUTF funded projects

Box 4: Fostering networks to promote local economic development

Box 5: Second generation LLH projects

1.EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. Background

The overall objective of this evaluation is to assess the current generation of European Union Regional Trust Fund in response to the Syrian Crisis (EUTF) livelihood (LLH) support, as well as mapping other innovative non-EUTF support, in order to identify future EUTF interventions contributing to increased economic opportunities and enhanced social and economic inclusion of Syrian Refugees, IDPs and members of vulnerable host communities.

One of the main purposes of the evaluation was the identification of future interventions contributing to increased economic opportunities and enhanced social and economic inclusion of Syrian Refugees, IDPs and members of vulnerable host communities. The evaluation covers a sample of 13 EUTF funded LLH projects operating on a regional/ multi-country or national level. It is focused on the performance of the sample projects working under a diverse context in each country.

1.2. Key findings

1.2.1. Relevance

Overall, the projects under evaluation are aligned with the developmental objectives pursued by the Action Document and the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) that inspired the Action Document in favour of the most vulnerable segments of refugees and host communities. The projects under evaluation have also striven to adapt to the evolution of national contexts. Several projects derive from the “livelihoods through employment/skills training” promoted by the EUTF, rather focusing on “social cohesion” activities. Projects pay specific attention, in line with the Action Document requirements, to the involvement of the most vulnerable members of refugee and host communities - especially amongst youth and

female refugees and host community members, population groups that are traditionally socioeconomically marginalized.

The projects relate differently to the notion of “livelihoods”, sometimes departing from the “livelihoods through employment” approach put forward by the EUTF. A majority of projects (9 out of 13) fully align with the “livelihoods through employment” approach, focusing on life skills and vocational training, often coupled with career counselling and/or direct employment activities through job placement and the creation of, or support to the creation of MSMEs (Micro, small and medium enterprises). Some of these projects also include “complementary” social cohesion interventions in the form of social entrepreneurship and participatory conflict mitigation activities involving refugee and host communities. Four projects do not fully square with the durable (medium/long term) employment approach required by the EUTF. Two of them (T04.12 FURSA, and T04.23 BADAEL) prioritize social cohesion interventions using livelihoods (limited to self/ microenterprises or cash for work activities) to promote local civic engagement and conflict mitigation activities. The two others are not fully in line with the EUTF’s Action Documents rationale/vision even though they fulfil some of its objectives: T04.40 Italian Cooperation only involves short-term (cash-for-work) employment for the implementation of infrastructural interventions - this contributes to infrastructure rehabilitation and development, and the improvement in the delivery of public services, indirectly alleviating social tensions and T0.82 KfW, aiming to equip schools with solar energy devices that is primarily an educational/infrastructural with no direct livelihoods component.

With a view to project design, overall, projects under evaluation have clearly identifiable outputs, outcomes, and overall objectives, and are equipped, with monitoring, evaluation, communication, and visibility mechanisms. However, the evaluation found that monitoring mechanisms were focused more on quantitative outputs than on the quality of livelihood services, and lacked baselines needed to measure the projects’ overall performance.

In addition, project design suffers from several inconsistencies that may bode ill for the success of the EUTF LLH initiative: lack of articulation between objectives and outputs/outcomes; limited time frames; and little budgetary support for activities common to the agencies of a consortium, such as monitoring and evaluation, visibility and communication, and coordination, for instance.

1.2.2. Effectiveness

For the two completed projects (T04.10 LEADERS and T04.12 FURSA) it has been difficult to reach the output results: in both cases requiring no-cost extensions were requested. Moreover, the outcomes and overall objectives could not be met during the (limited) allocated time frames due to the inability of the agencies involved to handle employment-oriented projects and to mitigate external risks that had no means to face. In general, the projects produced their numerous outputs but are unlikely to meet their overall objectives. Disconnection between outputs and objectives prevents interventions from decreasing poverty and unemployment levels or strengthening the prospects of the vulnerable in refugee and host communities for social and economic inclusion.

Overall, all projects faced difficulties to adapt to a volatile political, social and economic context entailing the need to adjust their initial planning including the selection of local partners and access to target areas or regions and beneficiaries. With two exceptions in Turkey (T04.15 QUDRA concerning its LLH component and T04.32 Concern) LLH projects managed to mitigate external delays yet to the expense of delays.

Contrary to expectations, in general, all agencies, whatever their type (NGOs, EU Ms or UN agencies, faced the same types of challenges during the inception period. In particular, their registration/ acceptance by the local authorities was proven difficult to obtain, especially in Jordan and in Turkey. The different agencies are able to refer to different specific competencies and capacities, obviously reflected by the EUTF during the selection process.

1.2.3. Efficiency

Overall, delays have not been caused by the lack of implementing agencies capacities or significant turnover of staff during the projects' duration. This applies to technical expertise, institutional setting, and the capacities to handle huge budgets. However, most of the projects face issues that have affected or will affect, their efficiency: delays at their inception and pressures on levels of human and financial resources. Despite delays, all agencies have the necessary technical and institutional capacities to ultimately plan and implement LLH activities, with no cost extension though. Financial resources have been deployed in an

efficient manner. Cost-efficiency differs along types of projects (regional, multi-country or national) and aid modalities, remaining within margins of comparable projects addressing humanitarian assistance and development.

1.2.4. Coherence

Based on a mid-term perspective and involving a wide range of activities, EUTF projects are in coherence with relevant national, and international strategies. EUTF projects aimed to achieve and, in most cases, achieved high coherence with national strategies and initiatives. Although the high political relevance of the regional and multi-sectoral approach is undeniable, it entails overly complex objectives and management structures hindering coherence. Regional projects offer a chance to scale up activities and to manage substantial budgets, while national projects have a comparative advantage to achieve coherence and complementarity.

1.2.5. Sustainability

The projects and their components pursue different objectives depending on the types of support oscillating between temporary humanitarian assistance and mid-term development. In consequence, not all of them are designed and likely to achieve sustainability at least not on all levels. Sustainability on an institutional level is considered however, except cooperation with public entities in Turkey and attempts for networking on a community level, the absence of strong and committed entities compromise prospect for institutional sustainability. Besides promoting employment leading to income on beneficiaries' level, achieving financial sustainability has not been a key objective and is unlikely to be achieved. Projects aim to achieve social sustainability by contributing to community development including community resilience and providing for social cohesion. Generation of additional income for both host and refugee populations remains the key factor. No options exist for the projects to address the strategic level and to influence labour legislation including provision for increased formal job opportunities and work permits for refugees.

1.2.6. EU Added Value

At large parts, the assumptions leading to the establishment of the EUTF have materialized. The EUTF proved to be able to mobilize, collect and allocate large funds under a holistic approach, and at the same time, it provides for a midterm perspective towards resilience by increasing predictability of substantial funding over a period of 5 years.

Overall, observations indicate that the visibility of the EU support channelled through the EUTF remains low with some gradual differences observed in each country. A lack of identity of the key services providers and clear messages and relevant information has been observed. Communication to promote services of the projects and to reach out to beneficiary communities and in consequence to attract beneficiaries indicates weaknesses.

1.3. Key conclusions

The EUTF LLH component attempts to establish a nexus between humanitarian and development assistance. However relevant this may be in theory, this approach has failed to materialize: Job opportunities for the most vulnerable segments of the refugee and host communities (primarily in search of “quick wins” addressing urgent conditions) on the one hand and local development based on medium/long term approaches) emerge as conflicting objectives. In addition, the objective to provide for sustainable employment for refugees and IDPs may be in conflict with the host countries’ restrictive labour market regulations (in Lebanon more especially) and/or the interests of the host communities. Given the challenges met by employment/ employability activities, the inclusion of (more) short-term cash-for-work initiatives or any short-term employment approach remains relevant as a secured source of income for the most vulnerable households; mixing Jordanian and Syrian workers together may also contribute to social cohesion. Addressing the formal labour market ignores the factual importance of the informal economy of target countries and the reality of vulnerable parts of the resident and refugee population.

Most interventions are implemented under a multi-country or regional approach, yet in the absence of a counterpart representing the governments of the region, they lack strategies and activities covering the entire region. The reservations of host societies to the inclusion

of the Syrian refugees within labour compounded by the insufficient number of jobs produced by the local economies have been underestimated by the projects. Projects generally underestimated the strong reservations within the governments in Lebanon and Jordan vis a vis formal employment of refugees. Finally, with only a few exceptions, project design turned out to be insufficient and often detrimental to the effectiveness and efficiency of the projects.

Projects may prove effective in terms of outputs, considering, for instance, the number of training held, or individuals trained, the quality of outcomes as regards social cohesion and job creation still needs to be substantiated, an aspect especially relevant for women which represent a remarkable part of the target groups. Although, completed LLH projects have been successful in improving skills and qualification of target groups (supply-side, there is little evidence that the demand side has been supported with the same positive effect (local economy, labour market). Raising the issue of how to cover urgent human needs and allow for some increased employability of the main target groups at relatively short notice.

Nearly all projects have been affected by delays caused by different kinds of internal and external challenges. In most cases, agencies had to resort to coping strategies including shifts in the contents of activities or a constant dialogue with local partners in order to “keep the ball rolling”.

Sustainability on institutional level turned out to be a pivotal element to address the demand side of the economy and to pursue a mid-term development approach to promote local economic development. Even where close cooperation with national entities was achieved, sustainability was not guaranteed due to lack of resources, competencies, and capacities on the level of national and sub-national partners.

1.4. Recommendations to inform future LLH support funded by the EUTF

1.4.1. Relevance, preparation of interventions and project design

As regards employment/employability activities, project design must be clearly targeted to increase and maintain relevance, firstly on accurate livelihoods assessments of the refugee/

IDP and host communities in terms of capacities and needs (especially the most vulnerable of them); secondly, on the demands of the corporate sector based on comparative socioeconomic advantages in targeted areas. In this respect, the EUTF should ensure that future implementing agencies carry out the necessary groundwork.

First, on the supply side of labour, ensure not only that the beneficiaries are in need of training and/or employment, but also that the proposed outputs of the interventions be tailored to the actual capacities and aspirations of the beneficiaries. This tailoring approach entails for instance that skills training activities be carefully focused on the beneficiaries’ individual chances of finding job opportunities, and accompanied by counselling and job placement, see financial literacy activities.

With a view to the demand side of labour, preparatory steps must ensure that the corporate sector is included in the elaboration of the training/employment programmes. This applies - whenever appropriate and possible - to other key stakeholders like municipalities / local communities’ institutions and includes identification of realistic perspectives for public/private partnerships.

Third, LLH activities need to be clearly aimed to reach multiplier effects and ensured institutional sustainability. This entails that the project implementation is carried out within available structures, processes and in line with ongoing local LLH policies. In this way, the projects would get rid of their “pilot-projects” aspect and embed more convincingly in the target countries’ policies.

When targeting the most vulnerable persons, specific microcredit or training schemes may not be enough. Rather, it is recommended that the EUTF promote LLH approaches specifically tailored to their conditions. Some of these are already pursued by a few EUTF and non-EUTF funded projects. For example, the “graduation approach” as promoted by the World Bank and the UNHCR among other institutions combines simultaneously cash/consumption support, skills training, financial literacy training and exposure to savings and seems more likely to lift refugees out of poverty. For non-economically employed or unemployed women (especially amongst Syrian refugee women), engage in support for home-based businesses with attention to registration regulations and safety standards as defined by the regulations of each target country. This is an activity that is carried out by T04.72 UN Women and could

be incorporated into other projects. Application of Gig Economy methods based on IT platforms - as tested, but not yet fully evaluated, by Mercy Corps in Jordan and in Lebanon. Finally, the “coping assistance strategy” aiming at increased inclusion of cash-for-work activities for long-term unemployed persons that also seek to equip beneficiaries with technical skills, “work spirit” and counselling/placement activities designed to facilitate their longer-term integration in the formal economy constitutes an additional option. Cash-for-work approaches have been widely implemented by Non-EUTF GIZ projects across the Near East, and by the T04.10 LEADERS project. It is to constitute a significant component of the T04.72 UN Women and the T04.40 Italian Cooperation projects. Although it does not square with the medium-long term employment approach promoted by the AD (except in the KRI where the AD acknowledged the relevance of shorter term approaches to LLH) and is usually deployed when no other more sustainable or more readily available alternatives exist, an increasing number of implementing agencies consider that they nevertheless constitute secured decent employment opportunities (wages and working conditions), and may also foster social cohesion through having Jordanians and Syrian refugees working side by side. As regards more skilled target groups, encourage and support skilled refugees and host communities, to focus on joint SME ventures between Syrian refugees and nationals. These interventions also serve social cohesion objectives but must be accompanied by financial literacy projects and advocacy initiatives at national level in favour of enhanced legal inclusion of Syrian refugees as entrepreneurs on par with their counterparts.

1.4.2. Design of future LLH interventions

Concerning the overall design of the EUTF, sufficient time must be allocated for inception activities, including adjustment of the Descriptions of the Actions. Duration of LLH projects with employment activities should not be less than 24 months (for skills training and job placement activities) and 36 months (for more complex employment activities involving the creation of enterprises).

Projects implemented by a consortium must be equipped with a budget designed to fund coordination of common activities among the agencies involved: monitoring, visibility and communication, building of synergies, collecting and processing of information to spread

lessons learned. This would provide for better opportunities to meet the objectives of the EUTF concerning the distribution of information and lessons learned including visibility.

More emphasis must be put during the selection of projects to improve sustainability on an institutional level for example by partnering between projects and local stakeholders. Longer term monitoring of beneficiaries of LLH support should be established at project and EUTF level to more accurately assess sustainability and impact of the support provided, especially after project completion.

2. STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The main body of this report comprises three sections. Apart from this Section 2 dealing mostly with the structure of the report, there are two more sections:

- Section 1 is devoted to the Executive Summary where the main points of the report are presented;
- Section 3 presents the main report divided into four sub-sections providing a contextual background, responses to the evaluation questions, conclusions and lessons learned and recommendations.

In addition to the main body, the report is supported by a series of annexes, including a more detailed analysis of certain aspects or providing background information. In particular:

- Annex 1 provides the full Terms of Reference (ToRs) for this review;
- Annex 2 presents the methodology applied during the evaluation;
- Annex 3 portrays the regional and national context including evaluation grids;
- Annex 4 encompasses further options for future EUTF LLH funding.
- Annex 5 lists interviews conducted during the evaluation.
- Annex 6 lists the documents that have been compiled and subsequently analysed.

This Report was prepared during the period May 2018 to May 2019.

3.MAIN REPORT

3.1. Introduction

This portfolio evaluation was commissioned by DG NEAR with the overall objective to assess and draw the lessons learned from the current generation of EUTF (European Union Trust Fund) LLH (Livelihoods) support to the Kurdish Region in Iraq (KRI), Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey, as well as identifying other innovative non-EUTF initiatives. One of the main purposes of the exercise was the identification of future interventions contributing to increased economic opportunities and enhanced social and economic inclusion of Syrian Refugees, IDPs and members of vulnerable host communities. The evaluation covers a sample of 13 EUTF funded LLH projects operating on regional/ multi-country or national level. It is focused on the performance of the sample projects working under a diverse context in each country, highlighted by examples from each project whenever relevant.

The response to the 10 evaluation questions is based on standard criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, sustainability, EU added value complemented by conclusions and recommendation to inform future EUTF-funded interventions in the LLH sector.

Data collection has been carried out by the team of experts, in order to capture key information and data complemented by semi-structured interviews with more than 150 key interlocutors in all countries covered. This collection was made based on grids which captured qualitative data through field visits carried out between July and November 2018 and in January 2019 in KRI.

Based on the response from DG NEAR to the draft report and after a follow up conversation, an additional document containing the key elements of an action document will be produced to inform the design of a second phase of EUTF funding in the sector.

3.2. Response to Evaluation Questions

I. Relevance

Evaluation question (EQ). 1: How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

In this section, the report evaluates the extent to which the projects conducted under the “Regional Resilience and Local Development Programme for Syrian Refugees and Host Communities” Action Document(s) are of relevance to the specific needs of the targeted countries, refugees (and displaced persons in Iraq) and host communities (EQ.1). In other words, the response to this question can be obtained by looking into (JC.1.1) what is the level of adequacy of the projects’ interventions to the livelihoods needs of the targeted populations; and secondly (JC.1.2), to what extent are the interventions’ logic clearly defined and articulated in terms of outputs, outcomes, objectives and programmed activities?

Judgement criterion (JC).1.1: Adequacy of the projects of the livelihoods needs of the targeted populations

Overall, the projects under evaluation are aligned with the developmental objectives pursued by the Action Document (and the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (the 3RP) that inspired the Action Document) in favour of the most vulnerable segments of refugees and host communities. The projects under evaluation have also striven to adapt to the evolution of national contexts. However, several projects derive from the “livelihoods through employment/skills training” promoted by the EUTF, rather focusing on “social cohesion” activities.

The projects are aligned with the livelihoods approach promoted by the Action Document and the overarching 3RP framework that seek long-term resilience, local development and social cohesion based on livelihoods activities that target the most vulnerable segments of refugees and host communities. Vulnerability targeting is thus an eligibility criterion shared by all projects, except for the T04.68 KfW and T04.82 TOBB projects in Turkey that cover the

entire resident population.¹ Projects also pay specific attention, in line with the Action Document requirements, to the involvement of the most vulnerable members of refugee and host communities - especially amongst youth and female refugees and host community members, population groups that are traditionally socio-economically marginalized. On the one hand, the percentage of expected female beneficiaries for skills training and employment activities is set around 40%-50% (93% for T04.72 UN Women), which is, in all cases, significantly higher than the percentage of economically active women in the targeted countries. On the other hand, youth participation is prioritized in social cohesion-driven projects (T04.12 FURSA and T04.23 BADAEL) and in skills training activities (80% in the T04.15 QUDRA), and they are among the main beneficiaries of the employment activities (40%-50% in T04.10 LEADERS and T04.70 ILO/IOM). Diverging from the Action Document guidelines, only half of the projects mention explicitly the inclusion of disabled persons in their LLH activities².

Projects also explicitly strive to comply with national laws and regulations and to adapt to national refugee response plans and their evolution. By way of example, the T04.10 LEADERS that was initially designed (in late 2015) to focus on the developmental needs of the sole host communities in Jordan and in Lebanon, endeavoured to include Syrian refugees as beneficiaries of its employment activities when the government legalized their employment within the formal sector, as from 2016 (cf. the Jordan Compact).

However, the projects relate differently to the notion of “livelihoods”, sometimes departing from the “livelihoods through employment” approach put forward by the EUTF. A majority of projects (9 out of 13) fully align with the “livelihoods through employment” approach, focusing on life skills and vocational training, often coupled with career counselling and/or direct employment activities through job placement and the creation of, or support to the creation of MSMEs (Micro, small and medium enterprises). In this context, short-term cash-

¹ It is based on available UNHCR-devised Verification Assessment Framework for refugees and Proxy Means Testing (PMT) scores. The LEADERS/DRC/T04.10 project has adopted a slightly different approach, targeting women and youth among the “mildly vulnerable” - namely those persons not poor enough to get cash assistance but still socioeconomically vulnerable and in need of ways to generate income, develop skills, and access more sustainable livelihoods to ensure they do not slide into the “extremely vulnerable” category. Given the risks of low retention rates in training or employment-support activities, several implementing agencies have judiciously added subjective eligibility criteria, including motivation to be trained, employed or start a business in order to reduce high turnover of beneficiaries that may compromise medium-term skills development activities.

² Mainly UN Women/ T04.72, Danish Red Cross/ T04.30, WVI/Youth Resolve/T04.17, UNDP/ T04.76. and SFCG/FURSA/T04.17 (in Iraq).

for-work activities are considered only for the members of the most vulnerable households³, within side-line infrastructural activities (T04.10 LEADERS), or as key activities (amongst other key activities) accompanied by counselling or training options designed to facilitate access to more sustainable employment (in the case of T04.72 UN Women, T04.70 ILO-IOM). Some of these projects also include “complementary” social cohesion interventions in the form of social entrepreneurship and participatory conflict mitigation activities involving refugee and host communities.

Four projects do not square with the medium-long term employment approach required by the EUTF. Two of them (T04.12 FURSA, and T04.23 BADAEL) prioritize social cohesion interventions using small-scale livelihoods limited to self/ microenterprises or cash-for-work activities) to promote local civic engagement and conflict mitigation activities. The two others are remotely related, or even contradict, to the EUTF’s Action Documents approach geared to a medium-long term approach to livelihoods: T04.40 Italian Cooperation that only involves short-term (cash-for-work) employment for the implementation of infrastructural and service-delivery interventions; and T0.82 KfW, an educational infrastructure project that aims to equip schools with solar energy devices with no prospects of direct employment for Syrian refugees. The implementing partner, however, expects that with the expansion of the solar energy sector, their project may trigger an increase in job opportunities for all in the future. Such a disparity between activities and approaches among projects may be detrimental to the evaluation of the overall action and of its visibility as an integrated and coherent instrument.

Furthermore, it is interesting to notice that several current Non-EUTF livelihoods interventions targeting, similarly to the EUTF LLH programme, the most vulnerable segments of the refugee and host communities such as non-economically or unemployed women and youths, use approaches that may appear less developmental but more cognizant of the limited capacities and social challenges constraining their ability to engage in employment:

³ Vulnerability targeting is based on available UNHCR-devised Verification Assessment Framework for refugees and eligibility to National poverty alleviation mechanisms for populations living under or around the national poverty lines, or on Proxy Means Testing (PMT) scores. In order to secure success of the action, several implementing agencies have added subjective eligibility criteria for the selection of beneficiaries, including motivation to be trained, employed or start a business.



The “**graduation approach**” promoted by the World Bank, the World Food Programme and the UNHCR among other institutions is based on experience gained in Africa (for examples see: <https://villageenterprise.org/what-we-do/>; <https://blogs.worldbank.org/jobs/how-innovative-financing-can-support-entrepreneurship-and-sustainable-livelihoods>); or <https://www.unhcr.org/55005bc39.pdf>). The “graduation approach” strives to complement and expand micro funding by providing for a time-bond sequence including cash or property transfer, trainings, continuous counselling and mentoring completed by access to financial services. The approach may be more likely to initiative a trajectory to a sustainable livelihood within a specified period (usually 18-36 months). It is obvious that the approach will be more costly compared to micro finance and more complicated to implement. Within the framework of its current Country Strategic Plan for Lebanon (2018-2020), the World Food programme (WFP) will focus on the graduation of poor refugee beneficiaries of its programmes (and poor Lebanese beneficiaries of the National Poverty Targeting Programme) through a flexible approach geared to a “case by case” response that may include, in addition to the WFP’s cash distribution programme, livelihoods training (carpentry, digital skills vocational training) with social protection tools. The UNHCR and the World Bank are started a pilot graduation approach project for Syrian refugees that may be expanded to other countries of the Middle East.

Gig economy: Google.org/Mercy Corps sharing economy (uberization) experience. Google.org asked Mercy Corps to create decent jobs for youth through technology. The duration of the programme is 3 years. One of the approaches pursued is to select and support (notably through guidance, training and grants) sharing economy start-up companies and SMEs that seek and connect skilled individual service providers to consumers. In Jordan, some 10 of such start-ups are supported (such as Mrayti in the sector of beautification, Bilforon in the sector of food catering, or Carers in the home-nursing sector for instance). As they grow, these start-ups will not only hire additional internal staff, they will provide job opportunities. Efforts are made to expand from the countries’ main cities where they are initially based to other areas of the country. A major obstacle to Syrian involvement in these ventures is the limited number of sectors open to them in Jordan, and especially in Lebanon.

Several organizations, such as ILO within the framework of its **Employment Intensive Investment Projects (EIIPs)** funded by Germany (BMZ/KfW) and Norway, promote “upgraded” cash-for-work initiatives, whereby the latter are not only designed to improve the host countries’ local infrastructure. They also aim to promote the further integration of vulnerable Syrian and host communities in formal and decent jobs through better attitudes towards work and enhanced skills and professional experience. As far as possible the inclusion of women in these labour intensive projects is encouraged.



The Finn Church Aid (FCA) and entrepreneurship for Syrian refugees and Jordanians, started in 2017 through RDDP funding, the FCA’s “**Tareeki**” **Livelihoods project** was composed of two main activities: vocational training for vulnerable Syrian refugees and Jordanian and entrepreneurship promotion, mainly in the retail and the food sectors. The allocated time-frame of the project (18 months) was too small to generate significant outputs. Yet, while the results vocational training activity was considered relatively disappointing (20 per cent of the trainees obtaining formal/informal jobs post training), the entrepreneurship activity was more promising, with outputs in line with objectives (55 SMES of different sizes) created. However, most of them had 1-3 employees and belonged in the microbusiness sector. In addition, near the end of the project, only about 25% of them had registered or were completing registration.

Challenges for Syrian refugee entrepreneurs exist: they can only be co-partners of Jordanian that are recognized by law as the heads of the business and registration fees for medium sized businesses are high (50,000JD. In future, the FCA’s entrepreneurial interventions will focus on female entrepreneurship.

Box 1: Examples of recent non-EUTF funded initiatives

JC.1.2: Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined in terms of outputs outcomes, and overall objectives

Overall, projects under evaluation have clearly identifiable outputs, outcomes and overall objectives, and are equipped, as required, with monitoring, evaluation, communication, and visibility mechanisms. However, the evaluation found that monitoring mechanisms were focused more on quantitative outputs than on the quality of livelihood services (especially in terms of LLH impact of training activities and the social consequences of job opportunities for refugees), and lacked baselines needed to measure the projects’ overall performance.

In addition, project design suffers from several inconsistencies that may bode ill for the success of the EUTF LLH initiative: lack of articulation between objectives and outputs/outcomes; limited time frames; and little budgetary support for activities common to the agencies of a consortium, such as monitoring and evaluation, visibility and communication, and coordination, for instance.

The rationale, objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities of the interventions are clearly defined in all the projects’ Description of the Action (DoA) and logical frameworks and often supported by a well-stated theory of change. The livelihood needs of host and refugee communities are well documented in the projects’ Descriptions of the Action. These are

informed by the experience accumulated by the implementing agencies since the start of the Syrian refugee crisis and, for some agencies such as Care, Save the Children, Oxfam, UNDP and the ILO, by decades of experience in the target countries. In addition, documentation and needs and assessments reports produced by agencies such as the Danish Red Cross during the inception period of the project (and distributed to other agencies) allowed for a detailed assessment of the local needs of the targeted communities and local labour markets.

The projects are covered by monitoring mechanisms devised by the Action Document and ensured by EU Delegations (EUD) in the target countries, with the assistance of specific Trust Fund field and liaison officers posted within the EU Delegations⁴. Besides direct monitoring by EUDs, a complementary Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system exists for all EU-funded activities, consisting in Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM)⁵ as well as Quarterly Information Notes (QINs), filled by the implementing agencies that provide information about progress made according to key performance indicators (KPI), tied to the outputs and outcomes of the activities. In addition, projects may be externally evaluated during the implementation period or shortly before their completion, as is the case of the T04.10 Leaders project.

As is often the case in short-term projects, the KPIs relate more to the activity’s outputs, for instance, the number of beneficiaries to be trained, rather than the number of trained beneficiaries that found employment. Moreover, employment placement activities are not equipped with tracking mechanisms designed to trace the durability and the “decency in terms of wages” of the jobs provided. Moreover, at the time of the evaluation, most livelihoods projects lacked the necessary baselines needed to measure the performance of their activities. In principle, baseline figures are determined in the planning phase of projects. However, in some cases, there is no convincing articulation between outputs and outcomes and ambitious overall objectives, especially given the relatively limited durations of the projects (see below). This is particularly the case of the T04.10 Leaders project in Jordan and

⁴ The EU Trust Fund is said to launch an independent M&E exercise to accompany all Fund projects and ensure that targets are met and lessons learnt can be incorporated into other EUTF actions. However, given the limited time frames of the projects, it is doubtful that an ad hoc monitoring instrument can alter the course of the implementation of the project.

⁵ In the context of the EUTF, ROM missions aiming to support EU services in charge of monitoring covered inter alia T04.10 LEADERS, T04.15 QUDRA and T04.30 Red Cross.

in Lebanon that aimed at a national-scale change in poverty levels, based on skills training and employment activities and on a national-level policy change from advocacy efforts with the countries’ stakeholders at local and national levels. As recognized by the DRC, head of the Leaders consortium, these objectives were well beyond the scope of the project.

Several projects intend to significantly impact on the livelihood’s status of the target populations, with a direct impact on income, resilience and social inclusion. Projects such as T04.10 LEADERS, T04.72 UN Women, T04.70 ILO-IOM, T04.76 UNDP and to a lesser extent T04.17 Youth Resolve/WVI in Jordan, cover (or have covered) both the supply and demand side of labour, while improving the performance of their local partners, including ministries, civil society institutions and municipalities. The planned number of direct beneficiaries is significant, being in the thousands for employment/employability interventions and in the dozens of thousands for correlated social cohesion initiatives. As indicated in the following table, these projects were not given adequate implementation timeframes at the time of the signature. Respondents from implementing agencies agreed that 36 months is a minimum period for projects of such complexity. Most projects were given, after negotiations between the leading implementing agencies and the EU, 18 months to 24 months, a time span more in line with humanitarian rather than with developmental aims. The sometimes-unanticipated amount of time required for registration with the local authorities and (logistic/research) inception work, about 4-6 months on average in Jordan for instance, further reduced the time left for actual implementation.

Implementing agency	Expected vulnerable refugee and host community beneficiaries (as stated in the programme documents)	Time allocated
T04.10 LEADERS project/DRC in Jordan and in Lebanon	250,000 direct (including 1,430 trainees; 4,620 recipients of business development services; and over 3,300 cash-for-work beneficiaries) and 650,000 indirect	18 months
T04.72 UN Women in Jordan, Turkey and Iraq	20,640 direct (including around 5,500 females graduating towards durable employment) and 40,272 indirect	24 months
T04.70 ILO in Turkey	16,900 direct (including 2000 SuTP and 1000 host community members with at least 500 getting certification of	24 months



qualifications; 5.000 Syrians and 1.000 host community members access public employment services; 1.000 Syrian refugees and 250 host community members access to apprenticeship programmes; etc.; 1850 jobs created)

T04.76 UNDP in Turkey	55,000 direct (including 2,000 Syrian refugees and host community member employed; 1,000 Syrian refugees and host community members with improved awareness and knowledge about business development and 52,000 Syrian refugees who benefitted from adult language training); and 307,000 indirect	24 months
T04.17 Youth Resolve/WVI in Jordan, KRI	4,600 direct (with 1,200 refugees, displaced and host community members getting vocational training; 1,000 apprenticeship; and 1,400 job counselling)	24 months
T04.15 QUDRA/GIZ in Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey and KRI	5,000 students (Syrian/Jordanian) (80% youth) in Jordan, 2,000 students (Syrian/Lebanese) in Lebanon and 24,000 indirect beneficiaries in Turkey	36 months
T04.30 Danish Red Cross in KRI, Jordan and Turkey	15,610 direct (training and semi-employment support; but mainly language training and counselling for 15,000 refugees and host community members)	36 months

Table 1: Time frame allocated for vulnerable refugee and host community beneficiaries addressed by LLH components under the project sample

The evaluation found that project budgets had no heading to finance activities common to agencies members of a consortium in one or more target countries, including monitoring, communication/visibility or operational coordination (synergies). This would have been necessary in complex consortium structures such as the LEADERS consortium that put together six large international and national civil society organizations. Evidence gathered for the evaluation indicates that, aside from mere exchanges of information, agencies of the same consortium have worked/work mostly in isolation and this also applies to the staff of the same agency working in different target countries. The GIZ-led T04.15 QUDRA consortium stands an exception in this regard.

Finally, in line with the guidelines of the EUTF, the DoAs of most projects (but not all, like LEADERS and FURSA) contain risks and contingency/mitigation plans. These sections carefully identify and address external risks resulting directly from potentially adverse responses to the activities on behalf of targeted populations and local stakeholders and more generally



to the tensions generated by the social and economic impacts of the Syrian refugee inflow in the targeted countries/regions. However, the chronic challenges that have plagued the latter’s economies in past decades such as high unemployment and small economic participation rates, insufficient number of decent jobs, large informal market, decaying vocational training sector, mismatch between the supply and demand of labour, etc. are ignored. So are the internal risks related to design shortcomings discussed above under EQ.1, such as inadequate timeframes for implementation, and inadequate funding allocations.

II. Effectiveness

EQ. 2: To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving (or are likely to be effective in achieving) their desired results?

In this section, based on judgement criteria (JC. 2.1 and 2.2), the report evaluates the extent to which EUTF-funded LLH projects have been effective or are likely to be effective in achieving their desired results in terms of quantitative outputs and of expected outcomes, and general objectives in terms of increased employment and enhanced social cohesion (EQ. 2). Internal and external risks addressed under JC. 2.3 “Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal risks” are investigated under the Efficiency section (EQ.4) below.

JC. 2.1: Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones

Overall, it has been difficult for the two completed projects to reach the output results in both cases requiring no cost extensions. Moreover, the outcomes and overall objectives could not be met during the (limited) allocated time frames due to the inability of the agencies involved to handle employment-oriented projects and to mitigate external risks that had no means to face.

At the time of the evaluation in August/September 2018, only two projects were completed and thus allowed a comprehensive effectiveness assessment. Firstly, T04.10 LEADERS, which



addresses, in line with the overall Programme vision, livelihoods (employment and training activities) as an entry point with some complementary “social inclusion/community engagement” interventions. Secondly, T04.12 FURSA’s activities focused more on social cohesion including, among other tools, youth livelihoods. The skills training component of the multi-sectoral T04.15 QUDRA project was under way in Jordan and Lebanon but was just picking up in Turkey. All other projects were in the inception phase, some of them still waiting for governmental approval (T04.17 Youth Resolve T04.40 Italian Cooperation). Therefore, the LEADERS and the FURSA projects, both implemented by civil society organizations mainly specialized in humanitarian/advocacy interventions, and to a lesser extent T04.15 QUDRA, are the principal sources of lessons learned concerning LLH effectiveness within the EUTF framework.

An overall comparison of the LEADERS and FURSA projects indicates that, given their profile, implementing agencies’ staff is more equipped to handle social cohesion interventions involving capacity building workshops and relation-building, joint implementation of community activities, and small vocational training or microcredit projects, than large scale employment-oriented interventions. A second finding relates to the “quality” of the projects in regard to positive outcomes and general objectives. While they may prove effective in terms of outputs (for instance, the number of refugees and host community members receiving vocational training or participating in joint dialogue exercises), these outputs often fail to achieve the expected outcomes and overall objectives in terms of durable employment and social cohesion set in the Description of Action documents. There are two main reasons for this. The first reason is technical, where these outcomes and general objectives are not (yet) observable⁶ or are not/cannot be determined precisely. In any case, they do not seem able to timely meet the ambitious overall objectives set by the implementing agencies. The second reason, often invoked by the implementing agencies met during the preparation of this report, relates to their inability to mitigate or bypass external risks, such as political instability, lack of cooperation on behalf of the local authorities; substandard training skills

⁶ In case longer term monitoring is envisaged, a separate independent entity in charge of monitoring is required. To assess impact, monitoring needs to be based on reliable and comprehensive information about beneficiaries and potential employees, which might involve sensitive data. This would need to be done at Fund level, not project or programme level.

systems and resources for active market policies;⁷ and, as far as refugees are concerned, limitations on the employment of refugees and foreigners, especially in Jordan and Lebanon.

JC. 2.2: Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality) defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries' expectations

The following paragraphs provide a more precise overview of the degree to which the LEADERS and FURSA projects (and to a lesser extent the LLH component of the QUDRA project) have - so far - been effective in terms of outputs, outcomes and overall objectives.

In general, the projects produced their numerous outputs but are unlikely to meet their overall objectives. Disconnection between outputs and objectives prevents interventions from achieving decreased poverty and unemployment levels or strengthening the prospects of youth in refugee and host communities for social and economic inclusion.

As its final evaluation report found,⁸ the FURSA project has managed to achieve most of its numerous outputs in spite of social microprojects and LLH opportunities created, despite contextual issues related to delays in signing micro-projects agreements with the local authorities and to the difficult political and security situations in Lebanon and in the KRI (notably in 2018) during the referendum on independence in the KRI and the general elections in 2018 in Lebanon). Yet, these contextual impediments, as well as the wide range of activities carried out, caused the need for a 4 months no-cost extension. In addition, the report highlighted the fact that the LLH component's impact had been undermined by the little relevance of the training received to the local market needs and, by the limited time-frame and delayed activities that did not allow for significantly sufficiently long activity

⁷ More precisely, respondents from the implementing agencies pinpointed the substandard quality of vocational training (outdated curricula and equipment poor training of trainers, uncertified diplomas granted by private training institutions); the mismatch between the type and quality of the technical/academic skills, the insufficient quantity of decently-paid jobs produced by the local economy, and legal obstacles to the creation of MSMEs.

⁸ See the internal evaluation report: *End Line Evaluation – Resilient Communities: Supporting Livelihoods, Education, and Social Stability for Syrian Refugees and host communities*, November 2018. Also see *FURSA Final Evaluation – Consortium Management Response*, not dated.

cycles, and by lack of coordination and shared monitoring and evaluation tools amongst the various members of the consortium.

As expected at the beginning of the project, some activities continued after the official end of the project, thus attesting to the stakeholders’ will to sustain the intervention post-EUTF funding. However, the degree to which the FURSA project has managed to meet its overall objective (strengthen the prospects of youth in refugee and host communities for social and economic inclusion in Iraq and in Lebanon) and outcomes (increased self-reliance and spread of tolerant relationships between youth in refugee and host communities) remains to be seen. However, achievements related to tolerance and self-reliance based on inter-community dialogue or community-based entrepreneurship are relatively volatile and are sensitive to any change in the target countries’ political and socioeconomic contexts; they may only be assessed in the long run. In addition, as found out by the project, the provision of job opportunities for Syrian refugees is likely to trigger hostile behaviour within the host communities, which contradicts the ultimate objective of the FURSA project.

The T04.10 LEADERS project activities in Lebanon and in Jordan reached many (but not all) of their output indicators in terms of skills training, support to MSMEs, improved local collective problem solving and participatory development planning, and increased investment in social and economic development at the local level⁹. The community-based activities, including support to the local economy and joint refugees-host community social initiatives, have been more effective in reaching their output objectives in Lebanon than in Jordan¹⁰. In Jordan, the project was effective in engaging male and female refugees and host communities, as well as private and public sector representatives in dialogue initiatives. However, the more complex investments in economic development projects lagged behind because of a series of factors including lack of support from municipalities, governorates, and ministries procurement issues, with little synergy between the implementing agencies. As a result, the outputs related to the number of employment days generated by

⁹ Following the drastic reduction of the project’s duration and budget during the inception phase of the project in 2015/early 2016, the DRC reviewed the design of the project, keeping the indicators but reducing the targets accordingly. Another Destabilizing factor was the “Jordan compact” concluded between Jordan and its main donors in February 2016 whereby Jordan accepted to formalize Syrian refugee labour in Jordan. Consequently, the project that only targeted Jordanian host communities was invited to include Syrian refugees, thus leading to another redesigning of its activities.

¹⁰ The LEADERS project (T04.10) was evaluated shortly before its completion by Parallel Perspective Management Consulting S.A.L. in Jordan and in Lebanon. The following statements are based on the report as well as interviews carried within the framework of this assessment with the main stakeholders.

infrastructural, service delivery or manufacturing projects (3,000 days) have been difficult to come by during the initial project duration (18 months). Two no-cost extensions conceded by the EU were necessary to reach the output.¹¹

In both Jordan and Lebanon, the LEADERS project achievements in terms of outcomes were more limited than expected in project documentation. Thus, although the business services were considered effective, lack of additional financial support for MSMEs¹² limited the opportunities for growth. The training activities have not translated into the expected employment opportunities, mainly due to the substandard status of the vocational training sector. In addition, Syrian refugee beneficiaries may be prone to discriminations from private enterprises. In Jordan, in addition, pressure has since 2016 been exerted on the Syrian refugees to formalize their labour status (involving additional costs for the workers and their employers). At the time of the project’s external evaluation (3 months before the end of the project), less than one-third of the Syrian trainees had reported any workdays 3 months prior to the survey (compared to two-thirds of the Jordanian trainees). Performance between Lebanese and Syrian beneficiaries were more similar: 48% and 43%, respectively. At any rate, the target of 80% of beneficiaries reporting increased access to income-generating opportunities was thus not met.¹³ Finally, as the LEADERS overall objectives were disconnected from outputs in the project design, none were in fact achieved, i.e. decreased poverty and unemployment levels amongst Syrian refugees and host communities at national level and policy changes in favour enlarged inclusion of the refugees in the labour market.

Finally, the T04.15 Qudra project which objectives were to not only train host communities and refugees but also to improve the target countries’ training system in order to achieve better outcomes. As the present assessment found, improvements in this latter sector

¹¹ And were not yet achieved during the project’s evaluation by Parallel Perspective Management, External Final Evaluation for EU-MADAD Funded Action Being Implemented in Lebanon and Jordan, 15 May 2018. As a matter of examples, the rehabilitation of a sewing factory in Baalama (Mafraq governorate), an ACTED-led activity launched following a participatory process involving the municipality and the local community faced difficulty following procurement problems (fake sewing machines received) and lack of assistance from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs. Another example is the community support project consisting in the establishment of a garment factory. The process was suspended following the decision by the newly elected Mayor for Al-Ramtha Municipality to stop the implementation of the project.

¹² This applied to other cases of MSME support observed during interviews conducted with non-EUTF funded projects in KRI, implemented inter alia by DRC, GOAL and IOM, as well.

¹³ Parallel Perspective Management, *External Final Evaluation for EU-MADAD Funded Action Being Implemented in Lebanon and Jordan*, p.77. Similar percentages could not be determined in Lebanon.

(improvement of the training system) are costly and time-consuming. They may have delayed the advancement of the project’s ambitious outputs in terms of trained persons¹⁴. Findings complement to the information provided under the 2nd Result Reporting, (June 2018) indicating high correspondence of outputs against target values concerning SMSE support and in terms of outreach to and information for young Syrian refugees.¹⁵ The non-EUTF funded project - Technical Assistance for a more practice oriented VTE in Lebanon (ProVET, although implemented by GIZ) - aims at improving the quality of TVET in Lebanon, considering to train host country nationals and equip Syrian nationals with transferable skills for reconstruction and improving their capacities to find employment in the construction sector (were formal employment of Syrian refugees is permitted by the Lebanese government)

All projects (except of T04.68 TOBB and T04.82 KfW) under the sample strive to address vulnerable groups. It might be too early for a comprehensive judgement, but findings based on projects that have been completed do not indicate increasing income or employment of vulnerable parts of the host country and refuge population. This applies especially to women¹⁶ and even more significantly to disabled persons.

JC. 2.3: Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate external risks

Overall, all projects faced difficulties to adapt to a volatile political, social and economic context entailing the need to adjust their initial planning including selection of local partners and access to target areas or regions and beneficiaries. With two exceptions in Turkey LLH projects managed to mitigate external delays yet to the expense of delays.

The experience of the T04.30 Danish Red Cross project illustrates the external challenges a project may face. Its inception operations in KRI were affected by the conflict against the Islamic State/ Daesh during the period from October 2016 to July 2017 and then by the

¹⁴ Progress achieved by the Qudra project, as observed between the two first QINS (November 2017 and April 2018) are relatively significant however, especially in Jordan (from 141 trained -including 56 Syrians and 100 women- to 842 trained -including 100 women and 509 Syrians). In Lebanon, the results stagnated at 111 persons (including 79 females; 65 Syrians). The overall target by June 2019 is still far away: 5000 trained including 200 women and 50% of Syrians.

¹⁵ EU Regional trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Refugee Crisis, 2nd Result Reporting,

¹⁶ See for example: The living conditions of Syrian refugees in Jordan. Åge A. Tiltne, Huafeng Zhang and Jon Pedersen, 2019. <https://www.fafo.no/index.php/zoo-publikasjoner/fafo-rapporter/item/the-living-conditions-of-syrian-refugees-in-jordan>

referendum held in September 2017: as a result, its access to the field was delayed. In parallel, in Lebanon the general elections of May 2018 delayed the host authorities' agreement of the project. At more local level, although agencies were aware about potential external risks, they could not always mitigate local opposition of stakeholders to activities promoting the employment of Syrian refugees in general (as evidenced by T04.10 LEADERS in Lebanon) or to a specific employment activity (the rehabilitation of a sewing factory to provide permanent employment to at least 120 women; as evidenced by T04.10 LEADERS in Jordan).

Aligning with national laws and regulations governing education and employment

Adapting to changing national laws and regulations governing education and employment turned out to be a key issue leading to considerable delays of the LLH components of the projects for nearly all projects and in all targeting countries, as could be expected from the projects' design (see Section EQ. 1 Relevance). Despite their experience of the region, several agencies failed to understand or to cope with the targeted countries' political dynamics and administrative mechanisms resulting, in Jordan, in repeated delays due to cumbersome project registration procedures and reluctance of local authorities to cooperate. The following paragraphs highlight the Turkish case.

In Turkey, T04.15 QUDRA which, as mentioned above, has suffered from considerable delays, especially under its LLH module 2. There are even doubts (raised by GIZ and EUD) whether the project will achieve its outputs by the end of the project in August 2019, with delays of more than 20 months having occurred. The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) necessary to start LLH activities in Public Education Centres was signed with the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) in May 2018 and its annex containing Implementation Principles in August 2018 only. The T04.32 Concern International project, with a starting date fixed to January 1, 2018, and a duration of 20 months, despite previous agreement, was put on hold by the Turkish Government and suspended all education activities. By December 25, 2018 the Memorandum of Understanding with the MoNE (commonly known as Protocol) had not yet been fully enforced.

The highly centralized system in Turkey regulating activities in the context of LLH related training and education, has obviously not been well understood by several implementing



agencies. The necessity to keep touch with the relevant government units in the capital Ankara has not been taken into account by the EUTF-funded Concern and non-EUTF DRC projects that only had offices in the regions of implementation. Activities on local / provincial level were planned, although agencies were not registered in the envisaged area of operation. Despite cooperating ties with a well-established local partner, Kizilay (Turkish Red Crescent Society), T04.30 Danish Red Cross faced problems starting its skills training activities and implementation of the small grant components. The establishment of community centres and staff recruitment was delayed. For T04.12 FURSA the registration of one of the international partners was delayed by about 6 months, seriously curtailing the implementation time period. This delay resulted in extending the project for another six months.

The table below indicates the types of actions (LLH, social cohesion) and indicates the state of implementation and the main types of activities.

Projects, implementing agencies and type of actions	Target country	Official duration	Status of projects in Sept. 2018	Main activities
T04.10 LEADERS project				
Main implementing agency (IP): DRC				
Partners: ACTED, Care France, Save the Children, Oxfam, Makhzoumi Foundation	Jordan / Lebanon	01.06.2016 / 01.12.2017 (18 months)	Completed in April 2018 (+no cost extensions)	1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5
<i>LLH Project (with social cohesion lens)</i>				
T04.12 FURSA project				
Main IP: SFCG				
Partners: COSV, NOVA	KRI, Lebanon	03.07.2016 / 03.12.2018 (18 months)	Completed in July 2018 (+no cost extensions)	2 / 3 / 4
<i>Social cohesion project (with LLH as an entry point) + education + psychosocial support</i>				



T04.15 QUDRA project
 Main IP: **GIZ**
 Partners: **Expertise France, AECID Spain**
LLH + educational + social cohesion + local admin. Support project

Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey (pending) (Jordan, KRI)
 LLH under CD for local authorities

15.06.2016 / 15.06.2019 (36 months)

Under way (preparatory steps)

3 / 5

T04.17 Youth Resolve project
 Main IP: **World Vision**
 Partners: **CAFOD, Caritas Lebanon, Generations for Peace, Islamic Relief, Questscope**
LLH + education + city development project

Jordan, KRI, and Lebanon (not LLH)

09.01.2017 / 09.01.2019 (24 months)

About to start (preparatory steps)

1 / 3 / 4 / 5

T04.23 BADAEL
 Main IP: **Oxfam**
 Partners: **Beyond Reform & Development, Utopia and Association Najdeh**
Social entrepreneurship, social cohesion project

Lebanon

01.12.2017 / 01.03.2020 (27 months)

Under way (preparatory steps)

1 / 3 (under social entrepreneurship) / 4

T04.30 DRC
 Main IP: **Danish Red Cross**
 Partners: **European and local Red Cross societies,**
LLH + Health + community entrepreneurship

Jordan, Lebanon, KRI, and Turkey

15.12.2016 / 15.12.2019 (36 months)

About to start (preparatory steps)

1 (micro), 3, 4.

T04.32
 Main IP: **Concern**
LLH project

Turkey

15.12.2017 / 15.08.2019 (20 months)

About to start (preparatory steps)

3 / 4

T04.40
 Main IP: **Italian Cooperation**

Jordan, Lebanon, and KRI

01.01.2018 / 01.07.2020 (36 months)

Not yet started

2



Support to local institutions and infrastructural project with LLH (cash-for-work schemes)

T04.68

Main IP: The Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (TOBB)

Turkey

26.12.2017 / 26.12.2019 (24 months)

About to start (preparatory steps)

1 (job matching), 3

LLH project

T04.70

Main IP: ILO-IOM

Turkey

20.12.2017 / 20.12.2019 (24 months)

About to start (preparatory steps)

1 / 3 / 4 / 5

LLH project

T04.72

Main IP: UN Women

Jordan, KRI, Turkey,

19.12.2017 / 19.12.2019 (24 months)

About to start (preparatory steps)

1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5

LLH + social cohesion project

T04.76

Main IP: UNDP

Turkey

01.02.2018 / 01.02.2020 (24 months)

About to start (preparatory steps)

1, 3 (language),

LLH + municipal infrastructure project

T04.82

Main IP: KfW

Turkey

1.03.2018 / 08.02.2022 (48 months)

About to start (preparatory steps)

1 / 3 (indirect)

Education infrastructure project

Table 2: State of Implementation of Projects under the Sample and key LLH activities

Legend: 1) Employment Long Term; 2) Employment Cfw; 3) Training, Live Skills, Counselling; 4) Advocacy & Social Cohesion Within LlH Projects; 5) Support to Local Institutions

EQ. 3: What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?



JC. 3.1: Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources

Overall, and contrary to expectations, all agencies, whatever their type (NGOs, EU Ms or UN agencies, faced the same types of challenges during the inception period. In particular, their registration /acceptance by the local authorities was proven difficult to obtain, especially in Jordan and in Turkey.

The state of implementation of the EUTF projects under the sample does not allow to fully assess the performance of the different types of implementing partners at this stage, be they international/national NGOs such as the DRC and Search for a Common Ground, the heads of the two completed projects, T04.10 LEADERS and T04.12 FURSA, respectively; EU member state agencies such as GIZ; UN agencies, such as UN Women, UNDP and the ILO; and national governmental agencies, such as TOBB in Turkey.

Challenges that occurred during the inception phase affected all types of agencies independently of their status. In Turkey, Jordan and the KRI, the authorities’ screening of interventions and granting of authorizations for the entire project or specific activities has affected all agencies, including outside the non-EUTF framework. In addition, in Turkey, the crackdown on NGOs following the failed coup of 2016 deprived all types of agencies from (further) cooperation with selected and suitable internal partners.

While the comparison of implementing agencies based on their performance in the field is impossible, the different agencies are able to refer to different specific competencies and capacities. This has obviously been reflected during the selection process in the context of allocation of grants by the EUTF. A careful assessment of the different type of agencies based on their proven capacities in the sector and their overall capacities and competencies by considering the caveats listed above allows for the following classification:

UN agencies

They are closely linked to national governments and, as such they are expected to face relatively fewer problems than NGOs to obtain governmental acceptance. They (UNDP, ILO; IOM and UN women) can refer to expertise and experience to address LLH under a specific context yet with a focus on promoting formal employment and social cohesion including,

TVET/ soft skills development, combined with high absorption capacity necessary to implement large operations. Concerns exist among EUDs on the performance of UN agencies in terms of cost-effectiveness and promotion of EU visibility¹⁷.

EU Member state agencies

They are able to rely on the existing expertise and experience in the livelihoods sector and were already operating in the sector and in the region and are able to scale up activities when needed. This is underlined by GIZ’s involvement in the implementation ~~and coordination~~ of the “Beschäftigungsoffensive Nahost” funded by the German government and equipped with a budget (since 2017 about 430 Mio EURO) that comes close to the funds made available by EUTF to promote livelihoods. Challenges GIZ had to face derived from external factors (which might have not been properly anticipated) and from the number of tasks in coordination with other European partner organisations under a huge and overly ambitious project. KfW (T04.82 KfW SOLAR) which is a development bank (usually funding but not implementing projects) is able to rely upon long term experience in the region and especially in Turkey.

National partner institutions

So far, national partner institutions only exist in Turkey. Under the portfolio of LLH projects, only TOOB presents itself as a national implementing agency. The agency represents the social actor’s section, namely the Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchange of Turkey (TOBB). However, the problems they have encountered in getting data from the Turkish Employment Agency – ISKUR, places them at the level of a national NGO.

There are no other national partner institutions directly implementing EUTF LLH projects. Among the possible partners of LLH activities there are the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) and the Turkish Employment Agency - ISKUR. The capacities of these partners cannot be assessed. However, at least in theory, the institutions in Turkey have considerably more experience and capacity to implement LLH interventions, compared to the other countries in the region. Notably, many of their institutions over the years have been exposed to EU

¹⁷ Special Report No 28, The Facility for Refugees in Turkey: helpful support, but improvements needed to deliver more value for money, European Court of Auditors, 2018

systems and processes, especially during aligning laws and institutions to the requirements of the EU Acquis. Vice versa the national institutional framework in the remaining countries is far less developed and familiar with the EU systems and approaches applied to promote employment.

INGOs/ NGOs

The Action Document expressed its preference for both international and national NGOs that “have the requested versatility and have shown proactivity and ability to implement significant projects at a local scale although having a smaller absorption capacity than UN agencies”. However, their experience has shown that while they can also claim to rely on previous experience in the region, using a more (social) approach to livelihoods, they have not proven to be able to face efficiently the complex legal, political and administrative context of livelihoods and to promote economic development and sustainable employment (This is especially evident in the DRC/ Acted for the T04.10 LEADERS project in Jordan; T04.32 Concern project in Turkey). Except for LEADERS, they have turned to their fields of expertise and experience by primarily focusing on social cohesion activities

III. Efficiency

EQ. 4: To what extent have the various stakeholders the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

Under the Efficiency section, the capacities of the various stakeholders to promote and implement EUTF-funded projects (EQ. 4) and the question which projects use resources in the most efficient way is examined and discussed (EQ. 5). Internal delays in implementation and their potential mitigation are covered under EQ 4. while external risks have been discussed under Effectiveness EQ. 2

JC. 4.1: Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen



Overall, delays have not been caused by lack of implementing agencies capacities. This applies to technical expertise, institutional setting and the capacities to handle huge budgets

Most of the projects face issues that have affected or will affect, their efficiency: delays at their inception and pressures on levels of human and financial resources. However, despite of delays all agencies have the necessary technical and institutional capacities to ultimately plan and implement LLH activities, with no cost extension though.

Delays in the pre-implementation phase

According to most implementing agencies, the first unexpected delay was due to the long time (up to nearly two years in the case of the Danish Red Cross project) it took to reach a contractual agreement with the EU. While it is admitted that the delay, at large parts, stems from formal requirements to be meet by both the EU and implementing agencies, it compelled the latter to mobilize resources to constantly adapt the inception notes (and the project design) to the evolution of local contexts and more particularly constant changes in the national legislations regulating employment

Following the conclusion of the contracts between the EU and the implementing agencies, other delays occurred that were detrimental to the efficiency of the projects, as summarized in the following table:

Project Number / Implementing agency/country	Estimated time of delays	Reasons for delays (internal risks)	Time initially allocated
TO4.10 LEADERS project/DRC in Jordan and in Lebanon	Project completed with 6 months of no-cost extension	Extension from 18 to 22 and then 24 months (2 no-cost extensions) became necessary due to delays in implementation of activities because of internal problems (ambitious goals and procurement issues in one activity; under-staffing); external (obstruction by municipality in one activity)	18 months



T04.15 QUDRA GIZ component 2 in Turkey	20 months	External: Problems to achieve permission to implement activities	36 months
	KRI: Min. 6 months		
T04.17 Youth Resolve WVI in Jordan, KRI	Jordan: 1-year delay for implementation due to JORISS delay (Jordan’s approval system)	External: Problems to achieve permission to implement activities	24 months
	KRI 8 months		
T04.30 Danish Red Cross in Jordan, KRI	Jordan: delay for implementation 19 months	Internal: Exchange of local partner	36 months
T04.32 Concern in Turkey	At least 9 months	External: Problems to achieve permission to implement activities and registration in target areas	20 months
T04.40 Italian Cooperation in Lebanon, Jordan and the KRI	At least 10 months contract signed on January 2018	External: Programme stuck in the 3 countries due to registration problems with host authorities	30 months
T04.68 TOBB in Turkey	3 months	Internal: Collection of information for the inception report, lack of quality of data	24 months
T04.70 ILO/IOM in Turkey	Minor delays	-	24 months
T04.72 UN Women in Jordan, Turkey and Iraq	Under inception; No delays	-	24 months
T04.76 UNDP in Turkey	Under inception; No delays	-	24 months
T04.82 KfW -Solar- in Turkey	Under inception; No delays	-	48 months

Table 3: Delays in implementation of LLH activities attributed to internal and external risks

Reasons for delays during inception and implementation

The following paragraphs examine the causes of the delays that have affected the project and how the different agencies and their national counterparts have had the necessary capacities (technical, institutional and financial) to overcome these challenges caused by the delays. (JC. 4.1).

Delays deriving from establishing complex consortia and obtaining the necessary permissions to start implementation represented a serious threat to implementing agencies but have been mitigated.

Internal risks affecting the efficiency first stem from project design issues, starting with the ambitious objectives, either in terms of number of beneficiaries (especially those adopting an employability/employment approach) or the numbers of activities involved (including those adopting a “social cohesion approach” with limited employment activities). As found in the cases of the LEADERS and the FURSA projects, the mitigating tool in this regard has been, in agreement with the EUTF/ EUD, the granting of no-cost extensions in order to achieve outputs. However, these “no cost extensions” may affect the concerned implementing agencies financially and organizationally.

Another observed cause of internal risk originates from the governance of complex consortia involving several implementing agencies. However, as far as LLH activities are concerned, only the T04.10 LEADERS, the T04.12 FURSA, and the T04.23 BADAEL projects had, or will have, more than one agency involved in LLH interventions. Under T04.15 QUDRA problems occurred during setting-up of the consortium. The only documented case experience is that of T04.10 LEADERS, which has highlighted the difficulty inherent for a civil society organization such as the DRC, the leader of the consortium, to establish synergies and a spirit of partnership among six partners, especially in Jordan. The platform where the implementing agencies would have posted, exchanged and exposed achievements was never established. Rather, the implementing agencies seemed to have worked independently from one another, “in silos”, resulting in tensions and pervasive climate of competition. These challenges were compounded by suboptimal staffing and high staff turnover during the project’s life span (as in the case of T04.10 LEADERS). However, as testified by the QINs sent by the three agencies that had started implementation (T04.15 QUDRA) or completed the

project (T04.10 LEADERS and T04.12 FURSA), the agencies did their utmost to adapt their action to changes.

The consortium of 4 EU-MS (European Union Member States) under the leadership of GIZ was better managed, although it took time and effort to align different management and corporate cultures. However, an overly complex management and coordination structure led, according to respondents, to frictions and frustration that further complicated implementation.

During implementation, several challenges from delays in (or refusal to) obtaining governmental authorizations required for externally-funded interventions to refusal to admit Syrian refugees in training institutions threatened to hinder project activities. Where possible, such risks were mitigated through lengthy negotiations with the concerned parties, handover of implementation to local civil society institutions, neutral stances in politically-charged contexts. In order to overcome the exclusion of Syrian refugees from occupations outside the sectors allowed for them in Lebanon (construction, agriculture and cleaning activities) in particular these sectors were targeted together with the development of apprenticeship which is not considered formal employment under the Lebanese labour law.

EQ.5: Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rational way?

In order to assess which projects used resources i.e. financial and human resources and time in the most efficient way, two parameters have been applied: the absorption of funds and cost efficiency. The last resource, time (i.e. delays in implementation) has been assessed under EQs. 2 and 4 while consequences of delays in terms of cost-efficiency are examined below based on JC. 5.1.

JC. 5.1: Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives

Overall, financial resources have been deployed in an efficient manner. Cost-efficiency differs along types of projects and aid modalities and remains within margins of comparable projects addressing humanitarian assistance and development.

Absorption of financial resources

Due to the above-mentioned delays, absorption of financial resources remained in general below initially expected. Although, fixed costs were incurred for logistics, offices, human resources and preparatory studies, variable costs (i.e. “investment”) related to the provision of services or grants in favour of the beneficiaries will occur at a later stage only. Funds have been used up but not as quickly as planned.

Delays in implementation have been addressed by extension of the project duration through no cost extensions, in the cases of T04.10 LEADERS and T04.12 FURSA. However, no cost extensions are unlikely to contribute to cost-efficiency. Implementing agencies will have to maintain their human resources and offices, basically reducing the financial resources available to produce outputs. In addition, agencies must mobilize additional funds, generally own funds, to maintain the operation. These costs (additional overheads) are unlikely to contribute to cost-efficiency and decrease the ratio of resources agencies will be able to spend in favour of the beneficiaries.

The Office of the President (OPM, former office of the Prime Minister) in Turkey indicated during discussions that only 10% of the total funds allocated to the EUTF projects end up with the beneficiaries. That means that 90% of the funds per project were consumed by project administration, overheads and human resources. Cost-efficiency of the different types of projects has been assessed based on the ratio of funds allocated and employed by managing the intervention (human resources) and the share used for “investment” respectively reaching the beneficiaries. For the sample projects, a comparison indicates a ratio of costs earmarked for human resources compared with the total costs of the projects between 43% and roughly 1%. Indicated in absolute figures, costs for human resources under the budget headings reach roughly 390,000 EUR (1% under T04.82 KfW with a budget of 40.000.000 EUR) to 22.850.000 EUR (43% under T04.30 Danish Red Cross with a total budget of 53.000.000 EUR). The calculation does not include costs for administration usually amounting to 7% of the total costs. Uneven attributions of costs by the agencies under the budgets for human resources only allows to refer to estimates. However, the overall share of human resources compared with the total costs of projects differs considerably as indicated in the table below.



Number	Agency / Title	No. of Partners	Countries	Percentage share HR
T04.10	DRC LEADERS	5	Jordan and Lebanon	38%
T04.12	SFCG – FURSA	2	Lebanon and Iraq	21%
T04.17	WVi- Youth Resolve	4	Jordan and Iraq	40%
T04.15	GIZ QUDRA	5	Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey	22%
T04.30	Danish Red Cross	10	Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey	43%
T04.23	OXFAM BADAEL	3	Lebanon	27%
T04.32	Concern	n/a	Turkey	20%
T04.72	UN WOMEN	n/a	Turkey, Jordan, Iraq	18%
T04.70	ILO-IOM	n/a	Turkey	16%
T04.68	TOBB	n/a	Turkey	17%
T04.82	KfW	n/a	Turkey	1%
T04.40	Italian Cooperation	1	Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq	10%
T04.76	UNDP	n/a	Turkey	6%

Table 4: Percentage share of costs for human resources (HR) on the total costs of the projects

To allow for a reasonable judgment, the comparison needs to be accomplished by further considerations. Projects focusing on allocation of resources like T04. 82 KfW providing support to the MoNE/Turkey cannot be compared with T04.30 Danish Red Cross. The latter operating under a regional consortium budgeted Red Cross training experts under human resources thus encasing this section of the budget considerably. In addition, the regional intervention required additional resources for coordination.

However, overall findings related to cost-efficiency indicate that savings occurred in those projects that were already ongoing in the region or target countries. They managed to scale up activities thus reducing costs for human resources under the LLH projects budgets.

Examples are UN organisations (UNDP, ILO, IOM and UN Women), GIZ, KfW and to a limited degree only others like DRC and Search for a Common Ground.

The size of the projects matters: While T04.15 QUDRA is a large multi-component project with a budget of more than 70 MEUR, T04.10 LEADERS, managed by a consortium of 5 agencies, was allocated roughly one tenth of this amount only. Compared with the available resources (funds and time) and the project duration, coordination efforts necessary to set up the consortium and to start implementation of project activities under a fragmented approach between at least 5 partners is unlikely to become cost-efficient. Economies of scale /scaling-up effects only materialize when larger budgets are allocated to few agencies implementing a limited number of different types of activities.

Under national projects, the share of costs for human resources ranges from about 1% for T04. KfW / Turkey to about 27% for T04. BADAEL /Lebanon. As mentioned above in this context the different nature of the projects has to be taken into consideration. Projects partnering with CBOs (Community-based Organisations) conducting research and providing for training or CD (Capacity Development) highly depend on human resources/ staff. This is the case of the T04.10 LEADERS and the T04.12 FURSA which human resources expenses consume 38% and 36%, respectively, as opposed to projects mainly focusing on allocation of funds like T04.82 KfW (1%).

Cost-efficiency of regional/ multi-country projects

Descriptions of the Action documents (DoA) in most projects generally include assurances regarding (well-monitored) high cost-efficiency. For example, through actions implemented by several partners under a consortium, savings might occur for logistics and office rent, conducting joint risk assessments and application of a joint visibility approach. Large implementing agencies already operational in the field are likely to easily expand existing activities, relying on pre-existing working partnerships with local civil societies and public organizations. Lessons learned can also be easily collected and distributed among partners and shared with stakeholders. Regional/multi-county projects allow to shift resources in a more flexible manner, if needed.

EUTF multi-country projects compared with national projects indicate a higher share of costs earmarked for human resources ranging between 18% (UN Women) and 43% (Danish Red Cross) under the total budgets.

The use of resources must be compared with the results achieved and ultimately with a view to impact and to the extent the interventions managed to ensure sustainability. In this respect not only cost-efficiency but also cost-effectiveness becomes a decisive factor. This would finally allow to answer the evaluation question 5 by classifying means to create employment, comparing different aid modalities and activities, including benchmarking and perhaps even to assess cost-effectiveness achieved by the different types of implementing agencies. However, this requires an assessment of the financial reports and finally the outputs and outcomes of the project (beyond the scope of this evaluation)

Assumptions that cash-for-work (by paying minimum wages) or the delivery of a comprehensive package of services consisting in TVET (Technical vocational and educational training), job placements including subsidies payed to employers constitute expensive solutions that need to be further considered. It holds true that the provision of cash-for-work rarely leads to sustainable employment. However, this can apply to both TVET and to job placement. Provision of more comprehensive packages (which was the case under BMZ funded activities) might be expensive; however, it can well be cost-efficient in so far as it produces job opportunities for both, local and refugee communities, while contributing to social cohesion.

IV. Coherence

EQ. 6: To what extent was the support provided by the EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

This section examines the coherence and complementarity of the EUTF funded projects with other EU funding mechanisms (EQ. 6) by considering both criteria to assess the advantages and disadvantage linked to applying a regional respectively a national approach (EQ. 7).



JC. 6.1: EUTF interventions have objectives that complement other EU and donor LLH interventions.

Overall, and based on a mid-/ long-term perspective and involving a wide range of activities, EUTF projects are in coherence with relevant national, and international strategies. EUTF projects aimed to achieve and, in most cases, achieved high coherence with national strategies and initiatives.

LLH projects funded under the EUTF aim to reach objectives that are in line with relevant national and international strategies and their respective funding mechanisms. Regional level projects align with the priorities set out in the 3RP. It may be said that the cooperation between the EUTF LLH projects and national and EU stakeholders takes place through the incipient preparatory phase involving the signing of the contract with the EU and registration with the authorities in charge.

The Regional Resilience and Local Development Programme for Syrian Refugees and Host Communities that overarches the LLH EUTF projects strives to achieve coherence and complementary with EU humanitarian and development funding mechanisms. These include the European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) and the development aid provided through the European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI). In Jordan and in Lebanon the ENI focuses on promoting growth and job creation, employment and fostering local governance and social economic development). In Turkey, the Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA II in Turkey) prioritizes employment and social policies beside democracy & governance, civil society, rule of law, fundamental rights public administration and education), as well as security and peace-building activities.

While coherence and coordination by the EU during the planning of the EUTF and allocation of funds to the different sectors covered by the EUTF might have been high, implementing agencies were not given any guideline to align their activities along priorities set under intergovernmental cooperation, concerning ENI or IPA for example. Rather some kind of coordination between EUTF and ENI delegates at EUD level.

For that matter, despite some ambitious objectives, relatively limited time and financial resources are hardly sufficient to meet the wider objectives addressed by the EU in cooperation with the target countries, for example strengthening local authorities or

establishing effective TVET, however, as already pointed out (under the relevance section EQ. 1) nearly all project descriptions (DoA) and inception reports provide information about how the planned interventions comply with other existing or forthcoming projects of the same scope.

In Turkey, EUTF projects implemented in cooperation with ministries or agencies (for example UNPD, ILO, UN Women, KfW or implemented by a public entity like TOBB) are closely incorporated into the existing system governing employment and education including the Regulation on Work Permits for Foreigners under Temporary Protection. In addition, their objectives are closely aligned to national strategies like the National Employment Strategy, 2014-2023, (ILO, UNDP, TOBB) the action plan on women’s employment (UN Women) or the Climate Change National Action Plan, the National Renewable Energy Action Plan and the Energy Efficiency Action Plan (KfW).

At national level, the existence of serious efforts of the EUTF projects to complement existing initiatives has been reported in all countries concerned with projects funded under ENI, other donors like USAID or by UN agencies like ILO addressing LLH and other priority areas like education or WASH. According to discussions held, all EUTF projects completed or already under implementation (or completed) managed to prevent overlap with other interventions. Lack of resources for coordination (T04.10 LEADERS) and staff most prominently struggling with day to day management (T04.15 QUDRA, T04.30 Red Cross) may be reasons why indications for substantial synergies were not observed.

However, as acknowledged by implementing agency respondents in Turkey and in the other targeted countries, the requirement to align with national contexts has translated more in risks and constraints (job sectors for Syrian refugees limited to construction, agriculture and cleaning in Lebanon, changing attitudes towards home-based activities in Jordan, requirement for NGOs with skills training activities to work under strict governmental in Turkey) than to windows of opportunities.

EQ. 7: In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

Under EQ.7 based on JC. 7.1 the advantages and disadvantages of applying a regional versus a national approach in terms of coherence and complementarity and the potential impact on stakeholders has been examined.

JC. 7.1: Which challenges and opportunities derive from regional or national approaches and to what are the consequences on operational level?

Overall, the high political relevance of the regional and multi-sectoral approach is undeniable, but it entails overly complex objectives and management structures hindering coherence. Regional projects offer a chance to scale up activities and to manage and substantial budgets. National projects have a comparative advantage to achieve coherence and complementarity.

The political and symbolic value of a joint EU member states approach to the region, highly affected by the Syrian & Iraqi refugee and Daesh crisis, aims at giving “... European aid in this crisis a more European face, by better leveraging European capacities and knowledge already built up by partners over the past 2-3 years in the region. It will thus initially focus, where feasible, on actions with European partners, who already have operations and capacities in the region:” and “Seek added value and impact by maximizing coherence and synergies through encouraging larger multi-partner, multi-country, and multi-year actions, which will also reduce transaction costs of Fund interventions. Partners are therefore encouraged to identify maximum scope for joint regional proposals.”¹⁸

Multi-country/ regional projects

In theory regional projects offer an opportunity to cover the entire region under a holistic approach, by employing experienced key agencies already operational in the region thus offering an opportunity to swiftly scale up-existing activities. At the same time, they provide for an instrument likely to contribute to improving coordination and coherence by preventing parallel structures and capitalizing on existing expertise. They offer an opportunity to rely upon existing capacities, expertise and experience available within consortia.

¹⁸ Strategic orientation document for the European Union Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Crisis, “the Madad Fund”.

The joint initiative of European partners is not only of high political and symbolic value; it also allows for the combination of valuable experiences and expertise. For example, as evidenced GIZ in its midterm review, T04.15 QUDRA’s programme approach was meant to counteract fragmentation of bilateral projects of various EUMS agencies that often do not sufficiently exploit synergies and mutual leverage effects.

Finally, regional projects – implemented by “privileged partners” such as EUMS agencies or large international / UN organisations which are in principle capable to manage huge projects and substantial budgets – represent an opportunity to disburse large funds and reaching larger numbers of beneficiaries at relatively short notice, thus facilitating the management of the EUTF. Under a further assumption regional projects would allow for flexibility in allocation of resources between countries to react to the volatile context (especially concerning LLH) and create synergies, including improvement of cost-efficiency¹⁹.

National projects

In practice, findings from interviews with stakeholders and project documents provide for a more nuanced picture. Since there was no genuine partner for cooperation with the EU / EUTF at regional level but only national counterparts at governmental or more local level, programming and project design focused on the specific situation in each target country at the expense of regional objectives. Conversely, being less complex, national projects have a comparative advantage to achieve coherence and complementarity on the ground. It also allows to provide for targeted advocacy (and information) provided by local actors directly in touch with the beneficiaries.

At times, regional meetings organized with the implementation of the T04.15 QUDRA project, for instance, provided for an opportunity to governmental and non-governmental stakeholders to meet and exchange on common issues. However, in the absence of effective advocacy strategies covering the entire region, it remains to be seen whether these experiences will trigger new synergies or coordinated policies between targeted countries.

¹⁹ Mid-Term Evaluation Report, QUDRA – Resilience for Syrian Refugees, Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and Host Communities in Response to the Syrian and Iraqi Crises, 31 March 2018.

V. Sustainability

EQ. 8: What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

Under this section the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded projects are examined to assess the degree to which the assistance of the projects provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy levels (JC. 8.1). Under the second section, sustainability on policy level and the degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees has been examined (JC .8.2).

Overall, the projects and their components pursue different objectives depending on the types of support oscillating between temporary humanitarian assistance and mid-term development. In consequence not all of them are designed and likely to achieve sustainability at least not on all levels. Sustainability on institutional level is considered however, except of cooperation with public entities in Turkey and attempts for networking on community level, absence of strong and committed entities compromise prospect for institutional sustainability. Besides promoting employment leading to income on beneficiaries' level, achieving of financial sustainability has not been key objective and is unlikely to be achieved due to the nature of the projects. Projects aim to achieve social sustainability by contributing to community development including community resilience, providing for social cohesion, reflecting and supporting the needs of vulnerable groups and by promoting human and labour rights. Generation of additional income for both host and refugee populations remains the key factor. No options exist for the projects to address the strategic level and to influence labour legislation including provision for increased formal job opportunities and work permits for refugees.

JC.8.1: Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, and financial level

Institutional sustainability

At institutional level, sustainability is addressed by utilising existing networks (T04.30 Red Cross) and, following the recommendation of the EUTF, by including local partners, primarily



as sub-implementing agencies (only in Lebanon are local non-governmental organizations co-applicants: T04.10 LEADERS and T04.23 BADAEL). Few local and national NGOs in Jordan, Lebanon and the KRI are said to be capable of absorbing large funds and implementing large-scale activities. Only two projects of the sample T04.68 TOBB - The Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey and T04. 82 KfW Solar are carried out by governmental organisations or are directly linked with government institutions and only three UN organizations are involved, two of them in Turkey only (T04.76 UNDP, T04.70 ILO/IOM), while T04.72 UN Women operates in Jordan, KRI and Turkey.

BMZ-funded and GIZ-implemented projects in Gaziantep entered into partnership with local stakeholders like the Syrian Economic Forum (SEF), Internationale Bund (IB) in cooperation with Darülaceze Foundation (DAV) and the Gaziantep Metropolitan Municipality and finally the Gaziantep Chamber of Industry (GCI).

An example to involve a local CBO, the Syrian Economic Forum (SEF) based in Gaziantep, seeks to enable the host community and Syrian informal MSMEs to enter into to the formal labour market through the registration of their businesses. Besides providing for training on business administration and information about the legal framework and commercial regulations including banking in Turkey, SEF provides financial support for registration and equipment.

Internationaler Bund (IB) and Darülaceze Foundation (DAV) in cooperation with the Directorate General of Forestry and the Gaziantep Metropolitan Municipality (and two Municipalities in Istanbul; almost 3,000 people planted trees and worked in the tree nurseries; Municipalities paid the trees) implemented a cash-for-work project aiming at reforestation and addressing 1.000 vulnerable Syrian refugees and Turkish citizens by tree planting and temporarily working in tree nurseries (cash-for-work). In order to facilitate the beneficiaries' long-term access to the Turkish labour market, the project provided Turkish classes to Syrian participants.

Gaziantep Chamber of Industry (GCI) is affiliated with The Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (TOBB). The project seeks to establish outreach to the corporate sector by meeting the identified demand for skilled labour. Theoretical vocational trainings including language courses and on-the-job-trainings in private companies are combined to increase participants long-term perspective in the Turkish labour market. The training is followed by a six months job-placement. Participants of the training receive a salary equalling the Turkish minimum wage which is covered 50% by GIZ-KfW and 50% by the employing company.

Box 2: Examples for attempts to achieve sustainability applied under non-EUTF funded actions

While all projects seek to start partnerships with local stakeholders, the ability of the latter to pursue their activities appears to be very limited. As the T04.10 LEADERS project has shown, municipalities have no financial and technical capacity to finance service delivery and local development projects without external assistance.

Some decisive factors influencing institutional sustainability can be identified. Obviously, Turkey, a country equipped with comprehensive laws and regulations governing vocational education and labour market and strong public entities in charge of supervision and regulation sustainability on institutional level, seems to be the most propitious of all four target countries for such sustainability; however, its high level of institutional centralisation offers limited opportunities for free cooperation with local stakeholders.

Institutional sustainability addressed by other non-EUTF funded projects implemented by UNDP are directly embedded into the existing institutional framework for example a project funded by KfW to promote “Employment and Skills Development” implemented in partnership with İŞKUR seeking to support the agency in designing and implementing active market labour services by providing for CD and equipment. Another project “Resilience Building via Increased Livelihoods Opportunities and Strengthened Social Cohesion for Syrian Refugees and Host Communities” funded by the Japanese government implemented with the Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry seeks to build institutional capacities for increased job opportunities in local economies (Sanliurfa) affected by the Syria crisis.

Box 3: Institutional sustainability addressed by other non-EUTF funded

In the cases of Jordan and KRI, vocational education and labour market legislation and administration is less comprehensively developed than Turkey’s but, according to interviews held with implementing agencies, commitment to promote education, vocational training and employment of IDPs and refugees exists. In Lebanon, weakness or absence of regulations and institutional framework combined with the absence of a strong government and limited commitment to address the refugees mid-/long term livelihoods needs seem to compromise any prospect for institutional sustainability.

Other non-EUTF funded interventions in KRI aim at creating sustainable networks incorporating relevant actors on community level like UNDPs Area Based Recovery Approach (ABRA) applied



countrywide in Iraq, piloted in Dohuk. ABRA sought to establish networks between all stakeholders concerned including municipalities, government, national / international corporate sector (PPP), CSOs and donor communities to promote economic development and employment.

GIZ and the Joint Crisis Coordination Centre (JCC) KRI aim to abandon from supply side-oriented trainings, and instead turn to local economic development including CD.

The approach aims at focusing on local communities, under a PPP approach including outreach to the agricultural & corporate sector. The approach seeks to expand the rural production chain from cultivating and harvesting to processing, aiming to increase the share of local products in shops / supermarkets (import substitution -branded as “Produced in Kurdistan”), and will be accompanied by improved high quality TVET. It is planned to be complemented by capacity development for local authorities and CBOs. Finally, it strives to support MSME and the establishment of cooperatives in the sector (establishing small clusters producing vegetables, pickles, etc.) by providing for cfw/small grants, (considering the negative experience in KRI and other examples where allocated grants turn out to be small to become effective) and high quality TVET.

Box 4: Fostering networks to promote local economic development

Some second generation LLH projects are characterized by a community based or sectoral approach combining capacity development and investment based on close cooperation with national line ministries in charge of interior / municipalities, social affairs, planning or agriculture.

Under a first component the project “Maintaining Strength and Resilience for Local Governments” (MAZAR) implemented by International Cooperation Agency of the Association of Netherlands Municipalities (VNG) in cooperation with EU MS agencies seeks to strengthen the long-term resilience of targeted subnational governments and their refugee and IDP populations to deal with displacement. It prioritizes the central role of the so far relatively neglected local authorities by promoting effective implementation of already existing laws and regulations governing local authorities by filling existing gaps in implementation by strengthening decentralisation and resilience of selected municipalities. This applies on the one hand to the provision of resources and on the other hand to capacity development. The latter is crucial to enable municipalities to engage or oversee planning, management of projects, mobilization of resources (accountability) and finally to promote and engage in local economic development (for examples see annex 3, KRI). Under a



second component implemented by UNDP & UN Habitat the project strives to provide for CD (all aspects of planning, service delivery etc.), to support multi-level governance systems including referral systems combined with investments and finally promotion of local economic development.

Under a sector- rather than a community-based approach - FAO and partner agencies seek to “Strengthening livelihood and food security of host communities and Syrian refugees through the development of innovative and sustainable agricultural practices” by strengthening the capacities of professional organisations and advisory bodies in the agricultural sector and at the same time to provide for technical and financial and social assistance (investment) to famers groups or individual farmers, in addition to cash-for-work interventions. Further on, it seeks to identify priority areas for protection, water and environmental management issues.

Box 5: Second generation LLH projects

Social sustainability

Under all projects, sustainability at social level is considered, yet to a different degree and by applying different “theories of change”, either focusing on social cohesion or LLH.

The underlying approach for most of the LLH projects is to reduce vulnerability and promote social cohesion within host communities by generating additional income for its target groups, including vulnerable ones, and promoting social relations between Syrian refugees and indigenous populations through shared community activities.

Although it is difficult to quantify results achieved in reducing vulnerability and enhancing social cohesion, the relevance of these objectives cannot be disputed although their long-term effect at collective level still needs to be demonstrated. Input into local infrastructure (carried out by cash-for-work), establishment and equipment of local centres and activities including advocacy aiming at facilitating social cohesion provide for elements, although which some reservations, might be likely to sustain. Generation of additional income for both host and refugee populations remains a crucial factor to promote social cohesion and to reduce tensions between both groups.

Financial sustainability

For all projects (except of T04.82 KfW), achieving financial sustainability has not been a key objective. As long as projects manage to promote and secure employment and lasting

income, financial sustainability at beneficiaries’ level is secured. However, to allow for a continuous flow of benefits, nearly all interventions - including those necessary to maintain social cohesion - will depend on further external/ donor funding. National systems and institutions are not in a position to provide the necessary financial and human resources to address additional needs of IDPs or refugees. Except for Turkey, yet with some limitations, this is not the case in all other target countries. Overall sustainability of the projects’ actions at financial level is therefore not secured.

Sustainability at policy level

Sustainability at policy level, namely the development of more inclusive policies or legislations is only distinctively (specifically) addressed by T04.10 LEADERS that set changes in labour law policies as a –yet unmet- overall objective.

The degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees may bring about such policy/legislative changes in the future. The political sensitivity of integrating Syrian refugees in local economies, which are already characterized by high unemployment and low economic activity rates, limits the likelihood of significant long-term employment effects, with regional differences however: reaching from growing tensions reported in urban areas in Turkey, Jordan and Lebanon to a more conducive context in KRI.

Strategic issues such as promotion of rule of law, strengthening public administration including local governments, economic development and promotion of employment are subject to the EU’s support channelled through other instruments like ENI, Development cooperation and its thematic programmes or IPA in the case of Turkey. Support provided by EUTF in the LLH sector (still) reflects an approach usually applied in emergency or post-emergency situations characterised by achieving objectives at short notice (‘quick wins’) or at best under a midterm perspective. Moreover, focus on local target groups rather than governments and oscillating priorities between strategies focusing on return and integration has prevented projects to design or promote new policies. In this context, the issue has to be raised whether capacity development (CD) at policy level, incorporating ministries or agencies in charge of employment or social cohesion, can contribute to major achievements under a short- or mid-term approach considering the weakness (except Turkey) of state institutions,

substandard equipment with resources and insufficient staff retention. Finally, there are doubts whether projects limited to 24 and 36 months only (Box 5, FAO and VNG) are capable to contribute to sustainability on institutional level. However, under a local perspective, CD for municipalities, CBOs and other local stakeholders might contribute to generate effects to promote local development and social cohesion. In addition, it offers an opportunity to generate multiplier effects as a contribution to increase institutional sustainability.

VI. EU Added value

EQ. 9: What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

The first section (EQ. 9) examines the extent to which gains were achieved from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF. The second part (EQ.10) examines the extent to which the communication and visibility actions provided for added value based on evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions' desired effects.

JC. 9.1: Gains deriving from funding and managing large scale EUTF-funded LLH interventions

Overall, the EUTF allows for collecting, bundling, allocating and coordinating large funds in a swift manner to enable the actors to address not only emergency but post-emergency needs under a holistic approach including social cohesion, resilience and LLH with a mid-term perspective.

The humanitarian, social-economic and political dimension of the Syrian Refugee Crisis obviously exceeds the capacities of the host countries, which already host other national groups of refugees (Palestinian, Iraqis, Sudanese, etc.).

Besides addressing the immediate needs through humanitarian assistance mechanisms, the protracted nature of the crisis requires a coordinated mobilisation - and most of all the coordination - of the supporting actors in order to address the emergency and post-emergency needs, including comprehensive support to host communities and to prepare for

a scenario that includes a support for the return of refugees to their host countries. However, it became apparent that the support provided by the international donor community, including the EU and its Member States through bilateral attempts and instruments, proved to be insufficient to respond adequately to growing needs in an effective and efficient manner.

In this context the EU took the decision to set up and manage an EU Trust Fund under an agreement concluded with other donors. The Fund, under the auspices of the EU, allows to collect and channel resources and to provide for coherence on regional level already during planning, by avoiding fragmentation or duplication of efforts. In addition, considering the complexity, the scope and the duration of the crisis, it became apparent that switching from short-term humanitarian assistance to a mid-term approach linking relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD) became essential (with the EUFT established for an initial duration of 5 years). At the same time, it became obvious that bundling of funds and resources would enable the donor community and the host countries to create economies of scale and induce leverage effects.

In general, the establishment of the EUTF was meant to achieve and demonstrate an EU added value exceeding the value created by the actions of individual Member States (Germany for example), highly engaged in operations to address the Refugee crisis in the region. More precisely the EUTF was established based on the following assumptions:

- (1) The EUTF will be able to collect, pool, direct and most importantly mobilize additional funds at relatively short notice.
- (2) The EUTF enhances the role of the EU in coordinating the international response to the crisis based on a holistic approach including coordination and employment of the comprehensive EU instruments (ECHO, ENI, IPA, DCI and others) already in place and at the same time limiting wasteful competition between national governments. Because of the innovative holistic and longer-term effects of its sponsored interventions towards resilience, the EUTF may further strengthen the economic and political status of the EU in the region.
- (3) Despite the existence of other instruments and funds established by the international donor community (RDDP for instance), the EUTF provides for a regional scope allowing the EU and its donors to engage in dialogue and coordinate around a strategic instrument to

respond to the changing needs and challenges that are likely to appear in the course of the crisis in a significant, flexible and timely manner. This includes starting operations in Syria based on an established network in neighbouring countries as soon as an opportunity occurs.

(4) Contrary to the existing EU and donor country budgets, which are not designed and equipped to address a mid- or long-term crisis, EUTF funding intends to provide at least some temporary continuity. This does not only allow to embark on mid-term planning but also increases predictability and sustainability of funding.

(5) Further expected advantages of the EUTF were the enhancement of EU visibility in the Middle East through a comprehensive and uniform monitoring system allowing for comprehensive reporting to media, taxpayers and in host countries and beneficiaries.

(6) Finally, the EUTF has been designed to achieve efficiency gains by reducing the financial burden of administering resources and management of the Syrian crisis response and its single interventions with planned overhead costs for managing the EUTF of less than 5%.

Overall, large parts the assumptions leading to the establishment of the EUTF have materialized. The EUTF proved to be able to mobilize, collect and allocate large funds under a holistic approach, and at the same time provides for a midterm perspective towards resilience by increasing predictability of substantial funding over a period of 5 years. Overall, it provides for EU added value.

The findings of the evaluation drawn from interviews with key stakeholders from EU services, host governments and implementing agencies provide for some evidence that the assumptions summarised under points 1, 2 and 4 mainly materialized. Discussions held with representatives of implementing agencies, whether funded by the EUTF or not, confirmed the innovative and comprehensive / holistic approach offered by the Fund.

Concerning the first assumption, the EUTF managed to attract, pool and allocate ample financial resources, although the total amount of funding available with or without the existence of the EUTF remains difficult to assess. The second assumption holds true as far as application of a holistic approach and limiting wasteful competition among EU member states are concerned. Finally, as regards the fourth assumption the EUTF gathered ample resources allowing to cover a longer period (initially 5 years) offering a perspective to shift

from short to mid-term support by, at the same time, increasing the predictability of the EU support²⁰.

Assumptions as regards to the added value in order to provide for a strategic regional dimension and outreach, concerning the enhancement of EU visibility still need to be fully materialised.

Interviews mentioned above, indicate, at the same time, that assumptions 3, 5 and 6 have insufficiently materialized so far. As for the third assumption, the EUTF provides significant resources mainly allocated in a flexible and timely manner. However, in absence of a counterpart, the regional / strategic dimension of the EUTF still needs to materialize. EU added value can be attributed to ample attempts, mainly of EU Member States agencies, to carry out complementary activities and provide for moderate evidence to gain synergies. However, the potential to generate synergies at regional level have proven limited due to limited availability and transferability of best practices or has so far not fully been exploited. The fifth assumption turned out to be over-ambitious and is discussed in further detail under EQ 10. Finally, the sixth assumption has been mainly confirmed. Efficiency gains have occurred as far as the management of the EUTF is concerned. Allocation of large grants to consortia or agencies capable to design and implement large-scale projects contributes to reducing the number of small single projects. However, to a certain extent, shifting of the “administrative” burden to the level of the consortium leading agencies inevitably requires considerable human and financial resources that were insufficiently taken into account in the contractual agreements between the EU and implementing partners. This already became obvious under the completed T04.10 LEADERS project (see also cost efficiency EQ 5).

EQ. 10: To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value

Visibility has been examined based on JC. 10.1. However, assessment of visibility including communication requires an in-depth examination. So far it is not possible and may be too

²⁰ As highlighted by potential / future implementing agencies like for example Mercy Corps and confirmed by others running pilots despite of challenges they had to face during implementation of LEADERS and FURSA.

early to deliver a final judgement concerning the visibility of the EUTF amongst beneficiaries and stakeholders.

JC. 10.1: Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions’ desired effects?

Overall, observations indicate that the visibility of the EU support channelled through the EUTF remains low with some gradual differences observed in each country. A lack of identity of the key services providers and clear messages and relevant information has been observed. Communication to promote services of the projects and to reach out to beneficiary communities and in consequence to attract beneficiaries indicates weaknesses.

At project level, all DoAs contain the mandatory section on EU visibility and Communication (outlined in the Visibility and Communication Plans) as required by the EUTF. However, the visibility outputs and outcomes are limited. Overall visibility of the EUTF has remained - according to discussions held with key stakeholders in all target countries and impressions gained during field visits- low and highlighting implementing agencies rather than the services offered by the consortium or the support provided by EUFT.

T04.15 QUDRA set up a comprehensive crosscutting component (no 5) aiming at promoting visibility and communication on different levels and regions (MENA, country- and module-wide and addressing EU member states). In addition, this component was meant to spread lessons learned by establishing platforms for dialogues, information exchange and spreading of lessons learned (i.e. EUTF Innovation Lab in Turkey). In practice, this component so far didn’t meet initial expectations. Implementation of the module across the region was delayed due to high staff turnover and gained momentum only at the beginning of 2018. The visibility and communication plans have been revised including the strengthening of the monitoring and the employment of social media formats.

According to QUDRA’s mid-term evaluation report, the provision of suitable inputs to communicate and spread projects’ results, including lessons learned, remained below

expectations. A lack of clear messages and information has been observed (issue already highlighted in this report already under Section II).

The visibility activities of the action LEADERS seem to have benefitted mainly the well-established implementing agencies (for example CARE) despite the action-related documentation distributed in local language and English by the agencies (usually carrying the logos of the EU and involved agencies).

ROM reports on T04.30 Danish Red Cross and the mid-term review of the project indicate weaknesses as regards visibility of the project’s local components. In addition, monitoring of the visibility of the action (and its components) needs to be improved.

In this context, it has to be stressed that the visibility of the actions is not limited to demonstrating the EUTF’s efforts to address the refugee crisis. It also constitutes a substantial element to promote the services of the projects and to reach out to the different target groups. Discussions with stakeholders across the target countries and across EUTF and non-EUTF projects indicated that attracting and recruiting beneficiaries for soft-skills or vocational trainings and apprenticeships has been a challenge. Communication between projects and beneficiaries did not reach the expected results. Limited staff resources to organize enough awareness activities within vulnerable categories and the absence of pre-established lists of eligible beneficiaries, namely materially vulnerable persons coming preferably from the ranks of unemployed/unoccupied women and youth groups are some of the reasons for limited communication between projects and beneficiaries.

It became a commonly accepted feature that communication with migrant communities must consider the way they collect, can absorb and trust information. Analysis of communication flows with different groups of refugees / IDPs based on existing networks or specific relations, addressing clusters of migrants stemming from different regions or municipalities or various social strata (for example city dweller or farmers) has been insufficiently developed, although highlighted in EUTF Action Documents.

Finally, visibility and communication of the projects’ objectives and services to the corporate sector, a key player in LLH projects, exists only in some projects, for example T04.68 TOBB. In Lebanon, reluctance of the corporate sector to employ or train Syrian refugees has been an ongoing challenge, defeating any communication strategy or interventions.

3.3. Conclusions and Lessons Learned

I. Relevance

EQ. 1: How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

C1) The EUTF programmes and projects are in line with strategic national, regional strategies/policies and EU actions plans. However, to a certain extent, the EUTF addresses conflicting objectives. Although highly relevant to the objectives of the EUTF, featuring a hybrid approach that combines humanitarian assistance targeting the vulnerable (underprivileged youths, women and disabled persons) and a development approach focusing on medium/long term employment and local development are unlikely to match.

C2) The objective to provide for sustainable employment for refugees or IDPs may be in conflict with national legislation that restricts (especially in Lebanon) the number of sectors available for employment of refugees and IDPs. Given the challenges met by employment/employability activities, inclusion of (more) short-term cash-for-work initiatives remains relevant for employment and social cohesion purposes in case no other more sustainable or more readily available alternatives exists. Addressing the formal labour market ignores the factual importance of the informal economy of target countries and the reality of vulnerable parts of the resident and refugee population.

C3) Most of the interventions are implemented under (within) a multi-country or regional approach. However, the absence of a counterpart representing the governments of the region in the elaboration of the projects results in lack of strategies and activities covering the entire region - including strategies for a return to Syria. The latter is not surprising since uncertain perspectives (and intentions) to return can hardly be addressed under interventions lasting for about 24 months.

C4) All actions funded under EUTF consider the specific challenges and needs of the target countries and regions including host communities as indicated in the 3RP or priorities of host governments by addressing livelihoods and social cohesion. Experience has shown that the

reservations of host societies to the inclusion of the Syrian refugees within labour markets and training institutions have been compounded by the insufficient number of jobs produced by the local economies. This issue was exacerbated by the reluctance of refugees to engage in LLH projects for fear of endangering their refugee status and, especially for women, lack of confidence/integration with their local social context. These factors have been underestimated by the projects. In addition, projects also generally underestimated the strong reservations within the governments, in Lebanon more especially, vis-à-vis the formal employment of refugees. Likewise, Turkey, with an existing referral system for education and employment, offered limited space to manoeuvre for EUTF funded actions in sectors like TVET and LLH unless formal agreements with the government were reached. In Lebanon and Jordan interventions were limited to selected fields of activity or niches unlikely to conflict with governments' intentions. In consequence, turning to training might have been necessary but it did not significantly contribute to formal employment and/or appear attractive to potential beneficiaries. At best, skills training schemes may produce cheap labour for the informal sector.

C5) With regard to project design, a clear shift from humanitarian assistance towards development/LLH interventions has been observed, the scope of which has depended on the margins of manoeuvre granted by national regulations/legislations. Two main types of activities have been implemented:

Type A) Activities directly addressing employment: skills training, counselling, job placement and job creation, advocacy for labour inclusion of vulnerable groups. In addition, short-term cash-for-work initiatives are also implemented within activities involving infrastructural activities.

Type B) Social cohesion activities: conflict mitigation mechanisms through joint social and mediation activities between Syrian refugees and their host communities, coupled with micro employment initiatives. Type A activities were given preference in the Action document, type B activities being considered complements to type A activities.

However, with only few exceptions, project design often turned out to be relatively inadequate and often detrimental to the effectiveness and efficiency of the projects.

The main reasons identified are:



- Overall lack of adequate needs assessments demonstrated inter alia in lack of baselines.
- (Overly) ambitious objectives and target values to be reached under restricted time-frames (in several cases 18-24 months only) represent a time span that is more in line with humanitarian assistance than mid-term development approach, as aimed at by EUTF.
- Indicators are oriented towards quantitative employment outputs (short-term/ long-term goals) without differentiation between LLH needs of Syrian and host communities. In addition, indicators are often neither SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Reasonable, Time bound) nor RACER (Relevant, Acceptable, Credible, Easy and Robust).
- Risk assessments and mitigation strategies remain weak (also due to unpredictable changes in the political context, and in refugee status and labour legislation) combined with a remarkable low awareness on potential management risks that occurred with projects implemented and steered by a consortium.
- For several reasons, no sustainable solutions are in sight for most Syrian refugees in the countries concerned, be it through return, reintegration or resettlement. In consequence, it remains of importance to reduce tensions and to improve livelihood for both Syrian refugees and IDPs, and for host communities. As confirmed by all stakeholders (local) economic development and stability remain key issues yet to be achieved or maintained under unpredictable political and legal contexts, including through the provision of LLH support to vulnerable groups and the creation of employment.
- All projects strived to support vulnerable groups, especially women and youths. However, the size and duration of the projects (both types A and B) render it unlikely to “boost” employment for this target groups. Existing cultural and social barriers are difficult to overcome and to gain “quick wins” in promoting female employment more especially.



- Given considerable time elapsed between project planning and design, and project implementation, implementing agencies have often had to face changes in the local or country’s contexts. Maintaining the relevance and the feasibility of the projects became a challenge. Exceptions are projects directly partnering with ministries or institutions in Turkey, mainly by providing investment.

II. Effectiveness

EQ. 2: To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving (or are likely to be effective in achieving) their desired results?

C6) The projects produced their numerous outputs, although with no cost extensions. Moreover, their outcomes and (ambitious) overall objectives could not be met during the (limited) allocated timeframes due to the inability of the agencies involved to mitigate external risks that they were not equipped to face. The projects, including those facing the target countries’ screening during the inception phase, were challenged by volatile political, social and economic contexts. This entailed adjustments to initial planning including selection of local partners and access to target areas or regions and beneficiaries.

C7) While projects may prove more or less effective in terms of outputs, for instance in terms of the number of trainings held, or individuals trained the quality of outcomes as regards social cohesion and job creation are still to be substantiated. This applies especially to women which represent a remarkable part of the target groups. In this respect, the T04.17 Youth Resolve project started in September 2019 that focuses on the training, counselling and placement of a relatively small (a few hundreds) of beneficiaries may eventually be more fruitful (and visible in terms of achievements) than the T04.15 QUDRA project, which aims at the vocational training of thousands of beneficiaries. There is little evidence that the demand side has been supported with the same positive effect (boost the local economy, labour market). Completed LLH projects (incl. cash-for-work projects) cover urgent human needs and allow for some increased employability of the main target groups at relatively short notice

EQ. 3: What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

C8) Since only international NGOs had completed their projects at the time of the evaluation (consortia led by the DRC and Search for a Common Ground), it is not possible to establish comparisons with UN agencies or EU MSAs (EU Member State Agencies) in terms of effectiveness. However, while it is assumed that the latter may have more political leverage in their regular relations with local/national authorities, it is presumed that they will face the same problems concerning adequate identification and access to target groups, especially among Syrian refugees. Although less versatile and less likely to adapt to changing contexts, strong UN or EUMSAs (EU Member State Agencies) may be more likely to overcome external challenges leading to delays and ensuing financial strains.

All agencies addressed thematic issues clearly belonging to their main fields of expertise, capacities and previous in-country experience. In some cases (for instance in the two completed projects, T04.10 LEADERS and T04.12 FURSA), both LLH / job creation and social inclusion were covered, although with different orders of priority: T04.14 LEADERS prioritized LLH/ job creation (in line with the Programme) and T04.12 FURSA prioritized social inclusion.

Under a small sample of projects with many of them still under inception, the advantages or disadvantages of the various implementing agencies are likely to materialize only at a later stage. However, the allocation of funds by the EUTF already reflecting the financial capacities of the agencies in line with their specific technical expertise available is likely to constitute the decisive factor.

III. Efficiency

EQ. 4: To what extent have the various stakeholders the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

C9) Despite of delays observed, all agencies are in principle equipped with the necessary technical and institution capacities to plan and implement LLH activities. The following decisive factors for delays can be identified to assess the capacities of the implementing agencies:

Nearly all projects have been affected by delays caused by different kinds of internal and external challenges. While internal challenges (considerable time to reach agreement with the EU against a constantly changing context; lack of coordination/synergies within consortia) may be dealt with in the future with additional funds for coordination and a revision of the EU-agencies negotiation modalities, external changes related to the instable situation or the local stakeholders reluctance or inability to respond swiftly to calls for agreements, although anticipated, will remain well beyond the agencies’ capacity to mitigate. In most cases, implementing agencies have had to resort to coping strategies including shifts in the contents of activities or a constant dialogue with local partners in order to “keep the ball rolling”.

EQ. 5: Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rational way?

C10) Overall, EUTF LLH projects used resources in a cost-efficient manner. Some decisive elements exist and are identified as follows:

- A comparison between budgets of regional/multi country projects and national projects based on the share of human resources of the total budget as a proxy-indicator indicates higher cost-efficiency among national projects, but there are other decisive factors addressing the efficient use of resources.
- The sample of national projects contains some projects that are mainly focused on investment. In these projects, for example those led by T04.82 KfW and T04.76 UNDP, cost efficiency (expressed by a very low share of costs for human resources) seems to be very high. Staff necessary to allocate funds and for supervision proved to be limited.
- Projects with small budgets tend to consume a higher percentage of budgets on human resources and overheads than large projects.

IV. Coherence

EQ. 6: To what extent was the support provided by the EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

C11) Overall LLH projects funded under the EUTF operate in line with relevant national and international strategies and their respective funding mechanisms based on cooperation between LLH projects and national and EU stakeholders. They develop sound incipient procedures of contracting, screening and monitoring. On operational level, coordination of EUTF funded projects with other EU funding mechanisms to achieve complementarity in the LLH sector exists in all countries and is maintained by formal or informal steering committees. Operational coordination has been established between the EUTF and the RDPP programme. It will be expanded under RDPP II including a focus on long term solution scenarios for refugees ²¹.

EQ. 7: In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

C12) Regional LLH projects can absorb substantial grants, are able to build upon existing activities and provide significant potential to up-scale activities. However, the assumption that projects implemented by EU MS agencies/ International Organisations would ensure an easy scaling-up of activities based on existing structures and contacts has proven to be too optimistic. Opportunities to reduce costs by employing already existent structures exist but they may be outflanked by costs occurring from permanent and complex coordination mechanisms. In theory a regional approach would allow for exchanges on lessons learned

²¹ RDPP II Middle East focuses on (1) research, (2) policy dialogue and advocacy. In addition, it strives to enhance (3) economic opportunities and capacities of the host and refugee population with special emphasis on the linkage between LLH and protection and longer term solutions for the refugees (addressing either a prolonged stay in the host country or a return to Syria). The EUTF MTR points to lack of capacities to manage the EUTF. In this respect the RDPP may provide for additional resources to support EUTF services by providing for recent data and information to underpin planning and management of the Fund based on evidence. An aspect dealt with under other EUTFs as well (see for example: EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa, Research and Evidence Facility on Migration in the Horn of Africa <https://www.soas.ac.uk/ref-hornresearch/>).

between countries and convergent advocacy campaigns; these assumptions been insufficiently materialized so far.

C13) National operations provide for limited options to spread lessons learned or to promote advocacy across the region. However, operations implemented under a national approach are less complex and better use the resources available for the necessary coordination to achieve complementarity during implementation of activities on the ground.

V. Sustainability

EQ. 8: What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

C14) The first generation of LLH projects does not sufficiently address sustainability requirements at institutional, social and policy levels. Achieving financial sustainability does not appear as key and seems to be unlikely to be obtained post-project implementation. Inclusion of elements of sustainability at an advanced implementation stage has resulted in mixed success. Few projects provide for capacity development to generate multiplier effects. As EUTF and Non-EUTF projects have shown, partnering with local actors, especially municipalities, in order to support capacity development or to promote social cohesion and employment encounters difficulties in all countries. Different factors, including interferences from the local authorities (Turkey), reluctance of the corporate sector to engage with Syrian refugees (Lebanon), little legal opportunities for Syrian refugee employment (earmarked sectors- Lebanon and Jordan) have been identified. Even where close cooperation with national entities is achieved, sustainability is not guaranteed due to lack of financial resources at the level of national and sub-national partners.

Under a local development approach, the second generation of LLH projects (see box 5) provides for a clear focus on the capacity development of municipalities and professional organisations combined with enhanced investments. By providing for support to implement existing laws and regulations, it addresses the policy level. However, the short duration of the actions will raise the issue of financial sustainability.

VI. EU Added Value

EQ. 9: What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

C15) The EUTF allows for collecting, bundling and coordination of funds to enable the actors to address emergency and post-emergency needs under a holistic approach including social cohesion, resilience and LLH under a mid-term perspective. The EUTF projects under survey capitalized on the EUTF support by implementing large-scale projects. However, as expressed by T04.10 LEADERS, T04.12 FURSA the EUTF was considered to be inflexible with regards to allocation of funds and timeframes. In their opinion the no cost extension granted by the EUTF did not compensate for additional costs occurring.

C16) The intention of the EUTF to provide for a regional instrument has not fully materialized, however limited indications for synergies exist and the presence of capable agencies operating in the countries offers an opportunity to scale up activities for future operations in Syria.

C17) There can be no doubt that the EUTF provided for an efficient approach as regards reducing the administrative burden of the EU service by focusing on funding of a limited number of large rather than a high number of small projects. However, indication exists that coordination of the projects by the implementing partner requires additional resources which are insufficiently covered by the EUTF.

EQ. 10: To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions' desired effects?

C18) All projects contain visibility strategies and plans. Observations indicate that the visibility of the EU support channelled through the fund remains low with some gradual differences observed in each country.

Joint exercises, coordination and exchange of relevant information and lessons learned between members of a consortium and among consortia in order to promote visibility

appeared to have been insufficiently developed. As it appears, the challenges faced by the agencies to achieve their objectives with limited time frames and budgets (including funds to promote lessons learned) against adverse contexts took their toll on their visibility and communication actions.

3.4. Recommendations

The recommendations are based on the findings of the assessment on the LLH EUTF-funded projects as well as discussions with representatives of other LLH projects not funded by the EUTF. It should here be borne in mind that, except for the source of funding and the regional/multi-country aspect of several projects (LEADERS, FURSA, QUDRA, UN Women, Danish Red Cross and Italian Cooperation - half of the projects), there is no specific or intrinsic criteria distinguishing EUTF-funded activities from activities covered by other projects: EUTF-funded LLH projects cover a wide variety of employment/employability and social cohesion activities. Several non-EUTF funded institutions may for that matter be included in a possible next phase of the EUTF (see Mercy Corps that may join the LEADERS consortium in Lebanon). Conversely, non-EUTF stakeholders acknowledged challenges that are similar to those of the EUTF projects, including mismatches between training activities and employment and reluctance of Syrian refugees to formalize their working status and of employers to employ them formally.

Addressees of the recommendations below are the EU services. They aim to inform future LLH support funded by the EUTF based on discussions with the EU delegations, implementing agencies and local stakeholders that focused on the most salient lessons learned from the projects' experience in terms of project design, management and performance. As outlined in annex 2²² it is beyond this evaluation's scope to provide for technical recommendations for host countries' governments to revise their legal and administrative framework governing economic development and labour market regulations or for implementing agencies to adjust ongoing projects. These have (and may be in future) dealt with in the technical evaluations carried out internally or externally

²² Annex 2, Evaluation Matrix and Scope of the Evaluation, section 2.2 Limitation

3.4.1. Relevance

R1-C5/C7) The EUTF should ensure that employment/employability activities proposed by the applicant agency (ies) must be based, firstly on accurate livelihoods assessments of the refugee/ IDP and host communities in terms of capacities and needs (especially the most vulnerable of them), taking into consideration the positive/negative trends that have affected those since the outbreak of the Syrian refugee crisis; secondly, on the demands of the corporate sector based on comparative socioeconomic advantages in targeted areas. In this respect, the EUTF should ensure that future implementing agencies carry out the necessary groundwork:

- First, on the supply side of labour, ensure not only that the beneficiaries are in need of training and/or employment, but also that the proposed outputs of the interventions be tailored to the actual capacities and aspirations of the beneficiaries. This tailoring approach entails for instance that skills training activities (for instance workplace-based learning/ on-the-job training as part of skills development measures) be carefully focused on the beneficiaries' individual chances of finding job opportunities, and accompanied by counselling and job placement, see financial literacy activities.
- Second, on the demand side of labour, preparatory steps must ensure that the corporate sector - Chambers of Commerce and Industry or individual target companies (and not only civil society organizations) are included in the elaboration of the training/employment programmes. This applies - whenever appropriate and possible - to other key stakeholder like municipalities / local communities' institutions and includes identification of realistic perspectives for public / private partnerships.
- Third, LLH activities need to be clearly aimed to reach multiplier effects and ensured institutional sustainability. This entails that the project implementation is carried out within available structures, processes and in line with ongoing local LLH policies as described for the region and the selected target countries under annex 3 evaluation details. In this way, the projects would get rid of their “pilot-projects” aspect



(coexisting with many other LLH pilot projects) and embed more convincingly in the target countries’ development policies.

R2)-C2/C5) If the target population is to remain limited to the most vulnerable persons within the Syrian and host communities, specific microcredit or training schemes may not be sufficient. Rather, it is recommended that the EUTF considers and the following approaches, some of them pursued by non-EUTF projects (portrayed in more detail in box 1):

- In addition or complementary to the current cash/consumption support project implemented through the World Food Programme the “graduation approach” (promoted by the World Bank and the WFP and the UNHCR among other institutions) defined as a sequenced and multi sector intervention combining simultaneously, skills training, financial literacy training, and exposure to savings may be more likely to initiate a trajectory to a sustainable livelihood within a specified period (usually 18-36 months), should be explored.
- For non-economically employed or unemployed women (especially amongst Syrian refugees), engage in support for home-based businesses with attention to registration regulations and safety standards as defined by the regulations of each target country. Typical home-based activities include traditional sewing and cooking, namely traditional sectors where Syrian refugees are known to have a comparative advantage over host population. Is so far as possible, these activities should be included in the related existing value chains in the targeted localities/countries.²³
- Gig economy methods based on IT platforms - as tested, but not yet fully evaluated, by Mercy Corps in Jordan and in Lebanon. The idea is to relate refugees and vulnerable host community members possessing skills (food catering, beautification, handicraft, learning, see even domestic work etc.) to clients through IT platforms. While such initiatives still required enhanced digital access among disadvantaged communities and control mechanisms aimed at ensuring such workers’ labour rights, they could pave the way for the establishment of work associations.

²³ <https://www.unhcr.org/594b7d7f7.pdf>, P.20 (experience in Egypt).



- Given the often mismatch between skills training and durable employment, and the difficulties in obtaining job opportunities for vulnerable Syrian refugees some alternative activities may be considered: advocate for and support technically the clustering of formal and informal micro-LLH initiatives in order to ensure their sustainability through increased opportunities and shared risks and improve work conditions.
- As a “coping assistance strategy”, consider increased inclusion of cash-for-work activities for long-term unemployed persons (especially for Syrian refugees) that also seek to equip beneficiaries with skills, “work spirit” and counselling/placement activities designed to facilitate their longer-term integration in the formal economy in case no other more sustainable or more readily available alternatives exists. Having nationals and refugees working side by side is acknowledged to be a strong vector of social cohesion.

R3)-C5) For all skilled refugees and host communities, focus on joint SMES ventures between Syrian refugees and nationals from the host communities (as promoted by Finnish Church Aid, for instance, (portrayed in box 1). These interventions also serve social cohesion objectives. However, such projects must be accompanied by financial literacy projects and advocacy initiatives at national level in favour of enhanced legal inclusion of Syrian refugees as entrepreneurs on par with their counterparts (especially in Jordan).

3.4.2. Design

R4)-C5) The EUTF should ensure that future implementing partners provide the descriptions of their actions (DoA) in line with the criteria listed under R1, and under a second step duly substantiated by inception reports: The outputs, outcomes and general objectives of future selected projects must be based on a logical sequence tied to SMART or RACER indicators, based on a logical sequence of inputs, outputs and outcome and geared to the recent local context.

R5)-C5/C9) Project duration needs to be adapted to the outputs and outcomes. Sufficient time must be allocated for inception activities, including adjustment of the DoA to the most recent context to be presented in the inception reports, procedures to set up the projects, and

implementation, also taking into account the many unexpected political and legal challenges the project’s activities are likely to face during the implementation phase. Duration of LLH projects with employment activities should not be less than 24 months (for skills training and job placement activities) and 36 months (for more complex employment activities). This applies even more to projects aiming to promote local and economic development as for instance planned in KRI, as indicated in annex 3 evaluation details, requiring to apply a mid-term approach likely to exceed the the period of three years.

R6)-C9) Projects implemented by a consortium must be more clearly equipped with a budget designed to fund coordination of common activities among the agencies involved: monitoring, visibility and communication, building of synergies, collecting and processing of information to spread lessons learned etc.). Such coordination must be clearly identified in the Description of Action (DoA) including the necessary resources. Although this will lead to increased costs for human resources and less money left for the targeted groups, it would provide for more opportunities to meet the objectives of the EUTF concerning distribution of information and lessons learned including advocacy and visibility. In short, better reach adequately a small number of targeted persons than reach a larger group but inadequately addressed due to poor coordination/management.

3.4.3. Sustainability

R7)-C14) During selection of future projects, the EUTF is recommended to consider sustainability by putting emphasis on institutional sustainability. Besides financial sustainability, which is difficult to achieve at project level, at least sustainability on institutional level for example by partnering between projects and local stakeholders (CBOs or municipalities or under Public Private Partnership) in combination with capacity development for key stakeholders to generate multiplier effects needs to be further expanded. A community-based approach facilitates the necessary communication including advocacy to promote and implement policies for local economic development and social cohesion. As recommendation for the content of future projects inclusion of CD for local public or private stakeholders should be further emphasised, which would also be in line with

the need to increasingly emphasize the development context and to foster institutional sustainability especially in Jordan, KRI and Lebanon.

R8) – C7) Longer term monitoring of beneficiaries of LLH support should be considered and established at project and EUTF level to provide for an instrument to more accurately assess sustainability and impact of the support provided by the LLH projects, especially after their completion. Both, administrative data driven analysis (with data collected by the partner government institutions) and survey-based analysis, preferably utilized in a mixed way, are suitable for monitoring of LLH measures. Such longer term monitoring however, needs to be planned in detail already during the design phase of projects, thus ensuring a harmonised approach for indicator definition, data collection and analysis.



ANNEXES

4. ANNEX A1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

4.1. Evaluation of EUTF-Funded Programmes/Projects for Livelihood – Final Terms of Reference

4.1.1. Background Information

Beneficiary countries

Jordan, Turkey, Lebanon, and Iraq

Contracting Authority

The EU Trust Fund (EUTF) in response to the Syrian Crisis.

Regional background

Since the start of the conflict in Syria, to January 2017, UNHCR has registered a total of 4.86 million Syrian refugees in the MENA region and Turkey. Egypt, Iraq, Jordan and Lebanon host 2.1 million refugees, and Turkey alone hosts 2.9 million. Alarming, these numbers do not include those that left Syria during the crisis and have not registered as refugees. In addition, Syria’s neighbours had already hosted large numbers of Syrian migrant workers before the start of the crisis, most of whom remain unregistered but are equally unable to return home. There is no doubt that host countries are facing an enormous challenge in dealing with the large numbers of displaced people that the Syrian conflict has generated since 2011. As the crisis developed, governments struggled to keep up with changing realities. Understandably, in the initial phases of the crisis, the responses and policies assumed that the situation would only be temporary. Due to the sheer numbers, Syria’s neighbours – Jordan, Turkey and

Lebanon in particular – soon became overwhelmed and struggled to establish temporary protection legislation for those fleeing the violence.

Some countries that have been hosting large numbers of Syrian refugees have recently started experimenting with integrating them into their respective labour markets, notably Jordan and to some extent in Iraq. This development is part of a paradigm shift in which host countries are changing their policy assumptions regarding Syrian refugees. Instead of designing policies from a ‘temporary and humanitarian’ perspective, governments are increasingly seeking more ‘developmental and (semi-)permanent’ solutions.

The drivers of this change in thinking are country-specific but include the acknowledgment of the protracted nature of the Syrian crisis and the unsustainability of providing social protection (education, housing, health care) to large numbers of Syrian refugees, while receiving little in state revenues in return. Especially for Syria’s neighbours, increasing the self-reliance of refugees is becoming particularly critical in the context of insufficient funding and the fact that, given political developments in key donor states, the international community is likely to press more often for ‘solutions in the region’.

Current situation in the Livelihood (LLH) sector

Overall, 2016 can be noted as the year that Syrian refugees, the societies hosting them, as well as the larger international community, began to acknowledge that the situation is less temporary than expected. Policymakers are realising that those who have fled violence in Syria are likely to remain in their host communities for many years, with many never actually returning home. At the same time, host countries have recognised that the current situation is unsustainable from an economic and political perspective.

Consequently, policy responses have shifted from purely humanitarian and temporary solutions toward approaches that are more developmental and (semi-)permanent in nature. The Supporting Syria and the Region Conference, held in February 2016 in London, marked this turning point and forced those involved to start developing a new framework to address the consequences of the protracted war in Syria. Notably, for the first time, the issue of livelihoods and employment surfaced solidly on the political agenda. It has firmly remained a key focus in subsequent discussions.

Many host communities, whilst wishing to support the refugees and share their limited resources with them, are also under pressure as economies are squeezed and there is a growing perception of competition for jobs, which creates increased tension and threats to social cohesion. There is also the risk that refugees become locked into a cycle of inferior access to services and inferior work and life opportunities. At the same time, there is the risk that resentment towards refugees and IDPs alike will increase, encouraged by erroneous and unchallenged assumptions about the capacity of the labour market to absorb new workers and grow. Also, the legal impediments to refugees accessing decent work vary across the region.

Despite considerable progress made in issuing work permits for refugees in Turkey and Jordan during 2017, the living conditions of Syrian refugees and vulnerable host community members have not been improved owing to slow GDP growth, limited job availability and a lack of access to jobs by the refugees in most host countries.

4.1.2. Jordan

The Government of Jordan has taken an unprecedented step amongst refugee hosting countries by employing an ambitious approach to respond to the protracted refugee crisis. This journey had its beginnings in London in February 2016 during the “Supporting Syria and the Region” conference, where the Government of Jordan supported by the international community commitments, announced the Jordan Compact, a courageous shift in direction. As noted in the Compact, “Cumulatively these measures could in the coming years provide about 200,000 job opportunities for Syrian refugees while they remain in the country, contributing to the Jordanian economy without competing with Jordanians for jobs.” Following the conference, the Government promoted several administrative changes to allow Syrian refugees to access work permits within the limits of occupations allowed to them. The Ministry of Labour (MoL) began issuing one-year renewable work permits in certain occupations open to non-Jordanians, while some administrative requirements were eased.

By March 2018, the MoL had cumulatively issued and renewed around 91,000 work permits. Some 46,000 refugees currently hold a valid work permit among which only 5% to women²⁴. Since the issuance of work permits began, additional steps have contributed to more Syrian refugees working formally, Individual work permits can be accessed in two sectors, agriculture and construction, without the need of an employer’s sponsorship; work permits’ costs have been waived; restrictions have also been loosened on moving from one sector to another, among the ones permitted to Syrian refugees. A recent decision of the MoL has also opened the way for refugees in camps to work formally in cities across Jordan; in Zaatari and Azraq camps, refugees with a valid work permit can leave the camp for up to one month after which they have to go back for registration, and access available jobs throughout the country. This increased mobility is very important to camp refugees and will also help in the long term in increasing work permits benchmarks. However, it is also important to note that not all work permits do correspond to actual legal contracts, that a good portion of Syrian refugees still work in the informal sector, and that decent work conditions need regular monitoring and abuses are reported.

Most male Syrian refugees in Jordan with employment work in agriculture as farm hands, work as mechanics or in construction. Female Syrian refugees prefer home-based activities in food processing and catering which unfortunately are not formally allowed in Jordan. Providing avenues to work and earn is vital to ensuring refugees have dignified and normal lives despite being in exile. Syrian refugees now form an important demographic in the labour market, representing one fifth of the total non-Jordanian workforce. They have entrepreneurial spirit and valuable skills in specific occupations. They differ however from other migrant workers in several key aspects: they are in the country largely with their families and most of their resources are spent inside Jordan

4.1.2. Turkey

Syrian nationals, refugees and stateless persons coming from Syria who need international protection are under Temporary Protection in Turkey. The country has been providing a solid

²⁴ data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/download.php?id=14373

and comprehensive rights-based legal framework through the Temporary Protection Regulation, offering access to services including education, health care and labour market for Syrian refugees in the country. The Temporary Protection Regulation (dated 22 October 2014) regulates the right to work by beneficiaries of temporary protection. Founded on this legal basis, a Council of Ministers regulation determining the principles and procedures for issuance of work permits was published on 15 January 2016. Beneficiaries of Temporary Protection can apply for work permits 6 months after their registration.

A positive trend can be discerned regarding entrepreneurship and small businesses, both formally and informally. The conflict in Syria has forced large numbers of people across borders and many of them brought businesses and entrepreneurial skills. To illustrate, in Turkey in 2015, Syrian refugees established 1,429 registered companies and invested US\$71 million in joint ventures with Turkish companies, equating to approximately 20% of the foreign direct investment in local partnerships in Turkey. In 2016, 1,764 companies were established by Syrian refugees in Turkey, bringing the overall number of businesses established by them to approximately 5,000²⁵. This development in itself has also led to job creation.

However, the structural challenges within the Turkish labour market and economy have also affected employment opportunities and the quality of jobs for refugees. Turkey has welcomed cheap labour in specific sectors, enabling refugees to work and providing them with a form of self-reliance, but this has left refugees vulnerable to exploitation and confined to poorly paid jobs. The informal labour market is not specifically a Syrian refugee issue, however: Turkish nationals work in the informal sector, as do migrants and refugees of other nationalities (albeit under a different legal framework to Syrian refugees).

4.1.3. Lebanon

Different structural and regulatory barriers hinder access to employment for Syrian refugees. The halting of registrations, *de facto* closure of borders to asylum seekers and cumbersome residency procedures create a climate of fear (arrests, evictions, limitation of movement),

²⁵ Livelihoods for Syrian Refugees: Transitioning from a Humanitarian to a Developmental Paradigm Labour Market Integration in Jordan and Turkey, April 2017

which prohibits Syrian refugees from providing for themselves in a dignified manner. As a consequence of their deteriorating conditions in Lebanon, refugee families have exhausted their limited resources, and are having to adapt to survive on the bare minimum. Refugees consistently report lack of legal residency and lack of livelihood opportunities as the main challenges. Coupled with worsening socio-economic situation in country, the combination of limited livelihood opportunities and access to quality services has meant greater pressure on families, and a higher likelihood of adopting harmful coping mechanisms. The impact of EU and other donor-financed economic development strategies on the Syrian population will remain limited as long as the right to legal employment is not adequately addressed. The use of internationally recognised terminology of “decent work” may help to offset some of the sensitivities and open up entry points for engagement.

According to the UN inter-agency household profiling data, only 27% of the adult Syrian refugees have worked at least one day per month, 50% of which are adult males and 7% of adult females. On average, one member of the family, regardless of the household size, is responsible for supporting the entire family financially. Typically, those who work, work irregularly and significantly less than full-time: on average 14 days per month. The average monthly income they earn of USD 177 is in stark contrast to the average monthly expenditure of USD 492, most of which are spent on food and rent. That income from irregular work is insufficient to cover monthly expenditures, including medical expenses, is also reflected in rising average household debts, which reached USD 991 for the first quarter of 2016.

Results in terms of job creation remain limited in terms of the number of people directly impacted, in a context where poverty is affecting 76% of refugees and 28% of Lebanese²⁶.

4.1.4. Iraq

The Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRI), where almost all the Syrian refugees in Iraq live, remains a relatively favourable context for access to jobs and livelihoods. By some measures (such as estimations of GDP per capita) the region is more prosperous than other parts of Iraq and

²⁶ Lebanon – InterAgency – Livelihoods – End Year 2017 Report

neighbouring parts of Syria and Turkey. To its credit, as well, the Kurdistan Regional Government has from early on been supportive of Syrian refugees accessing employment and services²⁷.

Employment rates for Syrian refugees in the KRI appear, on average, to be higher than for displaced Iraqis and impacted communities. For example, in Erbil governorate 80% of male refugees aged between 15 and 64 are in employment²⁸. This compares with rates of 53% for male IDPs and 70% for men from the host community²⁹. In Duhok governorate, the employment rate for male refugees is 75%, compared with 63% for men from the host community and internally displaced men.

However, such figures should not be read to mean that refugees in general have more financial security than IDPs. Refugees do not have the benefit of access to elements of Iraqi state support that many IDPs do, such as grants made to displaced families, the Public Distribution System, and salaries for those with public sector jobs (which generally continue to be received, despite displacement). Reported figures for employment are based on samples and household surveys, and probably obscure under-employment.

Furthermore, employment levels among women in general, and among young men, are much lower than the overall employment rates. Recent surveys indicate that in Erbil only 7.6% of women refugees are in employment, compared with a rate of 16.4% for women in the impacted communities. In Erbil only 33% of young men (aged 15-24) in IDP, refugee and impacted communities are in employment. For many refugees, the types of employment they find are low-paying and insecure. Half of employed refugees and IDPs in Duhok governorate work in construction, and daily waged labour in agriculture is the second most common job for refugees and IDPs.

²⁷ Granted in 2011 to Syrian refugees right to work in the region and to enrol in public schools and universities.

²⁸ According to 3RP 2017-2018 for Iraq.

²⁹ See Erbil Governorate, KRI, and UNHCR, “Displacement as challenge and opportunity – Urban profile: refugees, internally displaced persons and host community” (April 2016); and surveys for Dohuk and Sulaymaniyah.

4.2. Objective, Purpose & Expected Results

4.2.1. Overall objective

The overall objective of the project is as follows:

To assess the current generation of EUTF LLH support, as well as mapping other innovative non-EUTF support, in order to identify future EUTF interventions contributing to increased economic opportunities and enhanced social and economic inclusion of Syrian Refugees, IDPs and members of vulnerable host communities.

4.2.2. Purposes

The purpose of this project is as follows:

1. Analyse the current EUTF LLH portfolio in view of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and EU added value;
2. Map innovative projects/initiatives supported by non-EUTF funding sources, considering country-specific economic development strategies that could impact on social and economic inclusion of Syrian Refugees, IDPs and members of vulnerable host communities.
3. Provide recommendations for future EUTF support, with implementation options;
4. Propose the main elements of an Action Document to prepare a second phase of EUTF-funded LLH support, based on the option chosen by the EU services.

The evaluation and subsequent analysis needs to be based on a clear link to the EUTF's identified objectives and the EUTF Results Framework.

4.2.3. Results to be achieved by the Contractor

1. An inception report (draft and final) that will propose a detailed step-by-step methodology for conducting the assignment including a list of stakeholders to be met and field visits anticipated;



2. An evaluation report (draft and final) on the assessment of EUTF LLH projects with – amongst other things - the following elements:

- Analysis of the current situation of Refugees from Syria, IDPs and vulnerable host communities benefiting or potentially benefitting from LLH support.
- Evaluation of the existing programmes and recommendations for a future EU LLH programme with emphasis on cost-effectiveness.
- Map innovative projects/initiatives supported by other donors or non-EUTF funding sources.
- Provision of options for follow-up programmes/phases. In this respect, also follow-up of the European Regional Development and Protection Programme (RDPP) should be considered to the extent possible.

3. A short report, drafted to the point, containing the main elements of a new Action Document for a cooperation programme providing LLH opportunities for Refugees from Syria, IDPs and vulnerable host communities (draft and final).

The experts will receive all relevant programming and contractual documents. The experts will consult stakeholders, contacts of which can be provided by the EU Delegations of Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, and Iraq. Stakeholder consultations also include visits and interviews on the ground' with current beneficiaries, LLH institutions and EU partners. Based on consultations with stakeholders the experts will prepare drafts of the required outputs for discussion with the relevant stakeholders.

Where appropriate, the experts will consider the relevant sections of the EuropeAid Project Cycle Management Guidelines related to project formulation, about “Quality attributes, criteria and standards at formulation” as well as templates, which can be provided by the EUTF Management.

In developing the details of the proposed implementation arrangements, the consultants will also consider lessons-learned under other EU-funded LLH programmes in Syria, Turkey, Iraq, Jordan and Lebanon. To that end the experts will consult regularly and closely with the respective EU services.

The experts will also highlight critical project design issues requiring decisions by the local authorities and the EU and ensure that clear guidance is given on these issues.

4.3. Assumptions & Risks

4.3.1. Assumptions underlying the project

Risks and assumptions cannot be listed exhaustively. It is assumed that services within the Commission and the implementing authorities/ partner institutions accept the evaluation as an integral part of the project management cycle and are committed to provide the necessary information, and will subsequently act on recommendations and findings, as well as provide the follow-up information to the Commission. The following are additional relevant assumptions for the above project:

- Quantitative and qualitative data is available on time and provide sufficient and adequate information;
- Access to requested documentation and information on the programmes is ensured by the EU services, implementing partners, beneficiaries and non-EUTF funded projects/initiatives;
- Access to projects, stakeholders and beneficiaries is ensured allowing to set up a representative sample considering the proposed timeframe and resources available
- All staff of EU services, beneficiaries and implementing parties are regularly informed on objectives and methods of this assignment, to ensure their full cooperation.

The experts should immediately inform the Contracting Authority in the event one or several of the above assumptions prove to be untrue. The experts will also report any limitations to the assignment due to insufficient collaboration from key stakeholders.

4.3.2. Risks

There is the risk of political or social instability which hampers access to countries, stakeholders and universities. In such context stakeholders may also not provide detailed information on their operations as requested.

4.4. Scope of the Work

4.4.1. Description of the assignment

The assignment will be based on programming documents and progress reports of Madad-funded LLH programmes, as well as consultations with other stakeholders in the field. The list of LLH programmes/ project funded under EUTF is given in [ANNEX 1](#).

The assessments delivered should have absorbed secondary source figures (e.g. from available studies and interviews with actors in the field), such as

- EU services (DGs and EUDs) and EU member states concerned
- UN organisations (UNHCR, UNDP, WHO, UNICEF IOM, ILO)
- National and international CSOs / NGOs and implementing agencies for example Red Cross / Red Crescent, DRC, Oxfam, Care international, GIZ, KfW, etc.
- National entities concerned like line ministries, statistical units, regional and / or local authorities
- Corporate sector
- Relevant ROM reports.

At the kick-off meeting the evaluation team will be provided also with a list of other ongoing actions in the area of LLH. This should be considered by the team to the extent possible when setting up their meetings during the field phase.

4.4.2. Geographical area to be covered by the assignment

Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, Iraq.

4.4.3. Target groups

The target group of this assignment are refugees from Syria, IDPs and vulnerable host communities (potentially) benefitting from EUTF LLH support.

4.4.4. Specific work

The assignment is sequenced into three parts. The specific tasks of the experts will include the following:

4.4.4.1. Conduct an analysis of ongoing EUTF-financed LLH programmes in Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey and Iraq.

The analysis will be focused on the following questions:

- **Relevance**
 - How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?
- **Effectiveness**
 - To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results, and what possibly hampered their achievement?
 - What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?
- **Efficiency**
 - What is the currently most effective aid modality to support the provision of LLH under EUTF or other EU instruments?



- To what extent do the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?
- Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?
- **Coherence**
 - To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?
 - In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?
- **Sustainability**
 - What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?
- **EU added value**
 - What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?
 - To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions’ desired effects?
- **Lessons learned**

What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

The evaluation questions and methodology for this assignment may need to be further elaborated by the experts in the inception report. The experts may suggest additional questions. The final version of the evaluation questions will be agreed at the end of the inception phase. For each evaluation question at least one appropriate judgement criterion should be proposed, and for each such criterion the appropriate quantitative and qualitative indicators should be identified and specified. This, in turn, will determine also the appropriate scope and methods of data collection.

4.4.4.2. Conduct a rapid review of selected projects/initiatives supported by non-EUTF funding sources.

EUTF / EU Delegations will provide the team with an indicative list of projects and initiatives that fall outside current EUTF financing. The team will be expected to carry out a rapid review of these projects (a review of key project outputs and where logistically possible 1–2 interviews per project) in order to assess potential replication of successful approaches within the next phase of EUTF LLH financing. The team will be expected to also take into account country-specific economic development strategies that could impact on social and economic inclusion of Syrian Refugees, IDPs and members of vulnerable host communities.

4.4.4.3. Develop recommendations and options (maximum 3) for a potential follow-up LLH programme

The results of the evaluation will be used to propose recommendations and draft options for further EUTF support to LLH opportunities in the region for Refugees from Syria, IDPs and vulnerable host communities. They will highlight potential incoherence and formulate recommendations on problematic issues. The options shall reflect – amongst others – on the following issues:

- Comment on the funding mechanism to be adopted;
- Discuss how the current interventions can have a wider impact on the target groups in the recipient countries, ensuring also sustainability of the action;
- Comment on the ideal architecture of a future intervention;
- Discuss if and how capacity building should be included in a future programme;
- Advise on the nature and the role of possible new implementing organisation(s);
- Provide realistic recommendations related to the authorities of hosting governments, and the donor.
- Identify EUTF actions/ subsectors that could be potentially scaled up (e.g. cash-for-work versus MSMEs opportunities) and advise on how to create the link with the already existing ENI portfolio.

4.4.4.4. Further develop the choice made by the EU services into the main elements of an Action Document

Based on the choices made, formulate the main elements of an action document for a future LLH programme, to offer enhanced and better coordinated access for refugees from Syria, IDPs and vulnerable host communities. The scope and detail of formulation shall be agreed during the inception phase, respecting also the limited time and resources available for this activity.

Attention should be paid to innovative approaches in service provision for LLH. The new programme should be as inclusive as possible.

4.4.5. Project management

4.4.5.1. Responsible body

The EUTF Syria, based in Brussels.

4.4.5.2. Management structure

The contract is directly managed by the Project Manager of DG NEAR.B.1. EUTF operational section.

4.5. Logistics and Timing

4.5.1. Location

The assignment will take place in Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey and Iraq. Kick-off meeting and debriefing will take place in Brussels. Collection of primary data for Iraq (field interviews) will be facilitated by a dedicated member of the Evaluation Team located in Iraq.

4.5.2. Start date & Period of implementation of tasks

The intended start date is mid-May 2018 and the period of implementation will be 5 months from this date. A final calendar on the implementation and reporting for the different studies covered by these ToRs will be agreed during the inception phase. The planning by the end of the inception phase should indicate the tentative dates and duration of the field



work, and for the remaining milestones of the assignment. A suggested outline is presented below.

Task	Location	Indicative division of working days				Calendar
		Key Expert 1	Key Expert 2	Key Expert 3	Key Expert 4	
Inception phase						
Kick off meeting with EUTF Services	Brussels with VC connection to the region	1,5 days	1,5 days	1,5 days	-	Mid May 2018
Preparation for field mission and Draft Inception report	Home office	9 days	9 days	1,5 days	6 days	May/ June 2018
Preparation of Final Inception report	Home office	1 day	1 day	-	1 day	
Field phase						
Field mission	Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq	34 days	33 days	11 days	21 days	June/ July 2018
Debriefing of field mission	Brussels with VC connection to the region	1,5 days	1,5 days	-	-	June/ July 2018
Reporting phase						
Preparation of Draft Evaluation report	Home office	9,5 days	8,5 days	2 days	5,5 days	July 2018
Preparation of Main elements	Home office	4 days	4 days	-	3 days	



of Draft Action Document						
Presentation of draft outputs	Brussels	1,5 days	1,5 days	-	-	
Preparation of Final Evaluation report	Home office	2 days	2 days	-	1 day	
Preparation of Main elements of the Action Document (Final)	Home office	2 days	2 days	-	1 day	September/ October 2018
Total		66 days	64 days	16 days	38,5 days	

The detailed planning of the evaluation will be agreed during the inception period. Particular emphasis needs to be paid to the period of Ramadan (15 May-14 June 2018), where the availability of certain stakeholders might be limited.

The assessment of non-EU funded projects should be scheduled for October / November 2018. It is assumed that two interviews per day/ expert can be conducted. Based on the resources available in each country eight interviews covering one or more projects can be scheduled per country. Additional resources required to conduct interviews and group discussions are included in the indicative division of working days shown above.

4.6. Requirements

4.6.1. Key experts³⁰

The profiles of the key experts are as follows:

Key Expert 1 (Senior International Expert): Team Leader and Evaluation Expert

³⁰ Mr Elmar TE WILDT, key expert 1, TL; Mr Jalal AL HUSSEINI, key expert 2; Mr Yarub AL-SHIRAIDA, key expert 3; Mrs Samira KOUJOK, key expert 4

Qualifications and skills

- Master’s degree in economics, sociology or another relevant field or equivalent;
- Good command of written and spoken English;
- Excellent writing and reporting skills in English.

General professional experience

- Minimum 10 years of relevant experience in the field of monitoring and evaluation.

Specific professional experience

- Experience in international cooperation and in formulation of cooperation programmes;
- Experience with leading evaluations in the fields of migration, governance, civil society, humanitarian assistance and reconstruction is considered a major asset;
- Work experience in the EUTF region is an asset.

Key Expert 2 (Senior Local Expert): LLH Expert

Qualifications and skills

- Master’s degree in economics, sociology or another relevant field or equivalent;
- Good command of written and spoken English and Arabic;
- Excellent writing and reporting skills in English.

General professional experience

- Minimum of 8 years first-hand experience with programmes/ projects funded by EU and/ or other international institutions/ donors

Specific professional experience

- Expertise in refugee management issues (legal status, poverty, education and integration in labour market)
- Expertise in social development and labour market issues in the Middle East
- Work experience in the EUTF region

- Experience with monitoring and evaluation is an asset.

Key Expert 3 (Senior Local Expert): Co-Evaluator and Data Collector for Iraq

Qualifications and skills

- Fluency in spoken and written English
- Fluency in spoken and written Arabic

General professional experience

- Minimum of 8 years first-hand experience with programmes/ projects funded by EU and/ or other international institutions/ donors

Specific professional experience

- Experience in data collecting, data processing, data analysing and reporting
- First-hand experience with migration and refugee management in post-conflict environments
- Monitoring and/ or evaluation experience in the EUTF region is an asset
- Knowledge of the current migration and refugee situation in Syria’s neighbouring countries

Key Expert 4 (Junior Local Expert): Co-Evaluator and Data Collector for Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey

The expert will work a minimum of 39 full workdays.

Qualifications and skills

- Fluency in spoken and written English
- Fluency in spoken and written Arabic

General professional experience

- First-hand contact with programmes/ projects funded by EU and/ or other international institutions/ donors

Specific professional experience

- Experience in data collecting, data processing, data analysing and reporting
- Knowledge of the current migration and refugee situation in Syria’s neighbouring countries

All experts must be independent and free from conflicts of interest in the responsibilities they take on.

4.6.2. Office accommodation

The experts will carry out their duties related to desk work and reporting mainly at their home base. Missions to Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey and Iraq are considered necessary. The mission in Iraq will be conducted directly by Key Expert 3 (based in Iraq), in close guidance by the Team Leader.

4.6.3. Facilities to be provided by the Contractor

The Contractor shall ensure that experts are adequately supported and equipped. It must ensure that there is sufficient administrative, secretarial and interpreting provision to enable experts to concentrate on their primary responsibilities. Also, support with planning the field missions and organising logistical support on the spot will be provided.

4.7. Reports

4.7.1. Reporting requirements

The Contractor will submit the following reports in English in one original and one electronic version. The Executive Summary of the final Evaluation report also needs to be translated into Arabic. The final report(s) will require two hard copies as well as an electronic version.

- Inception Report in draft and final version of around 20 pages. It will have to cover the updated methodology, a tentative plan of interviews; the proposed outline of the report and the timetable for the implementation of the assignment. The inception report should also include an initial analysis of performance based on the Quarterly



Information Notes (QINs), thus ensuring that preliminary analysis has been driven by data and indicators already available.

- Evaluation report in draft and final version. This shall include an executive summary of 4/5 pages and should in total be of maximum 50 pages (main text, excluding annexes). This report should contain also the requested analysis and options.
- The main elements of the Action Document in draft and final version. The format of the document will be agreed during the inception phase.

The Contractor should ensure an internal quality control during the implementing and reporting phase of the project. The quality control should ensure that the draft reports comply with the above requirements and meet adequate quality standards before sending them to the EUTF Project Manager for distribution to stakeholders for comments. The quality control should ensure consistency and coherence between findings, conclusions and recommendations. It should also ensure that findings reported are duly substantiated and that conclusions are supported by relevant judgement criteria.

4.7.2. Submission and approval of reports

The reports referred to above must be submitted to the EUTF Project Manager. The Project Manager is responsible for approving the reports. Submission is expected as follows:

- The draft Inception report is to be submitted to the EUTF 20 days after the kick-off meeting in Brussels.
- The final Inception report should be submitted five days after submission of the consolidated comments EUTF in Brussels and the European Union Delegations in Amman, Beirut, Ankara and Baghdad.
- The draft Evaluation report shall be submitted 20 days after the end of the field mission.
- The draft containing the main elements of the Action Document, should be submitted within 10 days after the preferred programme option has been identified by the EU services.



- The final Evaluation report shall be provided ten days after submission of the consolidated comments by the EUTF in Brussels and the European Union Delegations in Amman, Beirut, Ankara and Baghdad.
- Submission of the final version of the main elements of the Action Document will be agreed during the inception phase.

Annex 1 – List of EUTF-funded LLH programmes and projects

No	Project partner	Associated partners	Objectives	Location	Start date duration	EUTF contribution €	Amount disbursed €
T04.10	Danish Refugee Council	ACTED, Care France, Save the Children, Oxfam, Makhzoumi Foundation	LEADERS: supports economic self-reliance, resilience and social stability of Syrian refugees and host communities in Jordan and Lebanon in preparation for durable solutions. Improves access to sustainable livelihoods opportunities benefitting vulnerable households and individuals, particularly youth and women.	Jordan and Lebanon	01.06.2016 22 months	7.005.043	4.650.179
T04.12	SFCG – Search For Common Ground	COSV, NOVA	To strengthen community resilience and cohesion among Syrian refugee youth and host community youth in Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey: Foster economic self-reliance of vulnerable youth in refugee and host community populations (Work Package Livelihoods & Food Security), refugee and host communities (Work Package Social Stability & Psycho-social Support.	Lebanon and Iraq	03.07.2016 24 months	4.453.447	2.796.426
T04.17	World Vision	CAFOD, Caritas Lebanon, Generations for Peace, Islamic Relief, Questscope	To strengthen youth resilience and empower youth as leading actors in post-conflict reconstruction and reconciliation	Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq	01.09.2017 24 months	12.796.827	6.532.546
T04.15	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	Expertise France, AECID Spain	Improve school conditions, access to economic opportunities, local administration, social cohesion and dialogue facilitation for refugee, IDP and host communities.	Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey	15.06. 2016 36 months	74.600.000	49.697.628



No	Project partner	Associated partners	Objectives	Location	Start date duration	EUTF contribution €	Amount disbursed €
T04.30	Danish Red Cross	IFRC, European Red Cross societies, Iraqi Red Crescent, Jordanian Red Crescent, Lebanese Red Cross, Turkish Red Crescent, Palestinian Red Cross	The project offers livelihood support, risk management, health and psychosocial support to refugee and host communities affected by the Syria crisis	Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey	15.12.2016 36 months	49.290.000	15.806.847
T04.50	Agence Française de Développement (AFD)	n/a	To improve living conditions and promote the resilience of Syrian refugees and most vulnerable populations in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq (Kurdistan), To develop coverage and quality of basic social services delivery while ensuring socio-economic empowerment of local communities.	Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq	25.07.2017 30 months	9.450.000	4.725.000
T04.23	OXFAM	BEYOND REFORM & DEVELOPMENT, UTOPIA and Association Najdeh	To promote Social Entrepreneurship as a mechanism for youth civic engagement and to enhance communities' engagement through networking and advocacy actions, contributing to social stability and enhance community resilience.	Lebanon	01.12.2017 27 months	3.224.458	1.319.010
T04.32	Concern	n/a	To improve resilience and strengthened social cohesion amongst targeted vulnerable Syrian and Turkish communities through improved access to quality education and livelihood opportunities.	Turkey	15.12.2017 20 months	17.280.000	11.710.334
T04.72	UN WOMEN	n/a	To strengthen the resilience and empowerment of Syrian women and girls and host communities in Iraq, Jordan, and Turkey through addressing economic vulnerability and violence by increased access to recovery and livelihood opportunities, comprehensive protection services and support to national justice structures to promote accountability for violence against women.	Turkey, Jordan, Iraq	19.12.2017 24 months	12.500.000	-

No	Project partner	Associated partners	Objectives	Location	Start date duration	EUTF contribution €	Amount disbursed €
T04.70	ILO-IOM	UN	To strengthen the economic and social resilience of Syrian refugees under Temporary Protection	Turkey	20.12.2017 24 months	11.610.000	5.538.724
T04.68	The Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (TOBB)	n/a	To enhance the economic, social empowerment and strengthen the resilience of Syrian refugees and host community members to become an asset for the local economy and economic growth potential.	Turkey	26.12.2017 24 months	15.000.000	4.075.391
T04.82	KfW	n/a	To increase the energy security in the refugee affected regions by promoting renewable energy generation, to implement energy efficient measures in public educational facilities and to strengthen the capacity towards energy efficient management of selected facilities.	Turkey	27.12.2017 48 months	40.000.000	-
T04.40	Italian Cooperation	n/a	To improve living conditions and promote the resilience of Syrian refugees and most vulnerable populations in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq (Kurdistan), To develop coverage and quality of basic social services delivery while ensuring socio-economic empowerment of local communities	Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq	01.01.2018 30 months	12.595.500	6.055.827
T04.76	UNDP	n/a	To strengthen the economic and social resilience of Syrian refugees, their host communities and relevant national and local Government institutions.	Turkey	01.02.2018 24 months	50.000.000	40.405.174

- The final Evaluation report shall be provided ten days after submission of the consolidated comments by the EUTF Madad in Brussels and the European Union Delegations in Amman, Beirut, Ankara and Baghdad.
- Submission of the final version of the main elements of the Action Document will be agreed during the inception phase.

5. ANNEX A2: METHODOLOGY, EVALUATION MATRIX AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

5.1. Description of the Methodology

This evaluation is guided by the ToRs and the minutes of the Kick-off meeting (KoM). It is based on internationally agreed evaluation principles and good practices such as the OECD/Development Assistance Committee principles (DAC) and the evaluation methods for the European Union’s External Assistance where appropriate experts will consider the relevant sections of the EuropeAid Project Cycle Management Guidelines related to project formulation, about “Quality attributes criteria and standards at formulation”. Finally, the evaluation builds upon and complements to the EUTF Syria Monitoring and Evaluation Framework which has been established to assess, across various levels, the degree to which the Overall Objective of the EUTF Syria has been achieved.

The evaluation adopts a mixed-method, evidence-based approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data. Based on the ToRs and the minutes of the KoM the analysis will apply the standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact. Information will be collected by analysing project documents as indicated under annex 1 of the ToRs. In addition, other interventions in the sector / countries concerned will be included.

5.2. Data collection and analysis

Data collection is based on two pillars:

1) Desk review of project documents and related sources of information about the LLH sector in each of the host countries. The sample of documents comprised EUTF Syria programme documents and project documents (DoA) including, budget, logical framework matrix (logframe), the contract and amendments, internal project monitoring reports and other documents like inception and interim reports. Another source of information consisted in documents, reports or studies issued by other donors or implementing actors operating in the LLH sector in the region / countries concerned as well as by media and academia.

2) Semi-structured interviews with EU-services, key stakeholders and project implementors. Preferably these interviews were conducted face-to-face during field visits. In case informants are not available in the field interviews were conducted through telephone communication / Skype. All interviews with key stakeholder of EUTF LLH projects were based on evaluation questions (see matrix below) applied to the specific context. Information gained from non-EUTF funded projects, was in principle based on the evaluation questions yet by addressing key only issues depending on the state of implementation of the projects, by conduction face to face interviews or by discussion via telephone communication / Skype. Selection of key informants on available lists of stakeholders and further information obtained during briefings and discussions in the countries concerned.

All data collected were analysed under a uniform approach allowing to classify information according to several criteria including type of implementing agency, type of intervention (national and / or regional), LHH sectors addressed indicated in the EUTF Syria Results Framework. Consistency of data collection and analysis among the four experts was ensured by two separate tools. First, a matrix containing the evaluation questions, judgement criteria and indicators (see section below). Second, a grid classifying relevant information collected through interviews with stakeholders per evaluation question, judgement question and indicator. The grids ensured consistency of data collection and analysis among the four experts. The grid was used for the drafting of the final report (Grids are contained in annex A4)

5.3. Evaluation questions, judgement criteria and indicators (Evaluation Matrix)

Based on the ToRs, the following evaluation questions (EQ) and judgement criteria (JC) were applied as listed in the matrix below. There is one exception: Under efficiency the ToRs list three EQs: (1) What is the currently most effective aid modality to support the provision of LLH under EUTF or other EU instruments? (2) To what extent do the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes? and (3) Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rational way? The EQs under efficiency in the ToRs were merged from three to two EQs as indicated in the inception report and in the matrix below. The EQ included in the ToRs “What is the currently most effective aid modality to support the provision of LLH under EUTF Syria or other EU instruments?” constitutes the key conclusion question on efficiency deriving from the findings collected under EQ 4: To what extent have the various stakeholders the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes? and EQ 5: Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way? in the matrix.

Likewise, EQ 11 (What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?), is one of the key conclusion questions deriving from the findings of the entire evaluation rather than a specific EQ.

Evaluation Matrix	
I. Relevance	
EQ 1	How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?
Judgement criteria	1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities



Indicators	X Needs of the three main target groups are incorporated in the project design	X Indication of consultations and involvement of target country governments and communities in projects' preparation and design	X Information about national policies & priorities in the target countries contained in the project documents
	X Recent statistical data from different independent sources available in the project descriptions / inception reports	X Degree to which the analysis provided for in the project documents reflects the specific context of LLH support on local, national or regional levels	X Existence of baselines and target values or milestones in the project documents (logframes)
	X Pre-targeting of the most vulnerable groups within the Syrian refugee population and host communities (poorest, female, disabled persons) reflected during project design		
Sources of information	Key informant interviews	Project description & annexes	EUTF – action documents
	Document review	Needs assessment reports	EUTF Result Framework
	Logframes	Inception reports Interim reports	

II. Effectiveness

EQ 2	To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving (or are likely to be effective in achieving) their desired results?		
Judgement criteria	2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones		
	2.2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality) defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries' expectations		
	2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks		
Indicators	X Quantitative and qualitative indicators and milestones contained in programme / project documents (logframes / Quarterly Information Notes (QINs))	X Existence of mechanisms for local authorities, communities and individuals to provide feedback on the quality and appropriateness of trainings, services or deliverables	X Information about the external or internal factors likely to obstruct the production and quality of outputs
			X Information contained in the risks assumptions (and mitigation strategies)
Sources of information	Key informant interviews	Logframes	Quarterly Information Network (QIN)
	Document review	Interim reports	



EQ 3	What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?			
Judgement criteria	3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources			
Indicators	X Leeway / room to manoeuvre for national organisations at any level to participate in decisions about design and implementation of projects	X Access of implementing organisations (alternative/additional) financial resources	X Links between implementing organisations and national / local/ community-level decision makers	
Sources of information	Key informant interviews Document review	Budgets Plans of activities (division of tasks)		
III. Efficiency				
EQ 4	To what extent have the various stakeholders the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?			
Judgement criteria	4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen			
Indicators	X Previous expertise, experience and capacities of the implementing agencies gained under interventions of similar scope (this is already a given in the next column)	X Criteria applied for selection of partners as regards expertise, experience, capacity including access to target groups	X Delays in project implementation	
	X Existence of capacity assessment and development tools for local partners	X Existence of management / work plans for the countries concerned including division of tasks between partners and timely monitoring of partners' performance	X Delays in consumption of resources	
Sources of information	Key informant interviews Document review	Logframes Plans of activities (division of tasks)	Interim reports QINs	
EQ 5	Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rational way?			
Judgement criteria	5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe			
Indicators	X Awareness among implementing agencies of country specific opportunities and challenges (concerning the provision of LLH) possibly affecting use of resources			



Sources of information	Key informant interviews Document review	Contacting and disbursement rates of funds
------------------------	---	--

IV. Coherence

EQ 6 To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

Judgement criteria

6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner

6.2 EUTF interventions have objectives that complement other EU and donor LLH interventions

Indicators

X Indication of consultations and involvement of target country governments during implementation of the programme in order to adapt to changes in national policies and legislations

X Indication of consultations between EUDs and the implementing agencies in order to discuss and address contextual / operational challenges and new opportunities

Sources of information

Key informant interviews
Document review

EQ 7 In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

Judgement criteria

7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country

Indicators

X Existence of information about challenges and opportunities, good / bad practices, lessons learned on national and regional level in project documents through formal / informal consultation (meetings, discussions, handbooks etc.)

Sources of information

Key informant interviews
Document review

V. Sustainability

EQ 8 What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

Judgement criteria

8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level.



	8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees		
Indicators	X Existing of capacity development on institutional and local levels	X Existence of self-sustained funding mechanisms to maintain activities in line with the EUTF programme objectives	X Reduction / increase of LLH / job opportunities at the regional, local communities and family level
	X Existing of multiplier effects		
Sources of information	Key informant interviews Document review		

VI. EU Added value

EQ 9	What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?		
Judgement criteria	9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF		
Indicators	X Evidence indicating financial and human resources savings by using multi-partner country approach		
Sources of information	Key informant interviews Document review		
EQ 10	To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions’ desired effects?		
Judgement criteria	10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme		
Indicators	X Existence of quality and implementation of communication & visibility plans of the projects at host country, regional and EU levels	X Wider host population is aware of benefits of the EUTF	
Sources of information	Visibility & communication plans	Project websites	Local / social media EU guidelines on communication and visibility

VII. Lessons learned

EQ 11	What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?		
--------------	---	--	--



Judgement criteria	<i>The team of experts has identified an issue with EQ 11. As formulated this EQ addresses the entire evaluation and refers to all above EQs.</i>
Indicators	
Sources of information	

Table 5: Evaluation Matrix

5.4. Scope of the Evaluation

5.4.1. EUTF LLH and non-EUFT project samples

The evaluation covers LLH projects in four countries where the experts conducted field visits: Iraq (KRI), Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey. In all countries, the key target groups (TG) consisted of Syrian refugees (displaced persons in Iraq) and host communities (Iraqi and Palestine refugees in the BADAEL T04.23 project led by Oxfam) and focused more particularly on the inclusion of specific vulnerable groups such as disadvantaged women and youths, disabled and elderly persons in the programmes under survey.

Initially the terms of reference document comprised 14 projects. Five of them are implemented in one country only: Turkey. The nine other projects are multi-country projects.

During initial briefing meetings held with EU Delegations in Beirut and Amman between 02.07.2018 and 08.07.2018 the EUTF task managers for Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq advised to remove projects addressing only “soft skills” and “social activities” from the evaluation list of projects and only consider projects with an employment component. The advice was endorsed by the task manager at DG NEAR. Excluded projects were T04.50 implemented by Agence Française de Développement (AFD) and T04.17 Youth Resolve led by Wold Vision as implemented in Lebanon (but not in Jordan). The following table presents the LLH projects under scrutiny.



Number	Project Partner	Associated Partner	Location	Start date / duration
T04.10	Danish Refugee Council	ACTED, Care France, Save the Children, Oxfam, Makhzoumi Foundation	Jordan and Lebanon	01.06.2016 22 months
T04.12	SFCG – Search For Common Ground	COSV, NOVACT	Lebanon and Iraq	03.07.2016 24 months
T04.17	World Vision	CAFOD, Caritas Lebanon, Generations for Peace, Islamic Relief, Questscope	Jordan and Iraq	01.09.2017 24 months
T04.15	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	Expertise France, AECID Spain	Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey	15.06. 2016 36 months
T04.30	Danish Red Cross	IFRC, European Red Cross societies, Iraqi Red Crescent, Jordanian Red Crescent, Lebanese Red Cross, Turkish Red Crescent, Palestinian Red Cross	Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey	15.12.2016 36 months
T04.23	OXFAM	BEYOND REFORM & DEVELOPMENT, UTOPIA and Association Najdeh	Lebanon	01.12.2017 27 months
T04.32	Concern	n/a	Turkey	15.12.2017 20 months
T04.72	UN WOMEN		Turkey, Jordan, Iraq	19.12.2017 24 months
T04.70	ILO-IOM	UN	Turkey	20.12.2017 24 months
T04.68	The Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (TOBB)	n/a	Turkey	26.12.2017 24 months



Number	Project Partner	Associated Partner	Location	Start date / duration
T04.82	KfW	n/a	Turkey	27.12.2017 48 months
T04.40	Italian Cooperation	n/a	Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq	01.01.2018 30 months
T04.76	UNDP	n/a	Turkey	01.02.2018 24 months

Table 6: Portfolio of EUTF LLH Projects covered by the Report

It is acknowledged that the list of EUTF-funded LLH projects includes a mixed sample of various approaches aiming to achieve resilience, inclusive employment and social cohesion. As agreed during the debriefing meeting (13.09.2018), the evaluation period was extended in order to collect lessons learned from other similar non EUTF-funded LLH initiatives, including initiatives funded by EU member states:

Project	Key Activities
Turkey	
DRC - BRIDGES (funded by the Danish government)	Counselling and skills mapping, VET and transferable skills training, provision of micro / SME grants in Hatay, Kilis, Sanliurfa, Kahramanmaras and Mersin provinces
CARE Intern. /Germany in Turkey (funded by BMZ)	Vocational and soft-skills training, Turkish language training and creation of linkages to job opportunities and employers
CARE Germany	Soft skills training, training and support to improve workforce preparedness (supporting shoe factory run by the local authorities for refugees in camp Yayladagi; employment of women)
UNDP and İŞKUR - Employment and Skills Development Project Component 1 (funded by	Capacity development for İŞKUR and for Applied SME Capability Centres



Project	Key Activities
Bundesministerium für Wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung BMZ and Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau KfW)	
UNDP –Resilience Building via Increased Livelihoods Opportunities and Strengthened Social Cohesion for Syrian Refugees and Host Communities funded by the Japanese Government), national implementing agency: Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	Building capacities and competencies of local Institutions for job creation, capacity development for enterprises belonging to Şanlıurfa Technopark, development of inclusive business models and/or to integrate in national/international supply chains; new business initiatives/start-up developed projects and gained access to finance opportunities;
Darülaceze Foundation (DAV) – Internationaler Bund (IB) - Gaziantep municipality (funded by BMZ)	Cash for work, recovery of public infrastructure (reforestation) combined with training: Turkish language courses
Gaziantep Chamber of Industry - affiliated with The Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (TOBB) - (funded by BMZ)	Provision of short term TVET in cooperation with the corporate sector under a dual system, job placement; Turkish language courses and issuing certificates approved by the Turkish Ministry of National Education (MoNE)
Syrian Economic Forum (funded by BMZ)	MSME support and capacity development, registration of informal MSMEs
Beschäftigungsoffensive Nahost (funded and coordinated by BMZ) with a budget exceeding 430 Mio. EURO since 2017	TVET, VET, cash for work, sub granting

KRI

Iraq Crisis Response and Resilience Program (ICRRP), UNDP funded by multiple donors	Market analysis, nationwide job creation and business development, legal and social support, cash for work (community deployment), grants for MSME development (Business start-up packages) and for CBOs
ABRA – Area Based Recovery Approach, UNDP	ABRA a pilot run in Dohuk, seeks to bridge the gap between relief & development particularly important for the transitional phase which lacks an established architecture and frameworks typical of the humanitarian response. Activities



Project	Key Activities
	consist in CD for communities / companies, networking, support for LLH and social cohesion.
Vocational Educational Centre, Erbil under MoLSA funded by UNDP, French Red Cross, Islamic Relief	Technical vocational and educational training (TVET)
GOAL (funded by BMZ and UNDP / ICRRP)	Skills enhancement, provision of small grants and small and micro business support (MSME)
GOAL International (funded by UNDP)	Implementation of ABRA – Area Based Recovery Approach
Vocational Educational Centre, Dohuk under MoLSA (funded by UNDP, French Red Cross, Islamic Relief)	Technical vocational and educational training
Danish Refugee Council (DRC) funded by UNDP under ICRRP	MSME development, provision of Livelihood Activation Grants (LAGs)
GIZ Economic development and livelihood program (funded by BMZ)	Cash for work, skills development, networking on community level
GIZ (funded by BMZ)	Job-matching database (additional to nat. Labour agency), registration of qualifications and job placements
International Organisation for Migration (IOM)	Nationwide job placements, vocational training, small business development services, and in-kind grants
Beschäftigungsoffensive Nahost (funded by BMZ), implemented by GIZ and subcontractors	TVET; VET, cash for work, sub granting

Jordan

Norwegian Red Cross NRC Jordan	Transition towards employment (training, matching and partnership with private sector), cash-for-work, development of employment in rural areas
Finn Church Aid	Vocational training, entrepreneurship support
UNDP Jordan	Skills exchange, short term employment, financial inclusion, support to MSMEs



Project	Key Activities
International Rescue Committee (IRC)	Financial literacy, business development, training/counselling/referral for placement
Caritas Jordan	Cash-for-work, support to small businesses, entrepreneurs, skills training
Mercy Corps Jordan	Gig economy, business literacy, soft and technical skills training
GIZ (Non-EUTF LLH initiatives), funded by BMZ	Support to private sector, technical training, job matching services
Lebanon	
Al Majmou’a	Microcredit for Lebanese and migrant workers (including Syrian refugees de facto)
AFD (Lebanon)	Private sector development in promising value chains (wood processing / agriculture) in the north of the country.
Mercy Corps	Support to SMEs, peer mentoring, skills training, support to intensive labour activities in municipalities
World Food Programme WFP	Graduation model (adaptation of small scale developmental interventions to the specific situations of the targeted populations)
ILO	Cash-for-work in rural areas
KfW	Training and vocational training, training/entrepreneurship, cash-for-work

Table 7: Sample of Non-EUTF-funded LLH Projects

5.4.2. Limitations

The present report does not constitute a standard programme or project evaluation, but a study commissioned by DG NEAR with the **primary objective** of reviewing a portfolio consisting in a selected number of LLH interventions funded under the EUTF interventions under a humanitarian perspective and providing recommendations leading to a mid-term

developmental orientation under a future second generation of EUTF-funded projects aiming to improve LLH and employment.

As such, it takes account of OECD-DAC evaluation criteria but does not strictly follow the EU evaluation methodology, with guiding questions that are not systematically framed along the usual EU evaluation criteria. Rather, the study focuses on horizontal issues, i.e. comparing design and performance of LLH interventions against the background of a volatile varying economic, social and legal context of the four target countries and the stakeholders attempts to maintain coherence and coordination among activities. It was beyond the scope of this report to carry out an in-depth examination of the vertical dimensions of the single interventions along the usually applied criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and finally impact in much detail. The state of implementation of the EUTF LLH programme, with only three projects finalised or under implementation and all other 10 projects still under inception during the time of the field missions in summer 2018 leads to focus primarily on the preparation and design of the actions, namely on relevance including coordination and coherence rather than effectiveness, efficiency or impact.

Even for completed projects, it was difficult to assess precisely the outcomes, the sustainability and the impact of their different activities because of the absence of suitable indicators and effective and sustainable monitoring systems. Factual limits need to be pointed out. For instance, the number of trainees and trainings held does not inform about future temporary or sustainable employment; sustainability of job placement or other types of subsidised employment (except of cash for work which is by definition not sustainable) cannot be taken for granted.

Since it was not envisaged and feasible with the resources available for this assessment to scrutinize all dimensions of EUTF and Non-EUTF LLH interventions, including examinations of project management or surveys with beneficiaries to assess the quality of deliverables, most of the findings are based on interviews with key implementing agency and governmental stakeholders. Alternatively, and in order to triangulate information, reference was made to studies, the existing result framework manifested in the Quarterly Information Notes (QUINs), Result Oriented Monitoring Reports, information provided by coordinating



agencies for example UNHCR and secondary sources (scientific analysis and studies). Debriefings with EUDs were scheduled to discuss and verify information.

In addition, the limited sample of non-EUTF funded LLH interventions did not allow to undertake a serious mapping of LLH initiatives. However, it allowed to collect additional information on different types LLH projects already completed or more matured than those contained in the EUTF funded projects. A further intention to include non-EUTF funded projects was based on the assumption that these projects may provide for additional approaches to successfully boosting female and youth employment, improving social cohesion or opening up new dimensions for job creation for instance through application of new technologies.

Table 8 below provides for an overview on field missions conducted in the countries concerned during the evaluation

Date	Agenda	Resource Persons	Country
Inception Phase			
31.05.2018	Kick-off meeting	DG NEAR	Brussels
01.06. -15.07.2018	Preparation and submission of the draft inception report Collection / study of documents		Home office
Field Phase*			
Field Missions Phase 1			
02. - 10.07 2018	Briefings EU Delegations Lebanon, Jordan & Iraq) and meetings with key government stakeholders & LLH sector coordinators	EUD / EUTF task managers key stakeholders	Lebanon / Jordan
06. - 08.08.2018	Briefing EU Delegation Turkey and meetings with key government stakeholders & LLH sector coordinators	EUD / EUTF task managers	Turkey
Field Missions Phase 2			



Date		Agenda			Resource Persons		Country
Mid-July		Assessment of projects, meetings with implementing agencies, target groups (TGs)& stakeholders			EUTF partners, stakeholders	project TGs,	Iraq
Late July	-late August	Assessment of projects, meetings with implementing agencies, target groups & stakeholders			EUTF partners, stakeholders	project TGs,	Jordan
16.07. - 05. 08.2018		Assessment of projects, meetings with implementing agencies, target groups & stakeholders			EUTF partners, stakeholders	project TGs,	Lebanon
10. - 31.08. 2018		Assessment of projects, meetings with implementing agencies, target groups & stakeholders					Turkey
13.09.2018		Debriefing of field missions DG NEAR with VC connection to EUDs			DG NEAR EUD / EUTF task managers (VC)		Brussels
Field Missions 3 (inclusion of non-EUTF funded projects)							
September - October 2018		Interviews with agencies, stakeholders	with target	implementing groups &	Non-EUTF partners, stakeholders	project TGs,	Jordan / Lebanon
November 2018		Interviews with agencies, stakeholders	with target	implementing groups &	Non-EUTF partners, stakeholders	project TGs,	Turkey
November 2018		Interviews with agencies, stakeholders	with target	implementing groups &	Non-EUTF partners, stakeholders	project TGs,	Lebanon
20.01. – 24.01.2019 (postponed from November 2018)		Interviews with agencies, stakeholders	with target	implementing groups &	Non-EUTF partners, stakeholders	project TGs,	KRI
Reporting Phase							
February - March 2019		Preparation of the draft evaluation report					Home office



Date	Agenda	Resource Persons	Country
February – March 2019	Preparation of the main elements of the draft action document		Home office
March 2019	Presentation of draft outputs		
March 2019	Preparation of the draft evaluation report		Home office
March 2019	Preparation of the main elements of the draft action document (Final)		Home office

Table 8: Timetable & Workplan

(*) Limited access to the task managers at the EUDs and other stakeholders concerned during summer break has been considered. Following the discussions during the KoM the field phase has been split to allow for briefings at the EUDs in Lebanon and Jordan (including Iraq) and early Augusts in Turkey. The third phase of the field missions has been conducted either by resident experts (K2, K4 and K4) or by scheduling additional missions to Turkey (14.-20.11.2018, K1), Lebanon (26. – 30.11.2018, K2) and KRI (20.-24.01.2019, K1).

6. ANNEX A3: EVALUATION DETAILS

The first section portrays the regional context and contains brief overviews of the current situation in the target countries as far as it is of relevance to the implementation of LLH projects. The second section of this annex consist in a sample of evaluation grids used to conduct interviews and to collect information about the EUTF projects.

6.1. Evaluation of the Programme: Regional Context

The conflict in Syria has led to the forced migration of large number of Syrian refugees, over 5 million of whom are registered with the UNHCR in Turkey (3.6 million), Lebanon (949,000), Jordan (672,000) and Iraq (252,000).³¹ In addition, an undetermined number of Syrians have not registered with the UNHCR in these countries, including migrant workers before the start of the crisis that were unable to return home.

Faced with the challenge in dealing with such large numbers of Syrian refugees (and displaced persons in Iraq), the host countries have struggled to establish temporary protection legislation for those fleeing the violence, first limiting the scope of national and international assistance (led by the UNHCR and partner organizations) to the provision of basic services. Since 2016, as the crisis became protracted and threatened their economic and political stability and social cohesion, host policies have gradually shifted from temporary and humanitarian policies to more developmental solutions aimed at the fostering the resilience of the refugees and their host communities, notably through the inclusion of the Syrian refugees and their host communities in their labour market. Formalization of the refugee labour force has been pursued in Jordan and Turkey. Ultimately, this strategy and the additional international support it is expected to turn the Syrian refugees into an asset.

³¹ Some 160 thousand refugees are registered with the UNHCR in Egypt and North Africa. Source: https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria_durable_solutions

The overall international and regional assistance efforts in favour of the host countries has been planned and coordinated under the aegis of the Regional Refugee & Resilience Plan, which brings together over 240 national and international, governmental and civil society assistance organizations.

Within this international context, the Supporting Syria and the Region Conference held in London in February 2016 tackled the long-term consequences of the protracted war in Syria at regional level, notably through the improvement of livelihoods and employment for Syrian refugees and host communities. The London Conference was followed by three yearly Conferences “Supporting the future of Syria and the region (Brussels I April 2017; Brussels II April 2018 and Brussels III March 2019) that have gathered the main international, regional and local stakeholders in order to tackle and support the humanitarian, political and regional recovery dimensions of the Syrian crisis.

Yet, despite of considerable progress made to integrate the Syrian refugees, the living conditions of Syrian refugees and vulnerable host community members have not been improved owing to sluggish economic slow economic growth, limited job availability and insufficient refugee access to jobs in most host countries.

The outbreak of the Syrian refugee coincides with economic downturn in all countries concerned with short and medium-term economic prospects remaining sluggish. Economic decline is likely to impact poverty rates and other already crucial areas like growing unemployment especially among youth and low employment rates of women³². Developments which are highly sensitive especially for all countries concerned in the MENA region as pointed out by the UN Arab Human Development Reports during the last decade³³. Unemployment among youth in Arab countries is the highest in the world, 29 percent in 2013, versus 13 percent worldwide. Creating of jobs for women proved elusive.

In particular the livelihoods programmes have been hampered by many contextual and structural challenges, including slow economic growth; insufficient job creation rates; limited

32World Bank, Global Economic Prospects: Middle East and North Africa <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2019/01/10/global-economic-prospects-middle-east-and-north-africa> and World Bank , Turkey Economic Monitor, December 2018:Steadying the Ship.)

33 Arab Human Development Report 2016, Youth and the Prospects for Human Development in a Changing Reality, <http://www.arab-hdr.org/Reports/2016/2016.aspx>)

job opportunities accessible to Syrian refugees (especially in Lebanon, where only the construction, agricultural and “cleaning” sectors are open to them and, what is more important, as informal workers); and reluctance of many refugee workers to formalize their situation for fear of affecting their status as registered refugees and related cash and resettlement services.

With a view to promote employment / LLH and social cohesion except of Turkey all countries concerned lack comprehensive and effective institutions. With EU support Turkey established a comprehensive legal, administrative and institutional framework governing employment and the labour market during the accession process. Since 2002 Lebanon and Jordan have been supported by the EU (ENI) under Association Agreements that seek to promote enhanced political cooperation, progressive economic integration and a strengthened partnership between the Union and partner countries and, in particular, the implementation of partnership and cooperation agreements. For both countries social and economic development has been in focus of the EU support.

6.2. Current Situation in the Target Countries

6.2.2. North Iraq/KRI

The Syrian refugees in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRI) comprise 97% of the total Syrian refugees in Iraq (or over 244,000)³⁴. About 38% of them live in nine refugee camps (four in Erbil, four in Duhok and one in Sulaimaniya) and the remaining 62% are living in urban areas outside the camps. The geographic distribution of Syrian refugees, as of July 2018³⁵, illustrates highest concentration of Syrian refugees in two governorates Duhok (88,342 re53,661fugees out of which 53,661 livening in camps) and Erbil (94,117 refugees living in non-camp areas and 30,049 in camps).

34 3RP Iraq: Syrian Refugee status and locations, 31 July 2018

35 Same reference

The increased influx of internally displaced persons (IDPs) to KRI, following the military operation in Anbar, Salahuddeen and Nineveh, made livelihoods opportunities more difficult to access due to competition, and put a heavy strain on the local host communities’ resources. Despite many of the IDPs have recently returned to their governorates, there is still a significant number of IDPs (approximately 727,000) who have remained in KRI. Those remaining IDPs will not return to their original homes in the near future³⁶. The estimated number of vulnerable Syrian refugees and members of host communities in KRI is over 400,000³⁷.

A recent multi-sector needs assessment survey carried out by UNHCR and IMPACT on Syrian refugees in host communities in KRI, showed that 91% of households had a source of income in the prior 30 days of the assessment. In 74% of the households, a male member (aged 18 to 59) worked in the seven days prior to the assessment. The highest rate of employment for this group was recorded in Sulaymaniya (82%), and the lowest in Dohuk (68%). The primary source of their income was agricultural wage labour (38%), followed by skilled wage labour (21%), and low skilled service (19%). The average household gross income in the 30 days prior was 540 IDs (or USD 455) and 83% of the total expenditure went towards essential needs of food, rent and utilities. Across all KRI governorates, cash assistance was most frequently reported as a ‘top 3’ priority need (71%), as well as access to employment and food. At the KRI level, almost two-thirds (63 percent) of surveyed refugees living out of camps reported that they are currently in debt³⁸.

There are at least 19 UN agencies and local and international NGOs implementing livelihood projects in KRI, though mostly at low scales. The livelihood projects, which were implemented in 2017 in response to the 3RP, could only assist 468 individuals out of 15,380 targeted refugees and members of impacted communities. The purpose of those projects was to establish or improve sustainable businesses through microfinance and small grants. In total,

36 Displacement Tracking Matrix, DTM/IOM Round 96, May 2018

37 3RP Plan 2018 - 2019

38 Multi – Sector Needs Assessment III for Syrian Refugees in Host Communities of KRI, UNHCR-IMPACT, Sept 2017

6,058 individuals (Syrian refugees and members of host communities) benefited from temporary employment activities such as cash for work – CFW, etc.)³⁹.

There are many factors contributing to the slow pace of creating or improving resiliency in the job market. Firstly, a shortage of funds to award effective small grants and an inclination toward easy CFW projects. Second, while most public careers are limited to Iraqi citizens and residents of KRI, the private sector is weak due to the economic depression. Third, though the Syrian refugees are allowed to work in KRI, they are not eligible to own businesses. Fourth, there are limited work opportunities in the refugee camps and most jobs are available in the city far from the camps, which adds extra costs and time for transportation, thus, discouraging many, particularly women and people with disabilities (PWDs), from accepting such jobs. Finally, with the current economic recession, unofficially, jobs become more and more restricted to national Kurds.

As for women, there are significant structural and cultural obstacles⁴⁰ hindering women’s ability to engage in livelihood activities and to increase their economic empowerment. Examples of these obstacles include: the wider institutional and legal system that discriminates against women and perpetuates patriarchal gender norms and the current economic crisis. Furthermore, the political priorities of the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) and the Government of Iraq (GOI) that overlook women’s rights and their economic empowerment create structural obstacles which hinder displaced women’s short-term opportunities to engage in livelihood activities and their long-term economic empowerment.

Interviews and findings indicate that Syrian refugees in KRI have better opportunities to work and to be integrated into the host communities than their counterparts in the three other target countries. The Kurdistan regional government (KRG) also granted the Syrian refugees the right to enrol in public schools and universities and to access public health facilities. Discussions with the JCC, agencies (among them DRC, GOAL, UNDP; GIZ) and EU services indicated not only high interest but also commitment of the KRG to promote local economic

39 Same reference

40 LSE-WPS Displacement and Women’s Economic Empowerment: Executive Summary Authors: Zeynep N. Kaya and Kyra N. Luchtenberg

development with a focus shifting away from supply – by turning to the demand side of the economy.

All stakeholder met, indicated that a shift in priorities from a short-term humanitarian to mid-term development approach is required. In addition, both agencies and their implementing partners complained about the short timeframe to implement projects. Instruments that proved to be useful at the peak of the Syrian refugee crisis especially TVET and cash for work are becoming more and more useless. Except of few specific cases cash for work might help to generate some income but did not lead to stable employment. According to all stakeholders, cash for work activities should be abandoned and replaced by other activities for example by small business development, or other related activities (small grants / provision of equipment).

Concerns were raised by JCC, EU-services and agencies concerning TVET. It failed to meet its objectives: Trainees / beneficiaries did not manage to find jobs.

Some reasons were identified during discussion: The quality of the training (for example in Vocational Educational Centres, supported inter alia by French Red Cross, UNDP) turned out to be insufficient. TVET was not in line with market demands, remaining too short, its content concerning theoretical and practical trainings outdated. Curricula need to be updated, trainers to be better trained (ToT) in line with market demands (for example maintenance of air-condition equipment). Centres need financial and human resources and modern technical equipment. Quality control is insufficient or absent, trainings are too short. Certificates which were issued, are finally not accepted, especially by international companies. Findings that align with information gained in interviews held in other countries (inter alia ProVTE / GIZ, Lebanon or Turkey, Gaziantep Chamber of Industry).

TVET offered by implementing agencies did not fare better. Few students were able to find jobs. As far as training is meant to address the “lost generation” (soft skills training without a clear focus on needs of the labour market) it does not contribute to LLH. Limited interest and motivation of potential trainees and recruited trainees has been observed (DRC, GOAL).

Job placement / apprenticeship (even if substituted) is not regarded to offer a suitable solution. It may lead to crowding out of former employees. Opportunities to place students are limited. There are doubts whether job placement / apprenticeship leads to formal

employment. Finally, a general problem prevailing in all LLH activities is lack of mid-term-monitoring to assess the results of this type of activities.

Instead of TVET, implementing agencies for example DRC applying Livelihood Activation Grants LAGs, IOM, UNDP (offering packages), seek to turn to small business development. In this case the criterion of vulnerability (youth, women, disabled) applied under humanitarian assistance must be abandoned in favour of an approach that considers the capacities and potential of the beneficiaries to start a small business (the « better offs »).

The way forward – shift to economic development

All discussions held indicated that a shift from short term immediate support which was necessary at the beginning of the crisis must be replaced by a more comprehensive and more complex mid-term strategy (job creation and economic development on local level instead of supporting employment).

Key constrains of KRI's economy must be considered and addressed (perhaps not under EUTF as far as the macro level is concerned):

- Diversification of the economy (high dependence on decreasing oil / energy revenues in combination with an inflated public sector) – However, far out of reach of the capacities of the EUTF.
- Promotion of local economic development to reduced internal migration flows.
- Fostering local production by expanding the local value chain and productivity in agriculture to expand the very low share of KRI's agricultural products in shops (“Produced in Kurdistan”) including identification and promotion of clusters: Vegetables, pickles etc.
- Revitalisation of factories, support to producers cooperatives (to meet the requirements of customers as regards quantities & quality and reliable permanent supply with necessary quantities of goods meeting certain quality standards).
- Based on the commitment of KRI government establish networks between all stakeholders concerned municipalities, government, national / international corporate sector (PPP), CSOs and donor communities to promote economic development (and finally to create jobs), this requires capacity development. Models exist: ABRA – Area Based Recovery Approach (UNDP – nationwide, although not continued in Dohuk);



considerations of GIZ (as considered in Turkey: cooperation on municipality level: Gaziantep, yet under a different context) and KRI seeking to expand the capacities of local actors.

- Provide stakeholders with the necessary resources. Adjust the EUTF to address larger projects with considerably longer (mid-term) duration and flexibility.
- Focus on vulnerability which is well justified considering the dimension of the Syrian refugee crisis turned out to be detrimental to or conflicting with other objectives. There is no indication that these types of activities contribute to substantial and sustainable employment. Other instruments for example creation of a second labour market should be considered.

Some caveats still remain: Most of the activities listed above are unlikely to create immediately employment. The timeframe and financial resources available under EUTF are insufficient to effectively address the macro-economic level. Challenges exist due to dependence on oil revenues, subsidies from the central government and high share of public sector in providing for employment. Doubts remain whether the legal, institutional and administrative framework has the competences, capacities and resources to contribute effectively to promote and implement local economic development.

6.2.3. Lebanon

The Government of Lebanon (GoL) estimates that the country hosts 1.5 million Syrians, registered with the UNHCR or not, who have fled the conflict in Syria (including 948,849 million registered as refugees with UNHCR by the end of 2018⁴¹), along with 34,000 Palestine Refugees from Syria (PRS), 35,000 Lebanese returnees, and a pre-existing population of more than 277,985 Palestine Refugees in Lebanon (PRL). According to a mapping in March 2016, there were 198,717 Syrian refugees living in 3,849 informal sites across Lebanon, compared to 114,000 individuals in 1,069 sites in April 2014. The no-camp policy adopted by the GoL since the beginning of the crisis resulted in the scattering of refugees over the country. More than half of the refugees have settled in the long-neglected

41 data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/71

regions of Akkar and Bekaa, prompting competition for the same scarce resources, such as jobs, houses and basic services. In search of refuge, the need for affordable shelter alternatives grew as shelter capacity diminished with more refugees continuing to arrive into Lebanon. Informal tented settlements have multiplied exponentially in the country with minimal government supervision/intervention.

As attested by the Lebanon Crisis Response Plans (multi-year plan between the Lebanese government and its international and national partners) since 2015, the international community (through the aegis of the UNHCR) has supported support Lebanon to provide for the needs of the Syrian refugees and host communities in short and longer term, while pursuing longer-term development strategies. However, as indicated by the UNHCR, international contributions have never matched the needed levels, resulting in assistance gaps. As a result of the cumulative effect of these gaps , depletion of savings, prolonged presence and increased difficulty to access income according to the UN, some 70% of the registered Syrian refugees in Lebanon now live below the Lebanese extreme poverty line (equal to USD 3,84 per day), an increase from 50% in 2014. It is projected that the number of households living in a severely vulnerable condition will grow as the situation becomes ever more protracted. Results in terms of job creation remain limited in terms of the number of people directly impacted, in a context where poverty is affecting 76% of refugees and 28% of Lebanese.

Different structural and regulatory barriers hinder access to employment for Syrian refugees, including the halting of registrations since 2015, the de facto closure of borders to asylum seekers and cumbersome residency procedures. Because of their deteriorating conditions in Lebanon, refugee families have exhausted their limited resources, and are having to adapt to survive on the bare minimum. Refugees consistently report lack of legal residency and lack of livelihood opportunities as the main challenges. Coupled with a worsening socio-economic situation in the country, the combination of limited livelihood opportunities and access to quality services has meant greater pressure on families, and a higher likelihood of adopting harmful coping mechanisms.

Lebanese host communities are also severely affected by the crisis. The Lebanese Government in its Vision for Stabilisation and Development, presented at the Brussels

conference in April 2017, stated: ‘The World Bank estimates that as a result of the Syria crisis some 200,000 Lebanese have been pushed into poverty (adding to the 1 million before the crisis) and that some 250,000–300,000 have become unemployed, in particular youth, with the overall unemployment rate doubling to about 20%. Unemployment among Lebanese youth stands at 30%’⁴².

According to the 2016 Vulnerability Assessment for Syrian Refugees (VASYR), 36% of working-age adults worked in the month before the survey. Syrian labour force is mainly concentrated in the construction sector (33%), agricultural activities (22%), services (26%), retail/shops (6%) and cleaning (6%).⁴³ Men are struggling to find economic opportunities that enable them to earn a regular income in Lebanon and are facing acute physical insecurity and a high level of discrimination. Other family members, such as women but also children, have had to make up for the lack of family income. Adding to their care-taking roles and to fulfilling household chores, many Syrian women have had to work to financially provide for their families. Women have been able to get more jobs in the informal sector, such as petty trading, seasonal agricultural work and cleaning⁴⁴. Child labour among Syrian refugees in Lebanon is also critical. And because of the prevalent gender norms, more boys are working than girls, including in services such as electrical, motor and barbershops, restaurants, supermarkets as well as in construction and agriculture⁴⁵. In contrast to boys, girls mostly work in the domestic and agricultural sectors. Ultimately, both girls and boys are vulnerable to mistreatment, harassment and violence.

6.2.4. Jordan

By July 2018, Jordan was hosting 668,123 Syrian refugees registered with the UNHCR, which represents 6.53% of the total number of persons residing in the country. Over 81% of them live in urban/rural areas outside the three refugee camps (Zaatari, Emirati and Azraq) that were set up to host the most vulnerable persons. The registered Syrian refugees are a young

42 World Bank (2015), Systematic Country Diagnosis, (2016) Lebanon Economic Monitor

43) WFP/UNHCR/UNICEF. 2016. Syrian Refugee Response: Vulnerability Assessment of Syrian Refugees 2016

44 Centre for Transnational Development and Cooperation. 2015. Syrian Refugees in Turkey: Gender Analysis. [Online] Available at: <http://ctdc.org/analysis.pdf>

45 UNHCR. 2016. «Children at Work: A Bigger Issue for Boys». [Online] Available at: <http://unhcr.org/FutureOfSyria/children-at-work.htm>

population: 51% of them are children below 18 years of age, 45% are between 18 and 59 years and 4% are 60 years old and above.⁴⁶

Since 2015, Jordan has sought to formalize the residence and freedom of movement of registered refugees living outside camps by granting them ID cards delivered by the Ministry of Interior. It has also granted them free access to its primary and secondary public schools and to its healthcare system. However, mounting levels of public discontent among host communities first pushed authorities to discourage the access of Syrian refugees to the job market. In 2016, Jordan and its international partners called for a paradigm shift, whereby by the end of 2019 Jordan is to provide 200,000 formal job opportunities (renegotiated to 150,000 work permits in December 2018) for Syrian refugees in segments of the labour market accessible to foreign workers, in exchange their increased assistance funds and economic aid. In order to reach its objective, Jordan has facilitated the inclusion of the Syrian refugees in the formal labour market by lowering the work permit fee to a symbolic sum and by lifting the requirements for a valid passport/legal entry into the country. More recently, in order to accommodate the aspirations of many Syrian refugees that prefer to work as daily workers/self-employed persons, the work permits in the agricultural and construction sectors have been untied from specific employers, and job centres have been installed in camps in order to promote the inclusion of their inhabitants in the labour market. As highlighted by the “Jordan Response Plan” (JRP) reports that compile the interventions to be implemented by the Jordanian government and its international partners, since 2017 focus has been set more on the more durable needs and resilience of the Syrian refugees including in the field of formal employment. The new livelihood opportunities for Syrian refugees have prompted international donors and implementing UN and non-governmental agencies to engage in employment-oriented interventions through skills training and direct employment schemes for both Syrian refugees and vulnerable host communities. Currently, projects outside camps are in principle expected to include 30% of Syrian beneficiaries and 70% of vulnerable Jordanian beneficiaries. Amongst the main livelihoods programmes currently implemented in Jordan, the most prominent are the multi-country/ regional EUTF programme and the European Regional Development and Protection Programme (RDPP). Smaller programmes

46 <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/36>



have mushroomed since 2016, run by international agencies such as the GIZ (CFW projects), the NRC (skills training), Caritas (self-employment) and the IRC (formal employment), Finn Church Aid (skills training), the UNDP/Jordan River Foundation.

Since early 2016 to 30 June 2018, the Ministry of Labour (MoL) had cumulatively issued some 105,404 work permits (WP) for Syrian refugees, including 17,470 in refugee camps.⁴⁷ However, this number includes new, valid, WP as well as 1-2 waves of WP renewed yearly. The total number of valid (currently active) WP is estimated by international agencies (UNHCR, International Labour Organization (ILO) at no more than 50,000, whereas some 300,000 male and female Syrian refugees are believed to be of working age.⁴⁸ Many Syrian refugees continue to work in the country’s vast informal economy, despite substandard working conditions and the risk of deportation.,

Almost half of the ‘first-time’ or renewed WPs in June 2018 were related to the construction sector (43.1%), then agriculture (26.6%), manufacturing (11.3%), hospitality and food service activities (7.4%), and trade and motor repairs (6.6%). MoL figures indicate a large gender imbalance: only 4% of WP for Syrian refugees have been granted to females since early 2016.⁴⁹

This illustrates the very low participation rates amongst Syrian women: according the latest survey carried out by FAFO and the Department of Statistics in December 2017/January 2018, it stood at only 7%, namely less than half the (already very low) national rate for women. Conversely, the employment rate for Syrian men is at 59%, which is 7 percentage points higher than in 2014 and now like the national rate (60%). Unemployment rates for Syrian refugees have also decreased during the same period, from 61% to 25% (including 23% among males and 46% among females).⁵⁰ However, such progress does not consider the quality (decency) of work, especially in terms of wages: their poverty rates are as high at 80%, indicating a significant percentage of working poor.⁵¹

47 *Syrian Refugee Unit Work Permit Progress Report June 2018*.

48 UNHCR, <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/64114.pdf>

49 Idem.

50 Source : Fafo (2018) The living conditions of Syrian refugees in Jordan- Results from the 2017-2018 survey of Syrian refugees inside and outside camps, <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/67914>

51 <https://reliefweb.int/report/jordan/unhcr-jordan-factsheet-february-2018>

6.2.5. Turkey

Syrian nationals, refugees and stateless persons coming from Syria who need international protection (according to UNHCR by January 2019, 3,640,466 million people, fewer than 10 per cent of whom live in camps) are registered and under Temporary Protection in Turkey⁵². Almost half of the Syrian population in Turkey are children. The majority live in the South-eastern provinces, however large numbers of Syrian refugees have also moved to other parts of the country. The largest refugee populations are in Istanbul (553 453), Şanlıurfa (477 202), Hatay (447 541), Gaziantep (375 633) and Mersin (205 240)⁵³. In addition, Turkey hosts some 49,000 Syrian refugees with a resident permit.

The country has been providing a comprehensive rights-based legal framework through the Temporary Protection Regulation, offering access to services including education, health care and (informal) labour market for Syrian refugees in the country. In 2016, the Prime Minister announced that some Syrian refugees (up to 300,000) may be granted citizenship provided they fulfilled certain conditions, including residence in Turkey for at least five years, knowledge of the Turkish language at sufficient level, a clean criminal record and ‘fitting into social harmony and public order’. By June 2018, 30,000 Syrian refugees had been granted citizenship.⁵⁴ The Temporary Protection Regulation (dated 22 October 2014) regulates the right to work by beneficiaries of temporary protection. Founded on this legal basis, a Council of Ministers regulation determining the principles and procedures for issuance of work permits was published on 15 January 2016. Beneficiaries of Temporary Protection can apply for work permits 6 months after their registration.

The conflict in Syria has forced large numbers of people across borders and many of them brought businesses and entrepreneurial skills. To illustrate, in Turkey in 2015, Syrian refugees established 1,429 registered companies and invested US\$71 million in joint ventures with Turkish companies, equating to approximately 20% of the foreign direct investment in local partnerships in Turkey. In 2016, 1,764 companies were established by

52 <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/113>

53 DGMM

54 <http://harekact.bordermonitoring.eu/2018/02/02/on-the-issue-of-turkish-citizenship-for-syrians/>

Syrian refugees in Turkey, bringing the overall number of businesses established by Syrian refugees to approximately 5,000⁵⁵. This development in itself has also led to job creation.

However, the structural challenges within the Turkish labour market and economy have also affected employment opportunities and the quality of jobs for refugees. Turkey has welcomed cheap labour in specific sectors, enabling refugees to work and providing them with a form of self-reliance, but this has left refugees vulnerable to exploitation and confined to poorly paid jobs. In addition, increasing the involvement of Syrian refugees in local labour markets has the potential to generate competition for employment opportunities within the hosting communities. Also, much of the economic activity in the urban centres of the southern provinces has always been based around informal labour; in these cases, the influx of refugees is simply adding to the pool of unskilled labour in these towns alongside the competition

In January 2016, Turkey announced that it would allow Syrian refugees access to its formal labour market through a work permit system. However, lack of adequate information to the Syrian refugees and the administrative requirements imposed on employers (proof that no alternative Turkish national worker is available; payment of USD 138 for the work permit; payment of the minimum wage; and contribution to social security and file tax reports) have resulted in relatively few work permits being distributed to Syrian refugees by 31 March 2018: 19,925 to Syrian refugees under temporary protection, 20,993 to Syrian refugees with residence permits and 13,776 to Syrian refugees who set up their own business.⁵⁶ Most Syrian workers thus continue to operate in the informal labour market, taking menial jobs in textiles, construction, restaurants and tourism. The informal labour market is not specifically a Syrian refugee issue, however: Turkish nationals work in the informal sector, as do migrants and refugees of other nationalities (albeit under a different legal framework to Syrian refugees).

The Regulation on Work Permit was followed by the International Labour Force Law enacted in August 2016, and establishment of a new Directorate General under the Ministry of

55 Livelihoods for Syrian Refugees: Transitioning from a Humanitarian to a Developmental Paradigm Labour Market Integration in Jordan and Turkey, April 2017

56 <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/34146/turkey-partnership-paper.pdf>

Family, Labour and Social Services (MoFLSS) for policy on labour migration, including Syrian refugees. This was accomplished by strengthening the capacities of institutions like ISKUR (which is responsible for the provision of active and passive labour market programmes) and the Directorate General for the International Workforce (as the main responsible body for policy making on labour and employment issues) under the MoFLSS.

Turkey established a comprehensive legal, administrative and institutional framework governing employment and the labour market. With the view to most LLH projects implemented in Turkey it is important to recall that formal, accredited vocational education and training (TVET) is covered under the Education Sector. Unaccredited and non-formal TVET and language training are covered under the Livelihoods Sector as part of labour supply development. Public works and emergency employment are usually covered under the Livelihoods Sector where the primary objective is to enhance jobs and livelihoods; and under the Basic Needs Sector where the primary objective is service delivery. Aligning with changing national laws and regulations governing education and employment turned out to be a key issue leading to considerable challenges, delays of the LLH components of the projects or even rendered their success unlikely to occur.

In line with the reasonable and tested approach to address needs at the local level and incorporate stakeholders, activities on local / provincial level were planned but competencies and capacities of sub-national entities like local authorities / municipalities turned out to be far more limited than anticipated, finally preventing from any attempt to enter into formal cooperation. Instead agencies turned to less regulated fields of activities and at the same time strived to come into agreement with the Government / line ministries in charge.

The government has provided Syrian refugees with access to basic rights and services; however, poverty remains prevalent among the Syrian population due to the lack of access to a regular income, and the high cost of living in urban settings. In combination with the impact caused by Turkey’s economic slowdown, growing tensions between host and refugee communities occurring especially in large cities like Istanbul and Ankara and in the South of Turkey have been reported⁵⁷ Since early 2018, statements from Turkish policy-makers have

57 Turkey’s Syrian Refugees: Defusing Metropolitan Tensions, Europe Report No. 248, International Crisis Group, 29 January 2018

alluded to a major change in the country’s open-door policy towards the Syrian refugees: promote their return to Syria in areas controlled by the Turkish forces following its operations in the Afrin area⁵⁸.

6.3. Evaluation Grids covering projects under the EUTF LLH portfolio

The evaluation grids (below) were used during interviews with key stakeholders of LLH projects under the EUTF sample. In addition to the project details and information collected in the evaluation grids further information about EUTF / non-EUTF LLH projects was collected in notes and in few cases in recordings. The grids contain under the first section project information based on DoA, and related documents and reports. In some cases, as regards multi-country projects country specific information has been added. The section sections contain findings, statements, and sometimes conclusions and recommendations.

T04.10 DRC -LEADERS

INTERNAL EUTF EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: October 2018 – K4 Lebanon
Project number (EUFT only)	T04.10
Project title	LEADERS – Promoting inclusive local economic empowerment and development to enhance resilience and social stability

⁵⁸ see footnote above



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Lead Implementing partner (IP) DRC – Danish Refugee Council

Other implementing partners / stakeholders
 ACTED (FR)
 CARE (FR)
 Makhzoumi Foundation (LB)
 Save the Children (DK & International)
 Oxfam (GB)

Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation) INGO

Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C) Lebanon August 14 , 2018 ;A, C

National (N) or regional project (R) N

Location (geographic zone and specific location) Turkey

Iraq n/a

Jordan x

Lebanon x

Turkey n/a

Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)

1. Access to basic education

2. Access to higher and further education

3. Resilience and development X

4. Access to health services

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection

Overall budget Total Budget of the Action: EUR 7,795,023 (initial according to project description annex 1)

EU financial contribution EU Contribution: EUR 7,005,044 (89%)

Starting date 01.06.2016



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed) 18 months / 22 / 24 months – completed

Final date (planned /actual) 30.10.2017 /28.02.2018/ 31.05.2018

Overall objective To contribute to the economic self-reliance, resilience and social stability of displacement-affected populations in Jordan and Lebanon in preparation for durable solutions.

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework) Specific objective 1 Improving access to sustainable livelihoods opportunities benefitting vulnerable households and individuals, particularly youth and women.

Specific objective 2 Improved economic enabling environment and service delivery in communities hosting refugees

Estimated Results / outputs
1.1 - Vulnerable community members have improved ability to access sustainable income.
1.2 - MSMEs have improved economic viability and profitability.
2.1 - Improved local collective problem solving and participatory development planning.
2.2 - Increased investment in social and economic development priorities at the local level.

Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)
1. Economically vulnerable individuals and households (particular focus on women and youth);
2. Marginalised Syrian refugee individuals and households through development of transferrable skills, promotion of host-refugee joint ventures and cooperatives as national policy frameworks allow;
3. Existing and scalable private sector enterprises (MSMEs), private sector associations;
4. Municipalities/cadastres in the most displacement-affected areas hosting refugees and who have demonstrated a clear willingness



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

to work toward more inclusive local economic development, in particular with regard to refugee populations.

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)

A set of (partially provisional) baselines exists on all levels (Overall objective, specific o, outputs / results in the logframe
 For example, on result /output level:
 R1.1 - Vulnerable community members have improved ability to access sustainable income
 - %/# of people who graduate from skills development courses (skills in Jordan; skills + VT in Lebanon) = Baseline: 0
 - %/# of target beneficiaries with improved scores measuring skills and knowledge compared to baseline = Baseline: 0
 - %/# of targeted beneficiaries accessing apprenticeships, employment and self-employment support = Baseline: 0
 etc.

Existence of target values (list)

Target values were defined on output and SO level
 For example:
 R1.1 - Vulnerable community members have improved ability to access sustainable income
 - %/# of people who graduate from skills development courses (skills in Jordan; skills + VT in Lebanon) = 80%
 - %/# of target beneficiaries with improved scores measuring skills and knowledge compared to baseline = 90%
 - %/# of targeted beneficiaries accessing apprenticeships, employment and self-employment support = 2,170 individuals
 etc.

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, Yes, see TGs



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

etc.)

Key stakeholders (list)	<p>Local / National authorities, Key Humanitarian and Development Actors (International organisations / NGOs). More precisely for Jordan: Ministry of Social Development (MoSD), Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MoPIC), Ministry of Labour (MoL), and the Ministry of Interior (MoI).</p> <p>For multi-level advocacy efforts: local, national and regional stakeholders</p> <p>For Local Economic Development (LED) stakeholders in include local government officials, service providers, trades’ and business unions, Chambers of Commerce and Industry, credit institutions, civil society groups, women and youth groups and community-based organisations plus corporate sector</p>
-------------------------	--

Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)

Project documents
Interim report revised, July 2017
Evaluation report May 2018

Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant

All EUTF projects in Lebanon
RDPP in Lebanon and Jordan
Other EU member states initiatives.

Donor (s) / sources of funding

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

Answers based on evaluation matrix: Indicators
With the agreement of the Lebanese government, and after negotiation, it was defined between 30 and 70 percent between host community and Syrian refugees

JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector

The time was sensitive and livelihood needs was growing. The leaders’ project was the same / equal in the percentage across.

The initial proposal was 3 years ago, but the amount was cut back

They chose four areas where people are from low socio-economic status. When they worked on rural areas, it was easier to target Syrian refugees

JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities

The logic behind the regional implementation was under humanitarian intervention at the beginning, unlike other projects under the same call.

II. Effectiveness

2. To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones

DRC kept the indicators but reduced the targets given the cut after the delay in signing the contract. They had to cut the budget and timeframe – initial outcome that was intended was not possible to reach. As such, they had to review the design to accommodate

Advocacy component at national level was building up , and engaged municipalities –they had then a much



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

targeted objective – which lead to their ability to resume the activities as initially suggested

Skill building – what the donor wanted as it is easy and short term

Cash for work element – should not be part of the project but it was a tiny component as part of the community support project and that which brings forward social stability

Collectively identify key projects and activities – for instance if the consortium painted the walls of hospitals, they gave the jobs to beneficiaries. and in that kind of way it is fine for future livelihood projects, it is better that they target program to selected chains. They are purely focused on labour supply / this is one of the activities to they both sides of the equation / support economy and support the Syrian community. **18 months was not enough for that, preferably 3 years.**

JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations

No interviews with beneficiaries

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks

Political economic development – need to take that in the design, and work well with civil society organization on advocacy – some components of advocacy will be taken as implementation

On the topic of The return of Syrian: the actual return is happening and only few are leaving – the most destitute. The numbers this year was less than half of who left last year in 2017.

It did not affect DRC's work.. the arguments on return are a fact but it has not hindered their work

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources

III. Efficiency



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen

DRC started to implement the project while figuring out how to have the cooperation ready and done. December 2016 – when leaders officially started, it took 5 months to have a cohesive consortium

They had to cooperate to deliver – they had interlinked component – Oxfam for skills analysis, ACTED were doing panel and round tables – there was a strong cooperation among ourselves. Makhzoume were responsible for the counselling and doing the training directly

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe

Few staff at coordination level – relying on few staff to coordinate the 10 implementing partners.

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF-Syria for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner

The decision was made by DRC – money was given to DRC and they managed the grant. They had 5 partners – 10 implementing agencies. The initial start period was tough.

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country

It was 18 months plus no cost extension, after it was 36? It was a significant cut – from the EUTF side. Previously it was two years, but it was cut down to 18 months with a cut in half in the budget

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level

The economic sustainability of this programme is solely dependent on donor funding to ensure its continuity. Given that the project was implemented as a pilot, no exit strategy was developed or implemented and is expected to be included in the designs and plans of future interventions

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees

Skills created are also applicable to be transferred to Syria when they return to Syria

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF.

In terms of sharing experiences- that was an added value especially with tools shared / the main concern was that we could not have the same activities and approach given the different contexts in the region. It was difficult to have coordination between the countries. they can have same outcomes and objectives, but the process could have been different. There was value placed in having a regional project. as a donor it is easier to have fewer grants. The consortium is easier to manage. One grant, one report – passes administrative burden from donor to the grantee.

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions' desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

As recommendation: as head of consortium, DRC would not be negotiating time and budget cuts. 24 months will be minimum for such consortium work, they are planning to do so with the same partners – with some alterations to the modalities of work.

Through leaders – each and every partner learned a lot and of course with their focus on employability they will define our strategy accordingly – for the next round, they will keep activities



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

but make it channelled into a more focused area AS IT WAS BROADER and it did not have the intended impact

Planning to work closer with municipalities in the upcoming term is a must



T04.12 SFCG FURSA

INTERNAL EUTF EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: 09.09.2018 – K3
Project number (EUFT only)	T04. 12
Project title	Resilient communities: Supporting Livelihoods, Education, and Social Stability for Syrian refugee and host populations
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	Search for Common Ground VZW (SFCG)
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinamento delle Organizzazioni il servizio Volontario (COSV) – Italy - Un Ponte Per ... Associazione (UPP) – Italy - Associacio NOVA Centre per a la Innovacio Social (NOVA-CIS) - Spain
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	Non-profit organization Registration No. 453975341, Belgium
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	Erbil, Iraq: 7/8/2018 a Erbil, Iraq: 12/8/2018 a Suli, Iraq: 14/8/2018 a, c Iraq, 1-6/9/2018 b
National (N) or regional project (R)	R
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	Lebanon, Turkey and Iraq
Iraq	Erbil, Duhok and Sulaimaniya Governorates
Jordan	n/a
Lebanon	
Turkey	
Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-	



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

2019)

1. Access to basic education

2. Access to higher and further education

3. Resilience and development

X

4. Access to health services

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection

Overall budget

Total Budget of the Action: €4,453,447

EU financial contribution

EU Contribution: €4,453,447

Starting date

03.07.2016

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed)

18 months / 24 /Ongoing

Final date (planned /actual)

02/7/2018 (some activities are still ongoing)

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)

Overall objective 0 Strengthen the prospects of youth in refugee and host communities for social and economic inclusion in Iraq, Lebanon and Turkey.

Specific objective 1 Increase economic self-reliance of youth in refugee and host communities.

Specific objective 2 Develop more tolerant relationships between youth in refugee and host communities.

Estimated Results / outputs

1.1 - Access to demand-driven livelihood opportunities for youth in refugee and host communities is increased.

1.2 - The basic social and economic skills of youth in refugee and host communities are strengthened.

2.1 - The psychosocial well-being of youth participants in refugee and host communities is improved.

2.2 - Understanding and empathy among youth in refugee and host communities is increased.



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

<p>Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)</p>	<p>For Iraq:</p> <p>Sources of information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project DOA - FURSA Revised Action Plan <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Total beneficiaries involved in different activities (including RG sessions and PFA) is 15,000 (6,000 are students of 10 schools, and 9,000 through 6 youth centres); 2. 1,500 received vocational training (focused on English language and computer skills); 3. 300 youth received supports on business development services (BDS); 4. Number of youth (not determined) involved in four community projects; 5. 200 youth received training in media skills; 6. 20 youth in charge of setting up two radio stations.
---	--

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

<p>Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)</p>	<p>Three Countries:</p> <p>Source: FURSA Baseline Report for Lebanon and KRI, Jan – Mar, 2017</p> <p>Overall Objective:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0.1: NA (66% of the target youth were currently facing challenges in finding a job) 0.2: 53.4% 0.3: NA <p>Specific Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 NA (68% of the surveyed youth mentioned difficulties to secure a regular income) 2 NA <p>Expected Results:</p> <p>R1.1: NA</p>
--	---



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

R1.2.1: NA

R1.2.2: NA

R2.1: NA (32% of the youth demonstrated high of very high level and 19% low or very low level of tolerance toward youth from the other communities while the remaining 49% were neutral)

R2.2.1: NA (59% of the surveyed youth scored between neutral and very low on empathy and understanding composite measures)

R2.2.2: NA

Three Countries:

Source: Project Logframe of Action

0.1 % youth who report increased access to economic resources and opportunities in their communities (target: at least 30%)

0.2 % youth participants who report feeling valued and welcome within and outside their community (target: at least 50%)

0.3 % community members tangentially involved in the project who report decreased violent conflict between youth in refugee and host communities (target: at least 20%)

1. % youth participants who report increased economic self-reliance (target: at least 40%)

2. % of youth participants who demonstrate increased tolerance towards youth from the other community (reported as a composite scale score), (target: at least 70%)

R1.1 # Livelihood opportunities created for youth from refugee and host communities (target: at least: ?)

R1.2.1 % participants who have increased their knowledge of life skills (arts, project management, peacebuilding, radio production, psychosocial support, etc.), (target: at least 60%)

Existence of target values (list)



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

R1.2.2 % participants who have effectively applied the knowledge gained (target: at least 50%)

R2.1 % of youth participants who demonstrate positive progress in their psychosocial wellbeing (target: at least 50%)

R2.2.1 % youth who score higher in understanding and empathy composite measures (target: at least 50%)

R2.2.2 % youth who demonstrate increased empathy and understanding during joint activities (target: at least 70%)

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)

Yes, Youth

Key stakeholders (list)

For KRI:
Representatives of UPP and COSV, Director of Youth Centre in Arbat camp (Suli), Beneficiaries from Radio station & Music group in Suli

- Project documents (proposal and annexes)
- QIN (Reporting Cut Off Date: 31/10/2017)
- QIN (Reporting COD: 31/12/2017)
- QIN (Reporting COD: 31/03/2018)
- FURSA Revised Action Plan (

Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)

- FURSA Interim Report & Annexes (Jul 2017 – Sep 2017)
- FURSA Baseline Report for Lebanon & KRI (Jan – March, 2017)
- Livelihood Opportunities in KRI (Media Sector), Sep 2017
- EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Crisis, 2nd Results Reporting, June 2018

Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI),

EUFT-Syria funded projects for:
SFCG, UN Women, Danish Red Cross, LWF



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant	Non-EUFT Funded projects: Goal
Donor (s) / sources of funding	EU

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column "your evaluation "(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector	General needs of the three main target groups are incorporated in the project design (Description of Actions, KIIs). However, details about these needs came later, during implementation, and still not comprehensive. Two key assessment activities were conducted during the early stage of the project. However, the assessments are focused on the interests of the targeted beneficiaries and their perceptions of social cohesion and livelihood and almost ignoring the market assessments (Livelihood Opportunities in Kurdistan, Baseline Assessment Report).	2
JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities	All outputs and activities are defined but sometimes overlapping. In addition, no baseline indicators to measure the outcomes against and thus, the success of the project can hardly be measured (Interviews of staff, review field documents).	1



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

I. Effectiveness

2. To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

<p>JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones</p>	<p>All outputs are delivered with few activities are still ongoing. It has been noticed that the majority of the fund was used to deliver social cohesion support rather than actual livelihood activities (project design and KIIs)</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations</p>	<p>In term of quantity, the outputs were mostly delivered. However, there is no mechanism to measure the quality and effectiveness of these deliverables with the exception of outputs related to media and music (Project documents and KIIs). With the exception of activities delivered in Duhok and activities related to media and music, all other LLH related activities were delivered by a local NGO and not by professional institutes (KIIs).</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks</p>	<p>In most of the cases, the risks were mitigated. The partners did well in creating independent radio stations in a politically dominated media and establishing music group. However, certain risks took very long to mitigate such as the negotiation with MOLSA (Directorate of Vocational Training and Employment) in Erbil and Suli, which took about six months with no success. The risk was mitigated by switching to a local NGO to deliver the training instead (KIIs).</p>	<p>2</p>

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

<p>JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources</p>	<p>The three implementing partners in KRI (UPP, COSV and NOVAC) are complementing each other (in delivering RG, PFA and PSS support, vocational training and business related activities and conducting assessments). UPP also made the youth centres available to other partners to outreach beneficiaries and conduct activities.</p>	<p>2</p>
---	---	----------



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

However, the role of main partner, SFCG, in KRI is not very visible except for coordination at international level and reporting (KIIs).

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen

For some reasons, including registering one of the international partners, there was a delay in starting the implementation. This delay resulted in extending the project for another six months and lacking the time to measure the impact of the delivered services, particularly the vocational trainings, on employability and business creation.

1

Not understanding the working environment in Iraq by the main partner could also be the reason for this delay.

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe

Internal resources were used efficiently, but utilizing external resources, particularly in providing capacity building for local staff and volunteers, may not be sufficient. The lack of professional training was expressed by few local staff (KIIs).

2

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner

EUTF funding for LLH came after and complemented other, but smaller size, EU and non-EU funds. The funding also came in the right time, particularly for Iraq case. Most of the challenges were identified previously and could be easily overcome with EUTF funds. Focusing on youth, in most of EUTF’s projects in Iraq, makes it a special and well received by the youth.

3

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country

Partners with regional experience can add values and improve performance. However, consortium led by a partner that has no presence in a particular country may cause some problems including delays in implementation and lack of coordination. 2

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level

Neither the youth centres nor the established radio stations are sustained. Without new funding, they may shutdown. While the musical groups and those individuals who got grants to establish small businesses (only four in KRI), may continue to generate income. 1

Definitely, the knowledge learned and skills gained by thousands of beneficiaries will help in seeking employments and shaping their life. It would be great if this project had a solid mechanism to measure the impact of these services and monitor the status of the targeted beneficiaries.

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees

The activities are well acknowledged by targeted communities. This is well noticed through the large number of applications received for various activities and confirmed by different stakeholders.

There are, however, criticisms expressed by older population who were not covered by these services. There criticisms are based on the concept that they are in more need for these services, particularly employment related services, and for they have dependents to care for vs youth who are not married and may still be students. 2

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional

The EUTF LLH program (all together) is currently the biggest program in KRI. If the intended services are all delivered, the impact will be great; the EUTF contribution to increasing employability and 2



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

interventions collected under the EUTF

improving the regional economy will be greatly acknowledged. Most of the activities, implemented by various partners, complement each other, such as targeting different groups of beneficiaries, different areas and focusing on different skills. At the same time, many of these activities are repeated and competitive.

In this particular project we noticed the following:

1. The fund for LLH services in general is small compared to the fund given for social services.
2. The fund available for establishing small businesses is very small and was not utilized properly. The fund was given to four individuals only by giving them relatively large size grants (average of €15,000). We don't see a reason for implementing a pilot project while this type of activity is well implemented and studied in KRI for long time by many NGOs including locals.

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions' desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme

Utilizing the youth centres (some of them were established prior to this project) well for advertising and promoting the activities helped a lot in recruiting beneficiaries and implementing activities. This is well recognized compared with projects that were implemented by other partners that did not have such centres prior to the implementation. This eliminated the requirement of obtaining permission that may not be granted.

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

- 1) Definitely, the services provided through EUTF funded program are great and well accepted by the afflicted communities and by the local and national government officials. The LLH component of EUTF is indeed addressing the top priority need of the vulnerable people in KRI. The provided services, however, could be improved as recommended by interviewed stakeholders. Among these recommendations are: increasing the grant funds, giving



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

incentives (such as small tool kits) to those who are trained but not given grants. Giving large size grants over €5,000 should be avoided to cover more beneficiaries.

- 2) We could not see any vigorous M&E mechanism implemented by any partner to monitor the employability status of the beneficiaries after gaining skills, particularly when there are delays and the trainings are conducted near the end of the project.
- 3) Most of the indicators provided by the partners to measure the success of their projects are outputs indicators. Impact indicators must be developed for future projects to measure the impact of services. In this particular project, no baseline indicators were stated during the design of the project. The indicators were supposed to be developed through a comprehensive research but were not developed. We strongly recommend that ERC-ECHO Livelihoods Key Program Indicators are used as standard indicators in developing LLH future programs.
- 4) We could not also see a systematic way of developing and examining the available training curricula. In this particular project, the curricula developed/used by the directorate of VT were used followed even by the local partner. The Directorate of VT in KRI is going through financial difficulties similar to all public directorates, and most probably could not revise and improve these curricula.
- 5) It seems that introducing social activities throughout trainings has noticeable impact in inducing cohesion among trainees of different cultural, religious and ethnic backgrounds and also in enhancing the learning process. Key implementing staff (particularly of UPP) emphasises that PSS component of the project is complementing the LLH component.
- 6) The Media and Music components of this project seem unique and successful. Unique in term of nature and the collective way of implementation. The media project, however, needs more support to improve, expand and become sustainable.
- 7) We also noticed, through this project, that the vocational trainings were beneficiary-interest driven and not market driven ones. This could reduce the opportunities of seeking jobs.



TO4. 12 SFCG

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: October 2018 – K4
---	-------------------------

Project number (EUFT only)	TO4. 12
----------------------------	---------

Project title	FURSA-Resilient communities: Supporting Livelihoods, Education, and Social Stability for Syrian refugee and host populations
---------------	--

Lead Implementing partner (IP)	Search for Common Ground VZW (SFCG)
--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Other implementing partners / stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinamento delle Organizzazioni il servizio Volontario (COSV) – Italy - Un Ponte Per ... Associazione (UPP) – Italy - Associacio NOVA Centre per a la Innovacio Social (NOVA-CIS) - Spain
--	--

Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	Non-profit organization Registration No. 453975341, Belgium
---	--

Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	Beirut – Lebanon August 17, 2018, A
---	-------------------------------------

National (N) or regional project (R)	R
--------------------------------------	---

Location (geographic zone and specific location)	Lebanon, Turkey and Iraq
---	--------------------------

Iraq	Erbil, Duhok and Sulaimaniya Governorates
------	---

Jordan	n/a
--------	-----

Lebanon

Turkey

Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Access to basic education

2. Access to higher and further education

3. Resilience and development

X

4. Access to health services

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection

Overall budget

Total Budget of the Action: €4,453,447

EU financial contribution

EU Contribution: €4,453,447

Starting date

03.07.2016

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed)

18 months / 24 /Ongoing

Final date (planned /actual)

02/7/2018 (some activities are still ongoing)

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)

Overall objective 0 Strengthen the prospects of youth in refugee and host communities for social and economic inclusion in Iraq, Lebanon and Turkey.

Specific objective 1 Increase economic self-reliance of youth in refugee and host communities.

Specific objective 2 Develop more tolerant relationships between youth in refugee and host communities.

Estimated Results / outputs

1.1 - Access to demand-driven livelihood opportunities for youth in refugee and host communities is increased.

1.2 - The basic social and economic skills of youth in refugee and host communities are strengthened.

2.1 - The psychosocial well-being of youth participants in refugee and host communities is improved.

2.2 - Understanding and empathy among youth in refugee and host communities is increased.



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

<p>Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)</p>	<p>For Iraq:</p> <p>Sources of information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project DOA - FURSA Revised Action Plan <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Total beneficiaries involved in different activities (including RG sessions and PFA) is 15,000 (6,000 are students of 10 schools, and 9,000 through 6 youth centres); 2. 1,500 received vocational training (focused on English language and computer skills); 3. 300 youth received supports on business development services (BDS); 4. Number of youth (not determined) involved in four community projects; 5. 200 youth received training in media skills; 6. 20 youth in charge of setting up two radio stations.
---	--

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

<p>Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)</p>	<p>Three Countries:</p> <p>Source: FURSA Baseline Report for Lebanon and KRI, Jan – Mar, 2017</p> <p>Overall Objective:</p> <p>0.1: NA (66% of the target youth were currently facing challenges in finding a job)</p> <p>0.2: 53.4%</p> <p>0.3: NA</p> <p>Specific Objectives:</p> <p>3 NA (68% of the surveyed youth mentioned difficulties to secure a regular income)</p> <p>4 NA</p> <p>Expected Results:</p> <p>R1.1: NA</p>
--	---



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

R1.2.1: NA

R1.2.2: NA

R2.1: NA (32% of the youth demonstrated high of very high level and 19% low or very low level of tolerance toward youth from the other communities while the remaining 49% were neutral)

R2.2.1: NA (59% of the surveyed youth scored between neutral and very low on empathy and understanding composite measures)

R2.2.2: NA

Existence of target values (list)	<p>Three Countries: Source: Project Logframe of Action</p> <p>0.1 % youth who report increased access to economic resources and opportunities in their communities (target: at least 30%)</p> <p>0.2 % youth participants who report feeling valued and welcome within and outside their community (target: at least 50%)</p> <p>0.3 % community members tangentially involved in the project who report decreased violent conflict between youth in refugee and host communities (target: at least 20%)</p> <p>1. % youth participants who report increased economic self-reliance (target: at least 40%)</p> <p>2. % of youth participants who demonstrate increased tolerance towards youth from the other community (reported as a composite scale score), (target: at least 70%)</p> <p>R1.1 # Livelihood opportunities created for youth from refugee and host communities (target: at least: ?)</p> <p>R1.2.1 % participants who have increased their knowledge of life skills (arts, project management, peacebuilding, radio production, psychosocial support, etc.), (target: at least 60%)</p>
-----------------------------------	---



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

R1.2.2 % participants who have effectively applied the knowledge gained (target: at least 50%)

R2.1 % of youth participants who demonstrate positive progress in their psychosocial wellbeing (target: at least 50%)

R2.2.1 % youth who score higher in understanding and empathy composite measures (target: at least 50%)

R2.2.2 % youth who demonstrate increased empathy and understanding during joint activities (target: at least 70%)

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)

Yes, Youth

Key stakeholders (list)

For Lebanon

- Project documents (proposal and annexes)
- QIN (Reporting Cut Off Date: 31/10/2017)
- QIN (Reporting COD: 31/12/2017)
- QIN (Reporting COD: 31/03/2018)
- FURSA Revised Action Plan (
- FURSA Interim Report & Annexes (Jul 2017 – Sep 2017)
- FURSA Baseline Report for Lebanon & KRI (Jan – March, 2017)
- EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Crisis, 2nd Results Reporting, June 2018

Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)

Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant

EUFT-Syria funded projects for:
SFCG, UN Women, Danish Red Cross, LWF
Non-EUFT Funded projects:
Goal

Donor (s) / sources of funding

EU



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column "your evaluation "(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

<p>JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector</p>	<p>The overall aim is to address tensions between host communities and refugees, provide opportunities for young people, and provide livelihood opportunities, and how we can make them get together.</p> <p>The consortium was built it was interesting to see how they could deal on livelihood, making it a tool for social cohesion- interesting to see how we can make it happen in a difficult situation like that here. COSV were interested in social cohesion activities done by SFCG , and COSV has been working on Livelihood before – so they decided to seek SFCG to apply for EUTF in 2015</p>	2
---	--	---

<p>JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities</p>	<p>All outputs and activities are defined but sometimes overlapping.</p>	1
--	--	---

I. Effectiveness

2. To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

<p>JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones</p>	<p>All outputs are delivered</p>	2
--	----------------------------------	---



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

	Some activities are still in place but that is because they are expected to continue even after the end of the project	
JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations	All outputs delivered , yet an evaluation mechanism has not been set to capture all outputs	2

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks	The consortium started in Turkey, Lebanon and Iraq. After some month they experiences problems when COSV registration was not renewed and they were in limbo and as such they needed to halt the project there and ultimately cancel turkey. This was not a bad decision as the resources were used for Lebanon and Iraq. The budget revision was complicated.	2
	Political issue of turkey – will they achieve something? When they started , local stakeholders were good especially with TOBB , but then they changed their position (at the same time when everything was moved to presidency)	

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources	During negotiation with EU, it was clear what the approach was – they needed to remove Jordan from the consortium – as many projects, they had to readjust what they brought to the situation. The process was rather shorter than other EUTF funded projects.	2
--	--	---

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen	The budget was transformed so many times and in turkey it was difficult to achieve results in the available time.	1
	The very first batch of projects – the thing that affected most is the fact that they were given	



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

shorter period of implementation – only 18 month but then they had a no cost extension. Because of the EU cutting down the project time – which meant some activities were cut down. EU stated that they wanted to see if a first phase to see how consortium can work before funding a longer period project

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe

The internal resources were well used and the cooperation between the CSOs provided a 2 comprehensive teamwork

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner

The funding also came in the right time as needs assessment was already set in place and most of the challenges were identified previously and could be easily overcome with EUTF funds. What is 3 interesting about this project is that it focuses on the youth – usually neglected in most livelihood projects

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country

FURSA abandoned Turkey (registration issues) , project duration too short to capitalize on existing 2 in country experience

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level

Definitely, the knowledge learned and skills gained by thousands of beneficiaries will help in seeking 1 employments and shaping their life. It would be great if this project had a solid mechanism to



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

measure the impact of these services and monitor the status of the targeted beneficiaries.

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees

– and we worked with a lot of young adults especially in the arts for social cohesion. We are trying to also make sure most of graduates are also TOT for others, one of the main achievement is a radio. most radio stations in the north where the project was carried out, is biased and sectarian. So they are now in the process so finalizing a radio program with the youth

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF

The LLH program's intended services are all delivered, Most of the activities, implemented by various partners, complement each other, such as targeting different groups of beneficiaries, different areas and focusing on different skills.

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions' desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme

The work with youth and support was widely acknowledged by the community

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

The services provided through EUTF funded program well accepted by the communities they serve and by the local and national government officials. The project is one of the best that has addressed the top priority need of the youth. The CSOs suggested that what could be is increasing the grant funds and time of implementation



T04.15 GIZ QUDRA

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: 1.09.2018 – K2 JORDAN
Project number (EUFT only)	T04. 15 JORDAN
Project title	Qudra – Resilience for Syrian Refugees, IDPs and host communities in response the Syrian and Iraqi crises
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	GIZ
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	<p>Only GIZ for LLH.</p> <p>Other IP for other components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Expertise France (EF) – France -L'Agence française de coopération médias (CFI) /France -Agencia Española de Cooperación -- Internacional al Desarrollo (AECID) - Spain -FIIAPP (Cooperación Espanola) - Spain
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	National
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	a, c
National (N) or regional project (R)	R
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Iraq	X
Jordan	Greater Amman Municipality, Irbid and Mafraq
Lebanon	X
Turkey	X
Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)	
1. Access to basic education	X
2. Access to higher and further education	
3. Resilience and development	X
4. Access to health services	
5. Access to WASH services	
6. Protection	
Overall budget	EURO 74million
EU financial contribution	EURO 70.6m from EU Trust Fund EUTF (95.4%)
Starting date	General contract:15/12/2016 Grant contract: March/April 2017 Contract Jordan: Sept/October 2017
Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed)	36 months
Final date (planned /actual)	14.06.2019 (but ST in Jordan not yet completed)
Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)	<p>Overall objective: Contribute to mitigating the destabilizing effects of the Syrian refugee crisis and to better respond to hosts’ and refugees’ needs in the communities hosting the refugees and their administrations in line with the overall EUTF Trust Fund objective.</p> <p>Objective module 2 “Skills training”: To enhance skills training for educational and economic opportunities for host communities and Syrian refugees, in particular for youth and women, in Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey</p>
Estimated Results / outputs for specific objective 1 (LLH)	<i>Main result indicator for second LLH module:</i>



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

The Qudra programme responds to the EU Regional Strategy for Syria and Iraq as well as the ISIL/Da'esh threat and the corresponding EUTF priorities²². In particular, Qudra contributes to the EU Regional Strategy as it aims at strengthening local capacities in the affected region, namely Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey and North Iraq/ KRI by supporting stabilisation and resilience of Syrian refugees, IDPs, and vulnerable host communities

This implies the following results:

JR 2.1: Training centres accept vulnerable Jordanians and Syrian refugees are chosen and upgraded. More explicitly, 10 training centres have new equipment based on training needs within the identified occupational fields; The capacities (knowledge and attitude) of 50% of the training staff at 10 training centres in dealing with difficult youth and groups with a variety of needs, including gender-specific needs

JR 2.2: New modules in at least 3 occupations have been upgraded according to labour market needs and are practised in training institutes. More explicitly, 5 new modules in at least 3 occupations of particular interest and relevance to Jordanians and Syrian refugees (based on work permissions for certain sectors) have been introduced at 10 training centres; e-learning modules for 5 modules of particular interest for Syrian refugees (and returnees) are available online and on CDs

JR 2.3: Holistic support, including advice on opportunities for skills development, career counselling, formalizing work experience, apprenticeship opportunities, support with recognition of Syrian certificates, skills training, employment opportunities, link to employers, work permits, setting up businesses, guidance to self-employment, etc., is available to host communities and



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Syrian refugees. *More specifically, 3 mobile support centres are set up and offer free-of-charge services; knowledge about available skills training, employment opportunities, work permits, business development, etc. among a sample of 40 young Jordanian and Syrian refugees has improved by 3 points (on a scale from 1 to 10, with 1 meaning no knowledge and 10 meaning fully aware of available training opportunities).*

Target groups and final beneficiaries

50% Syrian refugees, 50% Jordanians (although Jordanians have insisted on 70% Jordanians and 30% Syrian refugees). 80% youths and 40% females

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)

- 0

Existence of target values (list)

The number of young Syrian refugees and Jordanians that apply for skills training in 3 occupational fields has increased by 20%; 5,000 young vulnerable Jordanian and Syrian students, 80% youth, of which 40% are female, enrolled at 10 training centres; 1,000 (of the total 5,000) combine the skills training with practical work (via short-term employment and/or an apprenticeship).

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)

Yes, see TGs

Direct Key stakeholders (list)

Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC); Ministry of Interior, Education, Vocational Training Corporation, Balqa Applied University (higher technical education); National Company for Employment and Training (founded by the Army in 2007 and co-chaired now by VTC), private and foreign



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

	training centres (Luminus Foundation, DVV International, Jordan Education for Employment (JEFE)); Ministry of Labour; Centre of Accreditation and Quality Assurance (CAQA)
Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)	Basic project documents (Narrative, budget, logframes, and last Quins, medium-term evaluation report.
Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant	See WVI grid; in addition, valuable experience for the planned skills training will be gained through the project “Training for Water and Energy Efficiency Development TWEED”:
Donor (s) / sources of funding	EU/BMZ

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector

Answers based on evaluation matrix: Indicators

The Qudra programme responds to the EU Regional Strategy for Syria and Iraq. In particular, Qudra contributes to the EU Regional Strategy as it aims at strengthening local capacities in the affected region, including Jordan, by supporting stabilisation and resilience of Syrian refugees, IDPs, and vulnerable host communities.

Is in line with Jordan’s response Plan and the regional



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

3RP.

However, the third result (See JR 2.3 above: 3 mobile support centres are set up) was abandoned since local authorities believed it was not sustainable: better to operate on the basis of existing local structures.

JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities

Yes, clearly defined.

II. Effectiveness

2.: To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones

Start with delays. However, progress observed between the two first QINS (December 2017 and April 2018): from 141 trained (including 56 Syrian refugees and 100 women) to 842 trained (incl. 100 women and 509 Syrian refugees). Overall target by June 2019 is still far away: 5000 trained including 200 women and 50% of Syrian refugees...

GIZ as an IP considers the goal very ambitious: negotiated between HQs and now falls on their shoulders.

JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations

In line.

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks

Extensively taken into account in the DoA

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Extensive network of training institutions involved, according to QINs.

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen

Yet to be seen but as mentioned above, very ambitious numbers not negotiated with local stakeholders but at European level.

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner

Yes, non-sustainable components were abandoned (the mobile centres, see above) under local authorities' pressure.

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country

Not direct. But exchanges of ideas between stakeholders of different host countries.

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level

Sustainability led to abandonment of component (under local authorities' pressure).



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees

Also valid for other grids: in 2016, the Jordanians imposed 70% Jordanians -30% Syrian refugees but now seem to come back to 50% -50%...

At local level, still tensions between low skilled Jordanians and Syrian refugees, especially in the informal market and the formal construction and agricultural sectors.

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF

- Yes, a lot of operational lessons learned through EU funded regional/ multi component project.
- Time taken to sign contract reasonable for a project of that magnitude.

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions' desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme.

? Still progress is incipient.

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

OK but stress because of very ambitious targets.

T04.15 GIZ

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: Oct. 2018 – K4 -Lebanon
Project number (EUFT only)	TO4. 15
Project title	Qudra – Resilience for Syrian refugees , IDPs, Host communities in response to the Syrian and Iraqi crisis
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	GIZ
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	Expertise France (EF) – France L'Agence française de coopération médias (CFI) - France Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional al Desarrollo (AECID) - Spain FIIAPP (Cooperación Espanola) - Spain
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	INGO
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	a
National (N) or regional project (R)	R
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	Jordan, Lebanon , Turkey, IRAQ
Iraq	(North) Iraq (Dohuk, Erbil, Sulaimaniyya)
Jordan	Jordan (Greater Amman Municipality, Irbid and Mafraq
Lebanon	Lebanon (Beirut, Northern Lebanon, and Bekaa Valley)
Turkey	Turkey (4 provinces with a high presence of refugees such as: Ankara, Gaziantep, İstanbul, Şanlıurfa
Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)	
1. Access to basic education	



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

2. Access to higher and further education X

3. Resilience and development X

4. Access to health services

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection

Overall budget Total Budget of the Action: EUR 20,800,000 (initial according to project description annex 1)

EU financial contribution EU Contribution: EUR 19,500,000

Starting date 15.06.2016

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed)

Final date (planned /actual) 14.06.2019

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)

Overall Objective:

to contribute to mitigating the destabilizing effects of the Syrian refugee crisis and to better respond to hosts’ and refugees’ needs in the communities hosting the refugees and their administrations in line with the overall Trust Fund objective.

SO 1 - Module “Education Infrastructure”: To enhance conditions at schools for host communities and Syrian refugees in Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey

SO2 - Module “Skills Training”: To enhance skills training for educational and economic opportunities for host communities and Syrian refugees, in particular for youth and women, in Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey.

SO 3 - Module “Social Cohesion”: To foster social cohesion between refugees and local populations in host communities in Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey

SO 4 - Module “Supporting Local Administration”:



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

No result is planned for Lebanon under this Module.

SO 5 - Module “Facilitating Dialogue and Dissemination”: To provide a platform for exchange to the governments of (North) Iraq, Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey and other relevant stakeholders on policies conducive to enhanced economic resilience and future perspectives for refugee and host communities.

Estimated Results / outputs	<p>1.1: Physical infrastructure at schools is improved.</p> <p>1.2: School facilities (sport or playgrounds, theatres, laboratories or similar) at 5 schools are upgraded.</p> <p>2.1: In at least 2 sectors, 8 vocational training centres are systematically allowed and willing to accept Syrian and vulnerable Lebanese youth for certified skills training.</p> <p>2.2: Knowledge about available formal certified skills training among Syrian refugees and host communities has improved (on a scale from 1 to 10, with 1 meaning no knowledge and 10 meaning fully aware of available training opportunities, certified and non-certified).</p> <p>3.1: Information concerning the conditions and availability of formal, certified skills training as well as needs and interest of and access to potential students, specified according to age, gender, geographic location and sector of interest is accessible.</p> <p>2.3: 8 VTCs are ready to accept Syrian and vulnerable Lebanese youth for certified skills training.</p>
-----------------------------	---

Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)	vulnerable Syrian refugees and Lebanese
--	---

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Availability of baselines in project

documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)

Existence of target values (list)	<p>Enhance skills training for educational and economic opportunities for host communities and Syrian refugees, in particular for youth and women</p> <p>1.1: Physical infrastructure at schools is improved. – 10 schools</p> <p>1.2: School facilities (sport or playgrounds, theatres, laboratories or similar) at- 5 schools are upgraded.</p> <p>1.3: 50 sports teachers, coaches, social workers and/or volunteers, 30% of them female apply their newly acquired skills in “sports for development” methods. - 15</p>
-----------------------------------	---

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)

Key stakeholders (list)	UN, INGOs, beneficiaries
Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)	<p>30-01-18 EUTF QIN for Qudra</p> <p>30-04-18 EUTF QIN for Qudra</p> <p>30-11-17 EUTF QIN for Qudra</p>
Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant	All EUTF projects in Lebanon RDPP in Lebanon
Donor (s) / sources of funding	EU- EUTF-Syria

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

2. Column "your evaluation "(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!

3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

Answers based on evaluation matrix: Indicators

JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector

Activities u focus on heavily damaged schools and cover several aspects including necessary safety measures. In addition, since many schools are suffering from poor infrastructure or are in a bad condition, whether inside the schools (laboratories, theatres, arts and music facilities or similar) or around the schools (sports facilities, playgrounds, etc.), Qudra intends to support the upgrading of a number of school facilities together with the delivery of extra-curricular activities.

Qudra works on addressing the improvement of vocational/ technical skills of the target groups to increase their qualifications for broader perspectives in the job market

Qudra aims at fostering social cohesion/social stability between refugees and local populations in host communities through the provision of Public Education Centres as well as by strengthening civil society organisations, in line with the LCRP.

JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities

Qudra is in line with the National Response Plan (Regional Refugee & Resilience Plan 2017-2018 - 3RP) of Lebanon and its related priorities. Qudra Lebanon is also in line with the key priorities of the EUTF in response to the Syrian Crisis. It is comprehensively designed to strengthen local resilience capacities by supporting stabilisation and



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

resilience of refugees and host communities under the Specific Objectives (SO1, SO2, SO3)

II. Effectiveness

2.: To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones

For modules deployed in Lebanon, it is not possible yet to measure accurately the outcomes of Qudra Lebanon. There are only a few examples of successful activities delivering worthwhile outputs and, consequently results

The improvements of physical infrastructure at schools has been starting implementation with a contracting first rehabilitation works, covering three schools (out of ten schools envisaged in total.

the originally intended training of 50 sports teachers, coaches, social workers and/or volunteers acquiring and applying acquired skills for extra-curricular activities does not find the support from the MEHE/ PMU.

Achievement of the SO3 (“foster social cohesion between refugees and local populations in host communities in ... Lebanon) is currently highly at risk, particularly since implementation has not yet started, mostly due to a lack of consensus concerning the nature and scope of activities

JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations

Due to the current lack of tangible outputs it is also not possible yet to assess to what extent Syrian refugees will benefit from the project. Based on the designed activities, Syrian refugees may benefit from the intended outputs/ outcomes. Yet, the achievement of this will be evidenced only once activities will be implemented and outputs delivered

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks

The prevailing political sensitivity of integrating Syrian refugees in the Lebanese labour market, which is already characterised by a high unemployment rate, limits the likelihood of achieving broader socio-economic effects.



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources.

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen

Qudra Lebanon has delivered a very limited number of outputs as a result of the activities conducted to date due to the significant delays experienced

Particular difficulties have appeared for SO3, also due to significant changes in the political composition of the responsible ministry (MoSA).

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner

the Lebanese legal framework for the job market is challenging for Syrian refugees so it is not clear if immediate benefits foreseen in the design of the action will be sustained

The lack of adequate involvement of the partner country institutions represents the main challenge of Qudra Lebanon. The project design does not adequately take into consideration the contextual/ political framework of the country and does not offer an approach for effectively liaising with the local stakeholders in implementing activities and achieving the expected outcomes

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country

Qudra is highly relevant since it currently responds to the needs of the target groups and beneficiaries. The objectives are in line with the EU Regional Strategy for Syria

The Qudra governance structure is rather complex and not always able to manage and oversee the action at country and at the regional level. Moreover, coordination and communication problems between GIZ and EF affect the overall management of Qudra Lebanon

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level

The initial design did not fully reflect the institutional reality in Lebanon, resulting also in a certain risk that project results would not be sustainable as needed. This risk seems to be now less, with institutional ownership building up. Qudra intends to empower the local structures in terms of physically and capacity building to provide the targeted services to the Syrian refugees together with the host country people.

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees

Due to the complexity and magnitude of the Syrian refugee crisis, political circumstances and the lack of resources, financial contributions from international donors continue to be of utmost importance to ensure the continuation of services.

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF

Qudra offers some added value particularly in respect to the regional dimension and the visibility and communication of the Programme. However, it still has not been fully explored,

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions' desired effects?



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

The given division of labour between the implementing partners, different organisational set-ups and working methods did not facilitate internal partnership process. A more and earlier pro-active management of obstacles by the implementing partners, in line with the provisions of the given Delegation Agreement, would have been beneficial.



T04.15 GIZ

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I. information gathered during document review and if necessary during interviews will be collected.

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: K1 Date: 03.09.2018 - Turkey
[SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]

Project number (EUFT only) T04. 15

Project title QUDRA – RESILIENCE FOR SYRIAN REFUGEES, IDPS AND HOST COMMUNITIES IN RESPONSE THE SYRIAN AND IRAQI CRISES

Lead Implementing partner (IP) Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GIZ

Other implementing partners / stakeholders
Expertise France (EF) – France
L'Agence française de coopération médias (CFI) - France
Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional al Desarrollo (AECID) - Spain
FIIAPP (Cooperación Espanola) – Spain
Plus: Hungarian Interchurch Aid (HIA) incorporated later (2017).

Type of lead implementing partner: CSO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation, INGO

Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (c) A to c

National (N) or regional project (R) R

Location (geographic zone and specific location)



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Iraq X

Jordan X

Lebanon X

Turkey X

Others N/a

Funding programme title either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI) EUTF – Action document 1 plus specific action document for the project

Donor (s) / sources of funding EUTF and BMZ

Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)

1. Access to basic education x

2. Access to higher and further education

3. Resilience and development x

4. Access to health services

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

LF, up-dated but how often (after IR and others for Turkey and Lebanon (2018?))

Logframe updated:

Availability of baselines in project documents (list) Missing (source LF)
1. x (needs to be measured at start; status unclear, some refugees in camps already trained by PECs)
2. x (to be measured for existing course offer at start)

Existence of target values (list) For module (LLHS 02) only:
1. y (by project end, needs to be determined following initial assessment)
2. y (needs to be measured for new course offer at project end)
6 Satellite Centres



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Others...	
Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)	Gender approach / aggregated figures, children, youth, disabled children
Overall budget	74,6 mio (amount disbursed: 49,7 mio) 19.300.000 - disbursed 13. mio Turkey
EU financial contribution	(EURO 70.6m from EU Trust Fund, EURO 3.4m from BMZ – 4,6%)
Starting date	15.06.2016 – 13.06.2019 (36 months) amended DoA and budget to the DA was signed on January 10, 2018
Final date (initially / planned /actual)	14.06.2019 -- 31.12.2019
Overall objective and project purpose (according to DoA and logical framework specifically for Turkey)	<p>The overall objective of the proposed action is to contribute to mitigating the destabilizing effects of the Syrian refugee crisis and to better respond to hosts’ and refugees’ needs in the communities hosting the refugees and their administrations in line with the overall EUTF Trust Fund objective.</p> <p>S01: Education Infrastructure aims at enhancing conditions at schools for host communities and Syrian refugees in Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey. The module focuses on school rehabilitation and capacity development, including extracurricular activities and school facility management.</p> <p>- S02: Skills Training focuses on improving vocational and skills training for enhanced economic and job market opportunities for host communities and Syrian refugees in Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey, in particular targeting the youth and women.</p> <p>I 1: Number of Syrian refugees (aged 15-34) who have completed skills training at PECs has increased from x (2015) to y (project end), 50% of the total are females. (by GIZ)</p> <p>I 2: 80% of participants of PEC skills trainings (members of host communities and refugees) confirm that their newly acquired skills will help them to</p>



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

pursue economic opportunities and/ or improve their livelihoods.

- S03: Social Cohesion aims at fostering social cohesion between refugees and local populations in Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey.

- S04: Supporting Local Administration aims at strengthening capacities of local administrative structures and other local organisations for improved livelihood opportunities of IDPs, refugees and vulnerable host communities in North Iraq/KRI and in Jordan.

- S05: Facilitating Dialogue and Dissemination provides platforms for exchange and learning for stakeholder representatives and beneficiaries in all partner countries on policies and approaches conducive to enhanced resilience and future perspectives for refugee and host communities.

Target Results TR, LLH component 2 only:

TR 2.1: Qualifications for teachers of Public Education Centres, notably with regard to methods relating to adult learning and out-of-school youth enhanced.

20% of teachers in PECs of Gaziantep are applying methods learned to their courses by end of 2017. (by GIZ)

TR 2.2: Training modules offered by Public Education Centres, notably with regard to qualifications that increase (self-) employment opportunities and equip participants with life and reconstruction skills expanded.

8 new modules that are relevant to employment and/ or reconstruction and life skills offered by PECs of Gaziantep (50% of these for female employment) by end of 2017. (by GIZ)

TR 2.3: Access to Public Education Centres for members of the refugee population improved.

70% of PECs have introduced an operational Arabic desk/ interface that attend to the needs of the Syrian refugee population by mid of 2017. (by GIZ)



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)	<p>Main beneficiary in Turkey according to DoA: Turkish Prime Ministry Disaster and Emergency Management Authority (AFAD) and later PMO (?)</p> <p>Local host and refugee communities, their leaders, and civil society organisations, local and national authorities of Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey. This does include refugees, internally displaced persons and other vulnerable national groups.</p> <p>The direct beneficiaries of the action will be the partner organisations implementing the programme: Basmeh & Zeitooneh, Women Now for Development, UOSSM, Kesh Malek, Kirkayak Kültür, International Blue Crescent, Canal France International (CFI). The indirect beneficiaries are the refugee and host communities of Gaziantep, Istanbul, Şanlıurfa and their immediate surroundings</p>
--	--

Key stakeholders (list)	See above: Government of Turkey, line ministries (in reality)
Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)	DoA revised, annexes, inception report 10/2016, QINs / FRIT reporting annual report 2016, mid-term evaluation,
Other projects in the sector / country (except of EUTF) -list	DRC Turkey (others) BMZ / GIZ EUTF: Concern T04. 32, To4.72 UNWOMEN, T04.70 ILO / IOM, To4. 68 TOBB, T04.76 UNDP Plus other DAAD etc.

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector

In 2016, the three EUMSAs undertook separate appraisal missions to the partner countries with the aim to elaborate on the envisaged joint programme design as laid down in the origin Description of Action (DoA) and the preliminary work plan annexed to the Delegation Agreement (DA). Discussions were mainly held with the state coordinating bodies of the 3RP, the Jordan Response Platform for the Syria Crisis (JRPSC), the Lebanese Ministry of Social Affairs (MoSA), AFAD in Turkey and the Joint Crisis Coordination Centre (JCC) of the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) in North Iraq/ KRI and to a lesser extent with the competent line ministries (see chapter 4.1 and 4.3).

For the design, the appraisal teams took into consideration that, according to the regional 3RP, the human costs of the Syrian crisis will continue to grow, with continuing population movements and deepening vulnerabilities in the region. Accordingly, the programme design had been built on capitalising on existing structures, projects and networks in the relevant sectors of the EUMSAs and of the EU to make use of best practices and scaling-up effects.

QUDRA is in line with the Turkish Chapter of the 3RP and national priorities & regulations, while number of potential BFs (for all countries) are indicated in the DoA – based on which information? – (gender aggregated), until now baselines and target values are missing.

Figures / information about the LLH sector remains limited, even in the inception report.

Consultations with TG governments took place however discussions with LA / on community level turned out to be insufficient to receive the permission to cooperate with CSOs / NGOs and to implement

2



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

module 2. The country / regional context has been insufficiently taken into account (delays).

The quality of the adjusted LF is limited: Indicators are multi-dimensional multi-levelled; they are difficult to measure (if any).

Indicators are not conforming fully to RACER criteria applied under evaluations commissioned by the EU services (Relevant, Acceptable, Credible, Easy and Robust).

Risks and assumption concerning the LLH component and the employment of CES under the component were insufficiently taken into account.

JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities

External factors: (volatile surrounding in Turkey) coup d'etat, staff turnover, elections and shifts in responsibility turned out to be crucial issues. In consequence this led to changing responsibilities within the Turkish government. In addition, division of competence between various line ministries, AFAD / later PMO were not sufficiently considered including capacities and competences of sub-national and local authorities.

2

Finally, at least in Turkey NGOs need to be accredited by state institutions for the implementation of the programme activities. While the government was obviously not in favour of NGO / CSO participation.

~~Not much support from EUD because OM were not accredited at that time.~~ False: There was support, which has been confirmed during interviews

II. Effectiveness

2.: To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones

Qudra suffers from considerable delays, especially under the LLH component / module (2) in Turkey. There are even doubts (GIZ / EUD) whether the project will achieve its outputs under module 2 (LLH) until June 2019.

1

MoU with MoNE signed in August 2018 only,



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations

The overall objective of the Trust Fund is to provide a coherent and reinforced aid response to the Syrian crisis on a regional scale, responding primarily to the needs of refugees from Syria in neighbouring countries, as well as of the communities hosting the refugees and their administrations, in particular as regards resilience and early recovery. The Trust Fund shall address the needs of the following groups: refugees, internally displaced persons, returnees, and vulnerable host communities.

Council of the EU (2015): Council conclusions on the EU Regional Strategy for Syria and Iraq as well as the ISIL/Da'esh threat (7267/15; 16/03/2015).

Delays. Limited outputs so far

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks

The action was insufficiently capable to mitigate external risks such as. Signing of MoU with MoNE. ...

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources

The assumption under EUTF holds partially true. The consortium consisting in major EUMSA is at least in technical terms capable to plan and implement an operation of the given financial and regional dimension.

All IPs involved are able to refer to the necessary expertise and experience. This must be assessed against performance of small IPs.

The assumption that EUMSA are capable to mobilize additional fund holds true (GIZ / BMZ).

Upscaling GIZ / BMZ took place Community centre 15 + 10 / 15

EMSA are capable to absorb huge funds as long as external conditions allow for smooths implementation. This is not the case for module 2 LLH.

III. Efficiency



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen

Completion of module 2 LLH is endangered.
In case the action requires a no-cost extension cost for human resources will disproportionally increase to the expense of investment (training, CD).
According to PMO only 10% of the funds allocated reach the BF's. (Discussion with PMO – a political statement during a quite unfriendly discussion)
Delays of about 20 months or even more concerning LLH (26 months – minus 3 month inception) MoUs signed in August 2018 only MoNE Turkey

1

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe

In the case of QUDRA at least for module 2 resources are not used in the most rationale way: Absorption (funds cannot be transferred to other MENA).
Country specific challenges affecting the LLH sector (role of Turkish government & line ministries) was insufficiently considered.
During negotiations with MoNE and other Turkish stakeholders planned activities were adjusted. Shift of activities and resources to another sector or even country was not considered and most probably not possible. (Funds earmarked for Turkey: EUD Ankara)
QUDAR was unable to use resources earmarked for LLH in the most rational way (Funds earmarked for Turkey cannot be transferred to operations in other countries yet to other modules).
To weigh the cost savings of a regional programme against the additional financial expenditure, an efficiency audit could, for in-stance, be considered as integral part of the final evaluation.
In order to make verifiable statements regarding the additional effort of a regional programme in comparison with various bilateral projects, benchmarking is required.

1



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

According to the project documents and discussions held in the sector, with EUDs and stakeholders the support provided by QUDRA was complementary to other operations concerning sectors addressed and regions targeted. Effective coordination in the sector took place (committees).

However, QUDRA was not in a position to address the challenges the LLH component (and to a minor degree other module 05, communication) were exposed to. (External effects). 2

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner

The facilitation of EU coherence should not be in the remit of a single programme, but it is rather the mandate of the EUTF representatives at the EUDs to facilitate such process (chapter 4.3 and 4.2).

Amend the ToRs of the SC.

EUTF attachés/ programme managers at the EUD to organise regular country/ regional meetings with the EUTF-funded actions.

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

Different organisations, different approaches under the consortium

On the topic of school facility management in Jordan under SO1, intensive consultations took place in the School Infrastructure Donor Group, with other donors, other EUTF-funded programmes in Jordan and at ministerial level. 2

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country

- On the topic of social cohesion and livelihoods in Jordan under SO3 and SO4, exchange of information among relevant programmes, including EUTF-funded programmes, took place in the context of technical working groups, organised by UNHCR.
- In the implementation of the research component of SO5, Qudra cooperates with the EUTF-funded



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Programme Higher and Further Education Opportunities and Perspectives for Syrian refugees (HOPES) that is implemented by a group of EUMSAs under the leadership of the DAAD.

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

<p>JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level</p>	<p>In the case of Turkey in theory strong involvement of the Gov might indicated high level of ownership. In essence it is too early to assess whether the Gov is capable and willing to provide for continuous funding necessary to maintain CECs, trainings and other LLH activities.</p>	0
---	---	---

<p>JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees</p>	<p>The action provides for strong support to facilitate acceptance of the local communities. Since module 2 LLH is not operational, increase in job opportunities cannot be assessed.</p>	0
--	---	---

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

	<p>In order to provide for evidence on any gains deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF it will be necessary to distinguish between national and regional projects.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF</p>	<p>Funding of large scale LLH projects reduces the administrative burden of the donor. It is easier to manage one large project rather than a number of smaller initiatives. This applies at least for national projects.</p>	2
--	---	---

In the case of regional projects, the example of QUDRA (and other projects like LEADERS) indicates a strong need for coordination within the consortia and vis a vis national governments and other stakeholders.



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Partners overburdened by the complexity of the programme...multi-donor, multi-country and multi-sectoral programme

contextualisation is indispensable but all four countries are different... There are no definitive models to be imposed, even so they might have been successfully implemented in similar contexts

When coordination on government level is concerned INGOs or NGOs may not be best placed to effectively deal with this challenge.

Regional projects had been built on existing structures, projects and networks in the relevant sectors of the EU and of the EUMSAs

The idea to benefit from lessons learned (or perhaps even capitalize on scaling effects due to common risk management, joint reporting, using of premises and office facilities) needs to be scrutinized.

Additional resources are necessary for coordination (meetings travel)

In any case additional resources on consortium level are required for coordination and for any kind of knowledge management to collect the necessary information to draw lessons.

“In all partner countries except Turkey, partners and stakeholders acknowledged the high political relevance of the multi-country and multi-sectoral approach, thereby welcoming the opportunity for mutual exchange and learning. In view of the existing management effort of multi-donor coordination in general and the multitude of bilateral GIZ projects on country level in particular, partners and stakeholders seem, however, to be overburdened by the complexity of the Qudra programme. Their preference for a clear and designated contact and response structure on country level is evident. In particular in fragile contexts, trust-building is key and personal contacts and prompt management responses are indispensable. “



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

The shared use of premises, office infrastructure and support staff by implementing agencies in Lebanon and, partly, in Jordan is a cost-efficient approach. This also applies to the shared use of the regional risk management system of the GIZ. It is also obvious that joint annual, quarterly and bi-monthly reporting to the financial bearers is efficient and time-saving.

However, the assessment of the OECD/DAC evaluation criterion efficiency can only identify the above-mentioned key points and is not to be equated with an in-depth efficiency audit. Only such an audit can provide a valid assessment, whether the savings mentioned above are reasonable in relation to expenses such as travel costs of employees, and the hosting of regional SC meetings.

In order to weigh the cost savings of a regional programme against the additional financial expenditure, an efficiency audit could, for instance, be considered as integral part of the final evaluation. To make verifiable statements regarding the additional effort of a regional programme in comparison with various bilateral projects, a benchmarking is required which was neither arranged for nor feasible within the framework of this MTE.

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions’ desired effects?

<p>JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme</p>	<p>Too early to assess however strong potential (local / in country and within the EU)</p>	0
--	--	---

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

- Despite of some problems, there are strong arguments (and against) to apply a regional approach
- Strong Absorption capacities
- Scaling up of existing activities
- Potential to mobilize additional resources



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Cost efficiency still to be demonstrated / substantiated

High potential to achieve visibility within EU MS (City partnerships under Qudra as an example)

The programme is not fully implemented (including parts endangered to be implemented not at all especially component (05) and LLH (02).

Weak: High coordination efforts at least during inception, structure of QUDRA overly complex and not resilient. Prone to become affected by numerous internal and external frictions.

T04. 17 WVI – YOUTH RESOLVE

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: 27.07.2018 – K2
Project number (EUFT only)	T04. 17 JORDAN
Project title	Youth Resolve:: Resilience, Education, Social Cohesion, Opportunities for Livelihoods and reduced Violence in Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	World Vision Deutschland e.V.
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	For Jordan in livelihoods sector: -
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	International NGO
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	a, c
National (N) or regional project (R)	R as a whole / Only Jordan+KRI (?) for livelihoods
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq. Only Jordan and KRI for livelihoods.
Iraq	Erbil and Dohuk
Jordan	10 communities in the governorates of Mafraq, Irbid, Zarqa, Amman, Ajloun and Karak.
Lebanon	N/A for livelihoods.
Turkey	N/A
Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)	



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Access to basic education X (remedial, non-formal, informal)

2. Access to higher and further education X (idem)

3. Resilience and development X

4. Access to health services

5. Access to WASH services X

6. Protection X

Overall budget

Total budget: 13,470,000 Euro; revised budget not yet approved: 17,233,727 Euro.

Total Budget of the Action: EUR 7,795,023 (initial according to project description annex 1)
For Jordan: Euro 5,567,470

EU financial contribution

Total EU Contribution: Euro 12.796.827 across for all activities in all three countries.

Starting date

01.09.2017

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed)

24 months– Not completed. Has just started the implementation of the activities in August 2018 because delays in the approval of the Jordanian government: MoPIC, PM + line ministry).

Final date (planned /actual)

01.09.2019

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)

Overall objective: To strengthen youth resilience and empower youth as leading actors in post-conflict reconstruction and reconciliation.

- **Specific Objective 1** (livelihoods): Youth are empowered to utilise knowledge and opportunities to confidently participate in economic and social life. This will be achieved through training of skills relevant to the local job market and have greater access to livelihood opportunities through vocational training, skills training and employment services.

- **Specific Objective 2:** Tensions between refugee and host community youth and



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

families are reduced due to improved access to services and social cohesion.

Estimated Results / outputs	<p>For objective 1 (livelihoods) only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.1.1. (Preparatory): Conduct and utilize a market assessment of appropriate employment opportunities for youth - 1.1.2. (Preparatory): Develop vocational training curriculum in consultation with local stakeholders such as local government and potential employers - 1.1.3. Provide skills training and/or support access to vocational training for young women and men (aged 18-25) - 1.1.4. (Preparatory): Conduct training and workshops for local businesses, youth, government and civil society to build approaches and share best practice on promoting youth employment - 1.1.5. Facilitate apprenticeships for young women and men (aged 15-25) together with local businesses
-----------------------------	--

Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)	<p>For livelihoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Syrian and Jordanian youth, males and females, aged 18-25.
--	--

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)	Baseline yet to be released by end of September/October
---	---

Existence of target values (list)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 300 youth aged 18-25, including 75 women/225 males trained, offered career counselling and job opportunities (the whole cycle) <p>Target is different from what the action document stipulates: training and placement are separated, 300 each.</p>
-----------------------------------	---



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)	Yes, see TGs
Key stakeholders (list)	Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MoPIC), Prime Ministry / Ministry of Labour, Vocational Training Corporation, Private sector, CBOs that will be involved in training activities.
Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)	Basic project documents (Narrative, budget, logframes, etc.)
Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant	<p>The Compact agreement between Jordan and its international donors (employment /investments/growth components); All EUTF projects in Jordan/ Leaders, Qudra, UN Women, Danish Red Cross, Italian cooperation; RDPP in Jordan; Danish Refugee Council and the Jordan River Foundation Opportunity Project funded by the UNHCR (training, placement project targeting 800 Syrian refugees and Jordanians); Financial inclusion project, funded by the UNHCR with participation of SIDA and Grameen Credit Agricole in order to provide loans to Syrian refugees and Jordanians</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cash for work projects funded mainly for GIZ (stopped). - Luminous Technical University College funded by UNHCR and other UN agencies to train Syrian refugees.
Donor (s) / sources of funding	EU / WVi

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column "your evaluation "(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

Answers based on evaluation matrix: Indicators

<p>JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector</p>	<p>Intervention is fully adequate with a comprehensive model: from training to counselling and to job opportunity. The project tackles a pressing unmet need amongst the youths in Jordan: career counselling.</p>	3
---	--	---

<p>JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities</p>	<p>There are differences between the outcome and targets stated in the documents (600 youths) and those expressed by the staff (300); maybe last minutes changes due to the fact the project included home-based projects, which have recently been banned by the government. The staff was not able to explain the differences.</p>	2
--	--	---

II. Effectiveness

2.: To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

<p>JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">–</p>	0
--	--------------------------------------	---

<p>JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">–</p>	0
--	--------------------------------------	---



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks – 0

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on -- available human and financial resources 0

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen The delays in having the project screened and accepted by Jordanian authorities (MoL, MoPIC), will affect the efficiency of the project. Already a no-cost extension is envisaged. 1

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe – 0

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner Already at preparatory level, EUTF requested change to the initial concept note prepared and discussed with the EU: At the EU’s request, a livelihoods program was added for Jordan. 2

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country - Adaptation to changes in LLH context is a major challenge. Already exclusion of home-based activities from project (due to change in Jordanian 2



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

legislation) has disturbed the preparation of the project.

-Regional approach: In the Wvi case, the project in each country are very different (Lebanon for instance has no livelihood component because of strong tensions between Syrian refugees and host communities and local authorities are not believed to be able to manage) Yet, possibilities of learning from field to field.

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

<p>JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level</p>	<p>Notion of sustainability has not yet been seriously tackled by Wvi.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	--	----------

<p>JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees</p>	<p>To be developed later in the project.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--	----------

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

<p>JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF</p>	<p>EU offers visibility and funding at a time when there is much competition among implementing agencies.</p>	<p>2</p>
--	---	----------

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions' desired effects?

<p>JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme</p>	<p>To be seen.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--------------------	----------

VII. Lessons learned



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

To be seen.



T04.23 OXFAM -BADAEL

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date:10/10/2018 – K4
Project number (EUFT only)	T04.23
Project title	<u>BADAEL</u> —Building Alternative Development Assets and Entrepreneurial Learning
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	OXFAM
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	BRD UTOPIA Association Najdeh
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	International non-profit organization
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	A-C
National (N) or regional project (R)	N
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	Lebanon
Iraq	x
Jordan	X
Lebanon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> North Lebanon Governorate: Tripoli Municipality and Tripoli Union of Municipalities with areas of focus in: Qobbeh, Jabal Mohsen and Bab al Tabbaneh, Tripoli North Lebanon Governorate: Nahr el Bared and Beddawi Palestinian Camps, Tripoli



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

- North Lebanon Governorate: Union of Koura municipalities
- North Lebanon Governorate: Minyeh Union of Municipalities
- Bekka Governorate: Central and West Bekka with areas of focus in: Saadnayel and Jib Janine.

Turkey	X
--------	---

Egypt	X
-------	---

Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)	Livelihood
---	------------

1. Access to basic education	
------------------------------	--

2. Access to higher and further education	
---	--

3. Resilience and development	X
-------------------------------	---

4. Access to health services	
------------------------------	--

5. Access to WASH services	
----------------------------	--

6. Protection	
---------------	--

Overall budget	Total Budget of the Action: 4,030,573 Euro
----------------	---

EU financial contribution	
---------------------------	--

Starting date	01-12-2017
---------------	------------

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed)	27 months
--	-----------

Final date (planned /actual)	28-02-2020
------------------------------	------------

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)	<p>Overall objective 0 To contribute to promoting social stability and community resilience to countering the socio-economic drivers of radicalisation among vulnerable communities hosting refugees in Lebanon</p> <p>Specific objective 1 Strengthened ability of individuals’ and communities to engage in innovative and sustainable solutions to unemployment and socio-economic deprivation</p> <p>Specific objective 2 : Social entrepreneurship promoted as a mechanism for youth civic</p>
--	--



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

engagement and addressing socio-economic needs in vulnerable communities

Specific objective 3 RCRC Host National Societies in the region have strengthened their capacity and enhanced their ability to reach out to most vulnerable groups within the refugees and host communities. (Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey)

Estimated Results / outputs

ER1: Youth community leaders, women, local businesses, local authorities, and other relevant stakeholders have enhanced understanding of the socio-economic opportunities and local social resilience assets in target areas of Lebanon

E2.1: Youth, women, business leaders, activists, local authorities, and other target groups are equipped with strengthened skills, access, and knowledge of social entrepreneurship and use learnt skills to identify and develop solutions to local socio-economic problems

E2.2: Communities are engaged in initiatives and networks advancing social entrepreneurship as an approach to addressing socio-economic priorities

Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)

Syrian, Palestinian and Lebanese population in target communities

Local authorities

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)

(all baselines are 0)

% of key male and female community members reporting positive change in social interaction and inter-communal relations in targeted vulnerable communities hosting refugees - 60 %



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

	<p>% of project participants that perceive an increase in socio-economic opportunities in their area as a result of the Action- Male adult: 75%</p> <p>Female adult: 75%</p> <p>Male youth: 75%</p> <p>Female youth: 75%</p> <p>% of supported social ventures (social entrepreneurs and social enterprises) that are economically viable and are supported by incubators - 40% (out of 40 supported ventures)</p> <p>% of mapped social ventures in project locations that are engaged in advocacy on strengthening an enabling environment for social entrepreneurship - 30% and Baseline will be established for existing social ventures</p> <p>Number of socioeconomic opportunities and resilience assets identified- 20 (at least 5 x 4 target areas, i.e. 3 governorates + Palestinian camps)</p> <p>% of submitted ideas that have potential social impact- 60%</p>
--	--

Existence of target values (list)

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)

Key stakeholders (list)

- Local authorities.
- Local/national private sector and institutions
- Academics
- National and International NGOs Government and Public Officials at the National Levels

Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)

- QIN BADAEL_OXFAM_April 2018

Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI),

EUTF funded projects for: Leaders – Oxfam were co-applicants



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant	All EUTF projects in Lebanon RDPP in Lebanon
Donor (s) / sources of funding	EU

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

B. SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

<p>JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector</p>	<p>Although everything was delayed. In case of BADAEL – all approach and design is flexible. They studied the echo system of entrepreneurship. project design allowed for dealing with the reality of Lebanese Context. They looked at needs of community from a social entrepreneurship sphere lens.</p>
<p>JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities</p>	<p>The outputs, outcomes and activities The concept note was submitted as Lebanon and Jordan jointly together. Then EU stated that Jordan component is not strong enough. The challenge while developing the logical framework and adjust the activities was to absorb the full budget for two countries. Thus, they increased scope of targets and the timeline was then cut which was not helpful The EUTF ends in 2020, and so it took two years and then now they are out of time. Lost two years</p>



II. Effectiveness

2. To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

It is too early to determine that for the implementation is in the stage of identifying and verifying the beneficiaries and selecting the training agencies.

They have three level of audiences. Working with Syrian, Lebanese and Palestinians. The percentage is more on Lebanese, and this was suggested by MOSA as a requirement for implementation. for BADAEL, it was not given a clear discussion but in discussion with MOSA and they suggested 50 -50. (50 percent Lebanese, and the other 50 both Syrian refugees and Palestinians)

BADAEL is a process where social innovation and is used as a tool to adjust community needs. the outcome is more on active citizenship rather than economic empowerment. BRD has expertise the social entrepreneurship and mapping community needs. Other partners are locally based and operate in the field of the project activities so they have already engaged with the communities.

First stage is focused on research and needs assessment – resilience assessment research in the communities – they assess the beneficiaries resilience features and explore ways to support them through the activities and to achieve the goals set forth.

Afterwards, socio economic needs is assessed in the community and it is almost – finalized by end of October

Engaging with the local communities to start filtering the priorities. Second stage is on management (tool kits and manuals adapted to needs of communities) – then tot on social entrepreneurship has been done.

they are expected to train thousands of people. Target is 900 community.



JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations

Concerning the design of the project and promises of the partner, the intended outputs are in line with the objectives. The implementing team also intends to introduce a solid monitoring system to make sure that the promised deliverables serve well the targeted beneficiaries.

So far, the implementation is going on smoothly with no forecasted threats

Challenges are: The formality of the labour permits, legal and political issues, the environment right now is not very positive – the process for Syrian refugees – legal consultations have been taking place. What OXFAM does is try to manoeuvre around legality through supporting business that are not in need of registration

Oxfam realized the economic challenges and they tried to formulate their own economic stabilization, where they were expected to help Lebanese and Syrian work together.

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks

Secondly, the action document of EUTF, mentioned development of skills for preparation for return – when they eventually return to Syria. Oxfam sees social entrepreneurship as a tool that is beneficial where individuals can take back process back to Syria.

For Palestinians we have different roles – inside camps they are freer to open their business.

All depends on the type of business, so they aim to have a blanket rule to follow for the entrepreneurship. seven communities (saadnayel and jeb janeen) – 4 in the north – and 3 neighbourhoods in Tripoli -

These targets chosen where Oxfam has footprint – the community already trust them and aware of their projects. This makes the implementation smoother and impactful

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to

Oxfam is part of a confederation, there are engagement with HQ and other affiliates, where



capitalise on available human and financial resources

the partnership reflects Oxfam priorities .with respect to partner organizations they have worked before with them and as such they already forged a relationship with them and aware of their capabilities – utopia, Najde, beyond reform

BRD contribute small portion to co-financing but Oxfam accountable to the grant and if BRD cannot, Oxfam has to step up and do it .

2 years between concept note and signing. proposal February 2016

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen

Country strategy Oxfam cover 3 pillars which can be integrated into the two pillars of the EUTF call on , economic justice and citizenship. Hence, they decided to respond to the action

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe

Up to now, the resources were used efficiently, forgetting the past delay due to external causes. We observed the team working hard in advertising for the activities, collecting applications for training, identifying, and verifying the beneficiaries. Selecting vendors for providing training is also in the final stage. Training of the first group of beneficiaries is planned to start in September 2018.

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner

Problems managing EUTF in the EUD in Lebanon and specifically from the Brussels side . Everything was delayed over and over . Two years passed for a before the signing of the contracts and it is quite a long time , and the context changed for the project. The NGOs were contracted two years ago , and if it takes two years , there is a sense of deflation , and Oxfam begins asking itself if all still



makes sense given that a year and half ago things have been different for Syrian refugees. In case of BADAEL it is still good as an approach and design, it takes into account the varying echo system of entrepreneurship and how it changed . The design has a research element which allow for the ability to adjust the project accordingly.

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country.

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees

Not applicable yet

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions’ desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and So far , only this applies Publication: Oxfam will publish its research on its Policy and Practice website, as well as on other platforms used and developed during the action and as per visibility



convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme

plan, as a research piece presenting its framework for resilience; based on field research in target areas; this could also be shared with stabilisation sectors in Lebanon, with relevant INGO and humanitarian best practice fora in region, as well as international donors and GoL

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

The challenges have increased since conception but activities are still doable and being implemented however EU EUTF needs to be flexible. When the project was proposed by Oxfam it was supposed to cover 36 months and due to delays in signing the grant letter, they had to decrease it to 27 keeping same logframe

EU EUTF should work on a second phase – if this process goes well – and OXFAM expects EUTF to have some kind of changes. **Main recommendation:** timing of process to sign EUTF contract is too long – there is a lot of bureaucracy and NGOs need more resources especially for building communities and partnerships . what are we going to do when they have to wait for the next phase is approved - if that happens again then all the investment in the community ad building trust will perish . Oxfam stated that leaders is also perfect example of what happened – and they are hoping that with BADAEL things will be different especially that BADAEL requires some time and monitoring long term social and economic ventures.

T04.30 DANISH RED CROSS

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: 09.09.2018 – K3
Project number (EUFT only)	T04.30
Project title	Addressing Vulnerabilities of Refugees and Host Communities in Five Countries Affected by the Syria Crisis
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	Danish Red Cross
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	14 other co-partners For Iraq: FRC for Livelihood, NorCross for Health, SRC for Organizational Development, IRCS for Health & Livelihood
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	Private non-profit organization
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	Iraq 01 - 10.08.2018; a Erbil 07.08.2018; b, c Erbil 15.08.2018; b, c Duhok 16.08.2018; b, c
National (N) or regional project (R)	R
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey
Iraq	Erbil and Duhok Governorates
Jordan	X
Lebanon	X
Turkey	X
Egypt	X



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019) Health and Livelihood

1. Access to basic education

2. Access to higher and further education

3. Resilience and development X

4. Access to health services X

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection

Overall budget Total Budget of the Action: €12.796.827

EU financial contribution EU Contribution: €49.290.000

Starting date 15.12.2016

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed) 36 months / 36 /Ongoing

Final date (planned /actual) 14/12/2019

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)

Overall objective 0 Contribute to improved wellbeing, resilience and peaceful co-existence among vulnerable refugee and host communities in countries affected by the Syria crisis, contributing to overall stability in the region.

Specific objective 1 Refugees from Syria and host communities are more self-reliant and resilient to prevalent risks and local conflicts. (all countries)

Specific objective 2 Refugees from Syria and host communities have improved health and psychosocial well-being. (all countries)

Specific objective 3 RCRC Host National Societies in the region have strengthened their capacity and enhanced their ability to reach out to most vulnerable groups within the refugees and host communities. (Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey)

Estimated Results / outputs

1.1: Increased economic self-reliance and increased access to essential livelihood



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

opportunities for vulnerable refugees and host community members

1.2: Increased capacity to effectively manage risks and to adequately respond to prevalent threats

1.3: Target communities are empowered to promote social cohesion and active community-driven development

2.1: Increased access to inclusive and high quality health services for vulnerable refugees from Syria and host communities

2.2: Enhanced awareness among the target population on key public health risks and adaptation of good hygiene practices

2.3: Improved psychosocial well-being of targeted families

3.1: The involved RCRC NS have sustainable institutional and organizational capacity and are collaborating on various levels (local, regional, national) with relevant authorities and communities

Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)	<p>Relevant to Livelihood, KRI (QIN: 31.01.2018)</p> <p>1.1: 5.2% of the targeted refugee and host community families having increased their income during the project.</p> <p>1.2/1.3: 19.1% of targeted beneficiaries reporting improved skills and capacities to promote personal and community-driven</p>
---	---

Existence of target values (list)	<p>Relevant to Livelihood, KRI:</p> <p>1.1.1: # of individuals supported to start-up or scale up income generating activities (Target: 100)</p>
-----------------------------------	---



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

	1.1.2: # of individuals participating in professional skills, vocational or business development training courses (Target: 400)
Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)	No (age 18 – 40)
Key stakeholders (list)	For KRI: Representatives of: NorCross, FRC, IRCS (Erbil), IRCS (Duhok)
Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents (proposal and annexes) • QIN (15/12/2016-31/10/2017)-Iraq • QIN (15/12/2016-31/12/2017)-Iraq • QIN (15/12/2016-31/3/2018)-Iraq • Needs and Market Assessment Report for KRI, FRC, Sep 2017 • Internal Regional Midterm Report (TOR) • ICRC and FRC Joint Workshop Report, KRI, Jan 2018 • EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Crisis, 2nd Results Reporting, June 2018 • Project implementation publications (brochures, flyers and posters)
Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant	EUTF-funded projects for: SFCG, UN Women, WV, LWF- Non-EUTF Funded projects: Goal
Donor (s) / sources of funding	EU

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:



1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

B. SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

<p>JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector</p>	<p>General needs of the three main target groups are incorporated in the project design (Description of Actions, KIIs). Details about these needs (as related to LLH in the targeted areas of KRI) came later in an excellent Needs and Market Assessment report with over 90 pages of valuable data (Needs and Market Assessment Report, Carfax Projects and FRC, Sep 2017).</p>	3
<p>JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities</p>	<p>The outputs, outcomes and activities are not very clear and there is overlapping between activities of different sectors. However, the indicators clarify these confusions.</p>	2

II. Effectiveness

2.: To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

<p>JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones</p>	<p>It is too early to determine that for the implementation is in the stage of identifying and verifying the beneficiaries and selecting the training agencies.</p>	0
<p>JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations</p>	<p>Concerning the design of the project and promises of the partner, the intended outputs are in line with the objectives. The implementing team also intends to introduce a solid monitoring system to make sure that the promised deliverables serve well the targeted beneficiaries.</p>	0



JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks

Collaborating with IRCS helps reducing many risks, particularly risks related to delays because of authority approvals. IRCS is also highly accepted and respected by the general public and targeted communities. So far the implementation is going on smoothly with no forecasted threats.

0

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources

The FRC had difficulties in bringing international staff to the field in the past during and following the referendum. This caused some delays in starting the implementation. As for local resources, the IRCS has enough human resources to outreach beneficiaries and facilitate the implementation. However, it may not have the LLH experts to ensure quality services. In addition, none of the implementing partners has the experience in implementing a large size LLH project in KRI. Strong capacity building efforts are required for both FRC and IRCS teams in KRI.

2

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen

There is a delay in starting the LLH component of the project in KRI for many reasons including arrival of FRC staff in KRI (the assessment results were released in Sep 2017). However, the term of the project (36 months) will give enough time to the team to catch and deliver the services completely before the end of the proposed completion date. This requires careful planning and monitoring for the rest of the duration.

2

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe

Up to now, the resources were used efficiently, forgetting the past delay due to external causes. We observed the team working hard in advertising for the activities, collecting applications for training and identifying and verifying the beneficiaries.

2



Selecting vendors for providing training is also in the final stage. Training of the first group of beneficiaries is planned to start in September 2018.

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner

EUTF funding for LLH came after and complemented other, but smaller size, EU and non-EU funds. The funding also came in the right time, particularly for Iraq case. Most of the challenges were identified previously and could be easily overcome with EUTF funds.

This project is not targeting a wide range of beneficiaries (age: 18 – 40 years) which makes the selection easier. Selecting of the beneficiaries (demographically and among the three targeted groups) was determined based on the results of the assessment. However, the proposed number of beneficiaries in Zakho may be reduced as another NGO is implementing a similar project there.

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country

We could not identify any innovations in the LLH activities implemented by various partners; most of the approaches are traditional and could easily be adapted. However, the differences are in the operational environment and policies of different countries.

Partners with regional experience can add values and improve performance. However, consortium led by a partner that has no presence in a particular country (as the case of Iraq for this project) may cause some problems including delays in implementation and lack of coordination.

LLH experience in Iraq is long and partners should coordinate well with other key implementing parties to overcome any challenge.



V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level

All activities are well defined and their success can be measured if a solid M&E system is established. Based on the needs and market assessment, the partners should be able to identify the right vocational trainings (already 10 were identified) and provide quality training.

Selecting only 100 beneficiaries out of 400, who receive vocational training, for establishing new businesses or scaling up existing businesses, makes the future of the other 300 beneficiaries unknown. More efforts need to be exhausted to secure careers for these beneficiaries and monitor their status.

2

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees

The activities are well acknowledged by targeted communities. This is well noticed through the large number of applications for various activities and confirmed by different stakeholders.

However, a key stockholder criticised badly the concept of selecting only 100 beneficiaries for financial assistances and leaving the others without. He suggested many ideas to overcome this problem including giving them in-kind gifts.

Another criticism is heard regarding not giving the participants incentives for, for the age range of the targeted group, the beneficiaries are usually supporting families and cannot leave their families without support during the long training sessions.

2

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF

The EUTF LLH program (all together) is currently the biggest program in KRI. If the intended services are all delivered, the impact will be great; the EUTF contribution to increasing employability and improving the regional economy will be greatly acknowledged. Most of the activities, implemented

2



by various partners, complement each other, such as targeting different groups of beneficiaries, different areas and focusing on different skills. But at the same time, many of these activities are repeated and competitive. No advantage in this project except probably for a better outreach.

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions’ desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme

The partners did great job in making communities and individuals aware of their activities through different ways such as social media, meeting key stakeholders, conducting oriented meetings and distributing flyers and posters. IRCS itself probably has the best outreach among other INGOs for it is deeply rooted inside communities through a wide range of volunteers. For the first round of training, over 1,000 applications were received. 3

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

- 8) Definitely, the services provided through EUTF funded program are great and well accepted by the afflicted communities and by the local and national government officials. The LLH component of EUTF is indeed addressing the top priority need of the vulnerable people in KRI. The provided services, however, could be improved as recommended by interviewed stakeholders. Among these recommendations are: increasing the grant funds, giving incentives (such as small tool kits) to those who are trained but not given grants.
- 9) At this early stage of implementation, efforts should be made to develop/adapt solid training curricula and not to repeat the mistakes of other partners by relying on individual trainers to decide on what to teach and train.
- 10) No clear social cohesion/PSS element is introduced to the LLH component. It is recommended to be added asap before starting the vocational training. Such addition has been strongly recommended by other partners and proved effective in enhancing the training process.

T04.30 DANISH RED CROSS

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: 1.09.2018 – K2
Project number (EUFT only)	TO4. 30 JORDAN
Project title	Addressing Vulnerabilities of Refugees and Host Communities in Five Countries Affected by the Syria Crisis
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	Danish Red Cross
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	-
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	INGO
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	a, c
National (N) or regional project (R)	R
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	
Iraq	X
Jordan	Governorates of Amman, Mafraq, Ajloun and Irbid
Lebanon	X
Turkey	X
Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)	
1. Access to basic education	
2. Access to higher and further education	
3. Resilience and development	X
4. Access to health services	X



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection

Overall budget

Total Budget of the Action: In Jordan: Euro 53,000,000
For Jordan : Euro 3,088,971
Budget LLH Jordan : Euro 1.14 million.

EU financial contribution

EU Contribution total: Euro 49.290.000 (93%)

Starting date

General contract:15/12/2016
Grant contract: March/April 2017
Contract Jordan: Sept/October 2017

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed)

36 months

Final date (planned /actual)

15.12.2019

Overall objective: *Contribute to improved wellbeing, resilience and peaceful co-existence among vulnerable refugee and host communities in countries affected by the Syria crisis, contributing to overall stability in the region*

Indicator for the overall objective: % of the targeted refugees and host communities people (women, men, girls and boys) feeling better integrated.

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)

Specific objective 1: Refugees from Syria and host communities are more self-reliant and resilient to prevalent risks and local conflicts (all countries)

Specific objective 2: Refugees from Syria and host communities have improved health and psychosocial well-being (all countries)

Specific objective 3: RCRC Host National Societies in the region have strengthened their capacity and enhanced their ability to reach out to most vulnerable groups within the refugees and host communities

Estimated Results / outputs for specific objective 1 (LLH)

Indicators for specific objective 1.1 (LLH):



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

- IN 1.1: % of the targeted refugee and host community families having increased their income during the project
- IN 1.2: % of targeted beneficiaries reporting improves skills and capacities to promote personal and community-driven development

Output 1.1: Increased economic self-reliance and increased access to essential livelihood opportunities for vulnerable refugees and host community members.

Key indicators for Output 1.1:

- 1.1.1: # of individuals supported to start-up or scale up income generating activities (Iraq, Jordan).
- 1.1.2: # of individuals participating in professional skills, vocational or business development training courses (Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Turkey).

Output 1.2: Increased capacity to effectively manage risks and to adequately respond to prevalent threats.

Output 1.3: Target communities are empowered to promote social cohesion and active community-driven development.

Target groups and final beneficiaries

30% of vulnerable (unemployed, poor but willing to work) Jordanians from affected host communities and 70% of Syrian refugees that are not benefitting from other programmes.

Age range targeted: 18-39 years old but average of people about to start the programme is higher: 40-45 years old on average.

Preference is given to Female/disabled heads of households, and members of separated families.

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

<p>Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0 in the initial project - Baselines for 1.1.1 in QIN 1 and 2 (15 December 2016- 31 mars 2018): 5.2% of the targeted refugee and host community families having increased their income during the project. - Baselines for 1.1.2: 19.1% of targeted beneficiaries reporting improved skills and capacities to promote personal and community-driven development <p>No baselines for output indicators (number of trainees and cash grant beneficiaries):0</p>
<p>Existence of target values (list)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 325 individuals participate in professional skills, vocational or business development training courses (from 210 in Action document) - 150 other individuals supported to start-up or scale up income generating activities - 10% of individuals have started or scaled up a business or have gained employment since attending RC professional skills, vocational or business development training by the end of the project
<p>Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)</p>	<p>Yes, see TGs</p>
<p>Key stakeholders (list)</p>	<p>Jordan Red Crescent Federation. Jordan RC as auxiliary to the Jordanian Government is not required to go through the JORRIS (MoPIC) approval process but only needs to ensure coordination with JRP</p>
<p>Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)</p>	<p>Basic project documents (Narrative, budget, logframes, and early Quins, although only the preparatory work (business and labour market analysis) has been achieved.</p>
<p>Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI),</p>	<p>See WVI grid.</p>



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant	
Donor (s) / sources of funding	EU/DRC

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

Answers based on evaluation matrix: Indicators

JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector	The project is aligned with the Jordanian response plans to the Syrian refugee crisis. Challenge there is that Jordan has kept changing its stances in this respect. Also aligned with the regional 3RP recommendations	3
--	--	---

JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities	Clearly defined with outcomes and outputs. Existing baselines.	3
---	--	---

II. Effectiveness

2.: To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones	A lot of delays due to amount of time the EU is taking to respond to changes in the Danish RC project: the latest QIN states: “ <i>The changes in the partnership</i> (i.e.	1
---	---	---



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

no more French Red Cross) and the EU pending approval of the budget revision request presented in September 2017 (for more staff and M&E) are causing severe delays in the implementation of this component. In July 2018, EU approved it...but yet, the time wasted was there...

JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations

-

0

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks

Risks well taken into account prior to implementation. Mitigation measures are weak but few alternatives, especially given the limited time frame.

2

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources

0

Danish Red Cross team is understaffed, especially with regards to ambitious tasks (LLH and social cohesion). LLH poorly funded according to Danish Red Cross representatives.

More positively, have their own Training centres.

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen

-

0

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe - 0

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner - 0

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country - 0

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level - 2

Sustainability expected to be ensured through close work with local actors such as the Jordan National Commission for Women (on policy upstreaming) and the private sector. The communication and visibility plan (EU/UN Women) could be helpful in ensuring some sustainability of the interventions post-EUTF.

A sustainability plan is being prepared.

However, rapid changes in the LLH context in Jordan identified as a future challenge.

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees - 0

VI. EU Added value



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF

- Process to start the project was long and cumbersome. EU rigidity. 1

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions’ desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme

- 0

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

-



T04.32 CONCERN

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: - K1
Project number (EUFT only)	T04.32
Project title	Yarını Kurmak / Building Tomorrow: Quality Education and Livelihoods Support for Syrian refugees under Temporary Protection in Turkey
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	Concern Worldwide
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	No formal partnership (but service providers)
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	INGO
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	C
National (N) or regional project (R)	N
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	
Iraq	
Jordan	
Lebanon	
Turkey	Adana, Ankara, İzmir, Kahramanmaraş, Konya, Mersin, Sanliurfa
Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)	
1. Access to basic education	X



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

2. Access to higher and further education

3. Resilience and development X

4. Access to health services

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection

Overall budget

EU financial contribution 17,280,000 (100%)

Starting date Expected: August 2018

(14.12.2017 - 13.09.2019 -QUIN)

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed) January 1, 2018 – August 31, 2019, (20 months) planned.

Final date (planned /actual) MoU with MoNE went into force August 2018 – delay: minimum 5 months out of 20

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)

Overall Objective: Contribute to improved resilience and strengthened social cohesion amongst targeted vulnerable Syrian and Turkish communities through improved access to quality education and livelihood opportunities.

Specific Objective 1: Improved access to formal educational opportunities for school-aged Syrian refugees under temporary protection through outreach, learning support programmes and provision of learning and psychosocial support materials.

Specific Objective 2: Improved capacity of vulnerable Syrian and Turkish youth to access vocational high schools to prepare them to enter the labour market.

Specific Objective 3: Improved capacity of vulnerable Syrian and Turkish adults to access vocational training, on the job training and transition into formal employment.

Estimated Results / outputs

Output 1.1: Community outreach to encourage enrolment of children under temporary protection into educational opportunities and address barriers to education.



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Output 1.2 Provision of educational and psychosocial support programmes, catch up classes and Turkish languages classes in Public Education Centres (ages 6 – 13) (12,000 children in 30 locations across the 7 provinces)

Output 1.3 Safe transportation to and from Public Education Centres.

Output 1.4 Public Education Centres are equipped to provide safe spaces for children.

Output 1.5 Children in 21 refugee camps can access libraries containing Arabic and Turkish books for children and youth to encourage home learning initiatives.

Output 1.6. Social activities and social cohesion events for children attending Public Education Centres and from the host community.

Output 2.1 Vocational high schools are rehabilitated and provided with workshop equipment.

Output 2.2 Syrian students receive Turkish language course and certification prior to attending vocational high school.

Output 2.3. Vulnerable Syrian and Turkish students attending vocational high schools receive one-off back to school financial support.

Output 2.4 Vocational high school teachers are supported with teacher professional development.

Output 2.5 Vulnerable Syrian and Turkish students attending vocational high schools receive cash for education conditional on attendance.

Output 2.6 Vulnerable Syrian and Turkish students attending vocational high schools receive career mentoring and life skills support.

Output 2.7 Social cohesion events for youth attending vocational high schools



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Output 3.1 Syrian adults receive Turkish language courses to support integration into the Turkish community and labour market

Output 3.2. Vulnerable Syrian and Turkish adults receive certified technical and vocational training and complete on-the-job training.

Output 3.3 Vulnerable Syrian and Turkish adults receive accessibility and transportation stipends conditional on course and training attendance.

Output 3.4. Vulnerable Syrian and Turkish adults attending courses or training receive career mentoring and life skills support.

Output 3.5. Vulnerable Syrian and Turkish adults who complete on-the-job training are supported to transition into formal employment.

Output 3.6. Establishment of gender inclusive community maker workshops to promote skill sharing and social cohesion amongst Syrian and Turkish communities.

Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)

Vulnerable Syrian and Turkish adults 1,050 (735 Syrian, 315 Turkish)

Syrian and Turkish male and female youth
Off-camp school-aged children attending Turkish language classes (6,000) and catch-up classes (plus 6,000)

Teachers (150)

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

Availability of baselines in project

documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe) No baselines

Existence of target values (list)

Target values exists: 53,130 vulnerable Syrian and Turkish individuals living in Turkish communities

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture,

Turkish and Syrian women, children, youth



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

etc.)

Key stakeholders (list)	MoNE, the Sanliurfa Provincial National Education Directorate (PNED), and AFAD
-------------------------	--

Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)	Inception report, Quins
---	-------------------------

Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant

Donor (s) / sources of funding

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector	Overall, the action is of relevance to the needs in the country and the sectors addressed. It is doubtful whether a clearly defined and focused needs assessment took place: Concern could not refer to local offices and lacked (August 7, 2018) permission to carry out any of its activities. Conditions to implement the action were not met.	2
--	---	---

JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined	The LF indicates weaknesses: Baselines are missing, target values exist however indicators are at large	1
--	---	---



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

about outcomes, outputs and activities

part quantitative only.

TGs (schools, trainees and youth) are not properly identified so far).

The action is insufficiently prepared. Even if the MoU has been signed additional problems may occur or remain (permissions to run offices in the target regions, recruitment of local staff, etc.).

The project description and the LF is build-up on a blueprint rather than a realistic needs assessment. Relevant and most of all reliable information is missing.

The (considerably short) duration of the project 20 months only was determined by the duration of the school years. In consequence education activities linked to school years run already out of track resulting in missing the start of school year on 17 September 2018 in Ankara (there are no project activities except of running an office ??), Adana, Izmir, Kahramanmaras, Konya and Mersin- (except of Sanliurfa, however even there the action is unable to start with education activities it is simply about the office and recruitment of staff).

History according to inception report:

The final approval of the Concern proposal was signed on 7 August 2018 by MoNE. The approval, based on the initial approval of Concern proposal back in December 2017, consists of the Implementation Guideline (IG), which describes the responsibilities of Concern Worldwide and MoNE.

Concern’s proposal was first approved by MoNE on 12 December 2017, and subsequently by the EUTF. EUTF and Concern signed the agreement that officially started the action on 15 December 2017.

II. Effectiveness

2.:To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones

So far the action delivered an inception report only. Turkish Government put the action on hold, 0 suspended all education activities January 2018.



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

The inception phase has been extended from 3 to 9 months until September /October 2018 (entailing a potential 6 month no cost extension).

JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations

So far the action delivered an inception report only. 0

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks

The capacity to mitigate external risks was insufficient: Relevant political and administrative risks were neither realistically anticipated, nor realistic and effective mitigation strategies envisaged.

Concern does not have registration in six of the seven provinces covered in the action. Additional registration is required for the proposed 6 new provinces other than that of Urfa. This has not been achieved in month 8 (out of 20 months duration). 1

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

The action does not refer to own resources: 100% EU TF funding.

Concern carried out similar activities in Turkey mainly focused on education yet with considerably smaller scopes and budgets.

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources

There are reasonable doubts whether Concern is capable to adequately deal with the complex issue of hiring Turkish and most of all Syrian Staff (crack down on other INGOs Mercy Corps, DRC can be used as an example). 1

Problems have been reported concerning registration, the contract between EUTF and Concern has been signed with Concern Worldwide Dublin, problem with accounting have been reported.

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

<p>JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen</p>	<p>So far, the action delivered an inception report only.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	---	----------

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

<p>JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe</p>	<p>So far resources were not used in line with the proposed timeframe (there are considerable delays).</p>	<p>1</p>
---	--	----------

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

<p>JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner</p>	<p>The action is not operational.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	---------------------------------------	----------

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

<p>JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country</p>	<p>The action is not operational.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	---------------------------------------	----------

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

<p>JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level</p>	<p>Sustainability at financial and institutional level has been considered. At this stage it cannot be assessed whether this will finally materialize. Existing problems with the MoNE in cooperation and lack of formal approval of the action do not indicate that the ministry or other key stakeholders will assume responsibility.</p>	<p>1</p>
---	---	----------

<p>JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased</p>	<p>The action is not operational.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---------------------------------------	----------



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

formal job opportunities / LLH for
Syrian refugees

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result
deriving from funding and managing
large scale LLH national and regional
interventions collected under the
EUTF

The action is not operational.

0

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions' desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local
communities are aware, familiar and
convinced on the usefulness and the
relevance of the programme

The action is not operational.

0

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

Do facto Concern became an implementing agency for the MoNE. With very limited space to manoeuvre. The issue must be raised whether it make sense and provides for an added value to fund this intervention instead of turning directly to MoNE / Turkish Government.

The quality of the project description / LF and preparation of the project raises doubts about the quality of the approval of the action (selection process of EUTF).



TO4.40 ITALIAN COOPERATION

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: 22.09.2018 – K2
Project number (EUFT only)	TO4.40 JORDAN
Project title	<i>Strengthening the resilience of host communities and Syrian refugees in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq (Kurdistan)</i>
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	Italian Cooperation
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	For Jordan in livelihoods sector: - (except for local implementing partners).
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	State agency
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	a, c
National (N) or regional project (R)	Jordan+KRI+Lebanon for livelihoods
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	
Iraq	Kurdistan
Jordan	Nation wide
Lebanon	Nation Wide
Turkey	N/A
Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)	
1. Access to basic education	X



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

2. Access to higher and further education

3. Resilience and development X

4. Access to health services X

5. Access to WASH services X

6. Protection X

Overall budget Total budget: EURO 12.595.500 all in all (as mentioned in our ToRs)

EU financial contribution Total EU Contribution: All (check)

Starting date 01.01.2018 (programme stuck in the 3 countries due to problems with host authorities)

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed) 30 months

Final date (planned /actual) June 2020

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)

S01. To provide national and local authorities with effective instruments to perform early recovery and resilience activities

S02. To develop and strengthen the access to basic social infrastructures and services for the most vulnerable people in the main areas affected by the influx of the Syrian refugees

S03. To improve the income generation opportunities of the most vulnerable local communities and Syrian refugees

In the Livelihoods section: *“Improving municipal service delivery performance in host communities”, objective 2 “Revised local development priorities, projects, processes and systems to reflect and respond to changes and priorities arising from the Syria crisis” and objective 3 “Strengthened resilience of local governance systems and communities to crisis with particular focus on social cohesion”-*

S04. To reduce the tensions between stakeholders, Syrian refugees and host communities, by strengthening civic and



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

community capacities to promote dialogue and raise awareness on crisis-related matters

S05. To strengthen and sustain the role of the civil society (local NGOs and CSOs, grassroots organisations) and of the service providers in the resilience and stabilisation processes

Estimated Results / outputs	For Livelihoods only: <i>Livelihood is improved and income generation opportunities are increased for the most vulnerable host and Syrian refugee population</i>
-----------------------------	---

Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)	For livelihoods: No discrimination of age, gender: target, men, women, youths
--	--

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)	No
---	----

Existence of target values (list)	1500 (50% Jordanians and 50% Syrian refugees) 55,500 working days
Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)	Yes, see TGs

Key stakeholders (list)	Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MoPIC), Jordanian Ministry of Municipal Affairs (MoMA)
-------------------------	--

Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)	Basic project documents (Narrative, budget, logframes, etc.)
---	--

Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant	RDPP, JESSRP
---	--------------



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Donor (s) / sources of funding	EU
--------------------------------	----

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

<p>JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector</p>	<p>Yes, the action is in line with the JRP 2017-2019. Yet, issues with the regions to prioritize, MoMA prefers to focus on the south where there a fewer refugees.</p>	2
---	--	---

<p>JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities</p>	<p>Clearly defined despite no baseline. Is more infrastructural with LLH consequences than an LLH project</p>	2
--	---	---

II. Effectiveness

2. To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

<p>JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones</p>	<p>Not started (nowhere)</p>	0
--	------------------------------	---

<p>JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)?</p>	<p>–</p>	0
--	----------	---



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks – 0

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources 0

Good knowledge of the LLH scene in Jordan...

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen The delays in having the project screened and accepted by Jordanian authorities (MoL, MoPIC), will affect the efficiency of the project. Already a no-cost extension is envisaged. 0

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe – 0

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner 0



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country

Italian Cooperation dealing with procedural challenges that differ from country to country

0

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level

Will work with municipalities (MoMA); infrastructure is the main guarantee of sustainability; no livelihoods (temporary cfw)

1

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees

-

0

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF

Funding.

1

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions' desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme

To be seen.

0



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

To be seen.



TO4.40 ITALIAN COOPERATION

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: October 2018, k4--Lebanon
Project number (EUFT only)	TO4. 40
Project title	RESILIENCE & SOCIAL COHESION PROGRAMME (RSCP)- STRENGTHENING THE RESILIENCE OF HOST COMMUNITIES AND SYRIAN REFUGEES IN LEBANON, JORDAN AND IRAQ (KURDISTAN)
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	Italian Cooperation
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	- Ministero italiano degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione internazionale (MAECI)/Direzione Generale per la Cooperazione allo Sviluppo (Italian Cooperation - IC) Agence Française de Développement (AFD)
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	Non-profit organization
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	a
National (N) or regional project (R)	R
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq
Iraq	Erbil, Duhok and Sulaimaniya Governorates
Jordan	Irbid , Jerash
Lebanon	Bekaa, Beirut, North: Akkar (Nahr el Istwan Union, Wadi Khaled Union, South (Nabatieh, Sour)



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Turkey n/a

Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)

1. Access to basic education

2. Access to higher and further education X

3. Resilience and development X

4. Access to health services X

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection

Overall budget 22,045,000 euros (all 3 countries)

EU financial contribution Full cost

Starting date 01-01-2018

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed) 30 month

Final date (planned /actual) 20 -06-2020

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)

Overall objective of the action proposed is to improve the living conditions and promote the resilience of the most vulnerable populations in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq (Kurdistan), irrespective of nationality and gender.

In Lebanon

1) “*Ensure protection of vulnerable populations*”, strengthening protection services and interventions for displaced persons from Syria and vulnerable populations, empowering individuals and mainstreaming protection across all sectoral interventions

2) “*Provide immediate assistance to vulnerable populations*”, addressing the immediate needs of the vulnerable populations prioritizing the most vulnerable through temporary solutions, with the aim to mitigate the rapid deterioration of social and economic conditions

3) “*Support service provision through national systems*”, establishing or upgrading basic public



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

service infrastructure and strengthening service delivery in the most vulnerable communities affected by the crisis

4) “Reinforce Lebanon’s economic, social and environmental stability”,

Estimated Results / outputs	<p><i>R1.1. Institutional capacities are strengthened allowing for ownership of resilience and stabilization processes</i></p> <p><i>R2.1. Basic social infrastructures and services are rehabilitated in the host municipalities most affected by the influx of the Syrian refugees</i></p> <p><i>R3.1. Livelihood is improved and income generation opportunities are increased for the most vulnerable host and Syrian refugee populations</i></p> <p><i>R4.1. Capacities of local NGOs, CSOs and service-providers are strengthened allowing the civil society to actively participate in local development interventions</i></p>
-----------------------------	---

Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)	Country nationals and Syrian refugees, on a 50-50% basis
--	--

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)

Existence of target values (list)	<p>At least 13 municipalities/public local authorities that have acquired new/improved capacity</p> <p>At least 140.000 community members provided with access to rehabilitated basic social infrastructures and services</p> <p>At least 5 communities involved in awareness-raising campaigns At least 3.500 community members involved in social cohesion activities</p>
-----------------------------------	---



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

10 initiatives promoted by local NGOs and CSOs in response to the Syrian crisis

At least 5 national seminars and training sessions for central and local authorities' representatives held

At least 13 municipal grant projects identified and implemented following participatory processes

At least 3.500 community members sensitized around child protection concerns to mitigate risks faced by children within their community

At least 60 staff and volunteers from child protection and psychosocial support centres benefit from capacity building

10 CSOs, local institutions or service providers benefiting from capacity building training sessions 3 sub-national community forums organized to gather Social Development Centres and CBOs in order to share best-practices on social service deliver

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)

Age of beneficiaries: 16-65 years old

Nationality: both Country nationals and Syrian refugees, on a 50-50% basis

Village of residence: prioritization of vulnerable villages

Economic vulnerability: based on economic vulnerability index

One household member enrolled at one time

Key stakeholders (list)

For Lebanon: MoSA and the MoIM./ National and local authorities (Governments, Ministries, Municipalities etc.); - Civil society organisations; - International community (II.OO., INGOs, donors



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

<p>Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)</p>	<p>RSCP_Inception Report_Revised_IC</p> <p>Quarterly Information Note_Q1_Lebanon_Jordan_tosubmit</p> <p>QIN EUTF - RSCP AFD_IC - Lebanon - 30032018</p> <p>QIN2_NovDec_Lebanon_Jordan_tosubmit</p>
<p>Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant</p>	<p>All EUTF projects in Lebanon RDPP in Lebanon</p>
<p>Donor (s) / sources of funding</p>	<p>EU</p>

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

B. SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

<p>JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector.</p>	<p>A list of potential complementary Programmes ongoing in the three target countries was drafted, as reported here below. The project aims to gather further information regarding the activities and areas of intervention of the aforementioned actions; avoid overlapping or duplication of actions; develop synergies and promote effective coordination at country level.</p>
--	---



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities.

I. Effectiveness

2. To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones.

Minor adjustments were made in the geographical mapping of the Italian Cooperation activities, since the actual areas of interventions will be identified only after the selection of the municipal projects to be awarded through the Calls for Proposals that will be launched the first and the second year of the Programme. The modifications were made after consultations with the institutional counterparts in the three target countries.

JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations.

Minor adjustments relating to the indicators and targets have been made in the Logical Framework after consultation with the concerned EU Delegations, the Livelihoods working group/sector coordinators and the institutional counterparts in Lebanon.

Mitigation Measures

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks.

- Ensuring regular consultation with other Donors and Sector Working Groups
- Mapping of existing interventions in the targeted areas/municipalities
- Compliance with municipal development plans
- Participation of lead Ministries in charge of crisis response plan

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to

The institutional sustainability of the action is ensured in many ways: first of all, the local



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

capitalise on available human and financial resources.

municipalities in the three target Countries will benefit from improved socio-economic infrastructure and services, which will allow them to provide better delivery performance to the Syrian refugee and host communities, thus strengthening their institutional role.

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen.

the action is in line with the following Strategic Objectives identified by the LCRP 2017-2020:

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe.

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner.

in Lebanon, the first general elections since 2009 were held on 6th May. This event has slowed down the formalisation of the participation in the Programme of the institutional counterparts, the Ministry of Interior and Municipalities (MoIM) and the Ministry of Social Affairs (MoSA).

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country.



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level.

The empowerment of the social infrastructure and services in the host municipalities will benefit at least 400.000 vulnerable people from the Syrian and local communities, with a strong and long-lasting impact on their social conditions. The rapid employment approach of the Programme will allow at least 3.770 poor families to increase their monthly income, reducing the social tensions between refugees and local people and affecting positively the economic development in the targeted areas.

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees.

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF.

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions' desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme.

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Still very early to comment on this



T04.68 TOBB

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: 16.07.2018 – K4
Project number (EUFT only)	T04.68
Project title	Living and Working Together: Integrating SuTPs to Turkish Economy
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	TOBB (The Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey)
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey (TEPAV), 12 local chambers
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	National CSO
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	Turkey 07.08.2018; C
National (N) or regional project (R)	N
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	Turkey
Iraq	n/a
Jordan	n/a
Lebanon	n/a
Turkey	Şanlıurfa, İstanbul, Hatay, Gaziantep, Adana, Mersin, Kilis, Mardin, İzmir, Bursa, Konya and Kayseri)



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019) No QIN available

1. Access to basic education

2. Access to higher and further education

3. Resilience and development X

4. Access to health services

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection

Overall budget

EU financial contribution

Starting date

25.12.2017-25.06.2018

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed) (The Project’s Inception Phase ran from the beginning of the project to 25th June 2018)

Final date (planned /actual)

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)

Overall objective To integrate Syrian refugees under Temporary Protection (SuTPs) and host community members⁵⁹ to Turkish labour market by increasing their employability through vocational orientation, testing and certification.

Specific objective To enhance the economic and social empowerment of SuTPs and host community members to become an asset for the local economy and economic growth potential

Component A: To conduct labour market needs analysis.

Component B: To enhance employability of SuTPs and host community members via validating these skills through certification.

Component C: To increase the capacity of local chambers and companies about the needs and

⁵⁹ At least 35% of total beneficiaries will be Turkish citizens.



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

the legal restrictions of SuTPs in integrating them into the Turkish labour market while positioning them as the sources of employment for the target group.

Estimated Results / outputs

Skills Needs Analysis Report

Employability of SuTPs and host community members through certification of their existing skills are increased.

Certified SuTPs and host community members and companies are matched and Turkish language training provided to the employed approx. 2000 SuTPs .

Cooperation between local and regional stakeholders to support SuTPs enhanced,

Coordination with government institutions and other relevant actors in providing services to SuTPs built.

Consultancy services to the voluntary companies which will recruit SuTPs are provided.

Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)

Local communities in these provinces are the main group impacted from the mass influx of SuTPs.

Chambers in provinces

Government institutions such as provincial branches of ministries, municipalities, AFAD, DGMM.

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)

Existence of target values (list) At least 3.000 companies are knowledgeable of the legal requirements and procedures to be



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

followed for employing foreigners under temporary protection

- Existing skills of Syrian refugees identified and certified

At least 30.000 SuTP/ Turks received skill mapping which enables them to receive vocational guidance in line with their existing skills and skills gaps.

- Accession of SuTP to vocational training programmes of public institutions and international NGOs facilitated

At least 30.000 SuTP/ Turks received vocational guidance which enables them to be guided to (1) certification process within the project if they have existing vocational skills, or (2) vocational training programmes provided by other stakeholders if they do not have any vocational skills,

- Employability of SuTP increased.

At least 20.000 SuTP/ Turks participated in preparation programmes (2 days) at voluntary companies which enables them to have prior understanding on the examination system using national qualifications, which are approved by the Vocational Qualifications Authority. (these programmes will take 2 days and it will be possible to organise them in partnership with schools),

At least 15.000 SuTP/ Turks certified which enables them to validate their qualifications to enter in the labour market,

At least 3.000 certified SuTP/ Turks employed by the companies in the regions.

At least 2000 certified SuTPs received Turkish language courses.

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, NA



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

etc.)

Key stakeholders (list)

TC Prime Ministry Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD
 Directorate General of Migration Management (DGMM):
 Local chambers:
 Ministry of Labour and Social Security:
 Ministry of National Education:
 Vocational Qualifications Authority (VQA):
 Turkish Employment Agency (İŞKUR):
 Social Security Institution (SGK):
 Trade Unions:
 International Stakeholders:
 Civil Society Organizations:

Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)

Project documents

Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant

NA

Donor (s) / sources of funding

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector

In principle of thig relevance but needs assessment and preparation of the inception report obviously faces difficulties (Lack of / denied access to ISKUR's data -makes it difficult to provide for a realistic, substantiated assessment, quality of available data insufficient).

JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities

Labour Market Needs Analysis is to identify the existing skills of SuTPs and host community members, as well as to identify the approximately 1.000 employers' skills need in the selected provinces.

II. Effectiveness

2. To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones

The project is in line with the "resilience & local development programme" of the EUTF Fund which responds to the urgent need of improving economic opportunities for refugees and vulnerable host communities beyond dependency on humanitarian relief.

JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations

Acquisition and retaining of work is a central issue in migrants' integration into host countries. On the other hand, the migrant population in Turkey is a heterogeneous one, including many unskilled as well as skilled people. Identification of the existing skills is therefore an important step in integration efforts

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks.

They hope to use Iskur to reach out, but ISKUR is not being cooperative (see above 1.1)
To adapt to the changing in timeline with adapted salaries to Turkish lira so they can be able to sustain a no cost extension.



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen NA

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe

The importance of the chambers and how this actually plays in the social cohesion because we are able to look into the good relation with the employers

Importance of capacity building for the inside staff, which is part of the finding, exchange of information with people working on livelihood.

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner. NA

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country

A sustained engagement into the integration efforts of SuTPs will be very important for the success of this project.

Employers need to be supported for providing more inclusive employment opportunities. In free market conditions, it is not attractive for employers to employ



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

SuTPs. Therefore, intervention measures in the form of financial incentives (tax breaks, social security premium waivers, etc.) will be particular added-value element in this project.

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees

NA

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF

TOBB is already very important / they do not need EU visibility, but vice versa.

The visibility (communication strategy) is maybe for SuTPs

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions' desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Reporting takes a lot of time as you have to report to the presidency every three months and they are not coinciding with the EU reporting so that quite time constraining



T04.70 ILO / IOM

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: 30.09.2018 – K2
Project number (EUFT only)	T04.70
Project title	'Job Creation and Entrepreneurship Opportunities for Syrian refugees under Temporary Protection and Host Communities in Turkey
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	ILO
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	IOM
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	UN Agency
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	a, c
National (N) or regional project (R)	N (Turkey)
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	
Iraq	
Jordan	
Lebanon	
Turkey	Ankara, İstanbul, Bursa, Konya, Gaziantep, Şanlıurfa, Adana, Mersin, Hatay
Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)	
1. Access to basic education	



2. Access to higher and further education

3. Resilience and development X

4. Access to health services

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection

Overall budget Total budget: EURO 13,310,819

EU financial contribution Total EU Contribution: EUR 11,610,000

Starting date 20.12.2017 (24 months: until 20.12.2020)

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed) 24 months

Final date (planned /actual) 20.12.2020

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)

Overall objective: To strengthen the economic and social resilience of Syrian refugees under Temporary Protection (SuTP) and host communities.

Specific Objectives:

- 1.To increase the availability of a skilled, competent and productive labour supply to facilitate access to decent work for SuTP and Turkish host communities;
- 2.To promote an enabling environment for business development and economic growth in identified sectors and geographic locations to address job creation and stimulate entrepreneurship opportunities for SuTP and Turkish host communities;
3. To provide support to labour market governance institutions and mechanisms in implementing inclusive development strategies.

Estimated Results / outputs

- 1) Employability and labour market access of SuTPs and host community members increased,
- 2) Knowledge on basic labour market skills including intercultural interaction and workplace adaptation increased,
- 3) Knowledge on potentials for local economic



development and employment creation enhanced,

- 4) Decent work opportunities for SuTP and host community members created,
- 5) Capacity of government institutions and social partners to implement national policies improved,
- 6) Awareness on fundamental principles and rights at work increased.

Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)

Target groups:

12.600 Syrian refugees, 4300 host community members; 330 staff from relevant governmental institutions; 500 representatives from social partners (trade unions and employers' organisations); 500 enterprises

Final Beneficiaries:

Syrian refugee and host communities, with particular emphasis to youth and women; Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MoLSS) DG for International Labour Force, other relevant government institutions at central and provincial levels including Turkish Employment Agency (İŞKUR), Ministry of National Education (MoNE), Prime Ministry Disaster and Emergency Management Authority (AFAD), Directorate General on Migration Management (DGMM), Vocational Qualifications Authority (VQA), municipal authorities, employers' and workers' organisations

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

Availability of baselines in project

documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe) No baseline

Existence of target values (list)

OUTCOME 1: Number of Syrian refugees (gender disaggregated) increasing their skills required for decent employment:

2018:



5300 SuTP (2100 female and 3200 male);
1800 host community (720 female and 1080 male)

2019:

5400 SuTP (2160 female and 3240 male); and
1850 host communities (740 female and 1110 male)

OUTPUT 1.1. Employability and labour market access for SuTP and host community members increased.

Number of SuTP and host community members (gender disaggregated) accessed public employment services including job, career and vocational guidance & counselling services:

2018:

2500 SuTP

(1000 female and 1500 male) and 500 host community (200 female and 300 male)

2019:

2500 SuTP (1000 female and 1500 male) and
500 host community (200 female and 300 male)

OUTCOME 2: Number of SuTP and host community members accessing employment and entrepreneurship opportunities

2018:

600 jobs created

2019:

1200 jobs created

OUTPUT 2

2018:

34 enterprises established/or expanded

2019:

66 enterprises established/or expanded

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture,

Syrian refugee and host communities, with particular emphasis to youth and women



etc.)

Key stakeholders (list)	Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MoLSS) DG for International Labour Force, other relevant government institutions at central and provincial levels including Turkish Employment Agency (İŞKUR), Ministry of National Education (MoNE), Prime Ministry Disaster and Emergency Management Authority (AFAD), Directorate General on Migration Management (DGMM), Vocational Qualifications Authority (VQA), municipal authorities, employers’ and workers’ organisations
Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)	DoA, budget, 1st interim report, 1 QUIN (March 2018).
Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant	See EUTF list, GIZ, DRC LLH project not covered by EUTF (not specified)
Donor (s) / sources of funding	EU/ILO

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding	This Action is in line with the two key priorities set forth in the EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Crisis, namely: (i) promoting educational,	3
---	---	---



local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector

protection and engagement opportunities for children and young people in line with the NLG initiative, and (ii) reducing the pressure on countries hosting refugees by investing in livelihoods and social cohesion and supporting them in providing access to jobs and education that will benefit both refugees and host communities. li. Is the focus of ILO.

The action will also enhance economic growth potential and resilience of the local economy hosting target groups, strengthening local and national systems and service delivery capacities in target areas and finally decreasing tensions between refugees and local populations in host communities.

JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities

Clearly defined despite no baseline. The action and its targets build on previous experiences.

2

II. Effectiveness

2. To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones

Too early to say. However, large targets within relatively small time frame? However, operational cooperation with strong agencies: IOM and ITC as implementers.

2

So far, managerial steps taken and market studies only.

JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations

In line.

3

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks

Difficult to predict in advance

1

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?



JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources. 0

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen. Yes 3

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe. - 0

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner. 0

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country - 0

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level Sustainability is only conceived in relation with SMES, not as an overarching concept covering the entire project. 1



JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees - 0

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF Funding. 0

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions’ desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme To be seen. 0

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

To be seen.



T04.72 UN WOMEN

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: 09.09.2018 – K3
Project number (EUFT only)	T04.72
Project title	Strengthening the Resilience of Syrian Women and Girls and Host Communities in Iraq, Jordan and Turkey
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	UN Women
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	NA
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	UN Agency
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	Iraq 01 - 10.08.2018; a Erbil 20.08.2018; b, c
National (N) or regional project (R)	R
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	Iraq, Jordan, Turkey
Iraq	Anbar, Baghdad, Dohuk, Erbil, Kirkuk, Ninawa, and Salah Al Din Governorates
Jordan	X
Lebanon	
Turkey	X
Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)	Health and Livelihood
1. Access to basic education	



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

2. Access to higher and further education

3. Resilience and development X

4. Access to health services

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection X

Overall budget Total Budget of the Action: €15,625,000

EU financial contribution EU Contribution: €12,500,000

Starting date 19.12.2017 (20.10.2018 according to UN Women)

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed) 24 months /24 /Ongoing

Final date (planned /actual) 18/12/2019 (31.01.2020 according to UN Women)

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)

Overall objective 0 To strengthen the resilience of Syrian women refugees and women in host communities in Iraq, Jordan and Turkey.

Specific objective 1 Enable women’s economic empowerment through increased access to recovery and livelihood opportunities, and comprehensive protection services and support women to live and engage in public space free from violence. Bearing in mind the importance of men in work on gender equality and women’s empowerment, the programme seeks to engage men as champions and advocates around women’s engagement in the labour market.

Specific objective 2 Promote a culture of peace and co-existence through supporting women to lead and engage in peacebuilding, reconciliation, conflict prevention and rights protection.

Estimated Results / outputs

Output 1.1: Women (displaced, refugee and host country nationals) are supported through productive and financial assets and skills, graduating from short-term interventions into



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

longer-term employment opportunities – with a focus on entrepreneurship and job placement.

Output 1.2: Employment opportunities generated for women are monitored for compliance with ‘decent labour’ standards, and advocacy campaigns on decent work standards are undertaken.

Output 1.3: Women (displaced, refugee and host country nationals) have increased access to comprehensive essential services, particularly in women-only centres, for preventing and responding to GBV.

Output 1.4: Host governments are supported to hold perpetrators to account for violence against women, through support to the national justice chain.

Output 2.1: Women’s organisations are supported to promote stability and peaceful co-existence in their communities through dialogue and peacebuilding activities.

Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)

For Iraq Only:

Total No of Beneficiaries: 11,650; Cash of Work: 400 Women; Job Placements: 200 Women; Supported to establish business: 200 Women; Engaged for gender quality: 800 Men; Received GBV services: 10,000 Women; Engaged in Justice training: 50 Men & Women

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)

0 for all indicators (according to Logframe and final QIN)

Existence of target values (list)

For Iraq only:

% change in income of women from refugee and host community receiving assistance from the program (Target: 30%)



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

of vulnerable community members, including women, reporting increased access to income generating opportunities (Target: 800)

Change in beneficiary coping capacity (Target 10%)

% of women (from overall total enrolled) benefiting from employment 12 months after graduation from UN Women support (Target: 20)

% perceived increased in decision-making within the household (Target: 10%)

of women and girls directly accessing UN-Women supported humanitarian services (Target: 11,650)

of women receiving cash for work (Target: 400)

of initiatives and dialogues initiated by men promoting women’s rights and empowerment (Target: 20)

of men engaged in dialogues promoting women’s rights and empowerment (Target: 800)

of women placed in decent employment through job matching (Target: 200)

of women supported to establish or expand businesses (Target: 200)

of women accessing GBV-related services through the community centres (Target: 10,000)

of justice professionals per community who are trained to adequately address issues of GBV as per international standards and are currently servicing women (Target: 50)

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)

Yes (Women)



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Key stakeholders (list)	For KRI: Representative of UN Women (Erbil)
Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents (proposal and annexes) • QIN (Reporting cut-off date:1/5/2018) • QIN (Reporting cut-off date:30/6/2018) • Inception Report for the period Feb 1 – Apr 30, 2018 • EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Crisis, 2nd Results Reporting, June 2018
Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant	EUFT- funded projects for: SFCG, Danish Red Cross, WV, LWF Non-EUFT Funded projects: Goal
Donor (s) / sources of funding	EU

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

B. SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding	General needs of the three main target groups are incorporated in the project design (Description of Actions, KIIs). No comprehensive assessment was	1
---	--	---



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector provided by the partner.

JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities The intervention logic is clearly defined with clear outcome, outputs and activities. These are supported by a well stated theory of change. 3

II. Effectiveness

2. To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones It is too early to determine that for the implementation is in the early stage of implementation, the women centres just been established. 0

JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations Concerning the design of the project and promises of the partner, the intended outputs are in line with the objectives. This project is unique in focusing on women. However, it is early to determine the effectiveness of the intervention. 0

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks By focusing on women, it is expected to face many challenges. The partner developed a list of these expected challenges and how to mitigate them (DOA). However, it is early to say whether the main partner and its local partners can mitigate actual risks. 0

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources The UN Women is well rooted in the targeted countries and has enough experience to mobilize resources. Recruiting local organizations and establishing women centres that quickly is a clear indication of the ability of the partner in utilizing resources. However, implementing a livelihood project of this size, which requires a lot of expertise in business development and market assessment, may be difficult. 2



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

<p>JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen</p>	<p>So far the project is in progress with no noticeable delay. However, we did not see documents that clearly state the methodology of the implementation, the mechanism for monitoring the activities and curricula of training and delivered services.</p>	2
--	--	---

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

<p>JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe</p>	<p>We were not able to visit women centres or observe the activities to determine the efficiency of using resources.</p>	0
---	--	---

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

<p>JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner</p>	<p>EUTF funding for LLH came after and complemented other, but smaller size, EU and non-EU funds. The funding also came in the right time, particularly for Iraq case. Most of the challenges were identified previously and could be easily overcome with EUTF funds.</p>	3
	<p>This project is unique for it is targeting women. By empowering women, particularly vulnerable women, they will be protected against abuse and sexually harassment.</p>	

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

<p>JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country</p>	<p>The partner has strong background in working in the targeted countries. However, handling a project of this size with a major LLH component in three different countries will require a lot of coordination</p>	2
--	--	---



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

with other international NGOs with strong LLH background.

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level

The partner has a clear practical idea for sustaining the women centres. It has also a clear vision of relying on establishing small cooperative businesses. However, it is too early to determine whether the partner can provide long term employment or creating sustainable businesses for women. Many women would only accept job close to their homes. This makes the task of employing them more difficult.

0

We also couldn't see a rigorous system for monitoring the progress of the participants and measuring their success.

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees

The activities are well acknowledged by targeted communities and by women in particular.
The partner also ta

2

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF

The EUTF LLH program (all together) is currently the biggest program in KRI. If the intended services are all delivered, the impact will be great; the EUTF contribution to increasing employability and improving the regional economy will be greatly acknowledged. Most of the activities, implemented by various partners, complement each other, such as targeting different groups of beneficiaries, different areas and focusing on different skills. But at the same time, many of these activities are repeated and competitive. This project will be different if the partner can make the women

0



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

centres sustainable and if the idea of group employability succeeds.

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions’ desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme

The UN Women will rely on the local partners in promoting the activities of the projects and in attracting the beneficiaries. The location of the women centres is crucial for the attracting women. UN Women already identified that one of their 3 centre is far from the community and decided to change it. The UN Women has to be careful in monitoring the local partners as most of the local organizations in Iraq are not reliable.

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

Definitely, the services provided through EUTF funded program are great and well accepted by the afflicted communities and by the local and national government officials. The LLH component of EUTF is indeed addressing the top priority need of the vulnerable people in KRI.

The partner seems to have bright ideas to make this project successful. However, It is too early to learn lessons and see how challenges are overcome at this stage of the implementation.

Establishing centres to provide protection for women against violence and help empowering them economically is a great idea as both services complement each other. It will be worth to monitor how the organization can make these centres sustainable how the idea of establishing cooperative businesses succeeds.



TO4.72 UN WOMEN

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: 26.08.2018 – K2
Project number (EUFT only)	TO4. 72 JORDAN
Project title	Strengthening the Resilience of Syrian Women and Girls and Host Communities in Iraq, Jordan and Turkey
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	UN Women
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	-
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	UN organization
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	a, c
National (N) or regional project (R)	R
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	
Iraq	X
Jordan	Southern and northern parts of Azraq governorate as well as urban Azraq districts; districts in southern governorates including Tafileh, Maan, Karak and Sobek, and East Amman). Mapping assessment still under way but focus on the south of Jordan.
Lebanon	
Turkey	X



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)

1. Access to basic education

2. Access to higher and further education

3. Resilience and development X

4. Access to health services

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection X

Overall budget Total Budget of the Action: Euro 15,625,000
In Jordan: Euro 3,250,000

EU financial contribution EU Contribution: Euro 12,500,000
In Jordan: 4,000,000 Euro

Starting date February 2018 (contract signed in 19 December 2017)

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed) 24 months

Final date (planned /actual) 19.12.2019

Overall objective (Jordan): Strengthen the resilience and empowerment of women and girls affected by the Syrian crisis in Jordan.

Outcome (1) for Jordan: Women (refugee, displaced and host country nationals) contribute to, and benefit from, economic growth in ways that build their resilience and make it possible for them to attain more equitable relationships, free from violence

Outcome 2: Women and girls are engaged in promoting social cohesion and co-existence in their communities.

Output 1.1. Women - displaced, refugee and host country nationals – have increased access to short term productive and financial assets and skills, and men are engaged as partners in social equality and economic growth



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Output 1.2: Women supported by UN Women graduate from short term interventions into longer-term employment opportunities – with a focus on entrepreneurship, mentoring and job placement.

Output 1.3: Employment opportunities generated for women (by UN Women and international actors) are

monitored for compliance with ‘decent labour’ standards

Output 1.4: Women – displaced, refugee and host country nationals – have increased access to comprehensive essential services for preventing and responding to GBV

Target groups and final beneficiaries

- Syrian female refugees meeting UN Women’s mixed criteria (UNHCR vulnerability criteria plus skills criteria) inside (cfw) and outside camps: 30%

- Female host community nationals identified as working poor by the National Aid Fund (ratio 30:70 applied: 70%)

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)

0 (to be defined in the early months of the implementation of the project).

Existence of target values (list)

2,250 vulnerable community members including women reporting increased access to income generating opportunities (both cash-for-work (cfw) and longer-term employment), with

- 1,050 cfw
- 1,000 vocational/entrepreneurial skills training
- 500 women placed in decent employment through job matching
- 200 women supported to establish or expand businesses



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

- 200 women accessing EU supported community level, (micro-) financial services (EURF)
- 50 MSME's identified and trained

In addition, targets related to proportion of beneficiaries who see change in income (50%), get employed (50%) as a result of the project, etc.

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)

Yes, see TGs

Key stakeholders (list)

Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MoPIC), Ministry of Social Development, Ministry of Labour, Arab Renaissance for Democracy and Development, private sector, Sadaqa (ILO initiative for gender equality in Jordan), Jordanian National Commission for Women (JNCW), UNOPS (for efficient disbursement of Cfw payments), Jordan education for Employment (JEFE - a youth employment organization to link up with the private sector).

Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)

Basic project documents (Narrative, budget, negotiation process UN Women/EU etc.)
Visibility communication plan with EU/UN Women

Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant

In the field of female employment, women are often taken into account (but as in most EUTF projects, represent a minority of beneficiaries, reflecting the low female participation rates, but mostly crafts, or cfw

Donor (s) / sources of funding

EU (80%) / Japan (20%)

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!

3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

Answers based on evaluation matrix: Indicators

<p>JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector</p>	<p>Adequacy in the sense that women’s economic participation and unemployment rates are very low/high, respectively, especially amongst Syrian women. LLH target well linked to social protection activities and advocacy that also include men.</p>	3
---	--	---

<p>JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities</p>	<p>Logics clearly defined but no baseline, which makes certain outputs look random too ambitious (half of beneficiaries get employment or see increase in income for instance)</p> <p>During discussion, time frame is identified as a challenge. 2.</p>	2
--	--	---

II. Effectiveness

2. To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

<p>JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones</p>	-	
--	---	--

<p>JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations</p>	-	
--	---	--



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks	Risks well taken into account prior to implementation. Mitigation measures are weak but few alternatives, especially given the limited time frame.
--	--

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen -

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe -

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner -

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change -



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

in the LLH sector in each target country

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level

Sustainability expected to be ensured through close work with local actors such as the Jordan National Commission for Women (on policy upstreaming) and the private sector. The communication and visibility plan (EU/UN Women) could be helpful in ensuring some sustainability of the interventions post-EUTF.

A sustainability plan is being prepared.

However, rapid changes in the LLH context in Jordan identified as a future challenge.

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees

-

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF

-

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions’ desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme

-

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

funded LLH programmes?

-



TO4. 72 UN WOMEN

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date:28.08.2018 – K1
Project number (EUFT only)	TO4. 72 Turkey
Project title	Strengthening the Resilience of Syrian Women and Girls and Host Communities in Iraq, Jordan and Turkey
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	UN Women
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	UN Women has drafted a partnership strategy for this project: Gaziantep Municipality, International Labour Organization (ILO) in Nizip and Gaziantep, Association for Solidarity with Asylum Seekers and Migrants (ASAM), a local NGO from Turkey (Project Cooperation Agreement with ASAM and ILO has been signed in April 2018). Women groups: call for proposals for the implementation of the activities under Output 2.1
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	UN organization
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	a, c
National (N) or regional project (R)	R
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	
Iraq	X



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Jordan X

Lebanon

Turkey X - Nizip and Gaziantep

Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)

1. Access to basic education

2. Access to higher and further education

3. Resilience and development X

4. Access to health services

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection X

Overall budget Total Budget of the Action: Euro 15,625,000
In Turkey: Euro 4,6 Mio

EU financial contribution EU Contribution: Euro 12,500,000 / Japan 2,600,000,
UN WOMEN 0,55 mio

Starting date February 2018 (contract signed in 19 December 2017)

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed) 24 months

Final date (planned /actual) 19.12.2019

Overall objective

Programme goal: Women, girls and their communities are resilient to conflict, displacement and other crises.

Outcome (1) for Turkey:

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework) Outcome 1: Women refugees and host country nationals are empowered through increased longer term social and economic recovery and livelihood opportunities.

Outcome (2) Turkey:

Women and girls are engaged in promoting social cohesion and co-existence in their communities.



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Estimated Results / outputs	<p>(identical in all countries) Output 1.1. Women - displaced, refugee and host country nationals – have increased access to short term productive and financial assets and skills, and men are engaged as partners in social equality and economic growth</p> <p>Output 1.2 (Turkey):</p> <p>Women are empowered and have access to long-term employment opportunities.</p> <p>Output 1.3 (Turkey):</p> <p>Women refugee and host country nationals - have increased access to comprehensive essential services.</p> <p>Output 2.1. (Turkey): Women’s organizations are supported to promote, stability and peaceful co-existence in their communities.</p>
-----------------------------	--

Target groups and final beneficiaries	<p>TGs: Syrian refugees under Temporary Protection, along with the members of the host communities and service providers in key public institutions providing front line services to women and girls.</p> <p>BF organisations: Ministry of Family and Social Policies, AFAD (Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency), DGMM (Directorate General for Migration Management), and Gaziantep Municipality, will benefit from this training and capacity building programmes</p> <p>BFs: 5000 Syrian women (and their children) under Temporary Protection and women from host community</p>
---------------------------------------	---

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)	0 (to be defined in the early months of the implementation of the project). However, not available yet (QINs??)
---	---

Existence of target values (list)	Outcome 1:
-----------------------------------	------------



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Number of women and girls directly accessing UN-Women supported humanitarian services (UN Women SP indicator) - 5000

Number of women refugees and host country national receiving support from this project, actively seeking livelihood opportunities – 800

Number of women refugees and host country national receiving support from this project, actively engaging in solidarity groups --360

Output 1.2: Women are empowered and have access to long-term employment opportunities

Basic skill and vocational training—1600

from job counselling and referral services -- 800

Syrian refugees and vulnerable host communities benefited from active labour market programs funded by the project --(560 vocational trainings & 240 workshop)

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)

Yes, see TGs / BFs

Key stakeholders (list)

The Ministry of Family and Social Policies, AFAD (Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency), DGMM (Directorate General for Migration Management), later on PMO and Gaziantep Municipality

Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)

Basic project documents (Narrative, budget, negotiation process UN Women/EU etc.)

Visibility communication plan with EU/UN Women

Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant

In the field of female employment, women are often taken into account (but as in most EUTF projects, represent a minority of beneficiaries, reflecting the low female participation rates, but mostly crafts, or cfw

Donor (s) / sources of funding

EU (80%) / Japan (20%)



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

Answers based on evaluation matrix: Indicators

<p>JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector</p>	<p>Adequacy in the sense that women’s economic participation and unemployment rates are very low/high, respectively, especially amongst Syrian women. LLH target well linked to social protection activities and advocacy that also include men.</p>	3
---	--	---

<p>JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities</p>	<p>Logics clearly defined but no baseline, which makes certain outputs look random too ambitious (half of beneficiaries get employment or see increase in income for instance). During discussion in both Turkey and Jordan, time frame is identified as a challenge.</p>	2
--	---	---

II. Effectiveness

2. To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

<p>JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones</p>	<p>-</p>	0
--	----------	---



JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations - 0

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks Risks well taken into account prior to implementation. Mitigation measures are weak but few alternatives, especially given the limited time frame. 2

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources High, UN WOMEN can refer to considerable capacities and resources, partnership with other UN organisation (ILO) and local partners. Gaziantep Municipality, International Labour Organization (ILO) in Nizip and Gaziantep, Association for Solidarity with Asylum Seekers and Migrants (ASAM), a local NGO from Turkey (Project Cooperation Agreement with ASAM and ILO has been signed in April 2018). Limited to no problems in partnering and obtaining permissions for implementation 3

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen - 0

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe - 0

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?



JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner - 0

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country - 0

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level. - 2

Sustainability expected to be ensured through close work with local actors such as Gaziantep Municipality and on national level it is based on “trusted relationship between UN Women and the Ministry of Family and Social Policies”.

The communication and visibility plan (EU/UN Women) could be helpful in ensuring some sustainability of the interventions post-EUTF.

A sustainability plan is being prepared.

However, capacities and resources of local actors / municipality of Gaziantep still need to be substantiated.

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees - 0

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF - 0



10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions’ desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme - 0

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

-



T04.76 UNDP

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I, information gathered during document review, and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date: 30.09.2018 – K2
Project number (EUFT only)	T04.76
Project title	Turkey Resilience Project in response to the Syria Crisis (TRP).
Lead Implementing partner (IP)	UNDP
Other implementing partners / stakeholders	–
Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	UN agency
Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	a, c
National (N) or regional project (R)	N (Turkey)
Location (geographic zone and specific location)	
Iraq	
Jordan	
Lebanon	
Turkey	X Gaziantep, Hatay, Şanlıurfa, Izmir, Adana, Kilis, Mersin, Manisa, Bursa, Konya
Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)	
1. Access to basic education	X



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

2. Access to higher and further education

3. Resilience and development X

4. Access to health services

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection

7. Municipal services X

Overall budget Total budget: EURO 50,359,809.29 (11.5 mio for LLH and 16 mio for Turkish courses)

EU financial contribution Total EU Contribution: EUR 50.000.000

Starting date 1.2.2018

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed) 24 months planned

Final date (planned /actual) 1.2.2020

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework) To strengthen the economic and social resilience of Syrian refugees under Temporary Protection (SuTP-including Palestinian refugees from Syria), their host communities and relevant national and local Government institutions.

Specific objectives (only for LLH/economic support):

- 1) Job creation for SuTP and host communities
- 3) Adult language training

Estimated Results / outputs See below

Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available) *Target groups*
At least 55,000 Syrian refugees under Temporary Protection and host community members will directly benefit from the Action. This includes 2,000 Syrian refugees and host community member employed; 1,000 Syrian refugees and host community members with improved awareness and knowledge about business development and 52,000 Syrian



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

refugees who benefitted from adult language training.

Final beneficiaries

At least 307,000 Syrian refugees under Temporary Protection and host community members will benefit in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large from the Action

The official aim is 50% Syrians; 50% vulnerable Turks from the HC.

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

Availability of baselines in project

documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)

Not for socioeconomic support

Existence of target values (list) (ONLY FOR SOCIOECONOMIC SUPPORT-LLH)

– At least 2 (two) SME Capability Centres and at least 2 (two) Innovation Centres will be operational

– At least 2,000 Syrian refugees and host community members will be placed in formal jobs. Out of this total, 1750 will be jobs created through SME transformation, innovation programmes and self-employment through innovation driven initiatives (İzmir, Manisa, Adana, Hatay, Mersin). 250 will be jobs which will be created through industrial transformation in Gaziantep. At least 25% of the jobs will be self-employment, at least 40% (1,500) of the beneficiaries will be women,⁶⁰ At least 50% (1,000) of the beneficiaries will be Syrian refugees.

– At least 1,000 Syrian refugees and host community members (50-50%) will benefit from awareness raising and other types of

60 At least 3,425 job opportunities to be created under Component 1. This includes 2,500 job opportunities created (of which at least 25% self-employment opportunities) and 925 Syrian refugees and Turkish nationals (50-50%) who are either employed or self-employed as a result of the Action.



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

business development and employment services, including innovation-driven entrepreneurship;

– At least 650 SMEs will benefit from business advisory services in the form of technical assistance and investment/equipment support;

– At least 250 new SMEs will be established focusing on innovation. Those enterprises will be set-up by Syrian refugees and/or Syrian-Turkish joint ventures;

– Provision of Turkish language skills trainings for at least 52,000 Syrian refugees through in-classroom and e-learning modalities;

– Develop one learning platform and learning Management system for Turkish language and refurbish classrooms;

– Training of Turkish language trainers;

– Tailor made educational content developed, published and distributed

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)

interventions are specific to supporting access to the labour market for women and youth

Implementor: IOM

UNDP will thereby be the sole responsible party for the delivery of the results of the Action

Cooperation with:

Ministry of Development (MoD) the Ministry of Science Industry; Technology (MoSIT); Ministry of National Education

Key stakeholders (list)

Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)

DoA, budget, 1st interim report, 1 QUIN, logframes etc.

Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list

World Bank, KfW, European Investment Bank



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

if relevant

Donor (s) / sources of funding	EU/UNDP
--------------------------------	---------

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector	No clear reference to adequacy to national formal policies in the field of LLH sector (objective 1) The Action complements this ongoing support in terms of adult language training and will work directly with the Ministry of National Education as main partner for this component of the project.	2
JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities	Clearly defined despite no baseline.	2

II. Effectiveness

2.: To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones	Not yet started, operational framework is being set up, Turkish lessons to be started in early 2019.	0
---	--	---



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations In line. 3

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks Difficult to predict in advance 1

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to capitalise on available human and financial resources. 0

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen. Yes 3

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe. _ 0

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner. 0

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country. - 0

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level Relatively well taken into account for each component 2

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees - 0

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF Funding. 0

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions’ desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme To be seen. 0

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

To be seen.



T04.82 KfW SOLAR

INTERNAL EVALUATION GRID

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Under section I. information gathered during document review and if necessary, during interviews will be collected (per country!).

This section serves to collect key data and finally to allow classification of projects listed under annex 1 ToRs (sample projects) and if relevant of other initiatives in the countries / sector covered by the evaluation.

Grid produced by: [SK (K4), YS (K3), JH (K2), EW (K1)]	Date:01.09 .2018 - K1
---	-----------------------

Project number (EUFT only)	T04. 82
----------------------------	---------

Project title	Clean energy and Energy Efficiency Measures for refugee affected host communities in Turkey
---------------	---

Lead Implementing partner (IP)	KfW- Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau
--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Other implementing partners / stakeholders	IP: Ministry of National Education (MoNE); project Executing Agency (PEA) responsible for the implementation of the Action, AFAD is responsible for the overall coordination of the Action with the Turkish authorities,
--	--

Type of lead implementing partner: CSO /NGO, public entity (national, regional, international), organisation)	INGO / Development Bank
---	-------------------------

Sample - Project studied based on documents (a); studied in detail – telephone conference -TC / group discussions (b); – Throughout analysis: field visit (C)	A + c
---	-------

National (N) or regional project (R)	N
--------------------------------------	---

Location (geographic zone and specific location)

Iraq

Jordan

Lebanon

Turkey	Turkey: provinces with high concentration of refugees (e.g. Kahramanmaraş, Gaziantep) + others still to be defined
--------	--



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Sectors (see: EUTF Result Framework 2018-2019)

1. Access to basic education X

2. Access to higher and further education

3. Resilience and development

4. Access to health services

5. Access to WASH services

6. Protection

Overall budget Total Budget of the Action: EUR 40,000,000)

EU financial contribution EU Contribution: 100%

Starting date 01.03.2018

Duration (planned / actual/ ongoing / completed) 48 months (From 01.03.2018 until 28 February 2022)

Final date (planned /actual) See above

The Overall Objective of the Action is to strengthen the economic and social resilience of the population of host communities including Syrian refugees under Temporary Protection (SuTP).

Overall objective and project purpose (according to logical framework)

Specific Objectives of the Action are:

- i) To increase the energy security in the refugee affected regions by promoting renewable energy generation (Component 1),
- ii) To implement energy efficient measures in public educational facilities and to strengthen the capacity of MoNE for energy efficient management of selected facilities (Component2).

Estimated Results / outputs

Component 1:

10-15 MW PV capacities are installed at one or more sites as unlicensed power generation facilities (solar farms).



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

<p>Target groups and final beneficiaries (quantification, if available)</p>	<p>5-10 MW rooftop PV capacities are installed on educational facilities.</p> <p>Additional solar electricity generation capacity is allocated to multiple educational facilities on the consumer’s side.</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>Selected educational facilities are energy efficient rehabilitated.</p> <p>MoNE’s personnel is aware and trained for energy efficient management of selected rehabilitated educational facilities.</p> <p>School aged Turkish and Syrian children, the population of host communities and Turkey’s public institution involved (MoNE)</p> <p>FBs: MoNE, the local provincial population (Turkish as well as refugees)</p>
---	--

Indicators (Logframes, project documents & reports)

<p>Availability of baselines in project documents (list – as indicated in project documents especially logframe)</p>	<p>No baselines</p> <p>OVI contained in the LF</p>
--	--

<p>Existence of target values (list)</p>	<p>R 1.1</p> <p>1.1.1 Up to 120 educational facilities become energy efficient via installation of renewable energy facilities (rooftop PV).</p> <p>1.1.2.1 At least 25% of the present cost of electricity of the respective selected educational facilities (by rooftop PV).</p> <p>1.1.2.2 At least 25% of the present cost of electricity of the selected educational facilities (by Solar Farms</p> <p>R2.1</p> <p>2.1.1 Significant reduction (min. 20%) of energy consumption in at least 15 educational facilities (demand side approach).</p>
--	--



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

2.1.2 Specific energy consumption for the same services are reduced (heating, lighting, IT-services, etc.)

2.1.3 Regular monitoring of energy consumption and identification of deviations.

R 2.2

2.2.1 At least 1 awareness campaign in each educational facility and at least 1 information campaign in each participating municipality.

2.2.2 3 - 5 selected school classes per municipality (e.g. through competitive solar workshops, etc.) are invited to visit the Solar Farms with free bus service. 25% of educational facilities perform Open Days to the public.

2.2.3 Student Labs with PV demonstrator, light bulb collection with electrical meter, photocells for radiation measurement, etc. are introduced.

R 2.3

At least 4 trainings/ workshops/ study tours provided to regional MoNE staff

Focus on specific vulnerable groups (women, children, youth, unaccompanied minors, elderly, with health-related needs, victims of torture, etc.)

Children (difficult to be avoided by addressing schools...) – not addressed

Key stakeholders (list)

EU (Donor), MoNE (on national, provincial and local level), MoENR, the Energy Market Regulatory Authority (EMRA), the respective



I. PROJECT INFORMATION

	provincial governorships, the regional distribution companies, AFAD
Availability of reports: Inception, monitoring & QINs, interim, final and/ or ROM or evaluation reports (dates)	DoA; LF, budget, contract, inception report, reporting FRIT format, empty
Other projects in the sector / country either EUTF or other Instruments, whether thematic (Human rights, migration, ECHO) or geographic (ENI), initiatives of EU-Member States or others - list if relevant	<p>Government of Turkey relating to the National Renewable Energy Action Plan, the Energy Efficiency Action Plan as well as Turkey’s Climate Change Action Plan. Consequently, the Action is aligned with the general development strategy of the Turkish government (“Vision 2023”).</p> <p>EU/KfW - “Education for All in Times of Crisis I” EU/KfW- “Education for All in Times of Crisis II” EU/World Bank - “School Construction Project” EU - “Supporting Integration of Syrian Children to the Turkish Education System” GIZ “Education Programme for Syrian Refugees and Turkish Host Communities” (BMZ) ECHO/UNICEF “Conditional cash transfer for education programme – CCTE” EU: KEP I - increasing the school enrolment rate for girls, and KEP 2 - Increasing the school attendance rate for girls</p>
Donor (s) / sources of funding	EU; EU MS; USAID

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Comments on how to fill in the table below:

1. Column contains the judgement criterion;
2. Column “your evaluation “(short text) Please use short sentences with all relevant information. This is not the report!
3. Column: grade corresponding to your evaluation under column 2). Gradings: 0 = not existing / not available; 1 = poor; 2= sufficient; 3 = good.

Indicators are contained in the evaluation matrix

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED/ANSWERED



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

I. Relevance and Project Design

1. How effectively have specific country needs and contexts been translated into programming of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 1.1. Present level of adequacy of the intervention regarding local/national and regional needs of the target groups in the LLH sector

This action corresponds on all levels to the identified needs (national, regional, local// EU and EUMS and strategies). It seeks top scale up existing projects (school rehabilitation, facility management energy security and efficiency). The action does not address LLH however it might contribute to create additional employment and access to new business opportunities (renewable energy / solar technology).

3

JC 1. 2. Degree to which the intervention logic is clearly defined about outcomes, outputs and activities

The LF provides for necessary information concerning OOs, SOs, outputs and activities including a set of OVs and target values.

3

II. Effectiveness

2.: To what extent have EUTF-funded LLH programmes been effective in achieving their desired results?

JC 2.1. Degree to which programme outputs are in line with project plans/milestones

The project started in March 2018 only. An inception report has been submitted.

3

JC 2. 2. Degree to which outputs are in line with objectives (quality)? defined in the programme documents and the target groups / beneficiaries expectations

As above, too early to assess

0

JC 2.3. Degree to which the programme / projects managed to mitigate internal and external risks

As above

0

3. What are the specific advantages/disadvantages of the various implementing partners (national, regional, international) in terms of effectiveness?

JC 3.1. Degree to which international / local organisations are capable to

The action will be mainly implemented by the national partner MoNE. It is too early to assess effectiveness.

0



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

capitalise on available human and financial resources

III. Efficiency

4. To what extent have the various stakeholders have the necessary capacity (technical, institutional and financial) to promote and implement EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

<p>JC 4.1. Degree to which international / local partners implemented the assistance in time and with the resources foreseen</p>	<p>The key stakeholder and partner MoNE is likely to refer to the necessary capacities and resources to implement the action.</p>	3
--	---	---

5. Which LLH programmes use resources in the most rationale way?

<p>JC 5.1. Degree to which resources were used in line with the programme objectives and within the timeframe</p>	<p>Too early to provide for a judgement. High focus on investment (solar systems & maintenance) out of 40 mio. Costs for HR remain below 10% of the total amount (supervision, consulting, capacity development, monitoring)</p>	0
---	--	---

IV. Coherence

6. To what extent was the support provided by EUTF for LLH programmes coherent and complementary with other EU funding mechanisms?

<p>JC 6.1. Extent to which new challenges and opportunities were addressed in an adequate and swiftly manner</p>	<p>Too early to assess challenges and opportunities.</p>	0
--	--	---

7. In terms of coherence and complementarity, what is the advantage/ disadvantage of a regional versus a national approach?

<p>JC 7.1. Extent to which stakeholders are capable of adapting to any change in the LLH sector in each target country</p>	<p>The action is well imbedded into other activities aiming at improving energy security and rehabilitation of schools or public infrastructure.</p>	3
--	--	---

V. Sustainability

8. What are the main factors for sustainability of the EUTF-funded LLH programmes and to which extent are these factors currently ensured?



II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

JC 8. 1. Degree to which the assistance provides for a sound and measurable conceptual approach to sustainability at institutional, social, financial and policy level	It is too early for a final judgement but due to commitment of the GoT, and ownership by MoNE, by reducing energy consumption and related costs the action is likely to become sustainable.	0
--	---	---

JC 8.2. Degree of acceptance by the local communities of increased formal job opportunities / LLH for Syrian refugees	The action cannot be classified to be an LLH project, however limited additional employment and the potential for further business opportunities can be expected.	2
---	---	---

VI. EU Added value

9. What added value is resulting from the EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

JC 9.1. Extent of gains as a result deriving from funding and managing large scale LLH national and regional interventions collected under the EUTF	This is a huge but national project only! Involvement of KfW (a development bank) allows to disburse a major grant. Existing activities can be scaled up. Combination of supervision, CD, technical advice & commissioning of studies on one side and implementation (MoNE) on the other side allows for a cost efficiency.	3
---	---	---

10. To what extent are the communication and visibility actions providing added value in terms of contributing to mainstreaming the actions' desired effects?

JC 10.1. 1 Evidence that local communities are aware, familiar and convinced on the usefulness and the relevance of the programme	Too early to assess: The action provides for visibility component.	0
---	--	---

VII. Lessons learned

11. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the current generation of EUTF-funded LLH programmes?

This is a huge but national project only! Involvement of KfW (a development bank) allows to disburse a major grant. Existing activities can be scaled up. High cost-efficiency can be expected. Link to LLH still to be developed and not in focus.

7. ANNEX A4: OPTIONS FOR FUTURE EUTF SUPPORT

7.1. Basic Assumptions

- 1) The overall context in the entire Middle East region, as affected by civil conflicts, intercommunal tensions and financial/ economic crises, will continue to determine the willingness and capacities of the host countries, and more precisely the host communities to cope with the consequences of the Syrian Refugee Crisis. On the other hand, neither the EU nor the donor community at large will have options or capacities to significantly influence the Syrian refugee crisis, at least not at short notice.
- 2) Yet, the overall political situation in the EUTF-target countries (Jordan, KRI, Lebanon, and Turkey) remains stagnant, if not relatively stable. The same applies to the economic situation, it remains stable yet on a low level, but mid-term economic growth remains sluggish.
- 3) Given the overall situation in either Syria or in the EUTF-target countries (spring 2019), a massive return of refugees to Syria is not expected in the short term. On the other hand, no other permanent solution (for instance through the massive return to Syria or naturalization of refugees, or resettlement respectively legal migration to third countries) can be currently predicted.
- 4) At the same time, developments in Syria and in neighbouring countries, especially Turkey, remain unlikely to trigger additional massive displacements.
- 5) The overall objectives of the EUTF will remain untouched. The EUTF constitutes a funding instrument allowing to address short and mid-term priorities by considering “intervening developments on the ground and shifting needs” covering another funding period of up to five years. The decisions to address the Syrian Refugee Crisis under a regional approach combining the efforts and capacities of the EU and its member states will be maintained.

7.2. Key Lessons Learned

1) All projects (except T04.82 KfW – an infrastructural/educational project without any direct employment component) indicated high relevance to the needs of the target countries, refugees / IDPs and host communities. Cross-cutting issues comprising the social inclusion of vulnerable categories such as women and youth are well in focus. However, projects were designed based on rough estimates rather than throughout comprehensive needs assessments of the diverse target groups. In consequence, weaknesses in effective targeting became apparent during project design and prevailed during inception and implementation, for the three completed or under way projects (T04.10 LEADERS, T04.12 FURSA and T015. QUDRA). In addition – as pilot projects have demonstrated - the project duration turned out to be insufficient for the two former projects.

2) Completed projects were relatively successful in producing their outputs, yet with delays, but so far failed to meet their specific outcomes and their overall (too ambitious/disconnected) objectives. At the outcome level, envisaged outcomes such as preventing youth or women to apply negative coping mechanisms, or to improve social cohesion and generate income at least on a mid-term perspective still need to be substantiated.

3) The sample of regional/multi-country or national projects indicates an oscillation of operations between short-term relief and mid/ long-term local development. Besides, for one project directly supporting government institutions, different types of “Theory of Change” were applied and pursued: Type A (defined as a complementary set of activities by the Action Document): projects set the priority on social cohesion and then employment (SFCG); Type B (defined as a priority by the Action Document): focus was set on employment to create social cohesion. Most projects apply a mix of types A and B. This inevitably led to serious problems in targeting. A clear differentiation of target groups distinguishing between those unemployed and those being most vulnerable is required.

In consequence, considering the prevailing high unemployment among youth and existing cultural, social and perhaps religious barriers keeping the share of formally employed woman in all target countries at a low level, attempts to create stable employment among the most

vulnerable is unlikely to succeed. This points to the need to maintain an approach oriented on humanitarian assistance to gain “quick wins” at short notice.

Promoting local economic development and supporting those individuals of the target groups being skilled and “employable” definitely requires applying a mid-term development approach.

However, both types of support are still indispensable.

4) Efficiency and (especially cost-effectiveness) depend on the purpose of the interventions rather than on aid modalities applied or the types of implementing agencies. While interventions oriented on short-term social or humanitarian assistance (for example cash-for-work) might be deemed to be costly, they must be compared with the political or social costs for host or EU countries likely to be incurred by risking to create a “lost generation”. Support to promote employment or to create employability especially addressing selected “better offs” under “Packages” might be far more expensive considering the costs per person compared with trainings of hundreds of vulnerable persons. However, indication exists that the former is more likely to contribute to LLH, while besides providing for impressive figures, success of the latter still needs to materialise, as the high number of trained individuals either men or women does not necessarily lead to durable employment.

Regional projects, demonstrating the combined support of the EU and its member states to the region provide for options to scale up activities but may need additional resources to exploit all their potentials. In this respect, communication intra consortia and within each consortium across the region were not given enough attention and budgeting, leading to insufficiently used potentials at regional level.

5) Most projects, especially those (or their components) following type A are not designed to become sustainable (although their social impact might be). Under type B projects, sustainability is addressed by generating stable income. For nearly all projects, sustainability on institutional level became a crucial issue. All types of interventions focusing on social cohesion and/ or economic development require a mid-term perspective that can only be achieved as long as a minimum of institutional sustainability is guaranteed, manifested in existing capable structures on local level.

6) Along the basic assumptions underlying the establishment, the EUTF provides for considerable added value, except for providing for the necessary visibility of the EU and its member states in addressing the Syrian Refugee Crisis in the target countries (and in the EU member states as well).

7.3. Possible options to address observed weaknesses

The nature of the crisis requires to maintain a hybrid approach oscillating between humanitarian assistance and at the same time embarking on a mid-term development strategy. On the one hand by addressing immediate income-related needs and on the other hand to prevent social tensions to fester by supporting the local economy and generating additional opportunities for different types of employment (placement in the corporate sector, income-generating enterprises) for vulnerable target groups within the refugee and host communities.

While the EUTF and other funding schemes address a wide range of support covering different sectors like education or WASH, the promotion of resilience and livelihood is constrained by several specific contextual and operations challenges. This entails a number of contradictions that must be carefully considered on different levels.

Generation of subsidised income for the refugee and host populations might be easily achieved, provided the necessary financial and technical resources are available, but it only provides for temporary solutions. The postulation that the promotion of mid-term economic development will finally induce additional employment seems to be more tempting and might be based on longstanding tenets guiding development policy. However, it does not properly match the target countries' social and economic context as long as no substantial and lasting support is made available. In case the period to pursue a mid-term, development approach is defined by the funding period of the EUTF, namely an administrative regulation (pointing to a programme duration of a maximum of 48 months) rather than a proper assessment of what can be realistically achieved within this period. Conversely, at this stage it is impossible to predict mid/ long-term developments, as stated above, which prevents defining a realistic time frame.

While the stay of the refugee and IDP population might be temporary, the host countries' economies and labour markets are not. Considering the economic support provided by the EU to the region, as manifested *inter alia* through such instruments as ENI or IPA to the LLH sector during the last decade, although visible improvements can be observed for example in Turkey, a realistic assessment of the support channelled through the EUTF is necessary to adjust the interventions addressing LLH to the current instable contexts.

This implies (entails) several options to be considered rationally for future EUTF funded LLH projects along realistic objectives and adequate design parameters. Obvious weaknesses in effective targeting that became apparent during project design and prevailed during implementation indicates lack of information and reliable statistical data.

The following discussion of options will focus on a limited number of key elements that can be adjusted to design future interventions equipped with achievable outputs, outcomes and general objectives.

7.3.1. Aid modalities and types of implementing agencies

The allocation of substantial grants to EU member states agencies under a regional approach turned out to provide for added value and underlined the commitment and efforts of the EU and its member states to address the crisis. However, the issue of EU visibility was somehow neglected, which is a common feature under most projects. It has been observed that EU member states agencies (such as GIZ) were sufficiently successful in coordinating activities and scaling up of activities. In addition, they are present on the ground, namely in the host countries, providing a basis to expand activities and to address options or challenges depending on future developments in the region. In theory, UN agencies are capable to absorb substantial funds; yet, their capacity to operate on regional level (given the strong influence of national governments) and to effectively promote EU visibility remains limited.

As long as multi-country projects implemented by INGOs are capable to capitalize on the expertise and capacities available among all members of the consortium, this constellation will provide for added-value, mainly by absorbing substantial funds. However, in reality the partners for a number of obvious reasons, including lack of funds earmarked for coordination activities, have mostly worked independently. In addition, the context at least in the LLH

sector in all countries differs considerably allowing for limited exchange of lessons learned or best practice. Finally, exchange between countries at government or corporate sector levels has not been observed and may not even be relevant for these types of projects. The key advantage of regional projects is their capacity to absorb large funds and to reallocate funds to sub-contractors. In this respect they provide for EU added value.

As for LLH components, on operational level all regional projects finally became multi-country projects, with little (or non-substantiated) regional impact. Raising the issue whether the share of national projects should be increased especially based on considerations to expand attempts to promote local economic development (for example in KRI) or to support the supply side of the economy by improving the inclusion of the corporate sector, so far neglected in Lebanon and in Jordan. While during the evaluation, it became obvious that on one hand small and innovative initiatives (ideally initiated by local actors) are favoured not the least considering their feasibility, on the other hand attempts to promote economic development on local or community level require additional resources (time and funds). The promotion of economic development at local level requires more networking, including outreach to key stakeholders (PPP and/ or coalition building), capacity development and advocacy. The need to follow a holistic approach promoting local economic development has been considered by funding a new generation of projects aiming at capacity development combined with investment on municipalities are sectoral level.

While there are reasons (see above) to maintain the regional approach, options exist to swift focus between national and multi-country projects. Depending on the size and the design of the projects, expanding national projects may be carried out according to different options, awarding the funds to consortia or single agencies. In any case, exchange of experience and best practice will remain a challenge.

7.3.2. New implementing agencies and the role of national governments

Orientation on economic development under a national approach entails considering the issue (raised in the ToRs) of the nature and the role of possible new implementing organisations and the role and commitment of the authorities of hosting governments.

The EUTF projects lack the resources to become operational at macro-economic level, as such they are not designed to involve cooperation with national governments and to link directly with instruments provided by the EU such as the ENI. Recently contracted EUTF LLH projects aim at supporting the implementation national strategies, laws and regulations by cooperating with national ministries on local or sectoral level. In this context new types of implementing organisation providing for a focus on community or municipal development became involved. Otherwise no new types of implementing organisation in the target countries suitable to implement projects became apparent during the evaluation (except maybe strong and autonomous national NGOs in Lebanon).

7.3.3. Project design and targeting

Basically, most LLH projects addressing vulnerable (poor or quasi-poor groups), mainstream gender and youth. Projects strive to promote the latter’s social inclusion and employment; persons with disabilities are comparatively less covered. There is no doubt that the creation of a “lost generation” (addressed under other priority areas of the EUTF as well) must be avoided, and so are “negative coping mechanisms” with their adverse social and political consequences. However, this approach contributes to pursuing conflicting objectives. Addressing those who are most vulnerable is in line with the intentions of the EUTF but less conducive in selecting individuals most capable to enter the formal labour market and to find employment. Promoting economic development should raise the key question as of whom to target in priority: skilled and economically active persons or the economically marginalized? So far, the success of the projects whether being funded by the EUTF or from other donors shows limited visible results. High numbers of individuals trained do not necessarily complement with increasing employment in the formal sector; rather, they may train “armies” of cheap and exploitable labour for the informal market. In addition, it may be overly optimistic to assume that the LLH projects can overcome existing cultural, social or financial (low salaries) barriers that continue to hinder the inclusion of women or youth in the labour market in MENA countries.

Thus, future EUTF funded LLH projects should be driven by a clear understanding of the nexus set by interventions between targeted groups and outcomes and objectives. Design of the interventions must be based on evidence. Additional capacities to equip the EUTF

management, national governments and implementing agencies with reliable data are indispensable. The new RDPP II project might be able to fill part of the existing gap and to provide for additional input to promote advocacy, spread lessons learned and increase EU visibility.

Given the limited funds and resources available, this may lead to a focus on actions designed to fit the social and economic conditions of vulnerable groups that were outlined in the recommendation section of the report (graduation approach, gig/ sharing economy). This type of intervention may even have a local development effect if properly inserted within existing value chains and complemented by capacity development combined with investment.



8. ANNEX A5: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

- EU services (EU)
- Implementing partners (IP)
- Stakeholders (S)
- Others (O)

Class	Name	Email address	Function	Organisation
EU-DG NEAR				
EU	Nadim KARKUTLI	nadim.karkutli@ec.europa.eu	EUTF Trust Fund Manager	DG NEAR
EU	Paola PALLOTTO	paola.palotto@ec.europa.eu	EUTF M&E Task Manager	DG NEAR
EU	Danielle KEULEN	Danielle.KEULEN@ec.europa.eu	Deputy EUTF Trust Fund Manager	DG NEAR
EU	Anton STEMBERGER	Anton.STEMBERGER@ec.europa.eu	OPS EUTFHQ - Iraq	DG NEAR
Iraq				
EU	Mathieu GOODSTEIN	Mathieu.GOODSTEIN@eeas.europa.eu	OM EUTF Iraq	EEAS-AMMAN
IP	Ashis KUMAR KUNDU	akundu@iq.goal.ie	Program Manager/LLH Cluster Focal Point	Goal



S	Akram M. JAMO	akram@krgngo.org	Head of Department	Department of NGOs, KRI
IP	Hawre IHSAN SADIQ	Hawaree.ihsan@yahoo.com	Branch Manager/Erbil	IRCS
IP	Lars Tore KJERLAND	Lars.tore.kjerland@redcross.no	Program Manager	Norwegian RC
IP	Yiran LIN	Hop-iraq.frc@croix-rouge.fr	Programs Coordinator	French RC
IP	Emilie JEANNE	Hop-iraq.frc@croix-rouge.fr	Head of Delegation	French RC
IP	Ilaria LAVAI	ilrav@rodekors.dk	Regional Grant Coordinator	Danish RC
IP	Vittoria RINALDI	Vittoria.rinaldi@unponteper.it	Project Manager	UPP
IP	Eleonora BIASI	Eleonora.biasi@unponteper.it	Head of Mission	UPP
S	Akram SADEQ ALI	Akram.sadeq@irworldwide.org	Head of Programs	IRW
S	Hal MIRAN	hal@mselect.iq	CEO	MSelect VTC
IP	Farzad KAMIL	Farzad_ali@wvi.org	Youth Specialist	WVI
IP	Idres ABDULAZIZ	Idres_abdulaziz@wvi.org	Project Coordinator	WVI
IP	Maryam N. MOHAMMED	Maryam_mohammed@wvi.org	M&E Assistant	WVI
O	Kurdeen ABDULSTAR HASSAN	Kurdeen.abdulstar.hassan@gmail.com	Employment Director	Jinen VTC
O	Hamid MEZIRI	Arema.iq@lwfdds.org	Area Coordinator	LWF
IP	Kabar FAWZI ABDULLA	Kabar.fawzi@cosv.org	Project Coordinator	COSV, Erbil



S	Shahnaz ISMAEL	Shahnaz.ismael@unponteper.it	Manager	Arbat Youth Center, Suli
IP	Maroof TAHA	Iro.iraq.frc@croix-rouge.fr	Liaison Officer	FRC
IP	Nahawand FARHOD	nahopalany@gmail.com	Focal Point	IRCS
IP	Saman FAKHRADIN	Sam.kareem@unponteper.it	Project Coordinator	UPP
IP	Fahmy CHALABY	Fahmy_chalaby@wvi.org	Youth Lead/LLH Lead	Country Regional WVI
IP	Younis A. JALIL BAMERNI	Duhok.br@ircs.org.ir	Branch Manager	Duhok IRCS
IP	Noor MUQDAD	Nooralrubai91@gmail.com	Focal Point	IRCS, Duhok
IP	Jeelan KAREEM	Jeelan.karim@drciraq.dk	Livelihood Officer	Lead Jyan Center/DRC Job

Lebanon

EU	Ryan KNOX	Ryan.KNOX@eeas.europa.eu	Attaché	EEAS-BEIRUT
EU	Abel PIQUERAS	Abel.PIQUERAS@eeas.europa.eu	Programme Manager	EEAS-BEIRUT
EU	Virginie COSSOUL	Virginie.COSSOUL@eeas.europa.eu	Attaché	EEAS-BEIRUT
IP/O	Rebecca Lucy CARTER	rebcar@um.dk	Programme Manager	RDPP
S	Dr. Mohamad Abou Haidar		Staff in charge of Lebanon Crisis Response Livihoods Chapter	Min. of Economy & Trade
S	Mohamad Ali El Cheikh		Staff in charge of Lebanon Crisis Response Plan	Min. of Economy & Trade



IP	Enzo SCIOLLA	Enzo.sciolla@giz.de	Team Leader -VTE	GIZ
O	Sarah LOVE	s-love@dfid.gov.uk	Economic Adviser	DFID
O	Alain WAKED	a-waked@dfid.gov.uk	Programme & Policy Manager	DFID
IP	Benedict NIXON	hop@drclebanon.dk	Head of Programme/ Deputy Country Director	DRC
IP	Alex GOUTCHKOFF	cl.coordinator@drclebanon.dk	Cash and Livelihood Technical Coordinator	DRC
IP	Hovig WANNIS	HWannis@oxfam.org.uk	Project Coordinator	Oxfam (BADAEL)
IP	Sally ABIKHALIL	SAbiKhalil@oxfam.org.uk	Country Director	Oxfam
P	Shahrazad QASSEM	SQassem@oxfam.org.uk	Economic and Social Advisor	Oxfam (LEADERS)
IP	Mr. Federico DE NARDO		Country Director	COSV
IP	Leila HUSSEINI	leilah@sfcg.org	Team Leader - Search for FURSA	Common Ground
IP	Charles HOLMQUIST	cholmquist@sfcg.org	Programme Director	Search for Common Ground

Lebanon Non-EUTF funded projects 19.09. – 12.11.2018

IP	Alia FARHAT	alia@almajmoua.org	NFS & HR Manager	AL Majmoua
IP	Bassem HANNA	bassem.hanna@expertisefrance.fr	Deputy Team Leader	Expertise France
IP	Carrie BEAUMONT @ team	cbeaumont@mercycorps.org	Director of Program	Mercy Corps
O	Paul SKOCZYLAS	paul.skoczylas@wfp.org	Deputy Country Director	WFP



O	Tomas SENSTROM	stenstrom@ilo.org	Chief, Technical adviser	ILO
IP	Klaus KIRCHMAN	Klaus.Kirchmann_extern@kfw.de	Senior Consultant	KfW
S	Rafif BERRO & Johnny MATTA	rberro@economy.gov.lb & jmatta@economy.gov.lb	International Relations Team	UNDP/Ministry of Economy and Trade

Jordan

EU	Giorgia GAROFALO CORONARO	Giorgia.GAROFALO@eeas.europa.eu	Programme Manager /EUTF	EEAS-AMMAN
EU	Mauro GIOE	Mauro.GIOE@eeas.europa.eu	Attaché	EEAS Amman
EU	Ilektra TSAKALIDOU	Ilektra.TSAKALIDOU@eeas.europa.eu	Trade and private sector development	EEAS Amman
EU	Maria IARRERA	Maria.IARRERA@eeas.europa.eu	Private sector development	EEAS Amman
IP	Emily LEWIS	emily.lewis@drc-jordan.org	Livelihoods Technical Coordinator	DRC
IP	Sachitra CHITRAKAR	sachitra.chitrakar@drc-mena.org	Regional Head of programmes	DRC
IP	Alex KLASS	alex.klass@drc-mena.org	Chief of Party	DRCP
IP	Diya NANA	Diya.nanda@unwomen.org	Programme Management Specialist/Resilience and empowerment unit	UN Women
IP	Marta GARBARINO	Marta.garbarino@unwomen.org	Partnerships Advocacy Analyst	UN Women
IP	Sawsan AL-ABABNEH	Sawsan_alababneh@wvi.org	Livelihood Coordinator	World Vision



IP	Ala' ALHUSSEINI	Alaa_alhusseini@wvi.org	Jordan Lead/Youth Project	Country Resolve	World Vision
IP	Haikal ABED	EL Haikal.elabed@giz.de	Module Leader, QUDRA	Team Focal point	GIZ
IP	Raimund SOBETZKO	Raimund.sobetzko@giz.de	Advisor Training	Skills	GIZ
IP	Issam OTHMAN	Issam.othman@giz.de	Skills QUDRA	Training,	GIZ
IP	Mriganko BHATTACHARJEE	Bhattacharjee@ifrc.org	Livelihoods Delegate		IFRC
IP	Enrico PAPITTO	Enrico.PAPITTO@ifrc.org	EUTF Grant Manager		IFRC
IP	Maria TARANCON	qudra.madad@aacid.es	Project Manager		AECID
IP	Hanalia FERHAN	hanalia.ferhan@acted.org	Country Director		ACTED
IP	Sawsan MOHAMMED	Sawsan.Mohammed@care.org	Director-Sustainable Development Program		Care
IP	Mahmoud AL KARAKI		Case management Officer/ Save The Children Jordan		STC
IP	Laura CARPINO	laura.carpino@esteri.it	Infrastructure Expert		Italian Cooperation
O	Vincenzo SCHIANO-LOMORIELLO	vinlom@um.dk	Liaison and Project Manager		RDPP
O	Maha KATTAA	kattaa@ilo.org	Syrian Response Coordinator/ILO	Crisis	ILO



O	Hamdan YACOUB	0777757355	Head of Syrian Refugees Department/ Ministry of Labour	MoL
---	---------------	------------	--	-----

O	Eman ISSA	eman_issa@dai.com	Programme management unit/Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation	MOPIC
---	-----------	--	--	-------

Jordan Non-EUTF funded projects 19.09. – 12.11.2018

IP	Hector VIVERO & Jason ANDREWS	hector.j.vivero@nrc.no & jason.andrews@nrc.no	Regional Livelihoods Adviser & Livelihoods and Food Security Specialist Department – Jordan	NRC
----	-------------------------------	---	---	-----

IP	Kyle FIECHTER	Kyle.Fiechter@kirkonulkomaan.apu.fi	Livelihoods Project Manager	Finn Church Aid
----	---------------	--	-----------------------------	-----------------

IP	Ramzy MAAYTAH	ramzi.maaytah@undp.org	Inclusive Growth and Livelihoods Specialist	UNDP
----	---------------	--	---	------

IP	Sawsan ISSA	sawsan.issa@rescue.org	Economic Recovery and Development Program Manager	IRC
----	-------------	--	---	-----

IP	Nader DUQMAQ	nduqmaq@caritas.ch	Country Programme Manager Regional (Office Syria Crisis Response)	Caritas
----	--------------	--	---	---------

IP	Carron BEAUMONT	cbeaumont@mercycorps.org	Director of Programs	Mercy Corps
----	-----------------	--	----------------------	-------------

IP	Thorsten METZ	thorsten.metz@giz.de	Employment Promotion Programme	GIZ
----	---------------	--	--------------------------------	-----

Turkey



EU	Laura FALLAVOLLITA		Laura.FALLAVOLLITA@eeas.europa.eu	OPS EUTF	EUD Turkey
EU	Steven VRIENDT	DE	Steven.DE-VRIENDT@eeas.europa.eu	EEAS Ankara	EUD Turkey
EU	Silvio CORDOVA		Silvio.CORDOVA@eeas.europa.eu	EUTF Programme Manager	EUD Turkey
EU	Nurca TUZCUOGLU		Nurca.TUZCUOGLU@eeas.europa.eu	EUTF Programme Manager	EUD Turkey
IP	Ali SUTLU	Fuat	ali.sutlu@concern.net	Project Manager	Concern
IP	Arshad MUHAMMAD		arshad.muhammad@concern.net	Country Director	Concern
IP	Sinem SOYLU		sinem.soylu@tobb.org.tr	Associate	TOBB
IP	Öznur KUTLU		oznur.kutlu@tobb.org.tr	Project Coordinator	TOBB
IP	Fatma UNAL	GELIR	gelir@ilo.org	Nat. Coordinator	Project ILO
IP	Mehmet KORAY ABACI		abaci@ilo.org	Monitoring Officer	ILO
IP	Meliz KILAVUZ		mkilavuz@iom.int	Senior Assitant	Project IOM
IP	Mazen ABOULHOSN		maboulhosn@iom.int	Emergency Coordinator	IOM
IP	Leontine SPECKER		Leontine.specker@undp.org	Senior Advisor	Resilience UNDP
IP	Ezgi ARSLAN		Ezgi.arzlan@undp.org	Project Manager	UNDP
IP	Andrea MOSER		Andrea.Moser@kfw.de	Principal Programme Manager	KfW
IP	Corinna KOHL		Corinna.kohl@kfw.de	Project Manager	KfW



IP	Julide OGUZ	Julide.oguz@kfw.de	Senior Coordinator	Project	KfW
IP	Dagmar BLICKWEDE	dagmar.blickwede@giz.de	Team Leader, QUDRA Module 05,		GIZ
IP	Dr. Günther TAUBE	guenther.taube@giz.de	Programme Director QUDRA		GIZ
IP	Tina BREUM MARIEGAARD	timar@rodekors.dk	Senior Coordinator	Consortium &	Danish Red Cross Advisor - EUTF
IP	Aşkın TÖREN	askin.toren@iskur.gov.tr	Head of Foreign Relation & Projects Department		ISKUR
IP	Ceren YILDIZ	ceren.yildiz@iskur.gov.tr	Assistant Employment Expert		ISKUR
S	M.Nuri DILEKCI	nuri.dilekci@basbakanlik.gov.tr	Senior expert EUTF - PMO		Office of the President
S	Ugur AKARSU	uarkasu@basbakanlik.gov.tr	FRIT Coordinator		Office of the President
IP	Iris BJÖRG KISTIANSDOT TIR	iris.kristjansdottir@unwomen.org	Gender Humanitarian Specialist	&	UN WOMEN
IP	Zeynep AYDEMIR KOYUNCU	zeynep.koyuncu@unwomen.org	Programme Management Specialist		UN WOMEN
S	Necla UZ	necla.uz@ailevecalisma.gov.tr	Labour Expert, General Directorate of International Labour Force – Livelong learning		Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Services (MFLSS)
S	Sevgi CANSU	scansu@meb.gov.tr	Migration Office, Project Manager		MoNE
S	Ayşenur BÜLBÜL	abulbul@meb.gov.tr	Project Coordinator		MoNE



S	Burkay ERGOREN	burcayergorem@gmail.com	Project Coordinator	MoNE
S	Peter KLANSOE	Peter.klansoe@drc.ngo	Head of Section HQ	DRC
S	Konrad STERNISKO	Konrad.Sternisko@BMZ.bund.de	Länder-Referent Türkei	Bundesministerium für Wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (BMZ)
O	Dr. Dieter REHFELD	rehfeld@iat.eu	Senior expert	Institut für Arbeit und Technik (IAT)
S	Shahzad JAMIL	cd@drc-turkey.org	Country Director Turkey	DRC
S	Aide Botta	lvh.coordinator@drc-turkey.org	LLH Coordinator	DRC

Turkey Ankara and Gaziantep Non-EUTF funded projects 15. – 19.11.2018

Meetings planned, arranged but failed with: ECHO, YUVA, DRC, Municipality of Gaziantep, UNDP Gaziantep

O	Thomas Rottland	rottland@care.de	Programme Officer, Syria and neighbouring countries	CARE Germany
O	Salah Hamwi	Salah.Hamwi@care.org	Head of Programmes	CARE International in Turkey
O	Tuğçe Söğüt	Tusce.soqut@undp.org	Project Manager Syrian Crisis Response and Resilience	UNDP



0	Oksan Gürtuna Halilogulu	Oksan.gurtuna@undp.org	Project Manager Syrian Crisis Response and Resilience	UNDP
0	Burce Dünder	Bruce.dundar@undp.org	Portfolio Manager Syrian Crisis Response and Resilience	UNDP
0	Melih Cadirci	Melih.cadirci@kfw.de	Deputy Director of KfW, Ankara Office	KfW
O/ IP	Julide Oguz	Julide.Oguz@kfw.de	Senior Project Coordinator	KfW
0	Miresi Busana	miresi.busana@giz.de	Cluster Education Advisor	GIZ
0	Ruth Halle	ruth.halle@giz.de	Project Manager	GIZ
0	Ertik Kahan	kahan.ertik@giz.de	Project Advisor (DV)	GIZ
0	Gabriele Muehlig	gabriele.muehlig@giz.de	Project Manager	GIZ
0	Ali Aslan	ali.aslan@giz.de	Field Officer	GIZ
0	Muhamad Taher Kurdie	Taher.kurdie@giz.de	CfW field officer	GIZ
0	Osman Taşlica	osmantaslica@darulacezevakfi.org.tr	General Coordinator	Darülaceze Foundation (DAV)
0	Yusuf İymen	yusuf@gso.org.tr	Project Manager	Gaziantep Chamber of Industry
0	Kürşat Göncü	gs@gso.org.tr	Secretary General	Gaziantep Chamber of Industry



O	Ali Azizi	aazizi@syrianeef.org	Project Manager	Syrian Economic Forum
---	-----------	--	-----------------	-----------------------

O	Rami Sharrack	rsharrack@syrianeef.org	Dept. Executive Director	Syrian Economic Forum
---	---------------	--	--------------------------	-----------------------

IP	Martin Linden	martin.linden@giz.de	Advisor LLH, QUDRA	GIZ
----	---------------	--	--------------------	-----

Kurdistan (KRI) Erbil and Dohuk Non-EUTF funded projects 21. – 23.01.2019

IP (French RC T0.30)	Ismail Othman HAMAD		Assistant Director	Vocational Educational Centre, Erbil under MoLSA
-------------------------	---------------------	--	--------------------	--

O	Hazhar Hasan	A. hazhar.abdullah@drciraq.dk	Livelihood Project Manager	DRC Iraq
---	--------------	---	----------------------------	----------

EU	Clarisse PASZTORY	Clarisse.PASZTORY@eeas.europa.eu	Head of EU Liaison Office Erbil	EU EEAS
----	-------------------	--	---------------------------------	---------

O	Mitchell McTough	mitchell.mctough@undp.org	Livelihoods Support Officer, Crisis Response and Resilience (ICRRP)	UNDP
---	------------------	--	---	------

IP (French RC T04.30)	Nibar ABDULSATAR		General Director /Manager	Vocational Educational Centre, Dohuk under MoLSA
--------------------------	------------------	--	---------------------------	--

O	Haval Salman Taher	h.taher@syriarelieff.org.uk	Office Manager, Dohuk	Syria Relief
---	--------------------	--	-----------------------	--------------

O	Yassir FARIS	al Yassir.alfaris@drciraq.dk	LHH Officer, Dohuk	DRC
---	--------------	---	--------------------	-----



O	Binay BASYAL	bbasyal@iq.goal.ie	Country Director, Dohuk	GOAL
IP	Marc LEVESQUE	Marc.levesque@giz.de	Head of Programs Economic development and livelihood programs (cash for work II), Dohuk	GIZ
O	Alessandra CONTINGIANI	acontigniani@iom.int	Project Officer, Erbil	IOM
S	Hoshang MOHAMED	Hoshang.mohamed@jcckrg.org	Director General Ministry of Interior, Joint Crisis coordination Centre (JCC)	Kurdistan Regional Government



9. ANNEX A6: DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE & CONSULTED

Project Number / Implementing agency/country	Project documents	Inception report	QINs	ROM reports	Interim reports	Evaluations	Studies / Publications
T04.10 Leaders	X	X	X	n/a	July 2017	External final evaluation 5/2018 & management comments	Livelihood Intervention Recommendations, Jordan 12 / 2018 DRC Jordan Economic Recovery Strategy November 2018 – 2019 MSME Needs Assessment Jordan 02/2017 Enterprise Assessment Report: MSME CD & Training 05/2017
T04.12 Fursa	X	X	X	n/a	1st + 2nd	End line evaluation & management response 11 / 2018	Livelihood and social cohesion challenges in Lebanon 1/ 2007 LLH opportunities in Lebanon 2/ 2107 LLH opportunities in KRI 9/2017
T04.15 Qudra GIZ	X	X	X	Turkey Lebanon	Nov 2017	Mid-term Evaluation Report 03/ 2018	Challenges and Good, Innovative Practices in Dealing with the Syrian Refugee Crisis - Impressions from a Qudra Mission to Five Municipalities in south-eastern Turkey 03/2017
T04.17 Youth Resolve	X	n/a	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	Assessment of the Livelihood Opportunities in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq



								Project implementation publications (brochures, flyers and posters)
T04.30 Danish R. Cross	X	n/a	X	Turkey Lebanon Jordan KRI Egypt	n/a	Regional Midterm Review 11/2018	Regional Baseline Study 12/2017 Report on the Labour Market Analysis for the Livelihood component of the RCRC EUTF programme Jordan 10/2017 LLH study KRI 09/2017	
T04.32 Concern	X	X	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	QIN: Narrative overview	
T04.40 Italian Coop.	X	X	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	RSCP – Complementary Programmes	
T04.68 TOBB	X	X	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
T04.70 ILO/IOM	X	n/a	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	First Interim Report (internal)	
T04.72 UN Women	X	X	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
T04.76 UNDP	X	X	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	3RP Response Strategy & Conceptual Framework for Impact Measurement	
T04.82 KfW - Solar	X	X	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

* Project documents: Description of the action, annexes (logframe, budget, others), contract (General and specific conditions), revisions of the contract

Other Documents

G. J. A'war, The current approach of MOL (Lebanon) to Occupational Safety and Health, 2016

V. Barbelet et al., The lives and livelihoods of Syrian refugees in Turkey and Jordan, Veronique Barbelet and Caitlin Wake, Humanitarian Policy Group, BMZ, ODI, February 2017

Bertelsmann Stiftung, Beyond Crisis Management: The Path Towards an Effective, Pro-active and Fair European Refugee Policy, Matthias M. Mayer, Mehrdad Mehregani, Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2016

BMZ; Beschäftigungsoffensive Nahost, Bundesministerium für Wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (BMZ), März 2018

Care, SYRIAN REFUGEES IN LEBANON EIGHT YEARS ON: WHAT WORKS AND WHY THAT MATTERS FOR THE FUTURE, 2018

J. Charmes, How to tackle the informal economy? Key policies and approaches (Presentation), Jacques Charmes, July 26, 2018

J. Charmes, RESEARCH, NETWORK AND SUPPORT FACILITY (RNSF) - EuropeAid/135649/DH/SER/MULTI VOLUME 2 – DEFINITION OF THE INFORMAL ECONOMY, Jacques Charmes, 2018

Centre for Transnational Development and Cooperation. 2015. Syrian Refugees in Turkey: Gender Analysis. [Online] Available at: <http://ctdc.org/analysis.pdf>

Durable Solutions Platform and İGAM Research Center on Asylum and Migration. Working towards self-reliance: Syrian refugees' economic participation in Turkey, 2019

EPRD, Needs assessment report for the preparation of an enhanced EU support to Turkey on the refugee crisis, EPRD Office for Economic Policy and Regional Development Ltd., June 2016

Joint Humanitarian Development Framework in Response to the Syrian crisis, Lebanon 2018-2019

Joint Humanitarian Development Framework in Response to the Syrian crisis, Jordan 2018-2019



European Commission; Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA II) REVISED INDICATIVE STRATEGY PAPER FOR TURKEY (2014-2020) ADOPTED ON 10/08/2018, C(2018) 5067 final, European Commission

European Commission, Managing the Refugee Crisis, the EU Facility for Refugees in Turkey, European Commission, September 2017 ;
http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/news_corner/migration/index_en.htm

European Commission, INSTRUMENT FOR PRE-ACCESSION ASSISTANCE (IPA II), REVISED INDICATIVE STRATEGY PAPER FOR TURKEY (2014-2020), European Commission, August 2018

European Court of Auditors, Special Report No 7, EU pre-accession assistance to Turkey: Only limited results so far, European Court of Auditors, 2018

European Commission, Tools and Methods Series, Concept Paper No 5, Indicators to measure Social Protection Performance, January 2017

European Court of Auditors, Special Report No 28, The Facility for Refugees in Turkey: helpful support, but improvements needed
to deliver more value for money, European Court of Auditors, 2018

European University Institute, A study of the communication channels used by migrants and asylum seekers in Italy, with a particular focus on online and social media, Directorate-General for Migration and Home Affairs (European Commission), Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies (European University Institute), April 2018

GEOtest, Technical Assistance to the EU Facility for Refugees in Turkey, Humanitarian Aid, Crisis Management and Post-Crisis Assistance, Final report, GEOtest consortium, October 2018

Government of Lebanon, Capital Investment Programme, -CEDRE- Government of Lebanon, April 2018

Government of Lebanon, Capital Investment Programme, list of projects, Government of Lebanon, April 2018

R. EL Hafez, Economic Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis on Lebanon, Ramzi EL Hafez (ed.), 2018

ILO, Impact of Syrian refugees on the Jordanian labour market, Svein Erik Stave and Solveig Hillesund, 2015 https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---arabstates/---ro-beirut/documents/publication/wcms_364162.pdf

International Crisis Group, Turkey’s Syrian Refugees: Defusing Metropolitan Tensions, Europe Report No. 248, International Crisis Group, 29 January 2018

IOM - Comparative Research on the Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration of Migrants, Khalid Koser, Maastricht Graduate School of Governance and Katie Kuschminder, Maastricht Graduate School of Governance, IOM 2015, <https://www.iom.int/files/live/sites/iom/files/What-We-Do/docs/AVRR-Research-final.pdf>

IOM, GUIDELINES TO PROTECT MIGRANTS IN COUNTRIES EXPERIENCING CONFLICT OR NATURAL DISASTER, Migrants in Countries of Crisis Initiative (MICIC), IOM, June 2016

Maira Kuppens, Béangère Pineau Soukkarieh and Melike Karlidag, End line evaluation (FURSA) Resilient communities: Supporting Livelihoods, Education and Social Stability for Syrian Refugees and host communities, November 2018

Landell Mills, Strategic Mid-Term Evaluation of the EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Crisis, October 2017

B. Malaeb et al., Impact of Refugees on Immigrants’ Labour Market Outcomes, Economic Research Forum, May 2018, <http://erf.org.eg/publications/impact-of-refugees-on-immigrants-labor-market-outcomes/>

Mercy Corps, Creation of Economic Opportunities in Lebanon, 2018



S. Murodova et al., Challenges and Good, Innovative Practices in Dealing with the Syrian Refugee Crisis - Impressions from a Qudra Mission to Five Municipalities in South-eastern Turkey, Sevilya Murodova (GIZ), Leyla Sen (UCLG-MEWA), Dr. Günther Taube (GIZ), March 2017

Overseas Development Institute, The gig economy in complex refugee situations Abigail Hunt, Emma Samman, Dina Mansour-Ille and Henrieke Max (Overseas Development Institute / International Rescue Committee), in Forced Migration Review (FMR) 58, June 2018

Particip, EU Regional trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Refugee Crisis, 2nd Result Reporting, June 2018

Particip, Evaluation of Madad-funded Programmes/ Projects for Higher Education, Evaluation Report Final Draft Report, Particip Consortium, November 2018

PKF ProGroup, Promoting Inclusive Local Economic Empowerment and Development to Enhance Resilience and Social Stability Labor Market Research Report Irbid, Zarqa and Mafraq Governorates (Jordan, Save the Children), PKF ProGroup, September 2017

Rand Corporation (ed.), Opportunities for All, Mutually Beneficial Opportunities for Syrian refugees and Host Countries in Middle Eastern Labor Markets, 2018

Research Initiative, INFORMING REFUGEES: COMMUNICATION TO AND FOR SYRIAN REFUGEES IN JORDAN'S HOST COMMUNITIES, REACH, Jordan Report 2017;
<http://www.reach-initiative.org/jordan-how-can-we-better-communicate-with-syrian-refugees-2>

Sphere association, The Sphere Handbook: Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response, the Sphere association, fourth edition, 2018
www.spherestandards.org/handbook

Åge A. Tiltnes et al., The living conditions of Syrian refugees in Jordan



Results from the 2017-2018 survey of Syrian refugees inside and outside camps, Åge A. Tiltnes, Huafeng Zhang and Jon Pedersen, Fafo-report, April 2019
<https://www.fafo.no/index.php/zoo-publikasjoner/fafo-rapporter/item/the-living-conditions-of-syrian-refugees-in-jordan>

UNDP, Arab Human Development Report 2016, Youth and the Prospects for Human Development in a Changing Reality, <http://www.arab-hdr.org/Reports/2016/2016.aspx>

UNDP, Enhancing aid architecture in the regional response to the Syria crisis, Victoria Metcalfe-Hough, Marcus Manuel and Alastair McKechnie, UNDP, February 2016

UNHCR, Children at Work: A Bigger Issue for Boys, 2016.
<http://unhcr.org/FutureOfSyria/children-at-work.htm>

UNDP, Development of evidence-based policy options and frameworks for the accommodation of refugees in countries affected by the Syria crisis, Lebanon Report, UNDP – RDPP Initiative, Draft for consultation, May 2018

UNDP (Draft), UNDP – RDPP Project, Development of evidence-based policy options and frameworks for the accommodation of refugees in countries affected by the Syria crisis, KURDISTAN REGION OF IRAQ COUNTRY CHAPTER, 07/2018

UNDP (Draft), UNDP – RDPP Project Development of evidence-based policy options and frameworks for the accommodation of refugees in countries affected by the Syria crisis, JORDAN COUNTRY CHAPTER, 07/2018

UNHCR, Compendium on Good and Innovative Practices in the Regional Response to the Syrian and Iraq Crisis, Volume II, Regional Joint Secretariat UNHCR & UNDP, November 2017

UNHCR: Update: Durable Solutions for Syrian Refugees, February 2019,
https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria_durable_solutions;
<https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/68209>

UNHCR, Turkey Livelihood Sector, UN Cooperation Turkey, UNHCR, 2017 / 2018

Voluntas, Mid-Term Review of the Regional Development and Protection Programme (RDPP) – Final report, July 2016

Syrian Refugee Response: Vulnerability Assessment of Syrian Refugees 2016, WFP/UNHCR/UNICEF, 2016

World Bank, Systematic Country Diagnosis, (2016) Lebanon Economic Monitor

World Bank, Turkey Economic Monitor, December 2018: Steadying the Ship

World Bank, Global Economic Prospects: Middle East and North Africa, January 2019, <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2019/01/10/global-economic-prospects-middle-east-and-north-africa>

Imprint

This report has been prepared with the financial assistance of the European Union Regional Trust Fund in response to the Syrian Crisis (EUTF). The views expressed herein are those of the consultants and therefore in no way reflect the official opinion of the EUTF.

We would like to thank the EUTF teams in Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey and the Kurdistan Region of Iraq and all stakeholders for support and guidance during the evaluation.

Report drafted by:

Mr Elmar TE WILDT, Key Expert 1, Team Leader

Mr Jalal AL HUSSEINI, Key Expert 2

Mr Yarub AL-SHIRAIDA, Key Expert 3

Mrs Samira KOUJOK, Key Expert 4

A project implemented by a consortium led by Particip, July 2019