



UNHCR
The UN Refugee Agency

CENTRALIZED
ES/2018/11

Evaluation of UNHCR's Livelihoods Strategies and Approaches

ANNEXES
DECEMBER 2018

Conducted by Tango International

TANGO
INTERNATIONAL
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE to NGOs

Annex I: Additional methods description

Qualitative methods

The main qualitative research methods included: (see Annex 4 for tools)

Consulting refugees: FGDs and IDIs, along with direct observation, were conducted with refugees in both camp and urban settings to better understand their livelihood strategies and to better map the outcomes of the UNHCR programme. The total number of FGDs and IDIs collected was determined for each case study depending on timing, schedule, and team capacity. See ‘sampling’ below for more on the sample selection for FGD participants.

FGDs and participatory exercises in refugee communities were used to gather evidence of outcomes and coping strategies around protection, shocks and stresses, food security, perceptions of well-being, employment, and income/savings (and their contribution toward strengthened self-reliance and resilience versus vulnerability trajectories). This method contributed to all KEQs, and particularly to KEQ 1. FGD interviews were not audio-recorded.

Each FGD included no more than 8-10 persons. The FGD participants were livelihood programme beneficiaries (current or from recent activities) and, in most cases, were selected by UNHCR’s IPs. FGDs reflected a range of AGD views reflecting the composition of the livelihoods programming in the specific context, conducted separately for these groups as appropriate, i.e., separate focus groups for men and for women. Arrangements were made in advance confirming refugees’ willingness and availability to participate, meeting at the designated location/date/time. In most cases, the TANGO evaluator served as note-taker while the local translator facilitated the FGD.

Focus group interviews are a time-tested way to obtain a variety of perspectives from people of similar backgrounds, through a conversation around a specific topic that will stimulate group discussion and ideas from the participants. It helps to identify patterns in thinking and behaviour among like groups without requiring agreement or consensus among participants. Focus group techniques were used with refugee groups engaged in livelihood activities sponsored by the programme (and possibly independent of the programme) to get their opinions and experiences with pursuing a livelihood as a refugee. People were asked to analyse their collective situation and present their perspectives. Focus groups captured gender perspectives, and where appropriate intergenerational perspectives to capture changes in attitudes and behaviours.

IDIs with refugees identified as “positive deviants” documented the processes, mechanisms, and conditions that enabled them to succeed in the programme context above and beyond that of their peer beneficiaries (see next paragraph). In some cases, IDIs were selected to represent a more typical story of beneficiaries in the programme. This interview technique followed the life history format of the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) to chart how their perceived livelihood and well-being outcome levels relate to the livelihood programming and other life events or contextual factors.

The “positive deviant” IDI is someone who has been particularly successful in their livelihood/ business development without receiving more resources or programme support to do so than their refugee counterparts: i.e., they have participated in the UNHCR livelihood programme and have stood out or “risen above the rest.” The IDI explored the livelihood and coping strategies, behaviours, social networks, and other factors that have allowed them to succeed in these circumstances. The IDI participants were intentionally selected by UNHCR’s IP to ensure they reflect the “positive deviant” status described above, and if more than one IDI was conducted in the case study, they were selected to reflect the stories of men and women. Arrangements were made in advance confirming their willingness and availability to participate, meeting at the designated location/date/time. Further description of these techniques include:

- **Life History:** This is an adaptation from an ODI tool that maps an individual’s story from birth, highlighting the achievements, challenges, and significant events in that person’s life. It is useful to understand the context in which someone’s life has been lived, and what brought them to their current circumstances. For the purpose of the UNHCR Livelihoods review, the ET adapted the tool to begin the narrative just before the person’s entry into refugee status, mapping out their journey as a refugee with a particular focus on their livelihood activities and its effect on their lives. This tool is useful with individuals who have recently begun livelihood activities as well as those who have been working for some time.
- **Positive Deviance:** is a technique based on learning that, in different contexts, there are certain individuals who have access to the same resources and confront the same challenges as their peers, but are more successful because they have discovered strategies which enable them to find better solutions. These individuals are referred to as “positive deviants” and by investigating their strategies and behaviours the interviewers can uncover innovative solutions that may be of use to others. The technique

can also be used with individuals who have not been successful, to understand better the constraints faced by many participants. This technique is used with individuals.

Direct Observation: Direct and indirect observation by the evaluators enabled the interviewers to observe the context in which the programme and participants operate; learn about activities and events beyond what was discussed in interviews, and reveal activities or events that people have taken for granted and therefore did not mention in interviews—but that can be added as probes in interviews as a result of the observation. Observation opens up new areas of inquiry that help explain context and aid interpretation and analysis of interviews, and help evaluators understand the context as the participants experience it. The observations were informal, conducted by the evaluation team, and included in their interview notes where appropriate.

Consulting key stakeholders and mapping UNHCR's role in livelihoods: Different stakeholders play different roles and hold different perspectives and opinions in any given context; the purpose of key informant interviews (KII) is to capture the views of informed stakeholders on the local context and history, trends, the policy and enabling environment, the challenges and the effects of programme activities. Through in-depth structured and semi-structured KII, and by compiling relevant information on stakeholders from the other research activities, the team developed a mapping of UNHCR's role and strategic position in the operation in relation to the other livelihood actors and contextual factors in the country. Each case country described the livelihood actors in the case report, i.e., who is doing what, how efforts are coordinated, and where reported gaps in programming to meet PoC needs exist.

This method contributed to all KEQs, and particularly to KEQ 3 on the CO's role in livelihoods programming at local and national levels and the extent to which that contributes to outcomes. These interviews included:

- UNHCR CO and Regional staff
- Implementing partners of UNHCR-funded programming
- Government representatives related to refugee livelihood programming (e.g., Ministry of Labour) at local, district and/or national levels
- Private sector employers of refugees, banks or other businesses offering services to PoC
- Non-governmental organizations (NGO)/civil-society organizations working with PoC and/or NGOs working in livelihoods development, e.g., with the host community
- United Nations Country Team (UNDP, FAO, UNICEF, ILO etc.)
- Donors and other development stakeholders: World Bank, USAID, EU, etc.
- Camp managers, as appropriate
- Community leaders and host community members employing/being employed by refugees

Annex 2: Interview Lists and Case Study Reports

HQ Key Informants

Total Number Key Informants: 22	Name	Title	Subheading	Date
	Christine Fu	Sr. Evaluation Officer	Orientation and inception planning	23/07/2018
	Marcel van Maastrigt	Sr. Evaluation Officer	Orientation and inception planning	23/07/2018
	Elizabeth Morrissey	Protection Officer, SGBV, DIP	Protection outcomes in LH programming	23/07/2018
	Laura Madsen	Cash and Protection Advisor, DPSM	Protection outcomes in LH programming	23/07/2018
	Lisa Holmberg	Assoc. Protection Officer, SGBV, DIP	Protection outcomes in LH programming	23/07/2018
	Constanze Quposh	Sr. Protection Officer, Safe from the Start, DIP	Protection outcomes in LH programming	23/07/2018
	Anatoli Poujai	Sr. Resource Manager, Bureau for Europe	Background on Turkey	24/07/2018
	Frederique Famy	Sr. Programme Associate, Bureau for Europe	Background on Turkey	24/07/2018
	Rafael Rdovalho	Programme Associate, Bureau for Europe	Background on Turkey	24/07/2018
	Kleva Riza	Sr. Desk Officer, Bureau for Europe	Background on Turkey	24/07/2018
	Miroslav Medic	Inter-Agency Coordinator, Bureau for Europe	Background on Turkey	24/07/2018
	Ellen Lee	HQ Livelihoods Unit	Turkey inception planning, induction to UNHCR livelihoods programming and the MCCA	24/07/2018 25/07/2018
	Anna Gaunt	Regional Livelihoods Officer	Turkey inception planning	24/07/2018 25/07/2018
	Damla Taskin	Livelihoods Officer	UNHCR Turkey	24/07/2018
	Anjum Zulqarnain Hussain	Sr. Desk Officer	Africa Bureau (Ghana)	25/07/2018
	Angela Woode	Sr. Desk Associate	Africa Bureau (Ghana)	25/07/2018
	Oliver Smith	Sr. Desk Officer for India	Bureau for Asia	25/07/2018
	Felicia Owusu	Sr. Desk Officer	Bureau for Africa (Rwanda)	25/07/2018
	Betsy Lippman	Chief of Section	DRS	25/07/2018
	Andrew Mitchell	Senior Solutions Officer, Social Protection and Resilience Thematic Support	DRS	25/07/2018
	Jedediah Fix	Economist	DRS	25/07/2018
	Ziad Ayoubi	Head of Livelihoods and Economic Inclusion Unit	Phone interview and in-person discussions in Turkey	-

List of persons and institutions consulted during inception meetings in Geneva.

Note: both individual and small group interviews were conducted

E-survey responses and interviews

E-survey Responses Summary:

Total number of responses by country operation¹: 74 / Total number of responses: 102

Afghanistan	1	Jordan	1	Zimbabwe	1
Albania	0	Kenya	3	Total	102
Algeria- Tindouf	1	Liberia	1	Note on data cleaning: Cases that appeared to be false-starts, based on less than 10% of the survey completed, were deleted: i.e., someone began the survey and either didn't continue or continued and finished the survey on a separate device (making it a different case).	
Angola	2	Malawi	1		
Argentina*	1	Malaysia	1		
Armenia	1	Mali	1		
Azerbaijan	1	Mauritania	1		
Bolivia	1	Mexico	1		
Botswana	1	Morocco	2		
Brazil	1	Mozambique	1		
Burkina Faso	1	Namibia	1		
Burundi	1	Nepal	2		
Cameroon	2	Niger	1		
Central African Republic	1	Nigeria	1		
Chad	4	Pakistan	1		
Chile	1	Panama	1		
Colombia	1	Paraguay	1		
Congo	1	Peru	1		
Costa Rica	1	Republic of Korea	1		
Cote d'Ivoire	1	Rwanda	1		
Democratic Republic of the Congo	1	Senegal	1		
Djibouti	2	Somalia	1		
Dominican Republic	1	South Africa	1		
Ecuador	4	South Sudan	1		
Egypt	2	Sudan	2		
Eritrea	1	Syrian Arab Republic	1		
eSwatini	1	Tajikistan	1		
Ethiopia	7	Tanzania	2		
Georgia	1	The Gambia	1		
Ghana	1	Togo	1		
Greece	1	Tunisia	1		
Guinea	1	Turkey	1		
Guinea Bissau	1	Uganda	4		
India	2	Ukraine	1		
Iraq- KRI	2	Uruguay	1		
Islamic Republic of Iran	1	Yemen	2		
Israel	1	Zambia	1		

E-survey Interviews Summary:

Total number of follow-up interviews: 13 countries with 27 UNHCR staff (15 male/12 female)

¹ *Bolivia, Paraguay, Peru, Chile, and Uruguay are covered from the RO in Buenos Aires.

Country ²	Staff contacts (male/female)	Interview date (and representation)
1. Pakistan	1M	29 Oct (representing the full programme)
2. Chad	2M	29 Oct (representing three sub-offices)
3. Cameroon	2F	Separate interviews (both in French): 29 and 30 Oct (representing two sub-offices)
4. Afghanistan	2M	30 Oct (representing the full programme)
5. Ukraine	1M/2F	30 Oct (representing the full programme)
6. Mexico	2M/1F	1 Nov (representing the full programme; includes regional livelihood specialist based in Costa Rica who joined the call)
7. Kenya	2F	2 Nov (representing one sub-office and the urban programme)
8. Malawi	1M/1F	5 Nov (representing the full programme)
9. Uganda	1M	6 Nov (representing one sub-office)
10. Mauritania	1M	6 Nov (representing the full programme)
11. Ecuador	4F	8 Nov (representing full programme and four field offices)
12. Syria	2M	8 Nov (representing the full programme)
13. Niger	2M	9 Nov (representing the full programme and one sub-office)

Case Study Reports

The Case Study reports for [India](#), [Rwanda](#), [Costa-Rica](#), [Ghana](#) and [Turkey](#) are available for download at the Evaluation Service webpage: <https://www.unhcr.org/evaluation-and-research.html>.

² Djibouti and Ethiopia were also invited for interviews, but the interviews were not able to be scheduled in the allotted timeframe.

Annex 3: Evaluation findings on the Minimum Criteria (KEQ 2)

KEQ 2 key findings: Minimum Criteria contribution to outcomes

- Overall, the ET finds the shift to MERS for guidance in cases of implementation to be appropriate.
- The vast majority of UNHCR e-survey respondents view every component of the Minimum Criteria as contributing to their desired livelihood and protection outcomes.
 - Market and value chain analyses, livelihoods strategic plan, livelihoods expertise, and targeting components are the most helpful.
- Many operations appreciated the structure provided by the MC, which improved the design, efficiency, and quality of activities.
- Poor partner capacity is the most commonly reported challenge of implementing the MC, as well as insufficient funding such as to cover the costs of conducting ongoing market assessments; different operational contexts should be considered in how/if standard criteria can be applied.
- Many operations need technical guidance and support for conducting rigorous assessments, monitoring and impact measurement. Baseline, assessment and monitoring activities were considered useful, where available; though the quality and availability of these monitoring activities are often constrained by partner capacity, resources, and the one-year timing.

It should be noted that the recent Global Strategy Concept Note on livelihoods replaces and supersedes the Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming.³ The concept note instructs operations to use the MERS in cases of direct/or UNHCR-funded implementation. The MERS were drawn upon in the development of the Minimum Criteria. The ET finds this decision to replace the MC with MERS appropriate, as the MERS provides an adequate structure and set of standards.

Benefits of implementing the Minimum Criteria

UNHCR first released the Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming⁴ in February 2015 to bring greater accountability and quality assurance in livelihoods programming, but has recognized the need to shift and adapt these guidelines since their initiation. The Minimum Criteria have allowed UNHCR to align its livelihoods interventions with the direction of the wider humanitarian and development community – in particular, as described in the SEEP Network's Minimum Economic Recovery Standards⁵ (Sphere Standards companion); while also working towards UNHCR's Strategic Directions⁶ 2017 - 2021.

The annual Minimum Criteria Compliance Assessment (MCCA) MCCA's consist of assessing operations' fulfilment of the following: context analysis and socio-economic assessment; livelihoods market analysis; sustainable partnerships; context-specific livelihoods strategic plan; expertise; targeting; and monitoring.⁷ The DRS is responsible for monitoring operations' progress towards the Minimum Criteria. There are three main components of data collection in the MCCA, importantly culminating in individual interviews with each operation. Data from all three sources, along with some data

³ UNHCR (2018) Refugee Livelihoods and Economic Inclusion: 2019-2023 Global Strategy Concept Note.

⁴ See: <http://www.unhcr.org/54fd6cbe9.pdf>

⁵ See: <http://www.seepnetwork.org/minimum-economic-recovery-standards-third-edition-resources-1750.php>

⁶ See: <http://www.unhcr.org/5894558d4.pdf>

⁷ The 2015 "criteria" categories were different, including: 1) Baseline Assessment 2) Market Assessment (including Value Chain Analysis) 3) Targeting 4) Context-specific Livelihoods Strategic Plan 5) Partners 6) Expertise 7) Expenditure 8) Micro-finance 9) Impact Measurement.

from *Focus*, are used for the scoring framework. While the Minimum Criteria have been inspired by existing best practices following a market systems approach such as the Minimum Economic Recovery Standards (MERS), and fulfilment of the criteria should result in quality livelihoods programming and greater economic inclusion of persons of concern, this assumption has not been tested by UNHCR.

The vast majority (>84 per cent) of UNHCR global staff who participated in the e-survey view every component of the Minimum Criteria as contributing to the desired livelihood and protection outcomes of the programme (see Table 2, Annex 6). The market and value chain analyses, livelihoods strategic plan, livelihoods expertise, and targeting components are reported as the most helpful. Many operations appreciated the structure provided by the MC, which improved the efficiency and quality of activities, their evidence-based decision making, and the likelihood of making positive impacts (see quote below). The operations report using the MC components, including the baseline and monitoring activities where available, for designing and making adaptations to their programme.

“The guidelines provided in the minimum criteria for livelihood programming have ensured a more structured way in delivering livelihood interventions ensuring optimum use of available resources, key assessments linked to targeting have been crucial in deciding project design amidst key operational resource competing priorities.” ~South Sudan UNHCR Staff

The decentralized evaluation conducted for the Guinea livelihoods programme found that the socio-economic assessments (as required by the MC, previously called ‘baselines’) helped the programme interventions to be appropriate to the needs of the refugees; the assessments were carried out separately for urban and rural-based PoC.⁸

Challenges of implementing the Minimum Criteria

The top challenges in implementing the MC in UNHCR-funded livelihood programmes, according to the e-survey are shown in Box 1. Partner capacity to implement the MC and to use data such as from the baselines and monitoring to inform programming is the most commonly reported challenge (50 per cent). This is followed by insufficient funding to implement the MC such as the costs of conducting ongoing market assessments (49 per cent). See Table 3 in Annex 6 for the full results.

Box 1: Top challenges of implementing Minimum Criteria

- 1. Partner capacity (50%)**
- 2. Cost to implement MC (49%)**
- 3. Data collection challenges (33%)**
- 4. Difficulty establishing non-traditional/or new partnerships (30%)**
- 5. UNHCR staff capacity (25%)**

Source: Evaluation e-survey, October 2018.

Despite the partner mapping process being a key component of the MC, partner selection is a key issue effecting programme efficiency and effectiveness (refer back to Section 3.1.1). Further review is needed of the partner mapping process and the specific steps leading to the selection of partners with poor capacity. One KII with staff explained that partners with low market-based programming capacity are selected because the partners are chosen at the Branch Office level; while the partner capacity may seem good at the branch level, they may not have the local or technical experience in the area the intervention will take place.

Additional constraints in implementing the MC for livelihood programmes include lack of management support (particularly as it relates to the cost of MC implementation with small programme budgets), and generally, the lack of understanding and support from the non-livelihoods staff of UNHCR. And in some cases, such as several

⁸ UNHCR Guinea (2018). Évaluation des interventions de l'UNHCR en matière des moyens de subsistance et d'autosuffisance en République de Guinée de 2012 à 2017. Decentralized evaluation conducted by independent consultant, Seke Kouassi de Syg. October, draft report.

programmes in Latin America managed from Argentina, the MC is difficult to implement because UNHCR has little to no presence on the ground.

Some respondents report the need for more technical guidance from HQ for conducting rigorous assessments, monitoring and impact measurement. Numerous e-survey respondents and follow-up interviews report that the lack of adequate monitoring and impact measurement hinders their ability to make adjustments to improve the programme (see quote below).

“In general, UNHCR is limited in monitoring and evaluation activities, there is a great need to have dedicated staff for this domain.” ~Cameroon UNHCR Staff

E-survey respondents and case study interviews also noted that the operational context should be considered as it relates to a programme’s ability to apply certain MC but not others, with a mechanism in place for such programmes to not be penalized in their MCCA score. For example, in Greece there is very little space for the CO to do targeting as beneficiaries of cash assistance are, in principle, decided by the Greek authorities.

Annex 4: Qualitative tools

FGDs with refugee livelihood program beneficiaries (camp-based)

*Note: this outline may also be used for individual interviews with beneficiaries. This outline is meant to be used as a general interview guide and may be adjusted by the evaluation team as necessary.

Introduction: Interviewers will introduce themselves and explain the purpose of the interview and how the information will be used. The interviewers will inform the participants that their participation is strictly **voluntary**, that all information discussed is **confidential**, and that people will not be individually identified in the reporting of findings. Verbal consent must be gained.

General Introduction

1. How long have you been living in this camp?
2. What is satisfactory about living in this refugee camp? (e.g., probe for provision of basic needs and services, infrastructure such as electricity, education for children, safety, etc.) What is not satisfactory?
 - a. Are there some people who fare better/worse?

Programme Outcomes, Income, and Assets (also includes protection risks within the camp)

1. Please describe all income earning opportunities: Within the camp v. outside of the camp
 - a. What do most people like you do to earn some money in this camp?
2. Are refugees restricted in the work they can do? Where they can go to work/access markets? [Note: this helps us understand awareness of the enabling legal environment]
 - a. Has UNHCR helped to support policies and permits that help refugees have jobs/ livelihoods? (advocacy)
3. Have you participated in any UNHCR-funded [or INSERT PARTNER NAME] livelihoods programmes? [Note: If non-beneficiaries are present, ask them to wait aside in order to talk with them in a separate FGD/KII]
 - a. What types of activities have you participated in? [e.g., job placement, business grants, trainings]
 - b. Length of participation?
 - c. How are participants selected to participate in the programme? Are the right people included? Anyone excluded?
 - d. In what ways have UNHCR-funded livelihoods programmes affected you or other participants?
 - i. Kinds of education, skills and employment experience that refugees have? Before/after UNHCR-funded livelihoods programmes [Note: this is human capital]
 - ii. Have you been able to apply trainings to earn some income? Types of employment engaged in pre- and post-intervention(s) (Probe for how the IGAs have diversified).
 - iii. Length of time over the past 12 months employed part/full time? (Probe: stable?)
 - iv. Did income increase/decrease/stay the same for participants? (Probe: stable?)
 1. What do you use this income for? (Probe: Are you able to meet household needs regarding health, education, food and other essentials? Is it used for savings? Ask men and women separately if possible)
 - v. What do you purchase/invest in for your business/work? (Probe for proportions/amount)
 - vi. Have you been able to acquire more assets/tools for your livelihood as a result of being in the programme? Acquired household assets? (Such as what?)
 - vii. Have you been able to access financial services? (e.g., bank account, credit, etc.) If yes, what do you use it for? (Probe: debt? E.g., is cash assistance being used as collateral for loans, and if so, was that practice also done with in-kind assistance? For livelihood?) If no, why not?
 - viii. Has anything else changed due to your participation in the programme—changes in how you, your family situation or relatives back home? (Probe on unintended effects or additional outcomes, sending remittances to family/friends, protection issues, etc.)
 - e. What has worked well in the programme? What would have made it more helpful? (Note: this is to get at whether the interventions are market-oriented, aligned with government initiatives, relevant to the profiles of the target population, etc.)
4. Are there new opportunities for earning income that people could develop?

5. Any obstacles, risks that prevent you from engaging in any IGAs?
 - a. What do people do when they encounter those obstacles? (Probe on risky behaviour, protection outcomes related to harassment, exploitation, SGBV, child protection issues, etc.). How do they get help/who do they turn to for assistance?
6. Do you feel that your participation in this programme has prepared you for X (country-specific durable solution)? Why or why not?

Shock Experiences and Responses (including preparedness)

1. What are the main shocks refugees in this camp have experienced over the last 5 years? (Probe for idiosyncratic protection risks as well as natural hazards or economic shocks and their downstream effects, i.e., how droughts or floods affected other aspects of their lives or other household members, e.g., crops, income, livestock, child health, prices of household items, etc. [Note: facilitator will collect full listing of brainstormed shocks and then limit listing of shocks to top 3])
 - a. How have the X [TOP 3] shocks/stresses affected refugee households?
2. If refugee households experienced X [TOP 3] shocks/stresses (e.g., illness of household head, assault, drought, loss of income):
 - a. How did they cope? (both positive and negative) [Note: list possible coping strategy prompts]
 - (Forward) migration (out of country or to a city) – temporary for work; permanent
 - Livelihood diversification – multiple income sources, vulnerable to different types of risks
 - Took up informal wage labour (is it safe?)
 - Sold productive assets (e.g., chickens, livestock, sewing machine, household items)
 - Ate less/ate lower quality food
 - Used money from savings
 - Borrowed money; from whom?
 - Got help from family/friends
 - Got help from the gov't/NGO
 - Got help from informal safety net such as community group or savings group
 - Took children out of school (to save money; so they can work)
 - Other: (early marriage, illicit work- probe especially for youth)
 - b. Coping better/worse/same as before UNHCR programme?
3. Are some households better able to deal with/recover from these shocks? Why/why not? (Probe for differences they perceive to help some recover better than others, e.g., between male- and female-headed households; those with certain assets or income sources; etc.)
4. Are you aware of any shock preparedness plans to support households or the community to deal with shocks?

Transition to wealth ranking IF TIME (use piling exercise as appropriate): participants determine and describe the three wealth categories of participants

Social Capital and Relations with Host or Nearby Community

1. How do people here help each other deal with/recover from these shocks? If not, why not? If yes: why do people help each other; what is most effective at helping people?
 - a. Sharing resources (e.g., food, money, labour, information, etc.)
 - b. Remittances from relatives/friends living elsewhere (differentiate regular remittances from those provided only during shock times)
2. Describe the relationship with the host or neighbouring community.
 - a. Social relations, economic relations
 - b. Have relations remained smooth or not so smooth? Why or why not? Probe on any protection related issues—harassment, exploitation, discrimination, SGBV cases, conflict over natural resources.
 - c. If refugees needed help from the community outside the camp, are there people/groups that have provided assistance? What if community members asked for help from refugees?

FGD Summary (aspirations and confidence to adapt)

1. Please talk about your long-term goals.

- a. What does “self-reliance” in this context mean to you? What are the best ways to achieve self-reliance? (i.e., Are there other longer-term initiatives or interventions that would help you become self-reliant?) Please describe.
 - b. Probe: Do some feel that it’s out of their hands (i.e., there is really nothing they can do; it’s in God’s hands) or are they confident about the future, motivated to adapt?
2. Any final recommendations for refugee economic engagement with your community? What more is possible and desirable? How can UNHCR/partner help with this?

FGDs with refugee livelihood program beneficiaries (urban-based)

*Note: this outline may also be used for individual interviews with beneficiaries. This outline is meant to be used as a general interview guide and may be adjusted by the evaluation team as necessary.

Introduction: Interviewers will introduce themselves and explain the purpose of the interview and how the information will be used. The interviewers will inform the participants that their participation is strictly **voluntary**, that all information discussed is **confidential**, and that people will not be individually identified in the reporting of findings. Verbal consent must be gained.

General Introduction

1. How long have you been living in this X urban area?
2. What is satisfactory about living in this city/town? (e.g, probe for access to basic services by govt or NGOs, infrastructure such as electricity, education for children, safety, etc.) What is not satisfactory?
 - a. Are there some people who fare better/worse?

Programme Outcomes, Income and Assets (also includes protection risks within the urban area)

1. Major livelihood strategies of refugees in urban areas
 - a. Major sources of income for refugees in urban areas
 - b. Any major changes in last 5 years?
 - c. What kinds of changes? Why the changes?
2. Are refugees restricted in the work they can do? Where they can go to work/access markets? [Note: this helps us understand awareness of the enabling legal environment]
 - a. Has UNHCR helped to support policies and permits that help refugees have jobs/ livelihoods? (advocacy)
3. Have you participated in any UNHCR-funded [or INSERT PARTNER NAME] livelihoods programmes? [Note: If non-beneficiaries are present, ask them to wait aside in order to talk with them in a separate FGD/KII]
 - a. What types of activities have you participated in? [e.g., job placement, business grants, trainings]
 - b. Length of participation?
 - c. How are participants selected to participate in the programme? Are the right people included? Anyone excluded?
 - d. In what ways have UNHCR-funded livelihoods programmes affected you or other participants?
 - i. Kinds of education, skills and employment experience that refugees have? Before/after UNHCR-funded livelihoods programmes [Note: this is human capital]
 - ii. Have you been able to apply trainings to earn some income? Types of employment engaged in pre- and post-intervention(s) (Probe for how the IGAs have diversified).
 - iii. Length of time over the past 12 months employed part/full time? (Probe: stable?)
 - iv. Did income increase/decrease/stay the same for participants? (Probe: stable?)
 1. What do you use this income for? (Probe: Are you able to meet household needs regarding health, education, food and other essentials? Is it used for savings? Ask men and women separately if possible)
 - v. What do you purchase/invest in for your business/work? (Probe for proportions/amount)
 - vi. Have you been able to acquire more assets/tools for your livelihood as a result of being in the programme? Acquired household assets? (Such as what?)
 - vii. Have you been able to access financial services? (e.g., bank account, credit, etc.) If yes, what do you use it for (Probe: debt? Used for livelihood?) If no, why not?
 - viii. Has anything else changed due to your participation in the programme—changes in how you, your family situation or relatives back home? (Probe on unintended effects or additional outcomes, sending remittances to family/friends, protection issues, etc.)
 - e. What has worked well in the programme? What would have made it more helpful? (Note: this is to get at whether the interventions are market-oriented, aligned with government initiatives, relevant to the profiles of the target population, etc.)
4. Are there new opportunities for earning income that people could develop?

5. Any obstacles, risks that prevent you from engaging in any IGAs?
 - a. What do people do when they encounter those obstacles? (Probe on risky behaviour, protection outcomes related to harassment, exploitation, SGBV, child protection issues, etc.). How do they get help/who do they turn to for assistance?
6. Do you feel that your participation in this programme has prepared you for X (country-specific durable solution)? Why or why not?

Shock Experiences and Responses (including preparedness)

1. What are the main shocks refugees in this area have experienced over the last 5 years? (Probe for idiosyncratic protection risks as well as natural hazards or economic shocks and their downstream effects, i.e., how droughts or floods affected other aspects of their lives or other household members, e.g., crops, income, livestock, child health, prices of household items, etc. [Note: facilitator will collect full listing of brainstormed shocks and then limit listing of shocks to top 3])
 - a. How have the X [TOP 3] shocks/stresses affected refugee households?
2. If refugee households experienced X [TOP 3] shocks/stresses (e.g., illness of household head, assault, drought, loss of income):
 - a. How did they cope? (both positive and negative) [Note: list possible coping strategy prompts]
 - (Forward) migration (out of country or to a city) – temporary for work; permanent
 - Livelihood diversification – multiple income sources, vulnerable to different types of risks
 - Took up informal wage labour (is it safe?)
 - Sold productive assets (e.g., chickens, livestock, sewing machine, household items)
 - Ate less/ate lower quality food
 - Used money from savings
 - Borrowed money; from whom?
 - Got help from family/friends
 - Got help from the gov't/NGO
 - Got help from informal safety net such as community group or savings group
 - Took children out of school (to save money; so they can work)
 - Other: (early marriage, illicit work- probe especially for youth)
 - b. Coping better/worse/same as before UNHCR programme?
3. Are some households better able to deal with/recover from these shocks? Why/why not? (Probe for differences they perceive to help some recover better than others, e.g., between male- and female-headed households; those with certain assets or income sources; etc.)
4. Are you aware of any shock preparedness plans to support households or the community to deal with shocks?

Transition to wealth ranking (use piling exercise as appropriate): participants determine and describe the three wealth categories of participants

Social Capital and Relations with Host or Nearby Community

1. How do people here help each other deal with/recover from these shocks? If not, why not? If yes: why do people help each other; what is most effective at helping people?
 - a. Sharing resources (e.g., food, money, labour, information, etc.)
 - b. Remittances from relatives/friends living elsewhere (differentiate regular remittances from those provided only during shock times)
2. Describe the relationship with the host or neighbouring urban community.
 - a. Social relations, economic relations- How integrated do you feel with the host community? (Can consensus on this be gained in the FGD? Yes, Some, Not at all)
 - b. Have relations remained smooth or not so smooth? Why or why not? Probe on any protection related issues—harassment, exploitation, discrimination, SGBV cases, conflict over natural resources, etc.
3. If refugees needed help from the community in the area (not other refugee households), are there people/groups that have provided assistance? What if local community members asked for help from refugees?
4. Are there specific economic enterprises or other activities promoting development that bring together refugees and host communities? Does economic cooperation benefit the refugee or host community more? Explain.

FGD Summary (including aspirations and confidence to adapt)

1. Please talk about your long-term goals.
 - a. What does “self-reliance” in this context mean to you? What are the best ways to achieve self-reliance? (i.e., Are there other longer-term initiatives or interventions that would help you become self-reliant?) Please describe.
 - b. Probe: Do some feel that it’s out of their hands (i.e., there is really nothing they can do; it’s in God’s hands) or are they confident about the future, motivated to adapt?
2. Any final recommendations for refugee economic engagement with your community? What more is possible and desirable? How can UNHCR/partner help with this?

Kills with government representatives

*Note: This outline is meant to be used as a general interview guide and may be adjusted by the evaluation team as necessary.

Introduction: Interviewers will introduce themselves and explain the purpose of the interview and how the information will be used. The interviewers will inform the participants that their participation is strictly **voluntary**, that all information discussed is **confidential**, and that people will not be individually identified in the reporting of findings. Verbal consent must be gained.

Impact of key national policies

1. Key national policies relating to refugee livelihoods and wellbeing?
2. Describe & discuss recent changes to government policy
 - a. How have policies been implemented on the ground
3. Are policies contributing to livelihood durable solutions?
 - a. Discuss implications of policy changes on refugee livelihoods

Livelihoods

1. Types of livelihood strategy refugees can realistically pursue
 - a. Discuss by different refugee region
2. Is land available for refugee use?
 - a. Where and how much land?
 - b. Have refugees taken advantage of this?
 - c. Where and to what extent? (e.g., Is land available for large livestock/can refugees own livestock?)
3. Industrial parks involving refugees?
 - a. Where and to what extent?
4. Can refugees access financial services?
 - a. Where and to what extent?
 - b. Other kinds of services that allow refugees to pursue IGAs or agricultural opportunities
5. Potential livelihood opportunities for male and female refugees
 - a. Disaggregate discussion by (1) sex; (2) refugee region
6. To what extent are UNHCR-funded livelihood operations effective in reducing protection risks and improving employment, income and/or savings of targeted persons
 - a. What factors that contribute/hinder progress? Examples to probe for:
 - i. Legal and policy environment and enforcement
 - ii. Partner capacity and coordination
 - iii. Environmental factors (e.g., access to natural resources, climate change, natural disaster)
 - iv. Changes in humanitarian and sectoral responses (e.g., food rations, funding cuts)
 - v. Changes in population and movement of refugees and other persons of concern in host community
 - vi. Changes in the market/economy/labour market
 - vii. Access to cash/social protection
 - viii. Access to value chains
 - ix. Relationship between refugees and host community
 - x. Other
7. What are some successes in UNHCR's approach to livelihoods programming? Challenges?
 - a. successes /challenges as a result of implementing the Minimum Criteria?

UNHCR & Partner Collaboration & Coordination

1. Who are the primary partners you work closely with? Who are secondary partners? Are there any new partnerships you're planning to create, why? **Mapping the ecology of this system**—UNHCR's role and influence.
2. How do UNHCR and other actors work together to promote coherence and synergy? To what extent do you think this is working or is there duplication/parallel systems for some reason? Why/why not?
 - a. How do the roles of government, other UN agencies, INGOs, private sector form and what influences these relationships?
 - b. What are some limitations?
 - c. What more can be done? particularly in terms of promoting livelihoods, protection and long-term durable solutions
3. Where UNHCR takes on more of a convening/ facilitating role and less of an implementing role, what are some best practices? [IF APPLICABLE]
 - a. To what extent does UNHCR play this type of role here? What do you think influences the role UNHCR plays?
 - b. What factors contribute to how well (or not) UNHCR acts as convener?
4. Lessons learned and recommendations to update the livelihoods strategy concerning the types of roles UNHCR should play under what conditions

Long-Term Solutions and Self-Reliance

1. Discuss the most effective programming strategies to promote long-term/durable solutions and how livelihoods relate to that.
2. Describe important initiatives in promoting long-term solutions related to livelihoods?
 - a. Which agencies have been most prominent & most innovative in promoting durable solutions, including refugee livelihoods activities?
3. How can refugees achieve self-reliance within this context? Does this vary among refugees—due to gender, age, diversity?
 - a. How have UNHCR programming strategies promoted this goal?
 - b. How have the strategies inhibited this goal? External factors?
 - c. Is the goal obtainable? For whom? Why/why not?
4. What changes would you like to see in UNHCR programming strategies, how its partners work and how UNHCR functions as a refugee protection agency vis-à-vis livelihoods strategy for refugees inside and outside the camps/urban communities?

FGDs/or KII with host community leaders, host community market vendors, or community members/groups

*Note: This outline is meant to be used as a general interview guide and may be adjusted by the evaluation team as necessary.

Introduction: Interviewers will introduce themselves and explain the purpose of the interview and how the information will be used. The interviewers will inform the participants that their participation is strictly **voluntary**, that all information discussed is **confidential**, and that people will not be individually identified in the reporting of findings. Verbal consent must be gained.

General Introduction and Context

1. How long have you lived in this X community/urban area?
2. What is positive or satisfactory about living in this community/town? (e.g., probe for access to basic services, infrastructure, education, safety, etc.) What is not satisfactory?
3. What are the main shocks households in this area have experienced over the last 5 years?
(Probe for idiosyncratic protection risks as well as natural hazards or economic shocks and their downstream effects, i.e., how droughts or floods affected other aspects of their lives or other household members, e.g., crops, income, livestock, child health, prices of household items, etc. [Note: facilitator will collect full listing of brainstormed shocks and then limit listing of shocks to top 3])
 - a. How have the X [TOP 3] shocks/stresses affected households in this community?
 - b. Do community members and refugees help each other during times of stress? How?

Livelihoods and Relations with Refugees

1. What are the main livelihoods for people in this area? (Probe for differences among different groups)
 - a. How have your livelihood activities changed in the last five years? What changes do you expect to see in the next five years?
 - b. Do you expect your future activities to diminish, stay about the same, or grow?
 - c. What opportunities or constraints do you have in expanding your livelihood activities? How are you addressing these?
2. Please describe how refugees have been employed in your community.
 - a. What is working well in terms of working with refugees? Why?
 - b. What is not working well? Why? (Probe for protection issues)
3. Before refugees began working in this community, who did these activities? How did that shift take place?
 - a. What differences are there relative to working with refugees or these other people in terms of wage rates, work production, work quality, working period, or anything else?
4. How do refugees affect local markets? (e.g., prices, supply of goods, providing cheap labour, competition with local sellers, etc.)
 - a. Is the effect positive or negative?
5. Is there competition for resources between refugees and your community?
 - a. What kinds of competition for resources?
 - b. What problems does this cause? How is conflict handled?
 - c. Is land use affected? Other natural resources? How has this been handled?
 - d. Can refugees practice agriculture? To what extent?
6. What do you think the long-term solutions are for self-reliance of refugees living in/near your community?
7. What do you think the opportunities are for economic development in this community?

KIIs with implementing partners, other programme stakeholders (donors)

*Note: This outline is meant to be used as a general interview guide and may be adjusted by the evaluation team as necessary.

Introduction: Interviewers will introduce themselves and explain the purpose of the interview and how the information will be used. The interviewers will inform the participants that their participation is strictly **voluntary**, that all information

discussed is **confidential**, and that people will not be individually identified in the reporting of findings. Verbal consent must be gained.

NGO/other implementing partner refugee livelihood programme

1. Please describe your programme
2. Goals of your programme
3. How do you work or collaborate, if at all, with UNHCR?
 - a. What portion of livelihoods programming is funded by UNHCR?
 - b. To what extent does UNHCR support your work in other ways than financially?
4. Any livelihoods programming?
 - a. To what extent? Types of activities?
 - b. Potential for other livelihood programming
5. To what extent does your work involve refugees, asylum-seekers, stateless persons and/or IDPs?
 - a. What influences the extent to which you engage with such persons?
 - b. Do you receive any financial support from donors for working with these population groups?

Impact of key policies

1. Key policies relating to refugee livelihoods and wellbeing?
2. Describe & discuss any recent changes to government policy
 - a. How have policies been implemented on the ground
3. Are the policies helping or hindering refugee livelihood durable solutions? Discuss.
4. What is your organisation's role in advocacy for refugee protections and policies that promote refugee economic and social inclusion? What is UNHCR's role in that kind of advocacy? Any outcomes from this advocacy work?

Livelihoods programming in the refugee camps/or urban areas

1. Please describe the extent of livelihoods programming that is occurring writ large in camps/or urban areas, and what your organisation is doing in particular
 - a. Changes in the past 5 years and reason for changes
 - b. Ag / non-agricultural activities, other types of livelihoods activities (microenterprises, livestock, artisanal work, casual labour work, working for NGOs, etc.
 - c. What has worked well? Why?
 - d. What not so well? Why?
2. Goals of your programme—for refugees and other persons of concern; host communities?
3. IF programme is UNHCR funded:
 - a. Who can participate in the programme? What criteria are set and how?
 - i. To what extent are age, sex and diversity considered?
 - ii. To what extent are socio-economic data considered? (poverty, household composition, household head characteristics, etc.)
 - b. What have been the key livelihoods outcomes of the programme? [Probe for livelihoods-related outcomes and their indirect effect on other household members, probe for outcomes other than income or employment, and for unintended outcomes]
 - c. Progress toward UNHCR protection outcomes? How do you think the livelihoods programme is contributing to better protection outcomes, if at all?
 - i. Safety and dignity: improving protection while minimizing unintended negative effects of UNHCR-funded interventions, considering age, gender and diversity (AGD)
 - ii. Meaningful access to assistance and services, considering AGD
 - iii. Participation and empowerment: supporting self-protection capacities and assisting persons of concern (PoC) in accessing rights and enabling them to meaningfully participate in decisions that affect their lives

- iv. Any unintended outcomes (positive/negative) and the organisation's response (if adverse) (e.g., cash assistance used as collateral for loans with traders at high interest, and if so, was that practice also done with in-kind assistance?)
- 4. Potential for other livelihood programming
 - a. Potential for women/men, elderly, disabled
 - b. Refugee skills/experience found in the camps
- 5. Differentiate by region/camp?
 - a. Difficulties & successes in working with host communities or nearby urban/peri-urban areas
- 6. What more is needed to implement an effective refugee livelihoods strategy?

Minimum Criteria (asked to implementing partners)

- 1. Are you familiar with the Minimum Criteria standards for UNHCR livelihoods programming? [IF NO, skip to next section]
 - a. Any successes /challenges as a result of implementing the Minimum Criteria?
- 2. To what extent are intervention design(s) informed by the Socio-Economic and Context Analysis, Livelihoods Market Analysis, Partnership mapping, Targeting criteria and Context-specific Livelihoods Strategic Plan?
 - a. What other types of guidance (apart from the MC) have been used for programme design?
- 3. How are findings from baseline and endline data integrated in programme implementation?
 - a. E.g., to what extent is wage or self-employment data monitored and integrated into livelihoods activities?
- 4. Are you/your organisation aware of the monitoring approach established by the Minimum Criteria? Is the monitoring approach clear?

UNHCR & Partner Collaboration & Coordination

- 1. Who are the primary partners you work closely with? Who are secondary partners? Are there any new partnerships you're planning to create, why? Are any programmes multi-year? (Note: this can/should include partnerships related to refugee livelihoods without UNHCR funds) **Mapping the ecology of this system—** UNHCR's role and influence.
- 2. How do you, together with UNHCR and other actors work together to promote coherence and synergy? To what extent do you think this is working or is there duplication/parallel systems for some reason? Why/why not?
 - a. How do the roles of government, other UN agencies, INGOs, private sector form and what influences these relationships?
 - b. What are some limitations?
 - c. What more can be done? particularly in terms of promoting livelihoods, protection and long-term durable solutions
- 3. Where UNHCR takes on more of a convening/ facilitating role and less of an implementing role, what are some best practices?
 - a. To what extent does UNHCR play this type of role here? What do you think influences the role UNHCR plays?
 - b. What factors contribute to how well (or not) UNHCR acts as convener?
- 4. Lessons learned and recommendations to update the livelihoods strategy concerning the types of roles UNHCR should play under what conditions

Other Long-Term Solutions, and building self-reliance and resilience

- 1. What are the most effective programming strategies to promote long-term/durable solutions and how livelihoods relate to that? How does the programme measure whether targeted persons of concern have improved capacities and feel equipped to return home/resettle or locally integrate?
- 2. How can refugees achieve self-sufficiency within the refugee or host environment?
 - a. How have UNHCR programming strategies promoted or inhibited this goal? What other factors promote or inhibit this goal?

3. When you think about the refugee profiles of your programme, why are some refugees able to bounce back from national/social/economic shocks better than others? What sets them apart to be able to maintain their livelihoods and well-being when facing shocks/risks compared to others? (Probe for things like savings and assets as well as social capital/social supports, livelihoods diversified across potential risk areas, access to emergency safety nets, etc.)

Kills with private sector/business/banks engaging refugees

*Note: This outline is meant to be used as a general interview guide and may be adjusted by the evaluation team as necessary.

Introduction: Interviewers will introduce themselves and explain the purpose of the interview and how the information will be used. The interviewers will inform the participants that their participation is strictly **voluntary**, that all information discussed is **confidential**, and that people will not be individually identified in the reporting of findings. Verbal consent must be gained.

General Information

1. Please describe your industry/business: years in existence, size, etc.
2. What have been the factors affecting the success or growth of your business in the past 5 years?

Engaging with Refugee Livelihoods

1. Please describe how you have employed refugees.
 - a. What is working well in terms of working with refugees? Why?
 - b. What is not working well? Why? (Probe for protection issues)
 - c. How long have you been engaging refugees in employment? (Is this different from how long you've engaged with UNHCR's livelihood programme?)
2. Before you began working with refugees, who did you engage in these jobs? Why did you choose to work with refugees rather than continuing with other people?
 - a. What differences are there relative to working with refugees or these other people in terms of wage rates, work production, work quality, working period, or anything else?
3. What skills do refugees bring to your industry/business?
 - a. And what skills or experience do refugees need more of?
4. How do refugees affect the local job employment market?
 - a. Is the effect positive or negative?
5. [If a UNHCR private sector partner] How did you learn about the programme? How did you get involved?
 - a. Did you make any changes to your business or processes because of the programme? [Probe for protection related processes or trainings for the partner such as on GBV or worker safety, new processes for recruitment/hiring of refugees or hiring of women, new/expanded assets or infrastructure to accommodate the employees, etc.]
 - b. Who can participate in the programme? What criteria are set and how?
 - i. To what extent are age, sex and diversity considered?
 - ii. To what extent are socio-economic data considered? (poverty, household composition, household head characteristics, etc.)
 - c. What has worked well for your business in participating as a private sector partner in the programme?
 - d. What have been the main challenges?
 - e. What recommendations do you have for UNHCR to improve the livelihoods programme for refugees?
6. What positive impacts have you seen for refugees that have been employed in your industry/business?
7. Any negative or unintended effects *for refugees* participating in the employment/business programme you have observed/faced? (and did they try to respond/address this issue?)
8. Potential for other livelihood programming for refugees, such as in other industries?
 - a. Potential for women/men, elderly, disabled

Impact of key policies

1. Key policies relating to refugee livelihoods and wellbeing? (Work permits, mobility restrictions, quotas)
 - a. If there are quotas limited refugees in certain sectors, how is seen by business? Are quotas exceeded?
2. Describe & discuss any recent changes to government policy
 - a. How have policies been implemented on the ground
 - b. How have changing economic conditions impacted policies

3. Are the policies helping or hindering refugee livelihood durable solutions? Discuss.

UNHCR & Partner Collaboration & Coordination [If relevant for this private sector partner]

1. Who are the primary partners you work closely with? Who are secondary partners? Are there any new partnerships you're planning to create, why? **Mapping the ecology of this system**—UNHCR's role and influence.
2. How do you, together with UNHCR and other actors work together to promote coherence and synergy? To what extent do you think this is working or is there duplication/parallel systems for some reason? Why/why not?
 - a. How do the roles of government, other UN agencies, INGOs, private sector form and what influences these relationships?
 - b. What are some limitations?
 - c. What more can be done? particularly in terms of promoting livelihoods, protection and long-term durable solutions
3. Where UNHCR takes on more of a convening/ facilitating role and less of an implementing role, what are some best practices?
 - a. To what extent does UNHCR play this type of role here? What do you think influences the role UNHCR plays?
 - b. What factors contribute to how well (or not) UNHCR acts as convener?
4. Lessons learned and recommendations to update the livelihoods strategy concerning the types of roles UNHCR should play under what conditions

Other Long-Term Solutions, and building self-reliance and resilience

1. When you think about the refugee profiles of your employment programme, why are some refugees able to maintain their employment or livelihood sources when faced with shocks or stressors better than others? I.e., What sets them apart to be able to maintain their livelihoods and well-being when facing shocks/risks compared to others? (Probe for things like savings and assets as well as social capital/social supports, livelihoods diversified across potential risk areas, access to emergency safety nets, etc.)
2. What do you think the long-term solutions are for self-reliance of refugees living in/near your community?
3. What do you think the opportunities are for economic development in this community?

KIIs with UNHCR Country Office, RO, and Technical staff

*Note: This outline is meant to be used as a general interview guide and may be adjusted by the evaluation team as necessary.

Introduction: Interviewers will introduce themselves and explain the purpose of the interview and how the information will be used. The interviewers will inform the participants that their participation is strictly **voluntary**, that all information discussed is **confidential**, and that people will not be individually identified in the reporting of findings. Verbal consent must be gained.

Impact of key government policies and economic/shocks context

1. Key national policies relating to refugee livelihoods and wellbeing?
2. Describe & discuss recent changes to government policy
 - a. How have policies been implemented on the ground?
 - b. Difference by refugee region and setting
3. Are the policies helping or hindering refugee livelihoods programming? Discuss
 - a. Are there local/municipal policies/practices that provide more flexibility for refugees to work?
4. What is UNHCR's official relationship with the government and how has that changed, if at all, over time?
 - a. What is UNHCR's role in advocacy for refugee protections and policies that promote refugee economic and social inclusion? Any outcomes from this advocacy work?
5. How has the economic situation in the country affected inclusion of refugees into the workforce?
 - a. How have changes in the economy been considered in the livelihoods programme design?
6. We want to better understand the contextual risks of the areas where refugees reside in this country: What natural hazards have refugees faced in the past five years? What social, political, or economic shocks have refugees faced (e.g., violence after elections in the area, inflation, etc.)?

Livelihoods Programming

1. Please describe the extent of UNHCR livelihoods programming
 - a. Changes in the past 5 years and reasons for changes
 - b. Ag / non-agricultural activities, other areas
 - c. What interventions have worked well? Why? Probe for factors within the control of UNHCR/partner versus those external to the program
 - d. What have been the major constraints/challenges? Why? Probe for factors within the control of UNHCR/partner versus those external to the program
 - i. Challenges/gaps to implementing the strategy
 - ii. Recommendations on how UNHCR can address these challenges
2. What have been the key livelihoods outcomes of the programme? [Probe for livelihoods-related outcomes and their indirect effect on other household members, probe for outcomes other than income or employment, and for unintended outcomes]
3. Progress toward UNHCR protection outcomes? How do you think the livelihoods programme is contributing to better protection outcomes, if at all?
 - a. Safety and dignity: improving protection while minimizing unintended negative effects of UNHCR-funded interventions, considering age, gender and diversity (AGD)
 - b. Meaningful access to assistance and services, considering AGD
 - c. Participation and empowerment: supporting self-protection capacities and assisting persons of concern (PoC) in accessing rights and enabling them to meaningfully participate in decisions that affect their lives
 - d. Any unintended outcomes (positive/negative) and programme response in cases of adverse outcomes (e.g., cash assistance used as collateral for loans with traders at high interest; and if so, was that practice also done with in-kind assistance?)
4. Potential for other livelihood programming and/or interlinkages with other existing initiatives that other agencies/NGOs/government are implementing?

- a. considering age, gender and diversity
 - b. refugee skills/experience
 - c. private sector opportunities
- 5. Difficulties & successes in working with host communities or nearby urban/peri-urban areas?
- 6. Does CO have a dedicated livelihoods expert in-country? value-added?
- 7. Major constraints or achievements in applying market or value chain analyses to the programme? (Probe for private sector engagement- important to understand how UNHCR has implemented market-based and demand-driven activities.)
- 8. What can/should UNHCR do so that it can help improve livelihoods and protection outcomes for persons of concern at scale and for those who are most vulnerable and in need of greater assistance? Inputs/resources/ or expertise needed to expand livelihood programming? More sustainable? (Note: These two groups are important to capture—the majority and the minority who are more vulnerable and at-risk.)

Minimum Criteria

- 1. What are the benefits/challenges of introducing the Minimum Criteria on UNHCR-funded livelihoods programming?
- 2. To what extent are intervention design(s) informed by the Socio-Economic and Context Analysis, Livelihoods Market Analysis, Partnership mapping, Targeting criteria and Context-specific Livelihoods Strategic Plan?
 - a. Any of these criteria more helpful to programme success than others?
 - b. What other types of guidance (apart from the MC) have been used for programme design?
- 3. What process is used to select and monitor partners?
- 4. How are finding from baseline and endline data integrated in programme implementation?
 - a. E.g., to what extent is wage or self-employment data monitored and integrated into livelihoods activities?

UNHCR & Partner Collaboration & Coordination

- 1. Who are the primary partners you work closely with? Who are secondary partners? Are there any new partnerships you're planning to create, why? **Mapping the ecology of this system**—UNHCR's role and influence.
- 2. How do UNHCR and other actors work together to promote coherence and synergy? To what extent do you think this is working or is there duplication/parallel systems for some reason? Why/why not?
 - a. How do the roles of government, other UN agencies, INGOs, private sector form and what influences these relationships?
 - b. What are some limitations?
 - c. What more can be done? particularly in terms of promoting livelihoods, protection and long-term durable solutions
- 3. Where UNHCR takes on more of a convening/ facilitating role and less of an implementing role, what are some best practices?
 - a. To what extent does UNHCR play this type of role here? What do you think influences the role UNHCR plays?
 - b. What factors contribute to how well (or not) UNHCR acts as convener?
- 4. Lessons learned and recommendations to update the livelihoods strategy concerning the types of roles UNHCR should play under what conditions

Other Long-Term Solutions, and building self-reliance and resilience

- 1. What are the most effective programming strategies to promote long-term/durable solutions and how livelihoods relate to that?
- 2. How does the programme measure whether targeted persons of concern have improved resilience capacities and feel equipped to return home/resettle or locally integrate?
- 3. How can refugees achieve self-sufficiency within the refugee or host environment?

- a. How have UNHCR programming strategies promoted or inhibited this goal? What other factors promote or inhibit this goal?
4. When you think about the refugee profiles of your programme, why are some refugees able to bounce back from national/social/economic shocks better than others? What sets them apart to be able to maintain their livelihoods and well-being when facing shocks/risks compared to others? (Probe for things like savings and assets as well as social capital/social supports, livelihoods diversified across potential risk areas, access to emergency safety nets, etc.)

Annex 5: Quantitative (e-survey) tool

The e-survey tool is copied here from SurveyMonkey; hence, the format of text boxes are not always lined up perfectly.

This survey is part of a centralised evaluation being undertaken for UNHCR by TANGO International, an independent evaluation firm. The purpose of the evaluation is to contribute strategic and timely evidence that will inform and influence organisational strategy and practice within and external to UNHCR. We are sending this survey to UNHCR livelihoods focal points in country operations. The survey intends to:

- capture each operation's opinions on the achievements and challenges pertaining to UNHCR livelihoods programming and the Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming standards; and
- serve as the first assessment of operations' current approach in light of the new 2019-2023 Global Strategy Concept Note released in October 2018, an exercise that will be repeated annually to measure the extent to which the updated guidance is being fulfilled by operations.

The evaluation aims to answer the following key evaluation questions (KEQs):

- KEQ 1: How effective are UNHCR-funded livelihood interventions in reducing protection risks and improving employment, income and/or savings levels of targeted persons of concern? KEQ 2: To what extent is there a positive correlation between desired livelihoods programme outcomes (primarily increased employment, income and savings levels of persons of concern) and high adherence to UNHCR's Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming standards? KEQ 3: What are the different roles UNHCR has played in livelihoods programming? What has worked well and what are some constraints? What are lessons learned to inform the next iteration of the livelihoods strategy going forward?

In responding to the survey questions, we request that you consider programmes implemented by both UNHCR and its implementing partners. Please submit one survey per country operation. If the country operation has sub-operations, please complete a separate survey for each sub-operation - *from a different computer/device*. One survey is allowed per device. (See instructions in cover email.)

The survey has multiple choice and short-answer questions and will take 45 minutes to one hour to complete. Questions requiring a response are marked with an asterisk (*). You cannot continue to the next page if you leave these questions blank. As you advance through the survey, you may return to previous pages and update existing responses. You may change your answers on any survey page until you complete the survey. You may return to the survey to pick up where you left off and/or edit previous responses until you click the DONE button. However, if you plan to leave the survey and return to it later, you must use the same device and Web browser you used to start the survey. The survey will close on Friday, 26 October.

The responses will be presented as group data with examples provided at operation level. They will not be identified with you as an individual in the evaluation report. Response data will be shared with the HQ Livelihoods Unit for future follow-up purposes as they track progress against the Concept Note.

Advance thanks for your thoughtful participation in this survey.

* 1. Do you consent to participate in this survey on the basis of the explanation and conditions set out in the introduction?

☐ Yes

☐ No

About the Respondent

2. Please enter the following information for each Livelihoods Team member (up to 5)

Team Member 1: Current title

Team Member 1: number of years working on UNHCR livelihoods programming

Team Member 2: Current title

Team Member 2: number of years working on UNHCR livelihoods programming

Team Member 3: Current title

Team Member 3: number of years working on UNHCR livelihoods programming

Team Member 4: Current title

Team Member 4: number of years working on UNHCR livelihoods programming

Team Member 5: Current title

Team Member 5: number of years working on UNHCR livelihoods programming

* 3. What country operation are you currently located in?

4. If you are completing this survey for a sub-operation, please name the sub-operation. *(Please complete a separate survey for each sub-operation.)*

* 5. What region is the operation in?

- ☐ Africa
- ☐ Americas
- ☐ Asia and the Pacific
- ☐ Europe
- ☐ Middle East and North Africa

Definitions

To ensure a common understanding of key terms, this page lists terms used in this survey as defined or adopted by UNHCR. You may refer back to this page as needed.

Protection: as defined by the IASC: To uphold the rights of individuals in accordance with international humanitarian, human rights and refugee law, regardless of age, gender, social, ethnic, national, religious or other background. (IASC)

Livelihoods: Activities that allow people to secure the basic necessities of life, such as food, water, shelter and clothing. (UNHCR *Global Livelihoods Strategy 2014-2018*)

Economic inclusion: entails access to labour markets, finance, entrepreneurship and economic opportunities for all, including non-citizens in addition to vulnerable and under-served groups. (UNESCO and EBRD)

Self-reliance: The ability of an individual, household or community to meet essential needs and to enjoy social and economic rights in a sustainable manner and with dignity. Self-reliance can assist in ensuring that persons of concern are better protected by strengthening their capacity to claim their civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights. (UNHCR *Global Livelihoods Strategy 2014-2018*)

Resilience: The ability of individuals, households, communities, national institutions and systems to prevent, absorb and recover from shocks, while continuing to function and adapt in a way that supports long-term prospects for sustainable development, peace and security, and the attainment of human rights. (*Applying Social Protection and Resilience Approaches to UNHCR Action*. By A. Mitchell. June 2017)

Operating Context (urban/out-of-camp yes or no?)

The following set of questions is about the operating environment/context of the livelihood programme: urban or camp-based. In this survey, we use the term *urban / out-of-camp* to refer to any out-of-camp setting, e.g., urban, peri-urban, rural, integrated with host community.

* 6. Is the operation or sub-operation in a context where persons of concern reside in urban or out-of-camp areas?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

* 7. Consider the **urban/ out-of-camp refugee context** in which you work. Indicate whether each of the following statements is currently true or false for that context. (p1 of 2)

	True	False
PoC have the right to access land and natural resources for livelihoods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PoC are allowed to move throughout the country, for instance to access markets	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
PoC have access to work permits to access formal employment in some sectors/industries	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PoC have access to work permits to access formal employment in all sectors/industries	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
PoC have the right to own or lease property	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If any one of the statements above applies to some PoC but not others, please explain:

8. Consider the **urban/ out-of-camp refugee context** in which you work. Indicate whether each of the following statements is currently true or false for that context. (p2 of 2)

	True	False
PoC have the right to own a business	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PoC have access to formal financial services, such as bank accounts	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
PoC have access to government services, e.g. public education, public health services, national social protection/safety net system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
NGOs and/or civil society include PoC as a target group in their work	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

If any one of the statements above applies to some PoC but not others, please explain:

Operating Context: Urban/ Out-of-camp Economic

* 9. Which of the following best describes the economic environment for the **urban/ out-of-camp** refugee context in which you work?

- ☐ Income-earning opportunities are very few for most PoC; they are isolated from major markets.
- ☐ There are livelihood opportunities for PoC, but the vast majority are in the informal sector.
- ☒ There are both formal and informal livelihood opportunities for PoC, e.g., jobs are available with large-scale value chains and the formal private sector.
- ☐ Other:

Shocks and Stressors: Definitions

The next questions ask about the risk environment of the operation: what kinds of shocks and stressors have affected PoC. Here is an illustrative list of the kinds of shocks and stressors applicable to each category:

- Protection shocks:
- Widespread SGBV within households or within the community
 - Widespread extortion or abuse of PoC
 - Widespread child marriage

- Climate shocks:
- Excessive rains/ flooding
 - Variable rain/drought
 - Landslides/erosion

- Conflict shocks:
- Ongoing theft or destruction of assets/belongings targeted at PoC
 - Violence/clashes erupted between persons of concern and host communities (e.g., related to sharing natural resources)
 - Widespread insecurity (e.g., due to extremism, gangs)

- Biological shocks:
- Human disease outbreaks causing widespread illness or death (e.g., from contaminated water)
 - Crop pests/disease
 - Livestock disease/deaths

- Economic/political shocks:
- Interruptions or delays in safety net or humanitarian assistance
 - Sharp increases in food prices
 - Sharp increases in prices for agricultural or livestock inputs
 - Widespread unemployment for persons of concern and host communities (e.g., for youths)
 - Political violence/election instability
 - Harmful political language targeting persons of concern (e.g., fueling social discord toward refugees)

Shocks and Stressors: Urban/Out-of-camp

* 10. Please check the shocks and stressors faced in the past 5 years by the persons of concern in the **urban/ out-of-camp refugee context** in which you work.

	Applies	Does not apply
Protection shocks (e.g., SGBV, child marriage)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Climate shocks (e.g., drought, flood)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Conflict shocks (e.g., theft, violence, gangs)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Biological shocks (e.g., human, crop or livestock disease)

☒☒

Economic/political shocks (e.g., price increases, political instability, widespread unemployment)

☐☐

Comments:

Shocks and Stressors: Urban/ Out-of-camp Significance

* 11. In your opinion, how significant are these shocks and stressors in affecting the outcomes of the **urban/ out-of-camp** livelihood programme in which you work?

☒ Very significant

☐ Significant

☐ Not significant

☐ Don't know/ Refuse

Comments:

Operating Context (camp yes or no?)

* 12. Is the operation or sub-operation in a context where persons of concern reside in camps?

☒ Yes

☐ No

* 13. Consider the **camp-based context** in which you work. Indicate whether each of the following statements is currently true or false for that context. (p1 of 2)

	True	False
PoC have the right to access land and natural resources for livelihoods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PoC are allowed to move throughout the country, for instance to access markets	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
PoC have access to work permits to access formal employment in some sectors/industries	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PoC have access to work permits to access formal employment in all sectors/industries	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
PoC have the right to own or lease property	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If any one of the statements above applies to some persons of concern but not others, please explain:

* 14. Consider the **camp-based context** in which you work. Indicate whether each of the following statements is currently true or false for that context. (2 of 2)

	True	False
PoC have the right to own their own business	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PoC have access to formal financial services such as bank accounts	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
PoC have access to Government services, e.g., public education, public health services, national social protection/safety net system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
NGOs and/or civil society include PoC as a target group in their work	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

If any one of the statements above applies to some persons of concern but not others, please explain:

Operating Context: Camp-based Economic

* 15. Which of the following best describes the economic environment for the **camp-based** context in which you work?

- ☐ Income-earning opportunities are very few for most PoC; they are isolated from major markets.
- ☐ There are livelihood opportunities for PoC, but the vast majority are in the informal sector.
- ☒ There are both formal and informal livelihood opportunities for PoC, e.g., jobs are available with large-scale value chains and the formal private sector.
- ☒ Other:

Shocks and Stressors: Definitions

The next questions ask about the risk environment of the operation: what kinds of shocks and stressors have affected persons of concern. Here is an illustrative list of the kinds of shocks and stressors applicable to each category:

Protection shocks:

- Widespread SGBV within households or within the community
- Widespread extortion or abuse of PoC
- Widespread child marriage

Climate shocks:

- Excessive rains/ flooding
- Variable rain/drought
- Landslides/erosion

Conflict shocks:

- Ongoing theft or destruction of assets/belongings targeted at PoC
- Violence/clashes erupted between persons of concern and host communities (e.g., related to sharing natural resources)
- Widespread insecurity (e.g., due to extremism, gangs)

Biological shocks:

- Human disease outbreaks causing widespread illness or death (e.g., from contaminated water)
- Crop pests/disease
- Livestock disease/deaths

Economic/political shocks:

- Interruptions or delays in safety net or humanitarian assistance
- Sharp increases in food prices
- Sharp increases in prices for agricultural or livestock inputs
- Widespread unemployment for persons of concern and host communities (e.g., for youths)
- Political violence/election instability
- Harmful political language targeting persons of concern (e.g., fueling social discord toward refugees)

Shocks and Stressors: Camp Context

* 16. Please check the shocks and stressors faced in the past 5 years by the persons of concern in the **camp context** in which you work.

	Applies	Does not apply
Protection shocks (e.g., SGBV, child marriage)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Climate shocks (e.g., drought, flood)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Conflict shocks (e.g., theft, violence, gangs)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Biological shocks (e.g., human, crop or livestock disease)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Economic/political shocks (e.g., price increases, political instability, widespread unemployment)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

Shocks and Stressors: Camp Significance

* 17. In your opinion, how significant are these shocks and stressors in affecting the outcomes of the **camp-based** livelihood programme in which you work?

- ☐ Very significant
- ☐ Significant
- ☐ Not significant
- ☐ Don't know/ Refuse

Comments:

Programme Design and Implementation

* 18. What criteria are used for targeting persons of concern for inclusion in UNHCR-funded livelihoods programmes at your operation? Select all that apply.

- ☐ Vulnerability of the person of concern
- ☐ Protection issues/risks of the person of concern
- ☐ Persons of concern who are educated and/or have some skills that can be used in the local market
- ☐ Age
- ☐ Gender
- ☐ Poverty or other socio-economic
- ☐ Motivation/ interest of persons of concern
- ☐ Other (please specify):

* 19. What impact has the operation had on livelihood beneficiaries for each of the following? (p1 of 2)

	No positive impact	Minor positive impact	Moderate positive impact	Major positive impact	Negative impact	Don't know/ Refuse
Total household income	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Diversity of household income sources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Household savings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Household ability to access loans through financial institutions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Household ability to keep children in school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 20. What impact has the operation had on livelihood beneficiaries for each of the following? (p2 of 2)

No positive impact	Minor positive impact	Moderate positive impact	Major positive impact	Negative impact	Don't know/ Refuse
--------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------

Household health	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Household food access	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Household ability to live in a safe environment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Formal employment opportunities for household members	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Business/entrepreneurial opportunities for household members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify)						

Programme Design and Implementation – Effectiveness

* 21. What are the top three factors that hinder your operation's effectiveness? (*effectiveness* refers to increased protection, employment and self-reliance among PoC)

- ☐ Situational analysis of needs and contextual factors did not adequately inform intervention design
- ☐ Targeting criteria and selection of beneficiaries
- ☐ Partner capacity
- ☐ Lack of engagement with host communities and other community stakeholders
- ☐ Lack of interest/engagement with national and/or local government
- ☐ Lack of sufficient monitoring and evaluation of the programme
- ☐ Access to cash interventions or other assistance hinder PoC's desire to participate
- ☐ Limited budget and resources
- ☐ Barriers related to one-year budget cycle
- ☐ UNHCR lacking adaptive programme management
- ☐ UNHCR technical staff capacity
- ☐ High staff turnover on UNHCR team
- ☐ Other (please specify):

UNHCR's Role in Livelihoods - Partnerships

* 22. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on the role of UNHCR in livelihoods programming, strategic positioning and partnerships in your operation:

Don't
Strongly know/

Strongly

agree Agree Disagree disagree Refuse

UNHCR is advocating for policies that promote economic inclusion at the national level. ☒ ☐ ☐

UNHCR is coordinating with development actors* including **NGOs and civil society** to promote the economic inclusion of PoC in their programmes/services related to livelihoods.

UNHCR is coordinating with **other UN agencies*** to promote the economic inclusion of PoC. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

UNHCR is coordinating with **the private sector*** to promote the economic inclusion of PoC. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

UNHCR is coordinating with **government*** to promote the economic inclusion of PoC. ☐ ☐ ☐

UNHCR is coordinating with **financial service providers*** to promote the economic inclusion of PoC. ☐ ☐ ☐

*Please note the partners with whom you are coordinating.

UNHCR's Role in Livelihoods - Positioning

* 23. UNHCR is best positioned in my operating context as: (select one)

- ☐ a **funder** of livelihood programmes with implementing partners.
- ☐ a **facilitator** and/or **capacity builder**, partnering and coordinating with other stakeholders to include refugees in their programmes (this includes advocating for inclusion in government)
- ☐ an **implementer** of its own livelihood programmes (including jointly implemented programmes).
- ☐ None of the above; UNHCR should not be involved in livelihood programmes.
- ☐ Don't know/ Refuse

Comments:

UNHCR's Role in Livelihoods - Design Decision

* 24. How did UNHCR decide on its role in livelihoods in your operating context vis-à-vis other actors?

UNHCR's Role in Livelihoods - The Future (1 of 2)

* 25. If UNHCR stops funding the livelihoods programme, how likely is it that livelihoods activities will be able to continue?

- ☐ Very likely
- ☐ Likely
- ☐ Unlikely
- ☐ Very unlikely
- ☐ Don't know/ Refuse

Comments:

UNHCR's Role in Livelihoods - The Future (2 of 2)

* 26. What is the main reason the livelihood activities would be able to continue?

- ☐ The government can take it over or absorb it into its programmes. ☐ The implementing partner can continue with alternative funding. ☐ Another operational partner can support it.
- ☐ Other (please specify):

Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming

The goal of the Minimum Criteria is to assist operations in enhancing the quality and increasing impact of livelihoods programming. Please note that as of October 2018, with the new *Concept Note on Refugee Livelihoods and Economic Inclusion*, it is recommended that operations consult the industry best practice *Minimum Economic Recovery Standards (MERS)* for programme quality standards.

This survey addresses the Minimum Criteria to help answer KEQ#2. The Minimum Criteria follow a set of Livelihoods Programme Steps:

- a) socio-economic assessment;
- b) livelihoods market analysis;
- c) strategic planning (including sustainable partnerships and expertise);
- d) programme design (including targeting);
- e) baseline assessment of targeted population;
- f) implementation and monitoring; and
- g) endline assessment of targeted population.

(UNHCR Minimum Criteria Compliance Interview 2017)

Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming (1 of 4)

* 27. To what extent does each component of the Minimum Criteria contribute to the desired protection and livelihood outcomes of the programme?

	Contributes greatly to desired outcomes	Contributes some to desired outcomes	Contributes very little to desired outcomes	Does not contribute to desired outcomes	Don't know/Refuse
Socioeconomic and context analysis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Livelihoods market or value chain analysis	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Sustainable partnerships (including Institutional Mapping)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Context-specific livelihoods strategic plan	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Expertise (livelihoods experts)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Targeting	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Monitoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming (2 of 4)

* 28. What are the top challenges in implementing the Minimum Criteria (MC) in UNHCR-funded livelihood programmes? (select up to three)

- ☐ More work: fulfilling MC reduces time available to meet short-term programme goals
- ☐ Staff capacity: UNHCR staff lack capacity to implement the MC and to use data to inform programming
- ☐ Partner capacity: UNHCR partners lack capacity to implement the MC and to use data to inform program
- ☐ Cost: insufficient funding to implement the MC
- ☐ Insufficient guidance or technical support on implementing MC and/or using data to inform programming
- ☐ Data collection: dispersed, vulnerable communities, and other data collection challenges
- ☐ Partnerships: difficulty changing historical partners and/or establishing non-traditional partnerships
- ☐ Contextualizing standards: Hard to contextualize a set of standards across diverse operations
- ☐ Targeting: difficulty incorporating the MC findings into a targeting strategy
- ☐ No challenges
- ☐ Other (please specify):

Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming (3 of 4)

* 29. Thinking about livelihood interventions funded by your operation, how often are intervention design(s) informed by:

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Never	Don't know/Refuse
Socio-economic and context analysis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Livelihoods, market, or value chain analysis	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Partnership/ institutional mapping	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Targeting criteria	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Context-specific livelihoods strategic plan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Livelihoods monitoring data	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Comments:

Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming (4 of 4)

* 30. Thinking about livelihood interventions funded by your operation, how often are implemented livelihoods activities **modified** based on findings from:

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Never	Don't know/ Refuse
Socio-economic and context analysis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Livelihoods, market, or value chain analysis	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Partnership/ institutional mapping	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Targeting criteria	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Context-specific livelihoods strategic plan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Livelihoods monitoring data	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Comments:

Examples from the Field Q1-2 of 4

31. Please share any examples of achievements from the livelihoods programme in your operation related to **intended** outcomes or positive changes for persons of concern. Please name the country and sub- operation, if applicable.

32. Please share any examples of ***unintended*** outcomes (positive or negative) of the livelihoods programme in your operation. Please name the country and sub-operation, if applicable.

Examples from the Field Q3 of 4

33. Please share any examples of how livelihood activities were changed in response to changing needs (e.g., related to policy, security, emergency, and/or budgetary changes). Please name the country and sub- operation, if applicable.

Examples from the Field Q4 of 4

34. How can persons of concern achieve self-reliance and resilience within the country context where you work? How have UNHCR programming strategies or other factors promoted or inhibited this goal?

Additional Comments

35. Would you like to share any other comments/insights about UNHCR livelihood programming? Please use the space below.

Livelihood Programme Information - Introduction

The UNHCR Livelihoods HQ Unit requires that one Livelihoods Officer from each livelihoods programme complete an annual programme activities summary. This is the same as the Minimum Criteria “pre-survey” you have completed in previous years.

Please provide the requested information for each livelihoods activity that was planned in your operation for 2018. You may list up to 10 activities.

Livelihoods Activity Description #1

Enter the first activity. When the entries for the first activity are complete, you will be asked if you want to enter another activity.

* 36. Livelihoods Activity Description#1

Livelihoods activity description (e.g., vocational training, entrepreneurial training, financial services, computer/technology services)

Locations within country where activity is implemented

Population Planning Group(s) or Target Group(s)

PoC directly targeted

Partner name (if UNHCR implements directly, please write *direct implementation*)

2018 planned spending (USD)

* 37. What Results Framework output is this budgeted under? (select all that apply)

- ☐ Access to agricultural / livestock / fisheries production enabled Access to financial services facilitated (formal and informal)
- ☐ Access to self-employment / business facilitated
- ☐ Assessment and analysis undertaken Sectoral cash grants or vouchers provided
- ☐ Vocational training / technical skills provided
- ☐ Strategy developed and implemented
- ☐ Access to information and communications technologies enabled
- ☐ Access to training and learning enabled
- ☐ Access to wage earning employment facilitated
- ☐ Access to work facilitated through removal of legal barriers
- ☐ Assessment and analysis undertaken
- ☐ Recognition of diplomas by host state
- ☐ facilitated Other (please specify):

* 38. Do you have another activity to enter?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Livelihoods Activity Description #2

* 39. Livelihoods Activity Description#2

Livelihoods activity description (e.g., vocational training, entrepreneurial training, financial services, computer/technology services)

Locations within country where activity is implemented

Population Planning Group(s) or Target Group(s)

PoC directly targeted

Partner name (if UNHCR implements directly, please write *direct implementation*)

2018 planned spending (USD)

* 40. What Results Framework output is this budgeted under? (select all that apply)

☐ Access to agricultural / livestock / fisheries production enabled Access to financial services facilitated (formal and informal)

☐ Access to self-employment / business facilitated

☐ Assessment and analysis undertaken

☐ Sectoral cash grants or vouchers provided

☐ Vocational training / technical skills provided

☐ Strategy developed and implemented

☐ Access to information and communications technologies enabled

☐ Access to training and learning enabled

☐ Access to wage earning employment facilitated

☐ Access to work facilitated through removal of legal barriers

☐ Assessment and analysis undertaken

☐ Recognition of diplomas by host state facilitated

Other (please specify):

* 41. Do you have another activity to enter?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Livelihoods Activity Description #3

* 42. Livelihoods Activity Description #3

Livelihoods activity description (e.g., vocational training, entrepreneurial training, financial services, computer/technology services)

Locations within country where activity is implemented

Population Planning Group(s) or Target Group(s)

PoC directly targeted

Partner name (if UNHCR implements directly, please write *direct implementation*)

2018 planned spending (USD)

Livelihoods Activity Description #4

43. Livelihoods Activity Description#4

Livelihoods activity description (e.g., vocational training, entrepreneurial training, financial services, computer/technology services)

Locations within country where activity is implemented

Population Planning Group(s) or Target Group(s)

PoC directly targeted

Partner name (if UNHCR implements directly, please write *direct implementation*)

2018 planned spending (USD)

* 44. What Results Framework output is this budgeted under? (select all that apply)

☐ Access to agricultural / livestock / fisheries production enabled Access to financial services facilitated (formal

☐ and informal) Access to self-employment / business facilitated

☐ Assessment and analysis undertaken

☐ Sectoral cash grants or vouchers

☐ provided Vocational training / technical

☐ skills provided Strategy developed and

☐ implemented

Access to information and communications technologies enabled

☐ Access to training and learning enabled

☐ Access to wage earning employment facilitated

☐ Access to work facilitated through removal of legal barriers

☐ Assessment and analysis undertaken

☐ Recognition of diplomas by host state

facilitated Other (please specify):

--

* 45. Do you have another activity to enter?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Livelihoods Activity Description #5

* 46. Livelihoods Activity Description #5

Livelihoods activity description (e.g., vocational training, entrepreneurial training, financial services, computer/technology services)

Locations within country where activity is implemented

Population Planning Group(s) or Target Group(s)

PoC directly targeted

Partner name (if UNHCR implements directly, please write *direct implementation*)

2018 planned spending (USD)

* 47. What Results Framework output is this budgeted under? (select all that apply)

- ☐ Access to agricultural / livestock / fisheries production enabled Access to financial services facilitated (formal and informal) Access to self-employment / business facilitated
- ☐ Assessment and analysis undertaken Sectoral cash grants or vouchers provided
- ☐ Vocational training / technical skills provided Strategy developed and implemented
- ☐ Access to information and communications technologies enabled
- ☐ Access to training and learning enabled
- ☐ Access to wage earning employment facilitated
- ☐ Access to work facilitated through removal of legal barriers
- ☐ Assessment and analysis undertaken Recognition of diplomas by host state facilitated
- ☐ Other (please specify):

* 48. Do you have another activity to enter?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Thank you for your participation. Your input matters.

Annex 6: Additional tables and reference data

Table 1: Level of agreement with the following statements on the role of UNHCR (e-survey)

<i>Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on the role of UNHCR in livelihoods programming, strategic positioning and partnerships in your operation:</i>	STRONGLY AGREE–	AGREE–	DISAGREE–	STRONGLY DISAGREE–	DON'T KNOW/ REFUSE–
UNHCR is advocating for policies that promote economic inclusion at the national level.	39.2%	51.0%	7.8%	1.0%	1.0%
UNHCR is coordinating with development actors* including NGOs and civil society to promote the economic inclusion of PoC in their programmes/services related to livelihoods.	35.3%	52.0%	10.8%	2.0%	0.0%
UNHCR is coordinating with other UN agencies* to promote the economic inclusion of PoC.	26.5%	50.0%	17.7%	4.9%	1.0%
UNHCR is coordinating with the private sector* to promote the economic inclusion of PoC.	23.5%	54.9%	17.7%	2.9%	1.0%
UNHCR is coordinating with government* to promote the economic inclusion of PoC.	38.2%	52.0%	6.9%	1.0%	2.0%
UNHCR is coordinating with financial service providers* to promote the economic inclusion of PoC.	22.6%	46.1%	24.5%	2.0%	4.9%

Table 2: Minimum Criteria components' contribution to desired outcomes (e-survey)

<i>To what extent does each component of the Minimum Criteria contribute to the desired protection and livelihood outcomes?</i>	CONTRIBUTES GREATLY TO DESIRED OUTCOMES–	CONTRIBUTES SOME TO DESIRED OUTCOMES–	CONTRIBUTES VERY LITTLE TO DESIRED OUTCOMES–	DOES NOT CONTRIBUTE TO DESIRED OUTCOMES–	DON'T KNOW/ REFUSE–
Socioeconomic and context analysis	57.4%	29.7%	6.9%	2.0%	4.0%
Livelihoods market or value chain analysis	52.5%	33.7%	4.0%	3.0%	6.9%
Sustainable partnerships (including Institutional Mapping)	51.5%	32.7%	6.9%	3.0%	5.9%

Context-specific livelihoods strategic plan	55.5%	30.7%	3.0%	2.0%	8.9%
Expertise (livelihoods experts)	52.5%	32.7%	3.0%	2.0%	9.9%
Targeting	51.5%	36.6%	5.0%	2.0%	5.0%
Monitoring	53.5%	33.7%	5.9%	3.0%	4.0%

Table 3: Top challenges in implementing the Minimum Criteria, full responses (e-survey)

<i>What are the top challenges in implementing the Minimum Criteria (MC) in UNHCR-funded livelihood programmes? (select up to three)</i>	RESPONSES–
Partner capacity: UNHCR partners lack capacity to implement the MC and to use data to inform programming	50%
Cost: insufficient funding to implement the MC	49%
Data collection: dispersed, vulnerable communities, and other data collection challenges in attempting to fulfil this MC	33%
Partnerships: difficulty changing historical partners and/or establishing non-traditional partnerships	30%
Staff capacity: UNHCR staff lack capacity to implement the MC and to use data to inform programming	25%
Contextualizing standards: Hard to contextualize a set of standards across diverse operations	20%
Targeting: difficulty incorporating the MC findings into a targeting strategy	19%
Insufficient guidance or technical support on implementing MC and/or using data to inform programming	17%
Other	15%
More work: fulfilling MC reduces time available to meet short-term programme goals	12%
No challenges	0%

Annex 7: Terms of Reference

Evaluation of UNHCR's livelihoods strategies and approaches

Key Information at glance about the evaluation	
Title of the evaluation:	Evaluation of UNHCR's livelihoods strategies and approaches
Timeframe covered:	March 2018– Feb. 2019
Type of exercise:	Centralised evaluation of Livelihoods strategies and approaches
Evaluation commissioned by:	UNHCR Evaluation Service
Evaluation manager's contact:	fu@unhcr.org ; maastrig@unhcr.org
Date	03/4/2018 (last revised)

1. Introduction

1. The impetus for this centralised evaluation arose based on a series of consultations with UNHCR staff at multiple levels in the organization. A centralised evaluation of UNHCR's livelihoods strategies and approaches is timely given that since 2015, UNHCR has been adapting a market-systems approach through application of a standardized set of Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods programming. The *Operational Guidelines on the Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming (UNHCR/OG/2012)* are standards for UNHCR and partners to fulfil when planning, implementing and monitoring livelihoods programmes funded by UNHCR, to help UNHCR achieve and measure greater impact in livelihoods programming through a market-driven and results-oriented approach. The extent to which UNHCR field operations implementing livelihoods programs are compliant with the Minimum Criteria is assessed by the livelihoods unit at HQ, together with the livelihoods staff in country and the regional bureaus on an annual basis. While the compliance assessment process has allowed livelihoods teams to understand fulfillment of the Minimum Criteria for each operation, UNHCR has largely operated on the assumption that high compliance leads to improved livelihood outcomes for persons of concern. There exists a high level of buy-in and desire for evidence on outcomes associated with UNHCR's livelihood strategies and approaches to validate and inform organizational direction, strategy and practice.
2. Moreover, the centralised evaluation occurs within an ecosystem of changes, such as the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), the New Way of Working – Humanitarian-Development nexus and organisational change processes, including the creation of a new Division of Resilience and Solutions at HQ of which the livelihoods unit is a part, the Multi-Year Multi-Partner Protection and Solutions Approach (MYMP) and, and a renewed focus on data. UNHCR is developing “a global compact on refugees” in consultation with governments and other stakeholders. One way the compact aims to strengthen the international response to large movements of refugees is by broadening and diversifying roles and responsibilities of humanitarian-development response actors. This will have implications on UNHCR's future role broadly in the refugee response and coordination space, and also specifically in livelihoods programming, as UNHCR strategizes how best to position itself amongst the range of other actors to support the economic inclusion of refugees.
3. The evaluation is expected to inform future livelihoods-related strategic and operational decisions, and generate learning that will further enrich the discourse on refugee livelihoods and economic inclusion.

2. Subject of the evaluation and its context

4. In 2017, the scale of livelihood interventions in UNHCR totaled an operating level budget of approximately \$89.5million USD in 72 countries and reached an estimate of 1.2 million persons of concern. In 2018, it is anticipated that the operating level budget will decrease to around \$70.7million USD and the number of countries maintained around 70 countries. In line with the change processes mentioned above, many UNHCR

field operations have been phasing out of or shifting away from direct implementation or funding of livelihoods programmes, instead taking on more of an advocacy/convening role to have persons of concerns included into existing programmes with partners such as government line ministries, development actors, private sector and civil society. The shift towards inclusion yields benefits such as greater sustainability and scalability of programmes and services offered to persons of concern, a collaborative, multi-stakeholder approach based on the comparative advantages of each actor, as well as increased efficiency through the elimination of duplicative efforts.

5. Protection as defined by the IASC is to uphold the rights of individuals in accordance with international humanitarian, human rights and refugee law, regardless of age, gender, social, ethnic, national, religious or other background.⁹ Protection activities may be: 1) Preventative to minimize the risk of violence, abuse or exploitation by creating a social, cultural, institutional and legal environment that respects the rights of all people and ensures access to impartial assistance and 2) Responsive, using advocacy to compel duty bearers to uphold their obligations and strengthening capacities of local actors to provide direct services.
6. Economic insecurity, discrimination and marginalisation increase the protection risk for refugees, the displaced and other persons of concern as they seek income-generating opportunities, creating a need for a more integrated approach to livelihoods initiatives. Livelihoods programming aims to support persons of concern towards economic inclusion, enabling them to accumulate assets and capabilities and empowering them with the ability to make choices that affect their own lives. In line with UNHCR's two-pronged mandate of protection and finding permanent solutions, the overarching aim of economic inclusion initiatives is to support the protection and long-term solutions of refugees¹⁰, specifically by enabling them to develop transferrable skills, meet basic needs, recover or protect their livelihood assets, adapt to new environments, improve people's livelihood assets and strategies, access to markets and services, and promote an enabling environment (e.g., to promote the right and access to work). The intended outcome of interest is to build resilience by improving the employment, income and savings levels of persons of concerns. Interventions take many forms and approaches and depend heavily on the context, target group and market. Some examples may include advocating for the economic inclusion of persons of concern; building evidence for inclusion through research and data; building strategic partnerships with governments, other UN agencies, humanitarian and development actors, private sector and NGOs; connecting persons of concern to wage- and self-employment opportunities, such as in the agricultural sector or artisanal value chain; providing access to financial services for persons of concern; and implementing the Graduation Approach, a time-bound and sequenced poverty-reduction methodology for ultra-poor persons of concern.
7. The Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming serve as program quality standards to ensure that interventions are relevant, market-driven and achieve stated objectives. Since the Minimum Criteria were established in 2015, the UNHCR Livelihoods Unit has been conducting an annual compliance assessment in which country operations budgeting for livelihoods are assessed on their level of adherence to the criteria. The assessment is done based on data collected from operations through surveys, interviews and document reviews, and findings from the assessment are shared with each operation along with recommendations for how to improve fulfilment of the Minimum Criteria. While the Minimum Criteria have been inspired by existing best practices following a market systems approach such as the [Minimum Economic Recovery Standards \(MERS\)](#), and fulfilment of the criteria should result in quality livelihoods programming and greater economic inclusion of persons of concern, this assumption has not been tested by UNHCR.

3. Purpose and objectives

8. The evaluation will serve a dual and mutually reinforcing learning and accountability purpose.¹¹ The purpose of this centralized evaluation is to contribute strategic and timely evidence that will inform and influence organizational strategy and practice within and external to UNHCR; ultimately, contributing to improved

⁹Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) (2016). IASC Policy on Protection in Humanitarian Action.

https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/iasc_policy_on_protection_in_humanitarian_action_0.pdf.

¹⁰Please see this [Note on the Mandate of the High Commissioner for Refugees and His Office](#) for more information.

¹¹**Accountability** – through assessing and reporting on implementation and results, and requesting management to formally respond to the evaluation. **Learning** – Describing as well as explaining results is necessary to generate insights and pointers for learning to improve future livelihood strategies, interventions and programming – and if possible – in other contexts where UNHCR operations face similar opportunities and constraints.

economic inclusion of refugees and other people of concern. For example, the evaluation is expected to analyse and provide inputs to validate UNHCR's Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming, examine the effectiveness of livelihoods interventions that have high compliance with the Minimum Criteria and explore UNHCR's role in livelihoods programming. Moreover, the evaluation will also feed into a larger body of knowledge around designing, managing, supporting and understanding results from livelihoods interventions in refugee contexts.

9. The primary audience is UNHCR Senior Executive Team, livelihoods unit at HQ, Division of Resilience and Solutions, regional bureaus, regional and country offices, and its partners – including government. Secondary audience include other humanitarian and development actors.

4. Evaluation Approach

4.1 Scope

10. The evaluation scope – relating to population, timeframe and locations– is as follows:

- **Timeframe** to be covered in the evaluation: 2014 – 2018
- Population location and details: Primary data collection will involve fieldwork in Turkey, Rwanda and India.

4.2 Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs)

11. The evaluation will address the following headline questions. The analysis needed to answer them is likely to touch on other possible sub-questions and may be further refined during the evaluation inception phase.

KEQ 1: How effective are UNHCR-funded livelihood interventions in reducing protection risks and improving employment, income and/or savings levels of targeted persons of concern?

This KEQ will also seek to answer the following Sub-questions:

- Under what conditions are UNHCR-funded livelihood operations more or less effective in reducing protection risks and improving employment, income and/or savings of targeted persons of concern?
- What salient processes, mechanisms and conditions in UNHCR-funded livelihoods operations create an enabling environment for increased protection, employment and self-reliance among persons of concern?
- What are the typologies of protection risks and vulnerabilities targeted by UNHCR-funded livelihoods programmes? What experience and lessons learned can UNHCR draw from to inform future programming strategies?

KEQ 2: To what extent is there a positive correlation between desired livelihoods programme outcomes (primarily increased employment, income and savings levels of persons of concern) and high adherence to UNHCR's Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming standards?

- Do some of the Minimum Criteria contribute more to the desired protection and livelihood outcomes of interest than others? If so, which ones?
- What have been some of the benefits/challenges of introducing the Minimum Criteria on UNHCR-funded livelihoods programming, such as the design, implementation and quality of programs delivered to beneficiaries?
- How, if at all, has the Minimum Criteria changed the quality of partners that are funded by UNHCR Livelihoods? How, if at all, has this affected the strategic pivot of Livelihoods teams to engage outside partners, as operational partners (i.e. partners who bring their financing)?
- What changes have occurred, if any, in public perception of UNHCR's approach to Livelihoods programming as a result of implementing the Minimum Criteria? Particularly, how have the

improved programmes, particularly revisions to measuring outcomes through improved monitoring, increased their understanding of programme outcomes and potential longer-term impacts?

- In cases where there is a gap in services working toward economic inclusion of persons of concern and UNHCR has to implement livelihoods programs, are there further guidelines in addition to the Minimum Criteria that should be followed?

KEQ 3: What are the different roles UNHCR has played in livelihoods programming? What has worked well and what are some constraints? What are lessons learned to inform the next iteration of the livelihoods strategy going forward?

- In cases where UNHCR takes on more of a convening/facilitating role and less of an implementing role, what are some best practices? How can UNHCR add the most value in those situations?
- What factors and conditions should help determine what UNHCR's role in livelihoods should be in an operation?

4.3 Approach and methodology

12. This is a retrospective outcomes evaluation, involving an in-depth investigation of the factors, processes and mechanisms that contributed to the desired outcomes of interest, particularly protection, employment and income/savings. This involves evaluating the extent to which programming adhered to the Livelihoods Minimum Criteria for Programming, UNHCR's role and partnerships and other internal/external factors or conditions that affected the outcomes of interest. Last, the evaluation will map the different vulnerability and risk profiles of persons of concern targeted through UNHCR-funded livelihoods programming and lessons learned from those experiences.
13. The evaluation methodology should use a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to answer the three Key Evaluation Questions and Sub-questions. The evaluation will comprise the following: 1) desk review and content analysis of relevant background as well as programmatic data and documents; 2) focus group discussions and in-depth interviews with UNHCR staff, implementing and operational partners, key interagency stakeholders (e.g., OCHA, UNDP, UNICEF, etc.), national host governments; and 3) field data collection in 3-4 selected country operations, involving household surveys and qualitative interviews (e.g., outcomes mapping, focus group discussions) with targeted persons of concern in UNHCR-funded livelihoods programming.
14. The evaluation will consider the breadth and depth of UNHCR-funded livelihoods programming, sampling a large number of operations for desk review, (virtual) qualitative interviews and survey to UNHCR and partner field staff. This broad approach will be enriched with three to four deep dive case studies of specific country operations with field data collection. Each of these case studies examine different operational contexts to provide information across the varied settings and situations in which UNHCR works.
15. UNHCR welcomes the use of diverse, participatory, and innovative evaluation methods. The methodology – including details on the data collection and analytical approach(es) used to answer the evaluation questions – will be designed by the evaluation team during the inception phase, and presented in an evaluation matrix.
16. The evaluation methodology is expected to:
 - a) Reflect an Age, Gender and Diversity (AGD) perspective in all primary data collection activities carried out as part of the evaluation – particularly with refugees.
 - b) Employ a mixed-method approach incorporating qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis tools including the analysis of monitoring data – as available.
 - c) Refer to and make use of relevant internationally agreed evaluation criteria such as those proposed by OECD-DAC and adapted by ALNAP for use in humanitarian evaluations¹².
 - d) Refer to and make use of relevant sectoral standards and livelihoods-specific analytical frameworks.

¹² See for example: Cosgrave and Buchanan-Smith (2017) [Guide de l'Evaluation de l'Action Humanitaire](#) (London: ALNAP) and Beck, T. (2006) [Evaluating Humanitarian Action using the OECD-DAC Criteria](#) (London: ALNAP)

- e) Be based on an analysis of **(i)** the strategy and operational guidelines underpinning livelihoods programming being evaluated, and **(ii)** the main actors and stakeholders.
 - f) Gather and make use of a wide range of data sources (e.g. livelihoods monitoring data, mission reports, coordination groups meetings, strategy narrative, budget and indicator reports) in order to demonstrate impartiality of the analysis, minimise bias, and ensure the credibility of evaluation findings and conclusions.
 - g) Be explicitly designed to address the key evaluation questions – taking into account evaluability, budget and timing constraints.
17. The evaluation team is responsible to gather, analyse and triangulate data (e.g. across types, sources and analysis modality) to demonstrate impartiality of the analysis, minimise bias, and ensure the credibility of evaluation findings and conclusions.

4.4 Evaluation Quality Assurance

18. The evaluation consultants are required to sign the UNHCR Code of Conduct, complete UNHCR's introductory protection training module, and respect UNHCR's confidentiality requirements.
19. In line with established standards for evaluation in the UN system, and the UN Ethical Guidelines for evaluations, evaluation in UNHCR is founded on the inter-connected principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility, which in practice, call for: protecting sources and data; systematically seeking informed consent; respecting dignity and diversity; minimising risk, harm and burden upon those who are the subject of, or participating in the evaluation, while at the same time not compromising the integrity of the exercise.
20. The evaluation is also expected to adhere with pilot 'Evaluation Quality Assurance' (EQA) guidance, which clarifies the quality requirements expected for UNHCR evaluation processes and products.
21. The Evaluation Manager will share and provide an orientation to the EQA at the start of the evaluation. Adherence to the EQA will be overseen by the Evaluation Manager with support from the UNHCR Evaluation Service as needed.

4.5 Data and information sources

22. The Global Strategy for Livelihoods (2014-2018) and UNHCR Operational Guidelines on the Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming have generated data and information that will be reviewed, complemented and triangulated during the course of the evaluation. Below is an overview on some data and information available:
- Data collected on revised livelihoods indicators by select country operations beginning in 2017;
 - Historical data and analysis of data collected during the Minimum Criteria Compliance Assessment;
 - Livelihoods-related indicators from UNHCR's Results Framework;
 - Planning and budget information;
 - Livelihoods evaluation reports;
 - Guidance related to the Minimum Criteria, livelihoods models/initiatives (such as the Graduation Approach, MADE51, agriculture programs, financial services as relevant) and revised livelihoods indicators.

5. Organisation, management and conduct of the evaluation

23. UNHCR Evaluation Service will serve as role of **Evaluation Manager**. They will be responsible for: **(i)** managing the day to day aspects of the evaluation process; **(ii)** acting as the main interlocutor with the evaluation team; **(iii)** providing the evaluators with required data and facilitating communication with relevant stakeholders; **(iv)** reviewing the interim deliverables and final reports to ensure quality – with the support of UNHCR livelihoods unit at HQ.

24. The **Evaluation Team** will comprise a senior team leader, team members, and a statistician. The team is expected to produce written products of high standards, informed by evidence and triangulated data and analysis, copy-edited, and free from errors.

25. The language of work of this evaluation and its deliverables is English.¹³

6. Expected deliverables and evaluation timeline

26. The evaluation should be carried out April 2018 to Feb. 2019, will be managed following the timeline tabled below, and will be contracted to an evaluation firm as follows (demonstrative and can vary):

- 40 days for the evaluation Team Leader;
- 130 days for the evaluation team members;
- 27 days for the evaluation statistician;
- 18 days for the data collection teams (local consultants) in each country

27. The key evaluation deliverables are:

- Inception report;
- Data collection toolkit (including questionnaires, interview guides, focus group discussion guides) and details on the analytical framework developed for / used in the evaluation;
- Data collection toolkit (including questionnaires, interview guides, focus group discussion guides) and details on the analytical framework developed for / used in the evaluation;
- Final evaluation report including recommendations (30-40 pages excluding annexes);
- Executive summary in both French and English.¹⁴

Activity	Deliverables and payment schedule	Indicative timeline
Evaluation ToR finalised and call for proposals issued	ToR and call for Expression of Interest	March 2018
Selection process (bids evaluated, tender awarded)	Contract signed	April-May 2018
Inception phase including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Initial desk review and key informant interviews. - EQA review on the draft Inception Report - Circulation for comments and finalisation 	Final inception report – including methodology, refined evaluation questions (as needed) and evaluation matrix. PAYMENT 20%	June-July 2018
Survey of Livelihoods global programme and Round 1 group of in-country data collection and preliminary analysis phase	Presentation of preliminary findings and conclusions at stakeholder workshops PAYMENT 30%	July-Aug 2018
Review of preliminary analysis from Round 1	Presentation of preliminary findings with UNHCR HQ	Aug 2018
Round 2 group of in-country data collection and preliminary analysis phase	Presentation of preliminary findings and conclusions at stakeholder workshops PAYMENT 30%	Sept.-Oct. 2018
Data analysis and reporting phase including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder feedback and validation of evaluation findings, conclusions and proposed recommendations. 	Draft report and recommendations (for circulation and comments) PAYMENT 30%	Nov.-Dec. 2018
EQA review of draft report, circulation for comments	Consolidated comments	Jan. 2019
Finalisation of Evaluation Report and executive summary.	Final Evaluation Report (including recommendations and executive summary) PAYMENT 20%	Feb. 2019

¹³ The final evaluation report will be in English and should include an executive summary in both French and English.

¹⁴ The evaluation ToR, final report with annexes, and formal management response will be made public and posted on the evaluation section of the [UNHCR website](#). All other evaluation products (e.g. Inception Report) will be kept internal.

7. Evaluation team qualifications

28. **Functional requirements** for an evaluation firm comprising multiple team members. The firm should be able and willing to travel to selected countries of interest and be able to work in English – as follows:

Evaluation Team Leader

- A post-graduate degree in economics or social science plus a minimum of 10 years of relevant professional experience in livelihoods-related areas.
- Minimum of 7 years of evaluation experience in quantitative and qualitative analysis and synthesis of large multi-country livelihoods interventions in development and humanitarian settings.
- Proven experience in successfully leading an evaluation team and managing fieldwork in complex environments.
- Technical expertise in refugee protection work and the livelihoods sector, including relevant analytical frameworks and programming approaches and standards, particularly work employment, savings, and protection.
- Proven track record of leading (preferable) or participating as senior Team member in a large-scale evaluation commissioned by a large development, IFI, or humanitarian agency.
- Experience in evaluation in development settings preferred (World Bank, etc).
- Institutional knowledge of UNHCR's mandate and modus operandi.
- In depth knowledge of and proven experience with various data collection and analytical methods and techniques used in evaluation and operational research.
- Experience in generating useful and action-oriented recommendations to management and programming staff.

Evaluation Team Member

- University degree (in the areas of economics; social science; micro-finance; agriculture and food-security) plus a minimum of 5 years of relevant professional experience, or a post-graduate degree with at least 4 years of relevant experience to refugee protection and/or livelihoods.
- Proven experience (minimum 5 years) in supporting quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis for evaluation purposes (preferable) or studies and operational research around outcomes mapping, vulnerability/risk mapping, protection and livelihoods issues.
- Good knowledge of measuring vulnerability and protection risks, as well as livelihoods literature, relevant analytical frameworks and programming approaches and standards.
- In depth knowledge with various data collection and analytical methods and techniques used in evaluation and operational research.
- Proven expertise in facilitating participatory workshops involving different groups and participants.
- Technical expertise in relevant sectoral areas including Employment, Entrepreneurship, Job placement, microfinance.

Evaluation Team Member – Statistician

- Advanced degree in statistics or economics with a minimum of 5 years of relevant experience to livelihoods research/evaluation.
- Proven experience with survey design, development, testing and implementation of complex surveys and analysis.
- Deep understanding and experience of survey design methodologies, sampling design procedures, sampling size calculations, variance estimation, compound weights, simulation studies.
- Experience with data quality assurance protocols and data collection in the domains of sampling and measurement error, nonresponse and coverage bias to ensure reliable data collection.

8. Evaluation team selection criteria

Technical criteria used to evaluate proposals will comprise 70% of the total score while the remaining 30% is based on the Financial offer. The Technical offer will be evaluated using the following criteria:

- Company capability and qualification: Experience carrying out evaluations of livelihoods/protection interventions in humanitarian settings; multi-country evaluations involving mixed methods (max 21.25 points)
- Proposed services: Approach and methodology to the evaluation (max 20 points)
- Team Composition and Strength: Number of people, qualifications and relevant experience (max 28.75 points)

Annex I: Overview of the Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming

#	CRITERIA	REQUIREMENTS
1	Socio-economic Assessment and Context Analysis	Country Operations to conduct a socio-economic assessment and a protection and solutions context analysis to gain a full picture of the economic, legal, civil-political socio-cultural and environmental context, and related challenges, opportunities and protection and solutions risks and benefits for persons of concern. This provides the basis for strategic planning and designing programmes that respond to the livelihoods needs and capacities of specific target group(s) in support of protection and solutions.
2	Livelihoods Market Analysis	Country Operations to carry out a livelihoods market analysis to identify which markets (or sectors) have potential to provide real economic and self-reliance opportunities for persons of concern. Livelihoods market analysis is comprised of two steps: 1) Country Operations to select high-potential sectors using existing market analyses and/or through a rapid sector selection; and 2) Country Operations to conduct a value chain analysis of the selected sectors, examining different functions and actors in the value chain as well as protection and other risks, challenges and support needed for persons of concern to participate in and benefit from the value chain. Information from these analyses supports Country Operations to develop strategic plans and design programmes, in support of protection and solutions, with strong market orientation.
3	Sustainable Partnerships	Country Operations to conduct an institutional mapping to identify existing programmes and services in the country which could potentially include persons of concern, as well as potential partners, including from the development community and private sector. If considering facilitating access to financial services for persons of concern, Country Operations to partner with sustainable financial service providers (FSPs). Country Operations to utilize monitoring data on progress towards relevant livelihoods results to assess the performance of partners implementing livelihoods activities with UNHCR funds, retaining partners only if they are able to achieve and demonstrate sustainable impact in terms of employment and/or income and in support of protection and solutions.
4	Context-Specific Livelihoods Strategic Plan	Country Operations to develop a 3-to-5 year context-specific livelihoods strategic plan, based on socio-economic assessment, context analysis, livelihoods market analysis and institutional mapping (see MC 1, 2 and 3) to provide strategic direction for livelihoods programming that clearly aligns with and is designed to contribute to the achievement of the overall protection and solutions objectives of the Operation.
5	Expertise	Country Operations with a livelihoods programme budget (OPS) equal to or above USD 1,000,000 (OL) must have a dedicated livelihoods expert.
6	Targeting	Country Operations to develop clear, explicit eligibility criteria, based on the needs and capacities of persons of concern and the programme objectives and consistent with the Operation's overall strategy. This allows Country Operations to properly target livelihoods interventions, ensuring the support is appropriate, effective and efficient.
7	Monitoring	Country Operations to collect baseline data on targeted persons of concern before implementation of any programme to capture the socio-economic situation of participants and enjoyment of related rights at the start of interventions. Country Operations to collect and analyse endline data after interventions to measure changes in the socio-economic situation and enjoyment of related rights, capturing impact achieved since the baseline. Country Operations to monitor wage and/or self-employment of targeted persons of concern. Where programming aims at self-employment, Country Operations to report on the livelihoods Global Strategic Priority (GSP) indicator, "% of persons of concern (18-59 yrs) with own business / self-employed for more than 12 months."