

Terms of Reference

EVALUATION OF ICRC'S PREVENTION PROGRAMMES IN EASTERN EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	ICRC Prevention programmes in Eastern Europe and Central Asia	2
3	The Evaluation	3
3.1	Purpose of the evaluation	3
3.2	Intended use	3
3.3	The evaluation's audience.....	4
3.4	Evaluation scope and focus	4
3.5	Management and supervision of the evaluation	5
3.6	Evaluation method	5
3.7	Deliverables	6
3.8	Work Plan	6
3.9	Evaluation report.....	6
3.10	Evaluation team	7
3.11	Timeline	7

1 Introduction

ICRC mission statement

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) is an impartial, neutral and independent organization whose exclusively humanitarian mission is to protect the lives and dignity of victims of war and internal violence and to provide them with assistance.

It directs and coordinates the international relief activities conducted by the Movement in situations of conflict. It also endeavours to prevent suffering by promoting and strengthening humanitarian law and universal humanitarian principles.

Established in 1863, the ICRC is at the origin of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (more on www.icrc.org).

Prevention at the ICRC

ICRC action has developed along essentially two axes: the operational axis providing direct assistance to the persons affected by armed conflicts and other situations of armed violence, and the axis of IHL development and promotion. These two axes aim at:

- Directly meeting the essential needs of the affected persons;
- Creating or consolidating an environment favourable to the respect of life, physical or moral integrity, and of human dignity.

Both axes are an integral part of ICRC action because the first one takes place within the framework defined by the second one, and the second one needs the experience from the first one and contributes to meet the assessed needs. This duality reinforces ICRC's own identity.

Preventive action therefore covers all pre-emptive steps taken to limit violence and to prevent human suffering, by influencing the attitudes and behaviour of those who determine the plight of people affected by armed conflicts or other situations of violence, and/or who can influence the ICRC's ability to gain access to these persons and to operate efficiently in their favour. This covers a range of activities that are carried out as appropriate both in peacetime and in times of war.

2 ICRC Prevention programmes in Eastern Europe and Central Asia

The ICRC prevention programmes covered by this evaluation are the following:

Promoting the universality of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) instruments and their national implementation

If IHL is to be fully respected, it is of paramount importance that States adopt domestic legislation to implement its rules, in particular those relating to the repression of war crimes and to the use and protection of the red cross, red crescent and red crystal emblems and other distinctive signs and signals. The MEON¹ programme aims at pursuing an active dialogue with national authorities in order to promote accession to IHL treaties and their national implementation in domestic law and practice. Results and development of the programs depend mainly on the general environment and political willingness.

¹ MEON stands for "Mise En Œuvre Nationale" or National Implementation of IHL

Dialogue with military and armed forces

Wherever it operates, the ICRC strives to ensure that the rank and file of armed forces accept its activities as well as IHL and other rules that protect people in situations of armed violence (International Human Rights Law). Additionally, whenever a State is genuinely committed to fulfilling its obligation to promote compliance with the law and has the resources available to sustain its efforts over the long term, the ICRC is prepared to provide support for the integration of the law into the doctrine, education and training of the military, backed by an effective sanctions system. For this purpose, FAS programme focuses on providing the operations with a network of interlocutors within the armed forces and supporting the instruction and integration of IHL/IHRL. Lobbying top authorities, providing instructors with IHL training and organising workshops on particular issues or dissemination sessions are the main activities organised to reach these objectives.

Reaching out to decision-makers and opinion-formers

The main objective of the MINUNI program is to ensure that Academics and students (potential political and civil society leaders and future decision makers from the State's institutions) understand and defend the relevance of IHL, contribute to its development, implementation, promotion and respect, influence humanitarian debates and support ICRC action, policies and activities. To achieve these objectives, ICRC develops contacts with key academic institutions in order to have IHL taught as a compulsory subject, organises IHL competitions among students, promotes debates on IHL in universities and provides them with adequate publications. The ICRC also involves professors in other activities that are not directly linked to teaching IHL (eg. National IHL Committees, round tables on humanitarian issues) to advance its operational priorities.

The aim of the MINEDUC programme is to familiarize young people with the humanitarian concepts underlying IHL through an official education programme in secondary schools. Each country has developed its own programme with an approach based on its own culture and needs, the requirements of the target audience and of the education authorities.

Geographical coverage

These prevention programmes are currently being implemented in countries belonging to Eastern Europe and Central Asia region (hereafter called the region), namely Russian Federation, Ukraine, Moldavia, Belarus, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan.

Prevention programs targeting national authorities (MEON), military armed forces (FAS), universities (MINUNI) and schoolchildren (MINEDUC) have been carried out in these countries for the last ten years.

3 The Evaluation

3.1 Purpose of the evaluation

It has been more than 10 years since some of ICRC's prevention programmes were launched in the countries covered by this evaluation. Today, it is necessary to reflect upon the strategies of such programmes in the evolving environment and to take a critical look at what has been achieved given the existing constraints.

3.2 Intended use

Results of the evaluation will be used to decide, during the 2009 planning cycle (summer 2008), about the future orientation of the programmes and confirm or re-orientate the objectives currently followed by the concerned delegations. They may also be useful for orienting prevention

programmes in other regions and for helping revise regional perspectives for prevention programmes and adjusting ICRC's regional involvement, strategies and priorities of the programmes, in accordance with the respective contexts.

Given the above, it is the intention of the ICRC that this evaluation is planned, conducted and reported in a manner that will encourage the use of the findings, recommendations and lessons-learned, by the key ICRC stakeholders.

The final evaluation report will be the subject of follow-up meetings, workshops and/ or seminars to discuss and act upon the findings and recommendations.

3.3 *The evaluation's audience*

Primary readership

This evaluation is intended primarily for the information of the head of operations for Eastern Europe and Central Asia, the heads of delegation of the concerned countries and relevant headquarters units handling prevention programmes including the specialists in the field.

Secondary readership

The secondary internal readership may include the ICRC Directors, the heads of region and concerned staff at the headquarters and in the field.

3.4 *Evaluation scope and focus*

The evaluation focuses on the years 2005-2007 of the MEON, MINUNI, MINEDUC, EHL and FAS programs in the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan; it also takes into account the wider history of the three programmes (and their initial ambitions) since their inception over ten years ago.

The evaluators should address three main questions covering the following evaluation criteria (coherence, results, and management²):

- To what extent were the delegations' MEON, MINUNI, MINEDUC and FAS general and specific objectives coherent with the respective delegations' priorities, identities and working environment, ICRC regional positioning, and institutional policies?
- To what extent have the delegations and the "ERC"³ been able to assess the results of MEON, MINUNI, MINEDUC and FAS specific operational strategies, and to establish priorities based on programme performance, within available resources?

² **Coherence** is the extent to which the policy, intervention / programme / operation is in line with relevant policies and strategies; **Results** are describable and/or measurable effects of an intervention; **Management** is the degree of collaboration among the different local and international partners and stakeholders and within the ICRC delegation.

³ **ERC**: Equipe Régionale de Coordination (Regional Coordination Team, based at the headquarters). ERCs are permanent coordination fora under the responsibility of the Head of Region aimed at ensuring efficient intersectoral cooperation. Their members meet regularly and on an ad hoc basis, in small groups or in plenary session depending on the matter at hand; they hold regular briefings and define regional orientations and priorities. (ICRC: Management and Operational Framework, DIR 0741rev)

- What synergies and coordination opportunities have been identified between MEON, MINUNI, MINEDUC and FAS activities, and within the region, and capitalised upon by delegations? In successful cases, what factors enabled delegations to capitalise upon such synergies and coordination opportunities?

3.5 Management and supervision of the evaluation

Ultimate responsibility for the management and supervision of the evaluation rests with the ICRC Institutional Performance Management unit. A representative of the unit will provide the evaluation team with guidance and the necessary assistance throughout all phases of the work. The representative will be helped by the members of the "reference group" (representing the department of operations, the advisory service, the education and behaviour Unit, the unit for relations with armed and security forces and the field communication unit) and other representatives from the Department of Operations, including the head of region (headquarters) and the heads of delegation (field).

The principal functions of the reference group will be to:

- define what should be evaluated
- validate the questions and the ToR drafted by the Institutional Performance Management unit
- select the evaluators
- provide the evaluation team with support (access to sources of information)
- discuss notes and reports produced by the evaluators and give their opinion on the quality of the draft and final reports
- help provide feedback on the evaluation's conclusions and recommendations.

The Evaluation Team will consist of independent evaluators. It will be responsible for conducting the evaluation itself and the day-by-day management of the evaluation. The team will regularly report through the Evaluation Team Leader to the representative of the Institutional Performance Management unit. Approval will be sought for the evaluation work plan, first draft report and final evaluation report, before continuing on to the next phase.

Changes to the approved evaluation work plan that affect its scope or focus, methodology, schedule or budget, should be submitted in writing to the representative of the Institutional Performance Management unit for approval. During the field visit, the evaluation team will provide regular feedback to the head of delegation concerned.

3.6 Evaluation method

The following stages are required (but not limited to):

- desk research / review of literature
- interviews with key ICRC staff in Geneva
- interview with key external stakeholders and Red Cross / Red Crescent National Society representatives
- visit to the countries where ICRC has a permanent structure, namely the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan
- visit to another two of the concerned countries if necessary (evaluators' choice)

3.7 *Deliverables*

The evaluators will produce:

1. a work plan
2. a draft evaluation report
3. an evaluation report with an executive summary.

The final report should be in the form of a management paper, and include an executive summary, bibliography and list of consultations conducted. The work plan and draft evaluation report will be submitted to the ICRC for comments before the final documents are produced. The deliverables are to be prepared in English.

3.8 *Work Plan*

The evaluation work plan is the first contracted product of the evaluation. The work plan describes how the evaluation is to be carried out by refining and elaborating the terms of reference. It must present the intervention logic of the concerned prevention programmes in a graphical form, based on the available documentation. The work plan must be approved by the ICRC prior to launching the following phase. It will serve as the agreement between the parties on how the evaluation is to be conducted.

3.9 *Evaluation report*

The draft evaluation report is the second contracted product of the evaluation. It should clearly identify the purpose of the evaluation, what was evaluated, how the evaluation was conducted, the data considered, the findings, the conclusions drawn and recommendations made and lessons identified. The report should explain how each conclusion (judgement on findings) derives from the findings, and what their limitations are. Recommendations should be linked to conclusions, and addressed to the appropriate hierarchical level (operational, strategic, etc.) for follow-up. As to the lessons, the conditions under which the knowledge can be transferred should be set out. **The non-negotiable deadline for the handover of the draft report is end of May 2008.**

The final evaluation report is the third contracted product of the evaluation and may require one or more edited versions before being approved by the ICRC. The final report includes an executive summary that highlights in five pages or less the background, methods, main findings, conclusions recommendations and lessons. Where appropriate, technical appendices should be employed to separate items such as methodological issues, detailed tabulations or analysis of data, instruments and detailed procedure used from the main body of the report. For reasons of continuity, the appendices should also contain the original terms of reference and the approved inception report with the work plan. An outline for the final report is given below and can be elaborated on as required.

Structure:

- executive summary of conclusions and recommendations and lessons learnt (in line with the ICRC format, max. 5 pages);
- introduction, with background to the evaluation;
- description of methods used and approach, scope and limitations;
- description of the ICRC prevention programmes in Eastern Europe and Central Asia;
- analysis based on the evaluative questions, with findings;
- conclusions and recommendations;
- lessons.

In addition to the final text, the report must contain:

- title page;
- a short summary of the evaluators' background;
- complete table of contents including annexes;
- list of abbreviations used.

Annexes:

- TOR;
- Work plan / itinerary;
- geographical map if appropriate;
- list of interviewees;
- references / documentation/databases.

The quality of the draft report and final report will be appraised by a selection of ICRC staff members based on the following criteria: needs met? scope relevant? design appropriate? data reliable? analysis sound? findings credible? conclusions valid? recommendations useful? report clear? The resulting feedback will be made available to the evaluators in consolidated form for corrective action.

3.10 Evaluation team

The evaluation team should include 3 - 5 evaluators (negotiable) who have not been involved in the design and implementation of the ICRC prevention programmes in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Given the time constraint, the team leader may have to rely on local evaluation expertise for the data collection. The team members should combine the following skills and professional experiences:

- strong management skills;
- confirmed expertise and experience in evaluating humanitarian programmes;
- practical experience in managing prevention programmes;
- legal background and basic knowledge of International Humanitarian Law;
- knowledge of and working experience in the Commonwealth of Independent States
- knowledge of the Red Cross / Red Crescent Movement and practical experience working with the ICRC in the field;
- demonstrated reporting skills (candidates will be asked to provide evidence);
- strong written and oral communication skills in French and English.

The evaluators are expected to abide by the spirit of the Swiss Evaluation Standards (http://www.seval.ch/en/documents/SEVAL_Standards_2000_en.pdf).

3.11 Timeline

The evaluation will take place in **April - May 2008**. The evaluation process comprises the following stages:

1. briefing and interviews at headquarters; desk research
2. writing of work plan
3. field visits and data collection
4. debriefing with the heads of delegation at the end of each field visit
5. debriefing in Geneva at the end of the field visit(s) in order to share preliminary findings
6. writing of the draft report
7. round table meeting in Geneva before finalizing the evaluation report
8. writing of the final report