EVALUATION OF UNDP SUPPORT TO THE SYRIAN REFUGEE CRISIS RESPONSE AND PROMOTING AN INTEGRATED RESILIENCE APPROACH
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ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is carrying out an ‘Evaluation of the UNDP support to the Syrian crisis response and promoting integrated resilience approach’. The evaluation is part of the IEO work plan approved by the Executive Board in January 2018.¹ The evaluation will assess the contribution of UNDP to the Syrian refugee response at the national level and the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP). In addition, the evaluation will assess the extent to which the concept of resilience-based development has been used as an underpinning framework in other migration and displacement programmatic interventions and corporate approaches. This will include UNDP resilience-based development programmes in response to multi-country and cross-border migration and displacement in the Lake Chad Basin, Rohingyas, and Venezuelan refugee crises.

The evaluation will contribute to strengthening the Syrian refugee response, development of corporate programme strategies, policies on migration and displacement programming. The evaluation will strengthen UNDP’s accountability to global, regional and national development partners, including the Executive Board. The evaluation will be presented to the Executive Board at the Second Annual Session in January 2021.²

As the Syrian crisis enters its ninth year, the conflict’s protracted nature and its complexity, severity and scale have led to the largest refugee displacement in the world with massive humanitarian and development impacts. UNDP has supported a shift in approach towards resilience-building aimed to bridge the humanitarian-development divide. UNDP programme portfolio is composed of initiatives on livelihoods, employment and local economic development; local and municipal service delivery; social cohesion; and natural resources and environmental sustainability. UNDP’s programmes aim to mitigate the socio-economic impact of the crisis on the most vulnerable host communities and support the governments in coping, recovering and addressing the consequences of the influx of refugees. In the case of Rohingyas, Lake Chad Basin, and Venezuelan refugee crises development approach underpinned UNDP support, complementing national and international efforts in enabling livelihoods, reducing climate impacts, and enhancing social cohesion.

The evaluation will build upon four Independent Country Programme Evaluations (ICPEs) conducted by the IEO in 2019 in Turkey, Lebanon, Syria and Iraq to provide in-depth insights on UNDP’s engagement and contributions to the Syrian refugee response. In addition, the evaluation will carry out a case study of the Syrian refugee response in Jordan. An assessment of the organisational structure set up to coordinate the Regional Refugee & Resilience Plan (3RP) interventions will be carried out. Country and desk studies

---

² The evaluation will be carried out within the framework of UNDP Evaluation Policy (http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf) and UNEG norms and standards (http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22).
will be carried out to assess the application of UNDP’s resilience-building approach in the Rohingya crisis in Bangladesh, Venezuela refugee crisis in Peru and Ecuador, and Lake Chad Basin.

2. CONTEXT OF REFUGEE CRISES

Large numbers of people are migrating, mostly out of necessity. In total, there are an estimated 272 million migrants worldwide, comprising 3.5 per cent of the global population; women comprised 48 per cent of the migrants. According to the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the global refugee population rose from 43.3 million people in 2009 to 70.8 million people in 2019. This includes 41.3 million internally displaced people, 25.9 million refugees and 3.5 asylum-seekers.

International frameworks distinguish those leaving as a result of forced displacement and voluntary migration, with migrants and refugees being considered distinct groups governed by separate legal frameworks. Only refugees are entitled to the international protection defined by international refugee law.

Syrian refugee crisis

The Syrian civil war began in 2011 with peaceful anti-government demonstrations as part of the Arab Spring, protesting the lack of freedom and the tough economic situation. The government response that followed resulted in the killing and imprisonment of the demonstrators. The violence scaled up with implications beyond Syria, resulting in a mammoth refugee influx to the neighbouring countries. This unprecedented refugee crisis has displaced over 6 million people within Syria and over 5.6 million into neighbouring countries (Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, and Egypt –

---

3 IOM Glossary on Migration, [https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/iml_34_glossary.pdf](https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/iml_34_glossary.pdf)


5 [https://www.unhcr.org/figures-at-a-glance.html](https://www.unhcr.org/figures-at-a-glance.html)

6 According to the 1951 UN Refugee Convention and the 1967 Protocol, refugees are persons who, owing to a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.
Out of these, over 3.6 million Syrian refugees are registered in Turkey, 1.5 million in Lebanon\(^8\), 673,414 in Jordan\(^9\), 251,793 in Iraq, and 132,553 in Egypt\(^{10}\). Turkey hosts the highest number of refugees in the world and Lebanon has the highest concentration of refugees per capita.\(^{11}\) While 7 per cent of refugees live in camps in Turkey and 27 per cent in Lebanon, in Jordan and Iran 93 per cent live in urban or peri-urban areas within host communities.\(^{12}\) The number of refugees has remained stable since 2018, with each of the host countries closely managing their borders and refugee admission practices.

The refugee crisis significantly affected economic and social gains in the host countries, particularly Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan. While as middle-income countries they had in place systems for the provision of social and public services, their economic and development challenges were further aggravated due to the sheer number of refugees. The refugee crisis has stretched to the limit of public service systems and infrastructure that was already weak in many host communities. The Syrian refugees are highly vulnerable, and struggle to meet basic nutrition, health care and housing needs. Common challenges for the refugees across the host countries include legal uncertainty, lack of residency permits, limited work opportunities, and inadequate social services.

---

\(^7\) UNHCR estimates 5,663,558 persons of concern as of 13 January 2019. Governments estimate a total of 7,245,754 Syrians, including registered Syrian refugees, unregistered Syrian refugees and Syrians residing in host countries under alternative legal frameworks (3RP Regional Strategic Overview 2019-2020).

\(^8\) 1.5 million as per government estimates. Versus 951,629 3RP Regional Strategic Overview 2019-2020.

\(^9\) Versus 1.38 million as per government estimates. 3RP Regional Strategic Overview 2019-2020.

\(^10\) Versus 500,000 as per government estimates. 3RP Regional Strategic Overview 2019-2020.

\(^11\) As of mid-2018, the number of refugees per 1,000 inhabitants is estimated at: Lebanon (160), Jordan (71), and Turkey (44). UNHCR Mid-Year Trends 2018, p.11. See: https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/statistics/unhcrstats/5c52ea084/mid-year-trends-2018.html

\(^12\) 3RP Regional Strategic Overview 2019-2020.
Turkey has been hosting the largest community of Syrian refugees in the region. There have been important achievements in ensuring food security and basic needs and providing education services. While this support deserves attention, several issues need to be addressed, such as improving services in the camps to better refugee integration processes. Increased institutional capacity support, technical expertise, equipment and improved infrastructure for service provision are needed at both national and local levels to enable the effective and harmonised application of the national asylum framework and relevant legislation across the country. There is an increasing focus to integrate Syrians into national systems for access to health, education, employment and social services in line with the Temporary Protection Regulation. Over the first half of 2018, the Turkish Emergency Social Safety Net reached approximately 1.36 million vulnerable refugee households. Turkey follows a holistic approach to creating jobs that can also absorb Syrian refugees. It granted work permits to over 60,000 Syrians and specific employment policies to integrate Syrian refugees are evolving. Challenges remain in terms of sustainable livelihood for refugees.

Syrian refugees comprise about a quarter of the Lebanese population. Besides, Lebanon also hosts 34,000 Palestinian refugees from Syria and the pre-existing Palestinian refugee population of more than 277,985. Syrian refugees primarily live in Beqaa province (36 per cent), Beirut, North Lebanon, and South Lebanon. Approximately 69 per cent of Syrian refugees live below the poverty line. As of 2018, 40 per cent of the Syrian refugee work was informal labour (approximately 35 per cent men and 61 per cent women). The refugee crisis has impacted Lebanon’s social and economic growth and exacerbated pre-existing political and sectarian divisions. Tensions have grown at the local level due to an increased supply of informal and low wage refugee labour.

In Jordan, the government extended a fee waiver for Syrian work permit applicants and exempted Syrians from foreign employment restrictions in the manufacturing, construction and employment sectors. From 2016 to 2018, the Ministry of Labour has granted 129,154 work permits, predominantly to men. Non-Jordanians still cannot work in sales, services and professional sectors such as engineering and medicine, or can establish home-based businesses outside of camps without a Jordanian partner. Similar to other host countries, Syrian refugees continue to work informally in agriculture and construction.

---

13 3,622,366 Syrian refugees as of December 2018, of which 54.4% are men and 45.6% are women. See https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/113
15 3RP, 2018 progress report.
16 LCRP 2017-2020, Ibid.
17 World Bank, The Mobility of Displaced Syrians.
19 VASYR 2018, p.5.
21 World Bank, The Mobility of Displaced Syrians. There were inconsistent applications of labour laws regulating movement of work permits between sectors but, as of October 30, 2018, the Ministry of Labour issued circular allowing Syrian refugees to move freely between sectors.
Most of the Syrian refugees in Egypt reside in the urban areas of Cairo governorate, Alexandria and Damietta.\(^2\) A 2016 household survey found that 89 per cent of Syrian refugees are highly or severely vulnerable and unable to meet their basic needs.\(^3\) The coping capacity of the country is hampered by its high national unemployment (12.5 per cent) and poverty rates (27.8 per cent). In Iraq, challenges remain in terms of access to healthcare and medicines, education, necessities, and adequate shelter, mainly for refugees living outside camps. The camp population in Iraq is increasing, putting pressure on the basic services. Iraq started to provide residency permits in 2018, giving Syrian refugees greater freedom of movement, access to services, and livelihoods opportunities. With different waves of Iraqi displacements, demand for resources increases the risk of social tensions.

There are ongoing efforts by the host governments to improve livelihood support and social services and further refugee integration. Although the initial response was focused on immediate needs, there has been a shift to development and resilience efforts, particularly improving service delivery and infrastructure at the municipal level, strengthening capacities of the institutions, and boosting local economic and employment opportunities. Legislative and policy environments are slowly becoming more flexible to allow Syrian refugees to access economic opportunities. The host countries are also dealing with the consequences of increased competition over jobs and unemployment, which has impacted social cohesion and peace. Challenges remain in terms of overcrowded schools; shortages of qualified health staff, medicines and funds; water shortages and power cuts; gaps in local sanitation and solid waste management leading to the water, soil and air pollution; and insecure housing with threats of eviction.

Protection risks are also significant, and women face specific vulnerabilities of early marriage, gender-based violence, higher risk of intra-household violence, survival sex, marginalization, lack of gender-sensitive services and child labour. Syrian refugee women and girls face significant discriminations and inequality which are heightened by the risk of violence and exploitation.\(^4\) Economic insecurity is as a primary concern and challenge for women across all countries who must rely on negative coping mechanisms as they are unable to meet their basic needs. Challenges related to civil status and work permits are also particularly acute; only a few work permits are issued to women. Displacement also had an important impact on gender dynamics, particularly women’s roles and responsibilities, with changes in roles within and outside the household, leadership and engagement in public life. An estimated one million Syrian babies have born in neighbouring countries, who face a risk of statelessness.\(^5\)

**International response**

In response to the immense needs of the refugees and the host countries, many forums and international donor conferences have taken place setting ambitious goals. These range from multi-year funding mechanisms, localization, new ways of cooperation, employment creation to the integration of the humanitarian-development nexus. Strong calls to action have taken place annually, starting with the “First

\(^2\) UNHCR registration data as of 31 Jan 2019. See: [https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/1](https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/1)

\(^3\) Egypt 3RP 2018-2019.


\(^5\) 3RP Regional Strategic Overview 2019-2020.
International Pledging Conference" (30 January 2013) in Kuwait to the most recent “Supporting the Future of Syria and the Region – Brussels II” (24-25 April 2018). The Annex has the full list of international funding appeals. UN humanitarian interagency appeals have ranged billions of dollars (see Figure 1), which represent 84 per cent of total funding. As of September 2018, over $12 billion had been provided through the different UN Syrian refugee appeals since the start of the crisis. Donor support has averaged 60 per cent of funding needs between 2015 and 2018.

After the Brussels III conference in March 2019, international donors pledged $7 billion for 2019 and $2.38 billion for 2020 and beyond for programming in Syria and refugee-hosting countries, with an addition of $21.01 billion in loans for 2019 and beyond. The European Union member states and the European Commission represent the bulk of these commitments, with over $5.5 billion in 2019 and $2.1 billion in 2020 and beyond. In 2018, the education sector was the largest recipient of international funds (24 per cent), followed by $ 604 million for targeted economic recovery and infrastructure (11 per cent), and $ 557 million (10 per cent) funding for food assistance.

3. UN RESPONSE

Since 2012, the UN Security Council has adopted 23 resolutions on Syria or largely related to Syria. UN-facilitated talks started in June 2012 in Geneva between the Syrian government and opposition delegates. As mandated by the Security Council Resolution 2254 (2015), the UN has convened eight rounds of intra-Syrian talks since 2016 to achieve a military ceasefire and find a political solution to the conflict. The discussions “focus on governance, a schedule and process to draft a new constitution and the holding of elections as the basis for a Syrian-led, Syrian-owned process to end the conflict”. However, efforts to break a ceasefire have been unsuccessful and hostilities continue in some parts of the country.

Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP)

The first regional response plan was adopted in March 2012 to address the need for protection and assistance to Syrian refugees in Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq, followed by Egypt in 2013. A more structured Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) was initiated in 2015 to respond to a growing need for an integrated humanitarian and development approach and longer-term financial planning and

33 See: https://www.unog.ch/unog/website/news_media.nsf/%28httpPages%29/4d6470dbeaf92917c1257e59004fac2d
predictability. UNHCR and UNDP lead the refugee and resilience components respectively. The 3RP approach recognizes the protracted nature of the conflict and that a classic humanitarian response would not be adequate. It pursues regional coherence to enhance coordination, information management, monitoring, advocacy and fundraising. It is underpinned by the 3RP Regional Steering Committee (RSC), the Regional Technical Committee (RTC) and approximately 40 working groups across the five response countries (see figure 3). In 2019, financial requirements for the Regional Refugee & Resilience reached a total of $5.53 billion\textsuperscript{34} (for a list of major donors see Annex).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2.png}
\caption{Trend in 3RP Response Funding}
\end{figure}

\textit{Source: 3RP Regional Strategic Overview 2020-2021.}

\textsuperscript{34} 3RP 2017 Annual Report. May 2018.
Source: 3RP Regional Strategic Overview 2020-2021.

The 3RP framework aims to strengthen the resilience of individuals, households, communities and state institutions under strong national leadership.\textsuperscript{35} It invests in livelihoods and employment opportunities among refugees and host communities, promoting educational opportunities for children and young people in line with the No Lost Generation initiative.\textsuperscript{36}

4. UNDP’S STRATEGY AND PROGRAMME RESPONSE

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development fully recognizes migration and displacement as core development considerations. The number of displaced people, refugees and migrants have been increasing over the last years. In 2017, 68.5 million people were forced to leave their homes, among which 25.4 million are refugees.\textsuperscript{37} Displaced persons are increasingly residing outside of camps, relying on the informal economy. UNDP Strategic Plan emphasizes the importance of strengthening resilience to shocks and crisis (outcome 3 of the Strategic Plan 2018 – 2021)\textsuperscript{38} and a more integrated and holistic approach to resilience.

UNDP strategies recognise the importance of long-term development approaches in addressing migration and displacement. Also, there has been a specific emphasis on partnerships to advance the development dimensions of migration and displacement in the outlined in the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework, the Global Compact for Migration, the Global Compact on Refugees, the Global Forum for

\textsuperscript{35} Through the Lebanon Crisis Response Plan 2017-2020 (LCRP) in Lebanon, Jordan Response Plan (JRP) for the Syria Crisis 2018-2020 in Jordan and 3RP country chapters in Turkey, Iraq and Egypt.

\textsuperscript{36} See: https://www.nolostgeneration.org/


\textsuperscript{38} UNDP Strategic Plan 2014–2017 also reflected in through outcome 6 on recovery and rapid return to sustainable development pathways are achieved in post-conflict and post-disaster situations.
Migration and Development, the Platform on Disaster Displacement, the Plan of Action for the Guiding Principles for Internal Displacement (GP20), and other important fora on migration and development.

The universal presence of UNDP has allowed it to play an important role in countries affected by crisis through its development, capacity-building and governance mandates, making contributions around issues of displacement and migration. An initial mapping of UNDP’s country level efforts towards migration and displacement found that since 2006, 180 migration related initiatives (representing $375 million) are estimated to have been implemented through integrated development programmes, to harness the positive potential of migration for development and address its negative drivers.39 This includes a joint UNDP-IOM Global Programme on Mainstreaming Migration into National Development Plans and other efforts to address the negative drivers of migration and human trafficking.

Following the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, UNDP committed to scale up its development approaches to migration and displacement and framed its migration and displacement work around the 2030 Agenda and SDGs, ensuring to ‘leave no one behind’ and ‘to reach the furthest behind first’. This work was expected to contribute to three specific UNDP focus areas: eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, and keeping people out of poverty; accelerating structural transformations for sustainable development, especially through innovative solutions that have multiplier effects across the SDGs; and building resilience to crises and shocks, in order to safeguard development gains.40 The Syria refugee crisis has increased attention and urgency on bridging the humanitarian-development divide and the need to combine short-term responses to displacement impacts with medium to long-term development interventions. The concept of resilience-based humanitarian response, recovery and development in a crisis context has emerged to provide a common framework for all actors. As presented in Figure 4, it aims to support communities and institutions to respond to increased demands and

---

40 UNDP (2019) Advancing Dev Approaches to Migration Position Paper
pressures ("coping"), promote household recovery from the negative impacts of the crisis ("recovering") and strengthen the local and national economy and social systems to protect development gains from current and future shocks ("transforming"). It is expected to ensure that affected communities, both refugees and host communities, not only recover from crises but also improve their prospects for the longer-term development needed to move towards lasting peace and prosperity.

Key streams of UNDP Syria response programme using a resilience-based approach are the following. UNDP Syria response programme budget is presented in Table 1.

- Livelihoods and inclusive economic growth: Competition over access to livelihoods opportunities may create tensions. UNDP supports cash-for-work, vocational training, small and medium enterprise development, recovery and reconstruction for economic revitalization for both host community members and the displaced to enable a rapid return to sustainable development and inclusive growth.
- Peacebuilding and social cohesion: Support to dialogue and facilitation of conflict mitigation between host communities and displaced persons.
- Basic service delivery and governance: Efforts focus on ensuring access to basic services through the strengthening of municipalities’ capacities and inclusive and participatory local development planning; and strengthening national and local governance systems and core governance functions, including sustainable natural resource management to protect development gains.

Table 1. UNDP Syria refugee response programme budget ($USD millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>$0.0 M</td>
<td>$0.0 M</td>
<td>$0.0 M</td>
<td>$0.0 M</td>
<td>$0.0 M</td>
<td>$1.1 M</td>
<td>$1.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>$1.2 M</td>
<td>$2.6 M</td>
<td>$19.5 M</td>
<td>$33.5 M</td>
<td>$33.4 M</td>
<td>$22.1 M</td>
<td>$117.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>$4.9 M</td>
<td>$8.6 M</td>
<td>$7.7 M</td>
<td>$7.5 M</td>
<td>$7.7 M</td>
<td>$2.7 M</td>
<td>$39.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>$10.6 M</td>
<td>$21.1 M</td>
<td>$43.9 M</td>
<td>$45.6 M</td>
<td>$40.7 M</td>
<td>$46.8 M</td>
<td>$208.7 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>$3.6 M</td>
<td>$1.9 M</td>
<td>$7.0 M</td>
<td>$7.7 M</td>
<td>$9.1 M</td>
<td>$23.7 M</td>
<td>$53.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$20.3 M</td>
<td>$34.4 M</td>
<td>$78.0 M</td>
<td>$94.4 M</td>
<td>$90.9 M</td>
<td>$96.4 M</td>
<td>$414.2 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: figures are rounded to the nearest $100,000.

43 Note: Includes Iraq Crisis Response and Resilience Programme, targeted at Iraqi IDPs and Syrian refugees ($108M)
44 Includes Lebanese-Palestinian Dialogue Committee ($4.5M) and Palestinian Host Gatherings ($14.4M)
UNDP and UNHCR have a long history of collaboration in a wide range of crisis and conflict settings. Although the two agencies have always cooperated, recent changes in the international arena have widened the scope to expand the collaboration between the two agencies on the transition from short-term relief to longer-term recovery and development. In the Syrian refugee crisis, the two agencies set up a joint regional secretariat and jointly coordinated the humanitarian and resilience dimensions of the refugee response at the national level.

**UNDP's support to Lake Chad Basin, Rohingya, and Venezuelan refugee crises**

The Lake Chad Basin, Rohingya, Colombia, and Venezuela crises are among over 50 refugee and IDP crises UNDP responded to. In the Lake Chad region, the Boko Haram conflict has created a protracted displacement crisis which has entered its seventh year, with a total estimate of 228,500 refugees. The crisis has called for integrated humanitarian, development and peace approaches, with development initiatives for refugees and host communities through a resilience-building development approach. While national and multi-national military operations have re-taken territory, UNDP launched in 2019 a Regional Stabilization Facility for 2 years in the four Lake Chad Basin countries as a rapid response mechanism to help the local authorities curtail the ability of Boko Haram insurgency by restoring and extending effective civilian security; and improving the delivery of basic services and livelihoods.

The conflict in Myanmar caused severe displacement in 2017, with 745,000 Rohingya of which more than 400,000 children fleeing violence in Rakhine state to Bangladesh, in Cox’s Bazar. It is estimated that a total of 909,000 stateless Rohingya refugees live in refugee camps including the previous 278,000 refugees. UNDP supported livelihoods and social cohesion activities through cash for work / temporary employment for community infrastructure rehabilitation.

The Venezuelan crisis, refugees and displaced people are increasingly concentrated in formal and informal settlements in urban areas in neighbouring countries. Refugees attempt to blend in with the host communities and are reluctant to register. This has represented important challenges for national and international support, whose tools, methods and approaches had to be adapted to this new setting. UNDP response varied across countries with refugees from Venezuela and scale of engagement has been small.

### 5. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The evaluation will assess UNDP’s contribution to the Syria refugee response, including the support to the 3RP related coordination and programme implementation. This will entail an assessment of the contribution of the resilience-based development approaches to improved livelihoods and social cohesion of Syrian refugees and host communities, and service delivery at national and local levels. The evaluation will cover UNDP’s contribution to the 3RP and its role in UN coordination at the regional level. An area the evaluation will examine is the application of resilience approach in other refugee crises.

The main objectives of the evaluation are to assess:

- the role and contribution of UNDP in the Syria refugee response and the 3RP;

---

45 https://www.unocha.org/rohingya-refugee-crisis
• Identify the factors that have affected UNDP's contribution to the Syria refugee response and the 3RP;
• the extent to which UNDP resilience-based development approach has bridged the humanitarian and development divide;
• the extent to which UNDP programmes in other migration and displacement crises and UNDP corporate approach have built upon the 3RP and the resilience-based development approach.

The evaluation will cover Syrian refugee response programmes in Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq and Egypt for the period 2015-2019. The evaluation will assess UNDP’s country-level responses and the 3RP coordination structure. In making the overall assessment of UNDP’s contribution, the evaluation will examine how the conceptualization of resilience-based development approaches in migration and displacement settings and global debates have translated into practice and corporate guidance. For a wider analysis, programmes in response to the Rohingya, Venezuela, and the Regional Lake Chad Basin crises are included.

6. FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING UNDP CONTRIBUTION

The theory of change used for determining UNDP contribution distinguishes between immediate, intermediate and long-term outcomes, recognizing that some of the components are iterative. Immediate outcomes are outputs of UNDP initiatives that have the likelihood of contributing to programme outcomes. This implies UNDP programme strategies and choices of activities are appropriate for responding to refugee challenges and capacity needs of the host governments. Intermediate outcomes comprise initiatives to strengthen humanitarian and development linkages and resilient national development policies, processes and programmes for the social and economic development of the refugees and the host communities. The assumption is that the capacities of government institutions to pursue more holistic responses to development and the refugee crisis are critical for sustainable development. Based on the UNDP programme strategies, the areas identified for assessment are illustrated in Figure 5. The theory of change also presumes that the scope and scale of UNDP programmes are reasonably sufficient to contribute to intermediate outcomes.

Given the complexity of the refugee crisis and diversity of national level contexts, the level of visibility of UNDP programme outcomes or results achieved will not be uniform. Contribution to resilient refugee response strategies and the broader development of the host communities depends on a range of factors often beyond the scope of UNDP support.

The evaluation considers the contribution to four key refugee response and resilience support outcomes: a) contribution to improved livelihoods, services, and social cohesion of host communities and Syrian refugees; b) contribution of resilience-approaches to addressing development and migration challenges; c) contribution to 3RP and joint UN efforts; and d) corporate learning to respond to other migration and displacement crises. The line of accountability of UNDP programmes is however considered in this evaluation to be at the intermediary outcome level. Beyond the intermediary outcome, UNDP’s contribution will be considered as part of complex, multi-causal pathways of refugee response and strengthening resilience outcomes. The evaluation will, therefore, be paying more emphasis to the
immediate and intermediate outcomes where the contribution of UNDP programmes is more likely to be evident. The theory of change, however, leaves the possibility to establish different levels of contribution to outcomes and results, wherever it takes place; and enables an understanding at which level the contribution of UNDP has been greater.

Figure 6. A Theory of Change for assessing UNDP contribution

7. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS METHODS

Data will be collected for assessing the criteria in Table 2, answering the key questions and making evaluative judgements. Factors that can explain UNDP’s performance will be identified. The evaluation will use four independence country programme evaluations conducted in 2019 (Syria, Lebanon, Turkey and Iraq) which included these questions. Jordan country case study, and regional analysis to determine the contribution of UNDP to the Syria refugee response and the 3RP will be carried out. In addition, desk studies of Lake Chad Basin, Rohingya, and Venezuelan refugee crises will be conducted for a broader understanding of UNDPs role and contribution in refugee contexts and the application of resilience approach. The evaluation will elaborate on the extent to which corporate learning has taken place and has guided UNDP response in other refugee and migration crisis in which it operates.

Table 2. Evaluation criteria, what is judged, and key questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>What is Judged?</th>
<th>Key questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme positioning for improved contribution</td>
<td>- The level of emphasis given to refugee response programme</td>
<td>- To what extent is UNDP support relevant for refugee hosting countries? Did UNDP strategies enable positioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to improved national capacities to address livelihoods and social services; enhance social cohesion between host communities and refugees</td>
<td>The extent of UNDP’s contribution to Syrian refugee response and the factors that enabled UNDP’s contribution</td>
<td>What was the contribution of UNDP to the Syrian refugee response? Did UNDP respond to country-specific peculiarities and challenges in Syrian refugee response?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which refugee context and specific challenges are taken into consideration by UNDP while developing its programmes</td>
<td>The extent to which UNDP responded to key priorities of the host communities.</td>
<td>Is the prioritisation of refugee related programming commensurate with the scale of the issue is over 50 countries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The positioning of UNDP to promote gender-informed refugee response</td>
<td>The extent to which UNDP's engagement in global and regional debates/advocacy on refugee issues is commensurate with its presence globally and long-term engagement in crisis response</td>
<td>To what extent UNDP prioritised accelerating progress in enabling gender equality and safety of women?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which UNDP’s engagement in global and regional debates/advocacy on refugee issues is commensurate with its presence globally and long-term engagement in crisis response</td>
<td>What is the role of UNDP in addressing drivers of the refugee crisis?</td>
<td>What is the role of UNDP in addressing drivers of the refugee crisis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did UNDP respond to varied refugee contexts?</td>
<td>How did UNDP respond to varied refugee contexts?</td>
<td>How did UNDP respond to varied refugee contexts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did UNDP programme tools — Strategic Plan, Global Programme, global projects, Regional Programmes, Country Programmes — enable positioning of UNDP as a key actor in refugee response and enabling resilient solutions?</td>
<td>Did UNDP programme tools — Strategic Plan, Global Programme, global projects, Regional Programmes, Country Programmes — enable positioning of UNDP as a key actor in refugee response and enabling resilient solutions?</td>
<td>Did UNDP programme tools — Strategic Plan, Global Programme, global projects, Regional Programmes, Country Programmes — enable positioning of UNDP as a key actor in refugee response and enabling resilient solutions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did UNDP position itself in global and regional policy/advocacy space, specifically on debates about approaches to refugee issues?</td>
<td>How did UNDP position itself in global and regional policy/advocacy space, specifically on debates about approaches to refugee issues?</td>
<td>How did UNDP position itself in global and regional policy/advocacy space, specifically on debates about approaches to refugee issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The extent to which UNDP strategies were appropriate in addressing development challenges in the host communities that underpin Syrian refugee response

• The extent to which emphasis was given to gender-related issues and concerns of the marginalised populations in Syrian refugee response

• Contextual and programming factors that facilitated or constrained UNDP’s contribution.

• The extent to which lessons from Syrian refugee response informed other UNDP refugee programmes and addressing host community challenges?

• What was the contribution of UNDP to improving livelihood opportunities and employment and related policy processes?

• What was the contribution of UNDP to improving services and related policy processes? To what extent have UNDP programmes been effective in improving the absorptive capacities of the national systems of the host countries, improving access to basic services for host and refugee communities?

• What is the contribution of UNDP in enhancing peace and social cohesion between the host communities and Syrian refugees? Were UNDP’s programme choices appropriate for promoting peacebuilding efforts?

• Have the programme choices been effective to address the challenges faced by women and youth?

• Did UNDP use innovative approaches in addressing refugee integration challenges and safe return?

• Did UNDP engage the private sector in the refugee response?

• How conducive are UNDP’s management processes to respond to programme needs in migration and displacement contexts?

• What was the contribution of UNDP to Lake Chad Basin, Rohingya, and Venezuelan refugee crises? What factors impacted UNDP contribution?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution of resilience-approaches to addressing development and refugee/migration challenges</th>
<th>The extent of promotion of resilience approaches to addressing development issues in the host countries that had implications for the refugee response</th>
<th>How relevant was the 3RP strategy at the country level?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The relevance of the 3RP strategy at the regional and national levels</td>
<td>How did UNDP respond to the development impacts of migration and displacement at both the community and national level? How has UNDP reduced the impact of the refugee inflow on human development outcomes in host communities? To what extent UNDP promoted a resilience-based development approach bridging the humanitarian and development divide?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which UNDP resilience-based programme choices enabled bridging the humanitarian-development nexus and improved sustainable development outcomes</td>
<td>To what extent UNDP programmes have been effective in assisting host communities to cope with and recover from the refugee crisis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of emphasis given to gender-sensitive, protection and inclusive approaches in refugee response</td>
<td>To what extent UNDP programmes contributed to addressing long term policy issues at multiple levels? Did UNDP strategies enable a context-specific and people-centred approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which lessons from the Syrian refugee response are applied to other refugee crises</td>
<td>Did UNDP’s programme choices emphasize inclusiveness, protection, equity, and gender equality? Are there specific efforts to support most vulnerable regions and population?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution of UNDP to defining a 3RP resilience-building strategy</td>
<td>Did lessons from resilience approach used in the Syrian refugee response inform other refugee strategies and corporate refugee strategy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling partnerships for comprehensive refugee response and sustainable outcomes</td>
<td>How has UNDP contributed to the definition of the 3RP resilience approach?</td>
<td>How relevant was the 3RP strategy at the regional level?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Convening role of UNDP in bringing together actors for more coordinated and resilient refugee response (contribution to 3RP and joint UN coordination efforts) | • The relevance of the 3RP strategy at the regional land national level  
• The extent to which UNDP has taken a leadership and coordination role on the 3RP resilience component  
• Enabling partnerships for a comprehensive refugee response and sustainable outcomes  
• Convening role of UNDP for a coordinated refugee response  
• The extent to which UNDP has promoted a regional approach through the 3RP  
• The extent to which UNDP funding and advocacy have improved through the 3RP | • To what extent has the UNDP-UNHCR 3RP partnership improved synergies across the humanitarian-development nexus and resilience strategies?  
• To what extent has there been a cross-fertilization of resilience approaches between interventions in and outside Syria, particularly in other refugee crises such as Lake Chad Basin, Rohingya, and Venezuelan refugee crises?  
• What was UNDP’s role in enhancing and supporting coordination on the resilience component of the 3RP at the national and regional level? How effective was it in terms of leadership and coordination?  
• How effective has been the 3RP for supporting regional coherence, ensuring programme consistency and influencing country-specific UNDP responses?  
• How effective has been the 3RP been for enhancing longer-term financial planning, fund mobilisation and predictability for UNDP programmes? The flexibility of programme funding for resilience programming? | • Contribution to global and regional policy advocacy  
• Contribution of UNDP to global and regional policy debates on enhancing humanitarian -development linkages  
• The extent to which 3RP and Syrian refugee response informed UNDP’s global offer on resilience in refugee/migration response | • To what extent UNDP leveraged 3RP for advocacy on resilience in humanitarian response (at the global, regional and national level)?  
• What is UNDP’s value proposition to promote humanitarian -development linkages globally? To what extent has the 3RP resilience-approach influenced corporate |
Data collection and analysis methods

The evaluation will include multiple methods and will take an iterative approach to gather various perspectives to measure UNDP performance. This evaluation will make use of a range of evaluative evidence, gathered from UNDP policy and programme documents, independent and quality-assessed decentralized evaluations, credible external reviews, and reports on UNDP performance. The evaluation team will likewise interview a wide range of stakeholders. The evaluation will include a multi-stakeholder consultation process, including a range of development actors at the country level (see below). Protocols will be developed for each method used to ensure rigour in data collection and analysis. Methods used by this evaluation are as follows:

- **Document review**: A wide range of strategy, guidance, and programme-specific documentation will be reviewed. The review will include data from the UNDP Result-Based Management system and ATLAS. This evaluation will make use of independent evaluations and assessments conducted by UNDP and partners, country programme reviews and other performance reports. National development strategies, publications and documents of national and international agencies at the country level will be assessed as pertinent to specific analyses.
- **Meta-synthesis of ICPEs of countries with Syrian refugee response, viz.,** ICPE’s of Turkey, Lebanon, Iraq will be carried out.
- **Case study** of the Syria refugee response in Jordan will be carried out.

---

46 The approach and methods used for the evaluations will be quality assured by the IEO International Advisory Panel.
• A **regional analysis** will be carried out across countries, building upon four Independent Country Programme evaluations conducted by the IEO in 2018 in Turkey, Lebanon, Syria and Iraq, and the country case studies, to understand programme contexts, approaches and outcomes of the Syrian refugee response and the 3RP organizational structure and functioning.

• A **comparative analysis** of other multi-country and cross-border migration and displacement crises to examine to what extent the concept of resilience-based development has been used as an underpinning framework in the programmatic interventions and corporate approaches. Lake Chad Basin, Rohingya, and Venezuelan refugee crises will be included for this analysis:
  o the Rohingya refugee crisis in Bangladesh (2017-2019) and its related joint response plan[^47] where development and humanitarian actors are trying to strengthen the linkages for longer-term development priorities;
  o the Lake Chad Basin crisis in Niger, Chad, Nigeria and Cameroon, where UNDP is supporting scale-up of development interventions to strengthen resilience in the region, help people and communities recover as quickly as possible and prevent further deterioration of the crisis. UNDP and OCHA have been promoting a New Way of Working and other efforts to strengthen the humanitarian-development nexus based on resilience for sustainable development.[^48]
  o Venezuelan refugee crisis in Ecuador/Peru

• **Interviews**, in-person and long distance will be used to capture the views of an extensive array of stakeholders, which include, national counterparts; UNDP headquarters, Regional Bureaux and Hubs, CO management and staff; donor representatives; representatives of relevant UN programmes, funds and agencies; multilateral and bilateral agencies and other development organizations; representatives of international and national civil society organizations; private sector; and where applicable, programme beneficiaries.

8. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS


Table 3: Management Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Evaluation Office</strong></td>
<td>• Will manage the evaluation process, constitute a quality assurance system, and provide administrative and substantive backstopping support. IEO will coordinate and liaise with concerned agencies at headquarters, regional level, and UNDP management and programme units. It will also ensure that evaluations are conducted in accordance with the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IEO Lead Evaluator (LE)</strong></td>
<td>• Will manage the overall evaluation and ensure its smooth conduct. The LE will take a lead role during all phases of the evaluation and coordinate the work of all other team members; will ensure coordination and liaison with the headquarters bureaux, the regional hubs, and country offices. The Lead Evaluator has the specific responsibility of designing the evaluation, overall analysis, and drafting the synthesis report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IEO Associate Lead Evaluator (ALE)</strong></td>
<td>• Will support the LE, including in the preparation of terms of reference, data collection and analysis and the final report. Together with the LE, will help backstop the work of other team members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Consultants</strong></td>
<td>• IEO will be supported by a team of external consultants in various tasks of the evaluation. IEO will recruit all team members, who must possess educational qualifications in social sciences as well as expertise in development-humanitarian nexus, resilience development responses to migration and displacement and the 3RP. The team will have a good understanding of development processes at the country level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Assistant (RA)</strong></td>
<td>• Will support the evaluation team in conducting background research and documentation as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Bureaux and Hubs, Bureau for Policy &amp; Programme Support, COs</strong></td>
<td>• Will support the evaluation by providing the necessary information and documents requested by the IEO and the evaluation team. A substantive focal point will be identified for each programme unit. The focal point will provide the necessary information, and in collaboration with the Evaluation Manager, will facilitate meetings with the UNDP partners and programme stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDP management</strong></td>
<td>• Has the responsibility of reviewing drafts of the Terms of Reference (TOR) and evaluation report, in addition to ensuring timely availability of finance and programme information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IEO Evaluation Advisory Panel</strong></td>
<td>• Will provide guidance on the overall design of the evaluation as set out in the TOR and Inception Report and provide a substantive review of the draft evaluation report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External expert advisors</strong></td>
<td>• 2 external expert advisors (to be identified) will provide technical advice at critical junctures of the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Board</strong></td>
<td>• The evaluation will also be discussed at informal and formal meetings of the Executive Board, specifically for the presentation of the final draft prior to the Second Annual Session of the Executive Board in June 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **TIMEFRAME**

The evaluation will be presented to the Second Annual Session of the Executive Board in January 2021. This requires report completion (following all review processes) by September 2020, to comply with Executive Board secretariat deadlines and allowing ample time for UNDP preparation of its management response. A draft report will be shared with UNDP Management and programme units by August 2020.
### Table 4. Evaluation Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1: Country case studies and desk studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country programme evaluations of Turkey, Lebanon, Iraq, Syria completed</td>
<td>January 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Syrian refugee response case study</td>
<td>January 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk studies of Lake Chad Basin, Rohingya, and Venezuela refugee crises</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2: Validation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation, including additional interviews</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Synthesis</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEO internal Review</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 4: Management Review &amp; Board Presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial findings workshop and first draft sent to Management for review</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share final evaluation report with the management</td>
<td>September 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Board Paper with the EB Secretariat</td>
<td>Mid-Oct 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Board Informal Debriefing</td>
<td>Nov/Dec 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Board formal presentation of conclusions and recommendations</td>
<td>January 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10. EVALUATION TEAM

The IEO will conduct the evaluation and has the overall responsibility for the conceptualization and design of the evaluation, managing the evaluation process and producing a high-quality final evaluation report. IEO Evaluation Manager will lead this process with the support of an IEO Associate Lead Evaluator. IEO will be supported by a team of external consultants for specific areas of the evaluation. IEO will recruit all team members, who must possess educational qualifications in social sciences or related disciplines. The team members will have expertise in the development-humanitarian nexus and resilience development responses to migration and displacement. They will have a good understanding of the 3RP.

### 11. EVALUATION OUTPUTS

The main deliverables of the evaluation are:

- A comprehensive (synthesis) evaluation report covering the issues outlined in the terms of reference. The synthesis report will include an executive summary that highlights findings, conclusions, and recommendations;
- Executive Board paper comprising key findings, conclusions, and recommendations;
- Summary of the evaluation report.
ANNEX 2. TIMELINE OF KEY EVENTS OF THE SYRIA REFUGEE CRISIS AND INTERNATIONAL RESPONSE, 2011-2018

Key: Context Response 3RP Registered

- 500,000 Syrian refugees; First Regional Response Plan (RRP) launched December 2012
- Islamic State declares caliphate in controlled areas of Iraq and Syria March 2013
- 2 million Syrian refugees June 2013
- 1 million Syrian refugees January 2013
- Syrian refugee crisis begins; up to 5,000 refugees flee to Lebanon March 2011
- Fighting breaks out in Aleppo, Syria’s largest city; Za’atari camp opens in Jordan July 2012
- First international humanitarian pledging conference for Syria, Kuwait December 2012
- 2 million Syrian refugees June 2013
- 4 million Syrian refugees December 2014
- 490,280 Syrians arrive by sea to Europe in 2015 December 2015
- UN SG Guterres appeals for humanitarian access, protection of civilians May 2017
- Beirut II Conference February 2018
- Over 5 million Syrian refugees March 2017
- Syrian government offensive in Eastern Ghouta January 2018
- Launch of Dead Sea Resilience Agenda at Resilience Development Forum September 2015
- Launch of EU Facility for Refugees in Turkey August 2015
- London Conference February 2016
- UNSC statement on Syria Crisis – estimated 250,000 casualties, 12 million displaced July 2015
## ANNEX 3. UNDP PROGRAMME PORTFOLIO

Major donors to UNDP Syrian refugee programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>2015-2019 Budget</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany (KfW and GIZ)</td>
<td>$129.5 million</td>
<td>Iraq, Lebanon, Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>$75.5 million</td>
<td>Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>$75.3 million</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>$41.7 million</td>
<td>Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>$22.4 million</td>
<td>Jordan, Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>$18.3 million</td>
<td>Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. of Canada</td>
<td>$24.2 million</td>
<td>Jordan, Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>$14.0 million</td>
<td>Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>$11.1 million</td>
<td>Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>$7.4 million</td>
<td>Jordan, Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>$8.3 million</td>
<td>Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>$6.7 million</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>$5.8 million</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

49 $5 million budget and above. Source: PowerBI/Atlas, 9 Nov 2020, analysis based on project selection in 3RP countries.
Source: UNDP Atlas data provided by BPPS, 9 Nov 2020; includes all projects labelled with “refugees” as a beneficiary group.

Refugee Programme Expenditure by SP Outcome (2018-2019)

Source: UNDP Atlas data provided by BPPS, 9 Nov 2020; includes all projects labelled with “refugees” as a beneficiary group
ANNEX 4. WEIGHTED SCORING

1. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation used weighted scoring to assess UNDP contributions, for systematizing analysis. In the weighted scoring, parameters used for assessing contribution for a programme area or UNDPs overall contribution are assigned different relative weights. Multiplying the individual evaluation scores by the weight gives the score for a particular parameter. Aggregating the results of a set of parameters provides the overall contribution score. For example, the weights assigned for the overall assessment is presented in Table 1 and the four-point scale Box 1. The weighted scoring enabled the evaluation to map patterns and assess contribution on the individual as well as a set of parameters in key areas of support for assessing UNDPs contribution to conflict affected countries. The scoring as used in this evaluation analysis is not a stand-alone assessment but part of other qualitative assessments using different data sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme positioning</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening national institutional, policy, and programme capacities</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global and regional policy advocacy</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening role</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling partnerships</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Evaluation criteria and weights
The key steps in weighted scoring were as follows:

a. Drawing on the evaluation ToC and questions, a set of parameters and sub-parameters were developed for each of the programme areas assessed. The weights were determined by the importance of a parameter for the overall programme contribution of UNDP to refugee response.

b. For arriving at the performance scores the analysis carried out for this evaluation, based on multiple sources of data was used.

c. Before scoring analysis carried out for this evaluation the robustness of the findings was determined. Findings that are supported by 2 or more sources of information were used for scoring.

d. To arrive at the performance score of a programme area, the sum of the weighted score of the set of parameters/sub-parameters is used.

e. To arrive at the evaluation score an aggregate of relevant areas of programme area assessments was used.

### 2. PERFORMANCE SCORING

**Table 2. Performance score for promoting resilience approach within 3RP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A shared understanding of the resilience approach</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience approach applied to both humanitarian and development interventions (Mutually reinforcing humanitarian and development programmes)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened coordination on development initiatives to promote linkages</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme collaboration and common outcomes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared measurement approaches</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive capacity to adjust the design and implementation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility in funding including multi-year funding</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.07</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score: 1= poor; 2= Average; 3=Good; 4=Excellent
Table 3. Score for the contribution of resilience-approaches to addressing development drivers of refugee response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchoring 3RP programmes in national systems</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened policy process</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened institutional capacities at the national level</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened institutional capacities at the local level</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of refugee issues in development processes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes for sustainable and durable solutions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversifying development financing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score: 1= poor; 2= Average; 3=Good; 4=Excellent

Table 4. Performance score for UNDP’s contribution to 3RP mechanism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualisation of 3RP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualisation of the resilience approach</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RP regional and national coordination</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of resilience-based approaches</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource mobilisation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling linkages between humanitarian and development activities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling government engagement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score: 1= poor; 2= Average; 3=Good; 4=Excellent
### Table 5. Performance score for UNDP contribution to basic services and local development in Syrian refugee response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic services support consistent with the priorities and needs of the programme countries and address development drivers of refugee response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened institutional capacities and policies for improving services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened local government capacities in improving services</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressed immediate and critical gaps in services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives provided sustainable/durable institutional processes and solutions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives facilitated GEWE in basic services and local development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated partnerships</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score: 1= poor; 2= Average; 3=Good; 4=Excellent

### Table 6. Performance score for UNDP contribution to employment and livelihoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives consistent with the priorities and needs of the programme countries and address development drivers of refugee response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened institutional capacities and policies to enable employment of scale</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened local government capacities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressed immediate income and livelihood needs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives provided sustainable/durable institutional processes and solutions (Promoted employment models of scale)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated partnerships (private sector in enterprise development and job creation)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives facilitated GEWE in employment and livelihoods</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7. Performance Score for contribution to national policy and institutional strengthening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Syrian refugee response</th>
<th>Lake Chad Basin, Rohingyas, and Venezuela refugee crises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weight (%)</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchoring programmes in national systems and processes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened policy process</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened institutional capacities at the national level</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened institutional capacities at the local level</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of refugee issue in development processes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes for sustainable and durable solutions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversifying development financing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score: 1= poor; 2= Average; 3=Good; 4=Excellent

### Table 8. Overall performance score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme positioning for improved contribution to livelihoods, services, and social cohesion for host communities and refugees (Syrian, Lake Chad Basin, Rohingyas, and Venezuelan refugee crises)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global policy and advocacy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to strengthening national capacities and institutional processes in the Syrian refugee response</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution of resilience- approaches to addressing development drivers of refugee response (Syrian, Lake Chad Basin, Rohingyas, and Venezuelan refugee crises)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to 3RP and joint UN/ coordination efforts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Overall performance score - disaggregated score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key parameters</th>
<th>What is judged</th>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Programme positioning for improved contribution to livelihoods, services, and social cohesion for host communities and refugees (Syrian, Lake Chad Basin, Rohingya, and Venezuelan refugee crises)</td>
<td>1. The extent to which the refugee context and special development situations are taken into consideration by UNDP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The extent to which the programmes respond to national priorities in addressing the refugee situation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The extent to which UNDP strategies were appropriate in supporting host governments and addressing gaps in refugee response;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The positioning of UNDP to promote gender equality in refugee response and host community support</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. The positioning of UNDP to promote global and regional debates on resilience and humanitarian-development nexus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-score</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 (of 100)</td>
<td>2.6 /3</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Global policy and advocacy</td>
<td>Promote global and regional debates on resilience and humanitarian-development nexus</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitate knowledge exchange</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocate for multi-year and flexible funding for nexus programming</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribute to global debates</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-score</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Contribution to strengthening</td>
<td>Strengthening institutional and policy capacities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National capacities and institutional processes in the Syrian refugee response</td>
<td>Strengthening local government capacities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting sustainable and durable programme solutions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enabling local-national linkages</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancing inclusive development processes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthen data</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancing GEWE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total score</strong></td>
<td><strong>25 (of 100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.8/2</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.50</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. a). Contribution of resilience-approaches to addressing development drivers of refugee response (Syria refugee response)**

| A shared understanding of the resilience approach | 15 | 2 | 0.30 |
| Resilience approach applied to both humanitarian and development interventions (Mutually reinforcing humanitarian and development programmes) | 15 | 2 | 0.30 |
| Strengthened coordination | 15 | 2 | 0.30 |
| Programme collaboration and common outcomes | 15 | 3 | 0.45 |
| Shared measurement approaches | 10 | 2 | 0.20 |
| Adaptive capacity to adjust the design and implementation | 20 | 1 | 0.20 |
| Flexibility in funding including multi-year funding | 10 | 2 | 0.20 |
| **Subtotal Score** | **25 (of 100)** | **2** | **0.50** |

**b) Contribution of resilience-approaches to addressing development drivers of refugee response (Lake Chad Basin, Rohingya, Venezuela crises)**

<p>| A shared understanding of the resilience approach | 10 | 1 | 0.10 |
| Resilience approach applied to both humanitarian and development interventions (Mutually reinforcing humanitarian and development programmes) | 15 | 1 | 0.15 |
| Strengthened coordination | 15 | 1 | 0.15 |
| Programme collaboration and common outcomes | 15 | 1 | 0.15 |
| Shared measurement approaches | 15 | 1 | 0.15 |
| Adaptive capacity to adjust the design and implementation | 10 | 1 | 0.10 |
| Flexibility in funding including multi-year funding | 20 | 2 | 0.40 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-score (not included in scoring)</th>
<th>25 (of 100)</th>
<th>1.28</th>
<th>0.32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contribution to 3RP and joint UN/ coordination efforts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization of 3RP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization of the resilience approach</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RP regional and national coordination</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of resilience-based approaches</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource mobilisation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling linkages between humanitarian and development activities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling government engagement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>(20) 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.6/3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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