



# **Evaluation of Effectiveness and Relevance of Advocacy Approaches with the EU and in EU/EFTA countries (2015-2017)**

ANNEXES 2 - 8  
MAY 2019

Conducted by:  
Dr. Glenn O'Neil - Team Leader  
Rebecca Emerson-Keeler - Team member

## UNHCR Evaluation Service

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

### **Evaluation Service**

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Case Postale 2500

1211 Genève 2

Switzerland

[www.unhcr.org](http://www.unhcr.org)

Published by UNHCR

Evaluation Service Copyright © 2019 UNHCR

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

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

## **ANNEXES 2-8**

### **Evaluation of Effectiveness and Relevance of advocacy approaches with the EU and in EU countries (2015-17)**

<b>Annex 2 – List of persons interviewed</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Annex 3 – Main documents reviewed / bibliography</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Annex 4 – Contribution analysis summary</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Annex 5 – Description of methodology and evaluation matrix</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Annex 6 – Interview guide</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Annex 7 – Survey design</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Annex 8 – Evaluation terms of reference</b>	<b>23</b>

## Annex 2 – List of persons interviewed

<b>UNHCR HQ</b>			
<b>First name</b>	<b>Last name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Unit</b>
Karim	Amer	Snr. Policy Advisory	Asia Bureau
Jeanette	Zuefle	Head of Unit, Protection Service	RBE
Maria	Bances del Rey	Senior Protection/Durable Solutions Officer, Complementary Pathways	DIP
Duncan	Breen	Communications and Advocacy Officer	RBE
Vincent	Cochetel	Former Director	RBE
Scott	Craig	Senior Communications Officer	RBE
Christopher	Earney	Head A.I.	Innovation Service
Anna-Sophia	Heintze	DPSM Integrated Programme Service/Protection Management Unit	DIP
Emilie	Irwin	DPSM Integrated Programme Service/Protection Management Unit	DIP
Angela	Li Rosi	Deputy Director	RBE
Pascale	Moreau	Director	RBE
Joel	Nielsen	Senior Change Management Advisor	Executive Office
Jennifer	Pagonis	Chief of Section, Strategic Communications	DER
Ali	Perveen	Senior Executive Assistant	Executive Office
Natalia	Prokopchuk	Communications and Advocacy Officer	RBE
Francois	Renaud	Senior Desk Officer	RBE
Hayley	Scrase	Child protection focal point	RBE
Emad Aziz	Sedrak	Snr. Resettlement Officer	DIP
Ritu	Shroff	Director	Evaluation Service
Frank	Smith	Advocacy Consultant	DIP
Blanche	Tax	Chief of RSD Section (Refugee Status Determination)	DIP
Ana	White	Senior Communications Officer	RBE
Samarie	Wijekoon Lofvendahl	Legal Officer	DIP
Sybella	Wilkes	Senior Communications Officer	Media and Content Section

<b>Austria Office</b>		
<b>First name</b>	<b>Last name</b>	<b>Position</b>
Haleh	Chahrokh	Legal unit, bridge project
Birgit	Einzenberger	Head of legal unit
Lilian	Hagenlocher	Protection officer
Christoph	Pinter	Representative
Ruth	Schoeffl	Spokesperson
Marie-Claire	Sowinetz	Presse- und Öffentlichkeitsarbeit

<b>Austria external stakeholders</b>			
<b>First name</b>	<b>Last name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Alexander	Lesigang	Policy Advisor	Association of Towns and Cities
Lisa	Fellhofer	Team leader	Austrian Integration Fund
Elisabeth	Furch	Coordinator	Pedagogical University (Pädagogische Hochschule)
Hildegard	Hefel	Bildungsreferentin	BAOBAB
Irene	Höglinger-Neiva	Head of Outreach Unit	United Nations Information Service
Jens	Kessler		Amnesty International
Andrea	Kotorman	Head of Migration	Austrian Red Cross
Karoline	Krause	Journalist	Kurier newspaper
Stefan	Kühne	Director of youth information	WienXtra
Thomas	Marecek	Head of Public Relations	Austrian Red Cross
Asif	Safdari	Board member	IGASUS
Saskia	Sautner	Public relations	Association of Towns and Cities
Peter	Wesely	Press relations officer	Allianz Menschenwürde Österreich

<b>Brussels Office</b>		
<b>First name</b>	<b>Last name</b>	<b>Position</b>
Marta	Ballesterio	Head, Frontex Liaison Office
Veronika	Burget	ER officer DRRM
Alexander	de Chalus	Policy Officer
Elke	De Jagher	Senior External Relations Associate
Caroline	Delcroix	Programme Associate
Nicole	Dos Remedios	Regional Program Officer
Delphine	Drapeau	Regional Protection Officer
Marc	Fawe	Senior External Relations Associate
Desislava	Ivanova	Policy Associate
Sophie Anne	Magennis	Regional Representative for EU Affairs a.i.
Stefan	Maier	Senior Policy Officer
Peter	O'Sullivan	Resettlement Officer
Maeve	Patterson	RRWE Communication Coordinator
Veronique	Robert	Deputy Regional Representative
Gabriela	Romero Alvarez	Communications Associate
Federik	Smets	Communications and Advocacy Officer
Andrea	Vonkeman	Former Snr Policy Officer
Jeff	Walsh	Associate Liaison Officer, EASO Liaison Office
Randir	Wanigasekra	Senior Legal Officer

<b>Brussels external stakeholders</b>			
<b>First name</b>	<b>last name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Céline	Château	Political Administrator	LIBE Secretariat, European Parliament
Jo	De Backer	Regional Thematic Expert Resettlement	IOM
Stephen	Ryan	Deputy Head of Unit, Asylum	DG Home
Jure	Tanko	Parliamentary Assistant	Office of MEP Tanja Fajon
Catherine	Woollard	Executive Director	ECRE

<b>Germany Office</b>		
<b>First name</b>	<b>last name</b>	<b>Position</b>
Roland	Bank	Senior Protection Officer
Dominik	Bartsch	Representative
Rebecca	Einhoff	Assistant Protection Officer

<b>Germany external stakeholders</b>			
<b>First name</b>	<b>last name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Ernest	Bektasevic		Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration
Michaael	Kalkmann		Infoverbudn Asyl un Migration
Mieka	Riebau	Co Head Advocacy and Policy Team	Save the Children German
Lena	Donner	Resettlement Advisor	IRC
Sabine	Haq	Policy Officer for Migration and Asylum	German Red Cross
Jutta	Hermanns	Advisor, Restoring Family Links	German Red Cross
Melanie	Kobler	Lawyer	International Social Services
Severine	Lang		Federal Ministry of the Interior, Building and Community
Thomas	Langwald		Federal Ministry of the Interior, Building and Community
Eva	Lutter	Head, Reception Centre	Caritas
Ben	Ostropp		Caritas
Ronald	Reimann	Deputy head of tracing service	German Red Cross
Steffi	Riechmann		Infoverbudn Asyl un Migration
Eric	Schneider	Outreach Officer	IOM

Sarah	Tietze	National Programme Manager and Liaison officer	IOM
Franziska	Vilmar	Fachreferentin Asylpolitik und Asylrecht, Refugee Law	Amnesty International
Aubrey	Wade	Photographer	--
Corrine	Wicher		Federal Ministry of the Interior, Building and Community
Katharina	Stamm	Migration specialist	Diakonie

<b>Greece office</b>		
<b>First name</b>	<b>Last name</b>	<b>Position</b>
Miriam	Aertker	CB Protection
Iro	Argyroula Goutzidou	Child Protection Officer
Marion Francoise	Badot	Programme Officer
Cecilia	Chirila	Programme Officer
Leo Redmont Sydney	Dobbs	Senior Communications / PI Officer
Julie	Gault	Child Protection Officer
Sofia	Koutsou	Programme Associate
Anna	Leer	Senior Protection Officer
Giovani	Lepri	Assistant Representative, Operations
Ann	Maymann	Assistant Representative, Protection
Rehma	Namboze Kauma	Child Protection Officer
Evanthia	Savvopoulou	Senior Communications / PI Associate
Theodora	Tsovili	Senior Community-Based Protection Assistant

<b>Greece external stakeholders</b>				
<b>First name</b>	<b>Last name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Location</b>
Metin	Codalac	Case worker	PRAKSIS	Lesvos
Despoina	Stamataki	Case worker	PRAKSIS	Lesvos
Christof	Hombas	Director	EKKE	Athens
Kostas	Perezous	Dublin Unit	Athens Asylum Service	Athens
Antonia	Moustaka	Social Worker and Lawyer-Dubs Scheme	PRAKSIS	Athens
Stavroula	Aroukatou	Head of Department UASC	EKKE	Athens
Ms	Iannou	Public Prosecutor	Public Prosecutor	Lesvos
Marios	Kaleas	Head of Refugee Asylum Office	Government	Lesvos
Marianella	Kloka	Head of Advocacy	PRAKSIS	Athens
Dan	Manea	Operations Officer	Frontex	Athens
Katerina	Mastrodouka	Head of UASC	RIC	Lesvos

Mariela	Michailidou	Child Protection Specialist	UNICEF	Athens
Eleftheria	Oikonomidou	Social worker UASC	Iliaktida	Lesvos
Viki	Panagitsa	Social Worker Safe Zone	Iliaktida	Lesvos
Dionysia	Papilou	Head Dublin Unit	Athens Asylum Service	Athens
Dimitris	Patestos	Doctor/Coordinator	KEELPNO	Lesvos
Chryssoula	Patsou	Press Officer	PRAKSIS	Athens
Alkis	Souliotis	Consultant on UASC	Ministry of Migration Policy	Athens
Mrs	Stalidou	Public Prosecutor for Minors in Athens	Public Prosecutor	Athens
Alexandra	Tzanedaki	Head of Office	RIC	Lesvos
Periklis	Tziaras	President	National Centre of Social Security	Athens
Dina	Vardaramatou	Chairperson of the board	PRAKSIS	Athens
Galit	Wolfenson	Chief Of Child Protection	UNICEF	Athens
Antonis	Zeibekis	Coordinator Iliaktida shelters	Iliaktida	Lesvos

<b><i>Ireland office</i></b>		
<b><i>First name</i></b>	<b><i>last name</i></b>	<b><i>Position</i></b>
Jody	Clarke	External Relations Associate
Enda	O'Neill	Head of office, former protection officer

<b><i>Ireland external stakeholders</i></b>			
<b><i>First name</i></b>	<b><i>last name</i></b>	<b><i>Position</i></b>	<b><i>Organization</i></b>
Brian	Merriman	Head of Policy, Irish naturalisation and immigration service	Department of Justice
Sorcha	Pollak	Journalist (migration and refugee issues)	Irish Times
Caiomhe	Sheridan	Former Head	NASC

<b><i>Sweden office</i></b>		
<b><i>First name</i></b>	<b><i>last name</i></b>	<b><i>Position</i></b>
Wilfried	Buchhorn	Deputy Regional Representative
Asa	Hemingway	Senior Regional Legal Officer
Pia	Prytz Phiri	Former Regional Representative
Connie	Tran Hedberg	Child Protection Consultant

<b><i>Sweden external stakeholders</i></b>		
<b><i>First name</i></b>	<b><i>last name</i></b>	<b><i>Organization</i></b>
Anna	Beier	Swedish Refugee Advice Centre
Jonas	Doll	Swedish Migration Agency
Benjamin	Fayzi	Association for Unaccompanied Minors
Amir	Hashemi-Nik	County Administrative Board
Klas	Herrmansson	County Administrative Board

Darum	Ismahil	Association for Unaccompanied Minors
Fanny	Lingqist	Swedish Refugee Advice Centre
Feryal	Lövström	Social emergency services, Stockholm Municipality
Jens	Ölander	Ministry of Justice
Isabelle	Ravellius	Social emergency services, Stockholm Municipality
Daniel	Salehi	Swedish Migration Agency
Johanna	Viklund	Rights of Children Unit, Ministry of Social Affairs

<b>UK office</b>		
<b>First name</b>	<b>last name</b>	<b>Position</b>
James	Bulman	External Relations Associate
Sarah	Elliot	Legal Officer
Peter	Grady	Legal Officer
Laura	Padoan	External Relations Officer
Matthew	Saltmarsh	Snr. External Relation Officer
Gonzalo	Vargas Llosa	Representative UK

<b>UK external stakeholders</b>			
<b>First name</b>	<b>last name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organization</b>
James	Allawi	UNHCR Liaison	DFID
Lisa	Doyle	Executive Director Advocacy and Engagement	Refugee Council
Beth	Gardiner Smith	Head of Campaigns and Advocacy	Safer Passage
Dan	Hobbs	Deputy Director and Head of Asylum and Family Policy	Home Office
Paul	Hook	Advocacy Manager	Refugee Action
Paul	Morrison	Director, RST, Asylum Support and Integration	Home Office
Dragan	Nastac	Snr Policy and Advocacy Advisor	UNICEF

# Annex 3 – Main documents reviewed / bibliography

## UNHCR monitoring and review documents

DESS, (2018) *Emergency Response to the Europe Crisis*, RBE & Department of Emergency Security and Supply (DESS)

DIP (2018), *Review of advocacy practices in UNHCR*

Strategic Communications Section, *2017 Europe Review*, UNHCR Europe Communications

Strategic Communications Section (2018), *“The Dream Diaries”, UNHCR Communications Report. Results and Findings.*

Strategic Communications Section, *Q1 2018 Europe Review*, UNHCR Europe Communications

## UNHCR policy papers and compact

DIP, *policy papers on complementary pathways (various)*

UNHCR (2009), *Combating Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia & Related Intolerance through a Strategic Approach*

UNHCR (2010), *Voices of Afghan Children - A Study on Asylum-Seeking Children in Sweden*

UNHCR (2010), *Trees only move in the wind: a study of unaccompanied Afghan children in Europe*, PDES/2010/05

UNHCR (2011), *Age, Gender and Diversity Policy: Working with people and communities for equality and protection*

UNHCR (2014), *Safe & Sound: what States can do to ensure respect for the best interests of unaccompanied and separated children in Europe*

UNHCR (2014), *Why do children undertake the unaccompanied journey?* PDES/2014/03

UNHCR (2014), *The Heart of the Matter - Assessing Credibility when Children Apply for Asylum in the European Union*

UNHCR (2015), *This is who we are. A study of the profile, experiences and reasons for flight of UASC from Afghanistan seeking asylum in Sweden in 2015 (part 1 &2)*

UNHCR (2016), *Better Protecting Refugees in the EU and Globally*

(2017), *The Way Forward to Strengthened Policies and Practices for Unaccompanied and Separated Children in Europe*

UNHCR (2018), *Follow the Money - Assessing the use of EU Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) funding at the national level*

UNHCR (2018), *Fair and Fast: UNHCR Discussion Paper on Accelerated and Simplified Procedures in the European Union*

UNHCR (2018), *Global Compact on refugees (draft)*

UNHCR, UNICEF & IOM (2017), *Refugee and Migrant Children in Europe - Overview of Trends 2017*

## Public communication document

UNHCR, *Europe Resettlement factsheet (various)*

UNHCR, *Refugee and Migrant Children in Europe: accompanied, unaccompanied and separated factsheet (various)*

UNHCR, *Europe Monthly report (various)*

UNHCR, *Desperate Journeys factsheets (various)*

UNHCR (2017), *Refugees and Migrants Arrivals to Europe in 2017*

## UNHCR strategy, training, research and planning documents

DIP (2017), *Advocacy Benchmarking and Key Concepts* (presentation)  
Lefèvre, M, (2018), *Public opinion research insights on refugees-Engaging the conflicted middle*.  
Regional Bureau for Europe (2017), *Strategic Directions 2017-2020*  
Regional Bureau for Europe, Communication and Information Management Team – 2017 *Review*  
Regional Bureau for Europe, Communication and Information Management Team – *Strategy and Action Plan 2018*  
UNHCR (2012), *Strategic communication Training*  
UNHCR (2013), *Communication workshop documentation*  
UNHCR (2017), *Global Appeal 2017 Update*  
UNHCR (2017), *Strategic Directions, 2017-2021*  
UNHCR (2018), *Global Representatives Meeting: Advocacy Presentation*  
UNHCR, 2018 *DER Communicating Protection*  
UNHCR (2018), *Module 4B - The Implementation Phase - Programming for Protection Learning Programme*  
UNHCR, (Sweden) *Multi Year Multi Partner strategy (MYMP)*  
UNHCR, *Country operational plans (COP), various*

## External Approach papers, articles, research and toolkits

ALNAP (2016), *Evaluating Humanitarian Action using the OECD-DAC Criteria*  
ALNAP (2017), *Evaluation of Humanitarian Action Guide*  
Amnesty International (2016), *Impact and Learning System*  
Bansak, K., Hainmueller, J., Hangartner, D. (2016), *How economic, humanitarian, and religious concerns shape European attitudes toward asylum seekers*. Science  
Coe, J. & Schlangen, R. (2014), *The value iceberg: weighing the benefits of advocacy and campaigning*. Discussion Paper  
Coffman, J. (2009), *Unique Methods in Advocacy Evaluation*  
Coffman, J. & Beer, T., (2015), *The Advocacy Strategy Framework*. Centre for Evaluation Innovation  
Crawley, H. (2009), *Understanding and Changing Public Attitudes: Review of Existing Evidence from Public Information and Communication Campaigns*. Centre for Migration Policy Research, Swansea University  
Dempster, H., & Hargrave, K. (2017), *Understanding public attitudes towards refugees and migrants*. Working Paper 512. London: Overseas Development Institute  
European Commission (2017), *The protection of children in migration*, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council, COM 211  
European Social Survey (2017), *Attitudes towards immigration in Europe: myths and realities*  
European Union. (2017), *Integration of immigrants in the EU*. Eurobarometer 469  
Eurostat (2017), *Asylum applicants considered to be unaccompanied minors*  
Gienapp, A., Reisman, J., Stachowiak, S., (2007), *A guide to measuring policy and advocacy*. Organization Research Services. Annie E. Casey Foundation  
Glorius, B. (2018), *Public opinion on immigration and refugees and patterns of politicisation*. CEASEVAL Working paper 03-2018  
Guthrie, K., Louie, J., David, T. and Foster, C. (2005), *The Challenge of assessing policy and advocacy activities*. The California Endowment. Blueprint Research and Design, Inc  
Hyman, H. H., & Sheatsley, P. B. (1947). *Some reasons why information campaigns fail*. Public Opinion Quarterly, 11(3), 412-423  
IPSOS (2017), *Global views on immigration and the refugee crisis*  
Kane, R., Levine, C., Orians, C. & Reinelt, C. (2017), *Contribution analysis in policy work: assessing advocacy's influence*  
Migration Observatory (2016), *A Decade of Immigration in the British Press*. University of Oxford

Naeve, K., Fischer-Mackey, J., Puri, J., Bhatia, R. & Yegbemey, R., (2017), *Evaluating advocacy: an exploration of evidence and tools to understand what works and why*. 3ie Working Paper 29. New Delhi: International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)

OECD (2016), *Are there alternative pathways for refugees?* Migration and Policy Debates

Oxfam (2010), *Monitoring, evaluation and learning in NGO advocacy*

Oxfam (2011), *Oxfam Southern Campaigning and Advocacy*

UN-JIU (2015), *Public information and the communications policies and practices in the UN system*. JIU/REP/2015/4

Radicalisation Awareness Network (2005), *Counter Narratives and Alternative narratives*

UNICEF (2010), *Advocacy Toolkit*

UNICEF (2010), *Monitoring and Evaluation, companion- Advocacy Toolkit*

## Annex 4 – Contribution analysis summary

To respond to key evaluation question on effectiveness and as an integral component of the three case studies, the contribution analysis method was used. This method takes a step-by-step process to establish the level of contribution of a given initiative to observed results.<sup>1</sup> The contribution analysis was carried out through the following steps:

- Set out the cause-effect issue to be addressed;
- Develop the theory of change and the risks to it including alternative/rival explanations;
- Gather the existing evidence on the theory of change;
- Assemble and assess the contribution claim and challenges to it;
- Seek out additional evidence;
- Revise and strengthen the contribution story.

Within each of the case study areas, the unit of analysis for the contribution analysis was the advocacy initiative. The evaluation limited itself to reviewing only instances in the countries visited and the thematic areas of the three case studies. For each advocacy initiative reviewed, the initiative was reviewed following the above steps and summarised in the following fiche to facilitate comparison and analysis.

Contribution Analysis data fiche	
Case study theme	
Description of intended outcome of initiative	
Type of advocacy	<input type="radio"/> Direct <input type="radio"/> Indirect   <input type="radio"/> Singular activity <input type="radio"/> Multiple activities
Part of an advocacy strategy or plan	
Summarised theory of change	
Evidence confirms/refutes theory of change	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No. Describe any variation from ToC:
Other possible explanations	
Level of significance	<input type="radio"/> High <input type="radio"/> Medium <input type="radio"/> Low
Contribution of UNHCR	<input type="radio"/> High <input type="radio"/> Medium <input type="radio"/> Low
Strength of evidence	<input type="radio"/> High <input type="radio"/> Medium <input type="radio"/> Low
Enabling influences	Internal: External:
Impeding influences	Internal: External:
Description of evidence	

25 instances were identified where UNHCR's advocacy had contributed to progress towards specific outcomes to varying degrees. For each instance, the data was reviewed by one evaluation team member and an initial assessment made. Each assessment was then reviewed by the other evaluation team member and the assessment validated or revised.

The following table summarises these 25 instances based on the data fiches:

<sup>1</sup> For further information, see:

[/www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/contribution\\_analysis](http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/contribution_analysis)

	Advocacy strategy and location				Advocacy tactics and approach		Contribution analysis			Influences: P=Enabling; N=Impeding								
										Internal					External			
No.	Outcomes identified where UNHCR had an influence in changes seen	Country	Theme	Type of change sought	Direct or Indirect Approach	Multi or single Tactics	Level of significance	Contribution of UNHCR	Strength of evidence	Advocacy design	Positioning available	Resources	Know-how	Timeliness	Political context	Access	Supportive civil society	Policy environment
1.	Establishment of community sponsorship programme	Ireland	Alt. pathways	Policy, practices	D, I	M	High	High	High	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
	Establish formal resettlement programme and increase numbers	Germany	Alt. pathways	Policy	D, I	M	High	High	High	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
	Greece Guardianship law 2018	Greece	UASC	Law, policy, practices	D,I	M	High	High	High	P	P	P	P	P	P N	P	P	P N
	Best Interest Assessment (BIA) adopted for UASC seeking family reunion	Greece	UASC	Policy, Practices	D	M	High	High	High	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P N
	Influencing public opinion and parliament on taking children at risk	UK	Policy	Public Opinion, policy	D, I	M	High	Unknown	Medium	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P N
	Strengthened protection for UASC at entry in Greece: age assessment	Greece	UASC	Practices	D	S	Medium	High	High	P	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	N
	Strengthened protection for UASC at entry in Greece: minor status	Greece	UASC	Practices	D	S	Medium	High	High	P	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	N
	Establishment of community sponsorship pilot	Germany	Alt. pathways	Policy, practices	D, I	M	Medium	High	High	p	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

	Modifications to practices in family reunification processing	Germany	Alt. pathways	Policy	D	S	Medium	High	High	P	P N	P	P	P	N	P	P	N
	Influencing public opinion and parliament on detention	UK	Policy	Public Opinion	D, I	M	Medium	High	High	N	P	P	N	P	N	P	P	N
	Influencing public opinion by using goodwill ambassadors (David Morrissey and Kate Blanchet in Greece)	UK	Public Attitudes	Public Opinion	D	M	Medium	High	Medium	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
	SIL as an alternative protection/housing solution for UASC in Greece	Greece	UASC	Law, policy, practices	D, I	M	Medium	Medium	High	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
	Influencing parliament and public opinion on resettlement	UK	Public Attitudes	Public Opinion	D, I	M	Medium	Medium	High	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
	Improvements to UASC reception process at the municipal level	Sweden	UASC	Policy, practices	I	M	Medium	Medium	High	P	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	P N
	Profiling family reunification positively	Ireland	Alt. pathways	Public opinion	I	M	Medium	High	Medium	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
	Profiling community sponsorship	Ireland	Alt. pathways	Public opinion	I	S	Medium	High	Medium	p	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
	Moratorium on subsidiary protection cases	Germany	Alt. pathways	Law, policy	D, I	M	Medium	Medium	High	P	P	P	P	P	P N	P	P	P
	Modification to family reunification process (payment of DNA tests)	Austria	Alt. pathways	Practices	D	S	Medium	High	Medium	P	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	N
	Modification to travel documents duration	Austria	Alt. pathways	Practices	D	S	Medium	High	Medium	P	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	P
	Influencing public opinion through “dream diaries”	EU and global	Public attitudes	Public opinion	I	M	Medium	High	Medium	N P	N	N	P N	P	P	P	P	P N

	Modification of UASC procedures for asylum in Sweden	Sweden	UASC	Policy, practices	D	S	Medium	Medium	Medium	P	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	P N
	Influencing public opinion through schools programme	Austria	Public attitudes	Public opinion	D	M	Medium	High	Low	N	P	N	P	P	N	P	P	P
	Influencing public opinion through photo exhibition "No strange place"	Austria UK	Public attitudes	Public opinion	D	M	Medium	High	Low	N	P	N	P N	P	P N	P	P	P N
	Influencing public opinion through Great British Welcome Campaign	UK	Public Attitudes	Public Opinion	D, I	M	Medium	Medium	Medium	N P	N	N	P N	P	P N	P N	P	P N
	Influencing public opinion through annual event ("Long day of the flight")	Austria	Public attitudes	Public opinion	D	M	Medium	Medium	Low	N	N	N	P N	P	N	P N	P	P

The following table details the scales used in the contribution analysis fiche:<sup>2</sup>

<i>Level of significance of change seen</i>	<i>Contribution of UNHCR</i>	<i>Strength of evidence</i>
Scale: High: change is important and potential impact for PoC considerable. Medium: change is moderate with potential impact on PoC balanced. Low: change is limited as is potential impact on PoC.	Scale: High: UNHCR contributed alone or mostly alone to this change. Medium: UNHCR was an important contribution as were several other influences. Low: UNHCR was one of many actors and influences.	Scale: High: Evidence is strong and from multiple sources. Medium: Evidence is moderate and from limited sources. Low: Limited or no evidence exists.

<sup>2</sup> Based on existing rubrics methods, see: [www.betterevaluation.org/resource/example/rubrics-oakden](http://www.betterevaluation.org/resource/example/rubrics-oakden)

## Annex 5 – Description of methodology and evaluation matrix

The evaluation was based on a mixed methodology combining multiple methods and approaches. The evaluation team carefully considered all existing information and data collected and collated by UNHCR in the advocacy and communications areas to complement information and data collected directly.

The inception phase of the evaluation was carried out in June 2018. A selection of key documents were reviewed and 26 interviews conducted with staff in HQ and country offices. An inception report, detailing the planned approach, methods and timeline was produced and validated by the RBE and the ES.

The data collection phase was carried out from July to September 2018. The data collection phase contained the following key activities: key informant interviews, visits to six UNHCR country offices and Brussel; a taxonomy survey of all countries in the EU/EFTA region, an external comparison of three global organizations and a financial analysis. Three case studies were drafted from the data and information collected (see annex 1).

An external comparison was carried out with three global organizations; Oxfam, UNICEF and Amnesty International. The organizations were selected jointly by the RBE and ES. Based on available external documentation, the comparison looked at advocacy roles/responsibilities, planning and alignment to communications and global strategies.

The financial analysis examined the expenditure financial data for the Europe/EFTA region for the period of 2014 to 2017. The analysis extracted the information on expenditure by goals, objectives and outputs. The analysis was carried out jointly by the RBE, ES and the evaluation team and validated by UNHCR's financial service.

Further information on the taxonomy survey is found at annex 7.

The data analysis and report writing phase was carried out from October to December 2018. The data and information was collated, triangulated and analysed. Contribution analysis was used to respond to the evaluation question on effectiveness (see annex 4). The analysis was the basis for the three case studies and the final evaluation report. Prior to the finalisation of the report and case studies, the key findings were presented and discussed with the ES, RBE and staff of country offices and relevant HQ services.

The evaluation matrix matched the evaluation questions and sub-questions to indicators and source, as found in the next pages.

## Evaluation matrix

QUESTIONS	SUB-QUESTIONS & INDICATORS	SOURCES
Design and conceptual understanding		
<b>Key Evaluation Question (KEQ) 1:</b> In the period under review (2015-2017) how has 'advocacy' been described, designed and strategized in the context of UNHCR work in the EU region?	<p>Sub-questions:</p> <p>Which types of advocacy strategies, approaches and related activities (including from a communication perspective) have been carried out in the period under review?</p> <p>What were the different audiences? How were different audiences and targets for different types of advocacy (and communication) strategies and related activities identified?</p> <p>Which types of routine monitoring and analysis have been carried out to inform any correction and adjustments of advocacy and communication strategies and related actions?</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <p>No. of offices demonstrating strategic thinking for advocacy (e.g. coherent with an advocacy strategy<sup>3</sup> and/or working on an underlying logic of how change will occur (a theory of change)</p> <p>No. and types of audiences identified in advocacy strategies</p> <p>No. and of types of communication and advocacy activities identified by type of tactic and strategy</p> <p>No. and types of monitoring and analysis systems in place and informing advocacy and communication strategies</p>	<p>Secondary:</p> <p>Relevant internal (UNHCR) email and correspondence exchanges</p> <p>Relevant internal communications, policy and advocacy plans and strategies (including those referenced in annual plans and MYMP where applicable)</p> <p>All complementary planning and policy documents that will be collected during the data-collection</p> <p>Internal communication and monitoring data</p> <p>Primary:</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews with UNHCR staff, governments, stakeholders and partners</p> <p>Taxonomy survey on advocacy strategies and activities of EU UNHCR offices</p> <p>On site visits / observations in case study countries</p>

<sup>3</sup> Using as a reference for what constitutes an advocacy strategy: Coffman & Beer (2015). *The Advocacy Strategy Framework*.

QUESTIONS	SUB-QUESTIONS & INDICATORS	SOURCES
Relevance and appropriateness		
<p>(KEQ2): What were the assumptions and expected outcomes from the advocacy strategies and approaches in selected cases and what can be learned from this?</p>	<p>Sub-questions: In these different advocacy strategies, what were the assumptions about how these might support and further specific objectives as identified by UNHCR RBE? To what extent were advocacy and communication strategies clear and cohesive, with a clear and consistent set of messages and audiences? Do these strategies include the necessary elements of an advocacy strategy? What resources (human, financial and pro-bono) were available to implement the different advocacy strategies? How does this compare between the three cases?</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <p>Assumptions on supporting specific objectives identified in advocacy strategies</p> <p>No. of advocacy and communication strategies identified as clear and cohesive with messages and audiences described</p> <p>No. offices that use key elements of an advocacy strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Policy environment analysis</li> <li>-Audience analysis</li> <li>-Intended interim and long-term outcomes</li> <li>-Theory of change or explicit logic of how change will occur and the role of the organization in contributing to that change [awareness of partners/media and wider advocates]</li> <li>-Key messages</li> <li>-Activity plan</li> <li>-Monitoring tracking</li> </ul> <p>Identification and appropriateness of resources available</p>	<p>Secondary: Relevant internal communications, policy and advocacy plans Internal messaging and audience descriptions/analysis documents Partner mapping/media consumption reports commissioned to understand operational environment/context Resourcing and budgeting information</p> <p>Primary: Semi-structured interviews with UNHCR staff, governments, stakeholders and partners Taxonomy survey on advocacy strategies and activities of EU UNHCR offices</p>

QUESTIONS	SUB-QUESTIONS & INDICATORS	SOURCES
<b>Effectiveness</b>		
<p>KEQ3: How effective have selected UNHCR advocacy strategies and interventions in the EU contexts been in supporting progress towards specific outcomes of interest (and knowledge, attitude, and behaviour level) in the 2015-17 period?</p>	<p>Sub-questions: Under what conditions have selected UNHCR advocacy (and communication strategies) been more or less effective at contributing to positive outcomes of interest? Which factors (internal and external; within and outside UNHCR's spheres of control) have influenced: - the space within which UNHCR positions and carries out its advocacy (and communication) strategies and activities - timeliness of advocacy and related communication activities - the more or less proactive and reactive approach to advocacy (and related communication strategies and activities). What have been the roles played by the UNHCR Bureau for Europe, and other Divisions and Offices in Geneva in developing and carrying out selected advocacy and communication strategies?</p> <p>Indicators: No. and level of contribution of UNHCR advocacy (in three case studies) to positive outcomes; rating of level of significance; contribution of UNHCR; strength of evidence</p> <p>Main internal/external factors identified for achievement/non achievement of objectives: External: political environment; existing policy framework; access, etc. Internal: Timeliness; resources available; coordination; reactive/proactive, etc.</p> <p>Identification of roles played in advocacy by the UNHCR Bureau for Europe, and other Divisions and Offices in Geneva</p>	<p>Secondary: Relevant internal (UNHCR) email and correspondence exchanges Relevant internal communications, policy and advocacy plans and strategies All complementary planning and policy documents that will be collected during the data-collection Internal communication and monitoring data Evidence of policy/opinion change – policy documents; polling results</p> <p>Primary: Semi-structured interviews with UNHCR staff, governments, stakeholders and partners On site visits / observations in case study countries Contribution analysis (of data)</p>
<b>Lessons learned</b>		
<p>KEQ4: Which lessons can be learned from UNCHR advocacy and communication strategies and</p>	<p>Sub-questions: What lessons can be learned from a comparative analysis of selected examples of advocacy set-up of comparable organizations What lessons can be learned from the three case studies of this evaluation for moving forward?</p> <p>Indicators:</p>	<p>Secondary: All information and data collected and analysed for KEQ1-3</p> <p>Primary: All information and data collected analysed for KEQ1-3</p>

QUESTIONS	SUB-QUESTIONS & INDICATORS	SOURCES
approaches moving forward?	<p>Lessons identified from comparative analysis of advocacy set-up of three comparable organizations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Resources (human and financial) dedicated to advocacy</li><li>-Roles and responsibilities for advocacy</li><li>-Location of advocacy (HQ, regional, country)</li><li>-Place of advocacy within planning system and operations</li><li>-Alignment to communications</li></ul> <p>Lessons identified from the three case studies</p>	

# Annex 6 – Interview guide

## Internal – for UNHCR staff

1. Please describe your involvement in advocacy and communication activities, notably concerning the areas of 1) UASC, 2) alternative pathways and/or 3) influencing public opinion on asylum seekers and refugees since 2015?
2. How were these activities conceptualised? What were the intended outcomes? What were their origins (e.g. reaction to events, strategy, etc.)? [if necessary we break down or group the intended outcomes and link them to activities]
3. What were the assumptions for achieving the outcomes of these activities [i.e. if we did this, then this would happen...]?
4. How were the advocacy activities planned? [Examples of strategy elements?]<sup>4</sup> How were they monitored?
5. What resources were available for these activities?
6. Where have you seen advocacy activities successfully lead to the intended outcomes since 2015? Are there alternative explanations for the changes seen, e.g. other influences?[ask for examples and evidence of UNHCR's contribution]
7. In your experience what are the main drivers/barriers to successful advocacy activities [can be in relation to for instance: process, content and context].
8. What would you highlight as key lessons from advocacy activities since 2015?
9. Any other feedback or comments?

## External interviewees

1. Please describe your involvement with UNHCR advocacy and communication activities, notably concerning the areas of 1) UASC, 2) alternative pathways and/or 3) influencing public opinion on asylum seekers and refugees since 2015? [Were they a partner, a relay or a "target" to be influenced?]
2. How/where have you seen UNHCR active in trying to influence policies on refugees and asylum seekers since 2015? What were they trying to achieve in your opinion?
3. To what extent were UNHCR successful in achieving their intended outcomes for advocacy? Are there alternative explanations for the changes seen, e.g. other influences?[ask for examples and evidence of UNHCR's contribution]
4. What were the assumptions that UNHCR made for achieving the outcomes of their advocacy activities [i.e. if we did this, then this would happen...]?
5. In your experience what are the main drivers/barriers to influencing policy on refugees and asylum seekers? [Can be in relation to for instance: process, content and context].
6. What would you highlight as key lessons from UNHCR's advocacy activities since 2015?
7. Any other feedback or comments?

---

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Strategy elements such as: Policy environment analysis; Audience analysis; Intended interim and long-term outcomes; objectives; theory of change or explicit logic of how change will occur; key messages; activity plan; monitoring tracking.

## Annex 7 – Survey design

A survey in the form of an excel sheet was sent to all country offices in the EU/EFTA region. The excel sheet was pre-populated with the objectives categories of the countries based on the country operational plans. Each country office was asked to respond to the following questions for each objective category:

- Which tactics / actions / approaches did you use to reach the advocacy objective?
- Were the advocacy activities for this theme based on any strategy or plan? (Other than what is in the COP)
- When (year) was the strategy/plan 'adopted'?
- What period is covered by the plan/strategy?
- What are the main asks/objectives related to the advocacy output?
- Were AGD considerations reflected in the strategy, analysis, data gathering or other actions leading to these asks?
- What are the type(s) of change sought?
- What was the “ask” based on?
- What are/were the 3 main audiences?
- Who identified or initiated the advocacy activity/output?
- Who formulated advocacy asks?
- Was monitoring of performance undertaken?
- Was monitoring of results undertaken?
- How do you rate results in terms of state change (high/medium/low)?

Out of the 32 countries in the EU/EFTA region, 25 responses were received: 17 countries completed it fully; and 8 partially:

- Complete responses were received from: Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Croatia, Cyprus, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Switzerland, UK.
- Partial responses from: Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Sweden.
- Responses were not received from: Belgium, Luxembourg, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia and France. No response was received from Liechtenstein but it is assumed that it was covered by the Switzerland response.

The data and information was collated and analysed and triangulated with other sources to support the evaluation findings. Two units of analysis were used for the report:

- The country, for example, the number of countries indicating which themes they were advocating upon: 100% (25 countries) all reported advocating on integration.
- The advocacy activity, for example, the total number of advocacy activities across all countries that targeted a given audience; 71% of all advocacy activities across 25 countries reported targeting governments.

# Annex 8 – Evaluation terms of reference

## Evaluation of Effectiveness and the relevance of advocacy approaches with the EU and in EU countries

Key Information at glance about the evaluation	
Title of the evaluation:	Effectiveness and the relevance of the overall advocacy approaches being used with the EU and in EU countries
Timeframe covered:	2015-2017
Timeframe for the evaluation:	May – August 2018
Type of exercise:	Decentralised evaluation of advocacy approaches with the EU and in EU countries
Evaluation commissioned by:	UNHCR Evaluation Service

### Introduction

These Terms of Reference (ToR) have been prepared by the Evaluation Service (ES) of UNHCR together with the Europe Bureau. They provide the evaluation with its overall purpose, focus and deliverables. They also suggest the key evaluation questions to be answered and potential methodology to be followed.

The evaluation is a decentralized evaluation, commissioned by the Europe Bureau and benefitting from Evaluation Quality Assurance support from the Evaluation Service.

The aim of the evaluation is to provide the Europe Bureau with an evidence based assessment of effectiveness and relevance of the overall advocacy approaches being used with the EU and in EU countries.<sup>5</sup>

To this end, the evaluation will provide a descriptive analysis and mapping (such as a taxonomy) of the type of advocacy interventions, efforts and approaches currently undertaken by the Europe Bureau and Regional and Country Offices in EU Europe. It will then assess the effectiveness of such efforts by examining aspects such as key target audiences, types of change objectives and advocacy space and opportunities, the use of Information Management, data, communication and related tools, and coordination, timing, partnership and monitoring. As such, the evaluation will both examine whether the design of the advocacy efforts were based on reasonable assumptions, and the extent to which the execution of these efforts was effective. It will draw on available best practices which have worked well in Europe from other agencies to make recommendations regarding advocacy approaches and strategies.

Using three thematic advocacy examples, the evaluation will reflect on and analyse what has worked well and what has worked less well for UNHCR's advocacy in EU Europe during 2015-2017. In the three case studies, the evaluation will assess results of the advocacy efforts against the stated objectives of the advocacy interventions and will look at all factors that might have contributed to or hindered their effectiveness.

The evaluation is expected to inform future advocacy strategies and approaches of UNHCR with the EU and in EU countries operational decisions, which will improve protection and support solutions for persons of concern. It may further inform advocacy approaches and strategies more broadly in UNHCR.

---

<sup>5</sup> This covers the countries falling under the four regional offices RRNE, RRWE, RRSE and RRCE as well as the stand-alone offices in Greece. In addition to EU countries, this includes Norway, Iceland, Switzerland and Lichtenstein. This will be referred to as NWSC Europe.

## Background and context

---

The operational context in the NWSC Europe changed dramatically for UNHCR during 2015. Persecution, conflict and poverty forced more than 1 million people to flee to Europe by sea. The three main countries of entry were Greece (84 per cent), followed by Italy (15 per cent) and Spain (1 per cent). It is estimated that nearly half of those crossing the Mediterranean in 2015 were Syrian (498,370; 48 per cent), followed by Afghans (210,338; 20 per cent) and Iraqis (89,395; 9 per cent).

This led to a significant shift in strategic approach in the NWSC Europe. Whereas UNHCR in 2014 sought to enhance the protection of people of concern in this sub-region through a multi-faceted strategy of standard-setting, advocacy and partnership, in 2015 UNHCR launched an emergency response, to support and complement government efforts. Therefore, both aid and more than 600 emergency staff were deployed to 20 different locations to provide life-saving assistance and protection, and advocating for human rights and access to asylum, particularly for refugees with specific needs. As such there was an increased operational engagement by UNHCR throughout the NWSC Europe region in 2015-2017, while UNHCR's advocacy role nevertheless remain central in all operations.

During the period of the evaluation 2015-2017 the Europe Bureau Director's office was located both in Geneva and Brussels. In addition the region had four Regional Representations based in Stockholm, Brussels, Rome and Budapest respectively. The set-up of each of the Regional Representations varied, with Regional Representations covering both offices with UNHCR presence, either headed by a national officer or a Representative, and countries without UNHCR presence.

## Understanding of advocacy and its objectives

For the purpose of these ToR, no UNHCR-specific definition of advocacy is used. A generic definition of advocacy is applied to refer to 'the act, or process, of supporting a cause or proposal or engaging to create public support for or recommendation of a particular cause or policy'. This may be looked at further during the course of the evaluation.

UNHCR's offices in NWSC Europe and the Europe Bureau, both in Brussels and Geneva, have identified a broad set of advocacy objectives that speak to different UNHCR priority areas of work in Europe, with varied audiences and implementation strategies, both at the EU level and within individual countries. Overall, important aspects of advocacy work relate to the public support dimension, and the role communication plays in advocacy.

## Resourcing aspects

Since 2013, the Europe Bureau began investing more strategically in strengthening its communication and advocacy capacity, including by creating a Communication Officer Post for the Bureau and the creation of the Communication and Information Management Team (CIMU) under the supervision of the Senior Communication Officer placed in Geneva. The CIMU includes IM, communications, analysis and reporting capacity which has coverage over all the regions and issues covered by the Bureau for Europe (RBE). The CIMU has formulated three overall goal for its support to operations: 1) Enhance the strategic use of Information Management, Reporting and Communications; 2) Provide support on IM, Communications and Reporting, and 3) Strengthen partnerships and outreach on IM/Communications/Reporting.

Significantly the CIMU provides a number of external and internal products to support advocacy efforts. This include external monthly updates and reports and press releases, as well as themed communication material with maps and infographics such as the four reports in the Desperate Journeys reports series and material to advocate for issues such as statelessness, family reunification, end to detention, situation for UASC in Europe and the 'Better Protecting Refugees in the EU and Globally'.

In addition the CIMU provide operations with a number of updates and tools aimed at supporting operational and advocacy responses with data and information. Efforts are also made to improve partnerships and to strengthen collaboration, such as with Purpose, in order to increase positive public sentiment towards refugees and increasing public engagement to protect and advocate for refugees.

## **Purpose, objectives and expected use of the evaluation**

---

With the significant investment in advocacy, communication and information management in NWSC Europe in the period 2015-2017, it is considered now relevant and timely to initiate an evaluation to build an understanding of what works and what could be improved and done differently to use advocacy more effectively as a tool to ensure protection to persons of concern.

Routine monitoring and analysis of media coverage and public communication has taken place to provide information on trends and coverage with the support of DER Strategic Communication Unit. However, such communication and media monitoring and other routine analysis and reporting offers limited insight into the effectiveness of UNHCR's advocacy efforts in EU Europe. For example, such monitoring may not be able to answer questions on whether increased media coverage leads to support for recommendations around refugee protection causes, or specific policies for which change is sought. This evaluation is expected to bring a contribution to UNHCR in better understanding the results of these advocacy efforts, their contribution to outcomes, and the impact of advocacy efforts.

The evaluation will serve a dual and mutually reinforcing learning and accountability purpose. The purpose of this decentralized evaluation is to contribute strategic and timely evidence that will inform and influence Europe Bureau strategy and practice with regards to advocacy in NWSC Europe and with the EU institutions; ultimately, contributing to improved asylum space for protection and solutions for refugees and other people of concern.

The primary audience is the Bureau Director and senior managers in the Europe Bureau. Secondary audience include other bureaus engaged in advocacy as well as country operations and external partners advocating for protection and solutions for refugees.

## **Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs)**

---

The evaluation will address the following key 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) In the period under review (2015-2017) how has 'advocacy' been described, designed and strategized in the context of UNHCR work in the EU region?**

Possible sub-questions:

- Which types of advocacy strategies, approaches and related activities (including from a communication perspective) have been carried out in the period under review?
- What were the different audiences? How were different audiences and targets for different types of advocacy (and communication) strategies and related activities identified?
- Which types of routine monitoring and analysis have been carried out to inform any correction and adjustments of advocacy and communication strategies and related actions?

**KEQ 2) What were the assumptions and expected outcomes from the advocacy strategies and approaches in selected cases and what can be learned from this?**

Possible sub-questions:

- In these different advocacy strategies, what were the assumptions about how these might support and further specific objectives as identified by UNHCR RBE?
- To what extent were advocacy and communication strategies clear and cohesive, with a clear and consistent set of messages and audiences? Do these strategies include the necessary elements of an advocacy strategy?

**KEQ 3) How effective have selected UNHCR advocacy strategies and interventions in the EU contexts been in supporting progress towards specific outcomes of interest (and knowledge, attitude, and behaviour level) in the 2015-17 period?**

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

- Under what conditions have selected UNHCR advocacy (and communication strategies) been more or less effective at contributing to positive outcomes of interest? Which factors (internal and external; within and outside UNHCR's spheres of control) have influenced:
  - The space within which UNHCR positions and carries out its advocacy (and communication) strategies and activities;
  - Timeliness of advocacy and related communication activities;
  - The more or less proactive and reactive approach to advocacy (and related communication strategies and activities).
- What have been the roles played by the UNHCR Bureau for Europe, and other Divisions and Offices in Geneva in developing and carrying out selected advocacy and communication strategies?

**KEQ4) Which lessons can be learned from UNCHR advocacy and communication strategies and approaches moving forward?**

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

- What could UNHCR learn from a comparative analysis of selected examples of advocacy strategies and approaches carried out in the European context by other agencies in the 2015-17 period – such as other UN agencies (e.g. UNICEF, OHCHR, or INGOs and other non-profit entities e.g. ICMC)?<sup>6</sup>

## **Approach and methodology**

---

This evaluation is expected to be designed and delivered around the following analytical components:

- (a) an initial retrospective **mapping and taxonomy** to clarify conceptual and strategy issues around different types and forms of advocacy as understood by UNHCR in its work in the EU region;
- (b) a **comparative analysis** of selected advocacy strategies and approaches carried out by different actors to distil lessons relevant for RBE in its advocacy (and communication) work moving forward;
- (c) a **process evaluation** to analyse different advocacy thematic cases studies from conception and strategy, to implementation and contributions to early and

---

<sup>6</sup> Final selection of cases will be made at evaluation inception stage.

intermediate results (to the extent possible); through three case studies the evaluation will explore relevance and effectiveness in the approaches applied.<sup>7</sup>

The advocacy themes will be finally selected during the inception phase, however three possible advocacy themes selected for the evaluation reflect the breath in the type of advocacy done in EU Europe and the diverse audiences. The three themes are: 1) **'advocacy efforts to improve public opinion for asylum-seekers and refugees'**, as part of the efforts to foster welcoming societies, also for integration, and to preserve and ensure asylum space more broadly; 2) **'advocacy for appropriate standards for the protection of unaccompanied and separated children'**<sup>8</sup> and 3) **'advocacy for ending statelessness in Europe by 2024'**.

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.

The evaluation methodology is expected to:

- Reflect an Age, Gender and Diversity (AGD) perspective in all primary data collection activities carried out as part of the evaluation – particularly with refugees.

- Employ a mixed-method approach incorporating qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis tools including the analysis of monitoring data – as available.

- 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 evaluations.<sup>9</sup>

- Refer to and make use of relevant sectoral standards and advocacy-specific analytical frameworks.

- Be based on an analysis of **(i)** the strategy and operational guidelines underpinning advocacy, and **(ii)** the main actors and stakeholders.

- Gather and make use of a wide range of data sources in order to demonstrate impartiality of the analysis, minimize bias, and ensure the credibility of evaluation findings and conclusions.

- Be explicitly designed to address the key evaluation questions – taking into account evaluability, budget and timing constraints.

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, minimize bias, and ensure the credibility of evaluation findings and conclusions.

## Evaluation Quality Assurance

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.

---

<sup>7</sup> This will involve in-depth assessment of the approaches taken in each of the case examples including formulation of the objective, or asks, and the basis for this; the selection of audiences and development of advocacy and communication tools, including through IM and research; and the considerations of advocacy space and timing. Internal communication and structures will be considered in each case studies as will partnerships and coordination with external actors and stakeholders. The case studies will also explore challenges both in design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of advocacy strategies and how these can be overcome or mitigated.

<sup>8</sup> UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), Better Protecting Refugees in the EU and Globally: UNHCR's proposals to rebuild trust through better management, partnership and solidarity, December 2016, available at: [www.refworld.org/docid/58385d4e4.html](http://www.refworld.org/docid/58385d4e4.html)

<sup>9</sup> 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)

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; minimizing 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.

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.

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 Managers with support from the UNHCR Evaluation Service as needed.

## **Organisation, management and conduct of the evaluation**

---

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.

The **Evaluation Team** will comprise a senior team leader, and a team member. 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.

The language of work of this evaluation and its deliverables is English.<sup>10</sup>

## **Expected deliverables and evaluation timeline**

The evaluation should be carried out June 2018 to September 2018, and will be contracted to two evaluation consultants working in a team, guided by the below time-table:

---

<sup>10</sup> The final evaluation report will be in English and should include an executive summary in both French and English.

Activity	Deliverables and payment schedule	Indicative timeline
<b>Inception phase</b> including:	Final inception report – including methodology, refined evaluation questions (as needed) and evaluation matrix.	June 2018
<b>Data collection including country visits</b>  it may include preliminary data analysis through stakeholders workshops and validation sessions	Presentation of preliminary findings and conclusions at stakeholder workshops	June- July 2018
<b>Data analysis and reporting phase</b> including:  - preparation and circulation of PPT with emerging findings and conclusions (to be circulated ahead of the full eval report)  - Stakeholder feedback and validation of evaluation findings, conclusions and proposed recommendations.	Draft report and recommendations (for circulation and comments)	July - August 2018
EQA review of draft report, circulation for comments  Including internal round of review only with Eval Service (followed by possible changes) – before wider circulation	Consolidated comments	August 2018
<b>Finalisation</b> of Evaluation Report and executive summary.	Final Evaluation Report (including recommendations and executive summary)	September 2018

The key evaluation deliverables are:

- Inception report;
- Data collection toolkit (including questionnaires (if relevant), interview guides, focus group discussion guides) and details on the analytical framework developed for / used in the evaluation;
- Power Point Presentation with findings;
- Final evaluation report including recommendations (30-40 pages excluding annexes);

Executive summary in both French and English.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> 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.

**CONTACT US**

**Evaluation Service**

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Case Postale 2500

1211 Genève 2

Switzerland

[www.unhcr.org](http://www.unhcr.org)

Email: [hqevaser@unhcr.org](mailto:hqevaser@unhcr.org)