



FINAL DESK REVIEW REPORT

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Livelihoods Programs for Refugees and Refugee Returnees in Burundi and Ethiopia

March 2015

This publication was produced at the request of the United States Department of State. It was prepared independently by Social Impact, Inc.

EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LIVELIHOODS PROGRAMS FOR REFUGEES AND REFUGEE RETURNEES IN BURUNDI AND ETHIOPIA

March 2015

IDIQ Contract Number: S-AQMMA-12-D-0086
Technical and Advisory Services for Program Evaluation Requirements

Task Order Number: S-AQMMA-14-F-2515

DISCLAIMER

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Department of State or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

- Introduction: Promoting Refugee Livelihoods 1
- Purpose 1
- Definitions And Frameworks For Analysis 3
- Evaluation Questions 4
- Methodology..... 5
- Findings 6
 - Question 1: Types Of Livelihoods Assistance..... 6
 - Question 2: Recipients of Livelihoods Assistance 8
 - Question 4: Best Practices, Program Design, and Implementation:..... 10
 - 1. Assessments..... 10
 - 2. Characteristics of Livelihoods Programs 14
 - 3. Addressing Legal and Non-Legal Barriers..... 20
 - 4. Monitoring & Evaluation, and Reporting 23
 - Conclusions & Recommendations 26
- Annex I: Evaluation Scope of Work..... 32
- Annex II: Desk Review Works Cited 35
- Annex III: UNHCR Standards for Refugee Livelihoods Programming..... 41
- Annex IV: Desk Review Protocols..... 42

ACRONYMS

AGD	Age, Gender, and Diversity
AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
CFW	Cash for Work
CORD	Christian Outreach for Relief and Development
DFID	Department for International Development
DoS	United States Department of State
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
FH	Food for the Hungry
FY	Fiscal Year
GBV/SGBV	Gender-based violence/Sexual and Gender-based Violence
GoB	Government of Burundi
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IEC	Information, Education, and Communication
IFRC	International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPE	Internal Program Evaluation
IRC	International Rescue Committee
JRS	Jesuit Refugee Service
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
OFDA	Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance
PRM	Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration
SEEP	Small Enterprise Education and Promotion Network
SI	Social Impact, Inc.
SLF	Sustainable Livelihoods Framework
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SOW	Statement of Work
STI	Sexually Transmitted Infection
UAM	Unaccompanied Minor
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WASH	Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene
WHO	World Health Organization
WPE	Women's Protection and Empowerment
WR	World Relief
WRC	Women's Refugee Commission

YEP

Youth Education Pack

INTRODUCTION: PROMOTING REFUGEE LIVELIHOODS

Livelihoods programming in humanitarian settings presents a considerable challenge. A recent study by the Danish Refugee Council found broad consensus among the 60 practitioners who were interviewed that successful livelihood programming is one of the most difficult tasks for the humanitarian sector, both in terms of achieving impacts, as well as documenting them. It concluded that the humanitarian sector can and needs to improve its performance when it comes to implementing livelihood support programs in the context of displacement.¹

Livelihoods programs for camp-based, urban, and returned refugees (are important for PRM's mandate to promote durable solutions (repatriation, local integration, or resettlement) and to promote, to the extent possible, self-reliance for refugees and returnees. Many difficulties arise both in trying to bring about and to measure when durable solutions have been achieved, and such a discussion is beyond the scope of this review. But achieving self-reliance is a more manageable goal, and is a benchmark for durable solutions. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), individuals, households, or communities are self-reliant *when they are able to meet basic needs (including protection, food, water, shelter, personal safety, health and education) in a sustainable manner and with dignity.*²

The goals of durable solutions and self-reliance are reflected in PRM's internal livelihoods strategy, adopted in May 2014. This strategy seeks to: 1) improve design and implementation of livelihoods programming; 2) develop and disseminate tools and guidance for program officers and refugee coordinators; and 3) exert diplomatic efforts to improve livelihoods prospects for populations of concern.

PURPOSE

This desk review, conducted by Social Impact, Inc. (SI), examines the effectiveness of refugee livelihood programs funded directly by PRM or indirectly by its chief multilateral partner, UNHCR, in camp and returnee settings. The desk review is part of a one-year performance evaluation of refugee livelihood programs in Ethiopia and Burundi supported by PRM and UNHCR during 2009-2013. The desk review aims to identify best practices and recurring mistakes in livelihoods programs for refugees – particularly in camp settings.

The review focuses on six refugee programs implemented by international NGOs in Ethiopia and Burundi. These programs were:

Ethiopia: International Rescue Committee (IRC), the Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS), and the Norwegian

¹ The study sought to identify areas of current consensus on effective approaches to the design, implementation and monitoring of livelihood support programs among displacement affected populations. World Bank & Danish Refugee Council, *Livelihoods Support Projects for Displaced Persons: Global Expertise and Lessons Learnt*. Draft April 2014, p.3

² "Promoting Livelihoods and Self-Reliance: Operational Guidance on Refugee Protection and Solutions in Urban Areas." UNHCR, 2011. p. 15

Refugee Council (NRC)

Burundi: World Relief (WR), Christian Outreach for Relief and Development (CORD), and Food for the Hungry (FH).

The International Rescue Committee (IRC) has worked with Eritrean refugees in the Tigray region for over a decade and provides education, health, water and sanitation, gender and reproductive services in Adi Harush, My'Ayni, and Shimelba refugee camps. Their Youth Action Kit program is active in all Tigray camps and offers job training focused on construction and other vocational skills. IRC targeted many activities towards youth aged 18-25.

Jesuit Refugee Services (JRS) started programs in Ethiopia in Tigray and Dollo Ado in 2010, but works only in the My'Ayni, Melkadida, and Kobe refugee camps (the latter two are not reviewed in this evaluation). In Tigray, activities are centered around theater, music, sports, and psychosocial support to improve conditions for youth in the camp so they do not become desperate and attempt to leave on their own. In Dollo Ado, activities focus on youth, education, livelihoods, and psychosocial counseling with livelihoods activities comprising of functional literacy and marketable skills training.

The Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) started programming in Ethiopia in 2011, and currently runs activities in camps in Tigray and Assosa. Their Youth Education Pack project has been active in My'Ayni, Adi Harush, Sherkole, and Bambasi refugee camps since 2012 and focuses on providing literacy, entrepreneurship, and other vocational skills to youth under 25. In Assosa, NRC also provides an Accelerated Basic Education program to address the needs of children whose formal education has been disrupted.

World Relief (WR) began programming in the Makamba and Rutana provinces of Burundi in 2009. The program, titled "Resettlement Assistance for Returnees: Shelter, Restoration of Schools, Water Systems, and Livelihood Activities in Makamba Province, Burundi," focused on construction of shelters, pit latrines, primary schools, public latrines, and the distribution of seeds and goats for livelihoods development. WR structured its programming so that activity objectives focused on delivering integrated services to a variety of vulnerable populations.

Christian Outreach for Relief and Development (CORD) began exploratory visits to Burundi in 2005 and programming for refugee returnees in 2009. Their initiatives in Burundi took place in the Bukemba and Giharo communes in the Rutana province, and included the Gitanga commune the first year and also Mpinga Kayove in the last year. CORD's objectives were, within their targeted populations, to improve shelter and malaria prevention, to improve water, sanitation and hygiene, to increase food security, and to increase access to primary education.

Food for the Hungry (FH) began work in Burundi in 2009 in the Cankuzo Province (at different times, the Gisagara, Cendajuru, Mishiha, Kigamba, Giharo, and Bukemba Communes) and Ruyigi Province (at different times, the Gisuru, Kinyinya, and Butaganzwa Communes). FH's objectives were to improve food security and livelihoods, expand education opportunities, protect and enhance the environment, and, reduce the incidence of sexual and gender-based violence. Main activities included land allocation, seed and tool distribution, goat distribution, and training in livestock husbandry, stable construction, and improved agriculture techniques.

The six programs focused on health and sanitation, youth and community services, food security, agricultural development, and capacity building. However, while some programs included activities with

a livelihoods dimension, *it is notable that none were solely aimed at supporting refugee livelihoods*. Therefore, we cannot call the programs under review “livelihood programs”. For this reason, the review and subsequent field evaluation will explore *the impact on livelihoods* of the relevant programs, and will distill the livelihood activities and consequences resulting from the programs.

During the data collection in Ethiopia and Burundi in 2015, the SI team will explore potential areas of livelihood programming that could be linked to general programs. Each field visit will produce an in-depth evaluation addressing issues of livelihood effectiveness. The desk review and two field reports will inform a final synthesis report that will synthesize the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

DEFINITIONS AND FRAMEWORKS FOR ANALYSIS

We use the widely accepted *definition of livelihoods* coined by Chambers and Conroy:

“A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources), and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stress and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base.”³

Their definition addresses both the *components* of a livelihood, and defines *sustainable* livelihoods. This definition is similar to that used by the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.⁴ UNHCR’s definition of livelihoods focuses on activities,⁵ whilst that of the Women’s Refugee Commission (WRC) is stated more generally as “a means of earning a living; a source of income.”⁶

Livelihoods programs in refugee and internally displaced person (IDP) contexts, according to the WRC,

“cover the range of activities and programs that work toward and enhance self-reliance including: non-formal education, vocational and skills training programs, income generation activities, food for work programs, apprenticeship placement projects, micro-credit schemes, agriculture programs, business start-up programs, seeds and tools projects, animal disbursement projects, self-employment and job

³ Chambers, R. and G.R. Conway. “Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century.” Institute of Development Studies, 1991.

⁴ According to the IFRC, “Livelihoods comprise the capabilities, assets and activities required for generating income and securing a means of living. Sustainable livelihoods refer to people’s capacity to generate and maintain their means of living, and enhance their own well-being as well as that of future generations.” (IFRC guidelines for livelihoods programming, 2011)

⁵ UNHCR defines livelihoods as “activities that allow people to secure the basic necessities of life, such as food, water, shelter and clothing. Engaging in livelihoods activities means acquiring the knowledge, skills, social network, raw materials, and other resources to meet individual or collective needs on a sustainable basis with dignity.” UNHCR. “Global Strategy for Livelihoods 2014-2018.” 2014. p.7

⁶ Women’s Refugee Commission (WRC). “Livelihoods: Promoting Economic Opportunities for Refugee Women and Youth.” <https://womensrefugeecommission.org/resources/download/1>

placement programs. The goal of any livelihoods strategy is to develop self-reliance.”⁷

As an analysis tool, we employ the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development’s *Sustainable Livelihoods Framework* (SLF). This framework views livelihoods as a system, and identifies the factors affecting people’s livelihoods and how those factors interact with each other,⁸ including:

- The assets people draw upon;
- The strategies they develop to make a living;
- The context within which a livelihood is developed; and
- Those factors that make a livelihood more or less vulnerable to shocks and stresses.

The SLF is easily adaptable for the purpose of evaluating the impact of programs (whether specifically targeted at livelihoods or not) on the livelihoods of refugees in camps. It is this impact –on refugees’ livelihoods– that we explore in this review, rather than livelihoods programs per se, simply because the programs we reviewed in Burundi and Ethiopia did not have support for livelihoods as their primary goal.⁹

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The full set of questions for the evaluation of how PRM-supported programs supported refugee livelihoods are listed below. Some of these questions can only be answered after the field-based evaluations and are not addressed in the desk review; they are indicated with **bold** font. The questions in *italics* indicate those that are partially addressed in this desk review, but will be examined in depth during the field evaluations.

1. What types of assistance/programs was provided?
 - a. What were the types of livelihoods assistance provided? (e.g. technical/vocational training; business training; access to finance; cash grants; in-kind items)
 - b. To what extent did these meet beneficiary needs and preferences for assistance?**
2. Who are the recipients of assistance/programs?
 - a. What are the characteristics of refugees who received livelihoods assistance?
 - b. How well did partners reach vulnerable groups with livelihoods assistance?*
 - c. How many beneficiaries are continuing in the livelihoods activities for which they received assistance?**
3. Were PRM-supported programs designed and implemented using best practices?

⁷ Women’s Refugee Commission. “Livelihoods: Promoting Economic Opportunities for Refugee Women and Youth.”

⁸ For a useful overview of the SLF, see Guidance Note On Recovery: Livelihood http://www.unisdr.org/files/16771_16771guidancenoteonrecoveryliveliho.pdf Accessed December 23, 2014.

⁹ “Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets: Framework.” Department for International Development (DFID), 1999.

- a. Did NGOs conduct baseline assessments such as market and livelihoods assessments?
 - b. Were any external evaluations conducted? Any internal M&E?
 - c. **What indicators should PRM use to measure the efficiency and effectiveness of the livelihoods programming it supports?**
 - d. Based upon the available evidence and the literature review, what are the qualities of successful refugee livelihoods programs? What are recommendations to PRM and other donors for future livelihoods programs?
- 4. What was the impact of the programs/assistance?**
- a. **Did beneficiaries' asset base change after participating in the programs? In what ways? How long were changes sustained?**
 - b. **Where beneficiary incomes/assets did not noticeably improve, what are potential reasons for this lack of improvement?**
 - c. **What factors influenced the success or failure of the livelihoods programs?**
 - d. **Did PRM-supported programs promote self-reliance?**
 - i. **Were beneficiaries able to meet more of their basic needs?**
 - ii. **What percentage did and for how long?**
 - e. **How many beneficiaries are employed in the formal sector vs the informal sector?**
 - f. **What were the secondary benefits/costs of participation in livelihoods programs, if any? For example, did participants feel they were more/less vulnerable to abuse and exploitation and/or gender-based violence?**

METHODOLOGY

The desk review examined UNHCR and NGO documents including proposals, reports, and interim evaluations of programs funded directly by DoS/PRM or indirectly through UNHCR. This literature included:

- **International guidelines**, including but not limited to: *Building Livelihoods: A Field Manual for Practitioners in Humanitarian Settings* (WRC), *Promoting Livelihoods and Self-Reliance* (UNHCR), and *Local Economic Recovery in Post-Conflict* (International Labor Organization [ILO]).
- **Grey literature** refers to informally published written material, primarily reports, which are often difficult to trace because they are not published commercially or widely accessible. Grey literature is an important source of information because it is usually original, recent, and reflects the experiences of implementers, donors, and other experts in the field. Examples of such literature from the review include: *Cash transfer programming in emergencies* (Humanitarian Practice Network/Overseas Development Institute), *Minimum Economic Recovery Standards* (SEEP Network), and *Refugee Livelihoods: a Review of the Evidence* (UNHCR).
- In addition, a small selection of **peer reviewed articles** were also included for review, primarily as case studies.

All documents in the desk review were those identified by DoS/PRM in the evaluation Statement of Work (SOW), as well as those recommended by the team's Senior Technical Advisor, Dr. Karen Jacobsen, and others identified through web-based searches. For a full list of documents reviewed, please see

Annex II. The evaluation team used a standardized template to abstract relevant data on the nature of livelihood programs and participants.¹⁰

The desk review methodology also drew on key informant interview with PRM staff members and experts in the field of refugee livelihoods.

The review sought to identify key findings about topic areas outlined in *UNHCR's 2014-2018 Global Strategy for Livelihoods* including, livelihood program objectives, guiding principles, and strategic approaches. The topic areas include:

- Type of livelihood programs addressed;
- Target refugee group;
- Guidance for effective livelihood programs;
- Guidelines for monitoring livelihood programs;
- Self-sufficiency strategies in livelihood programs;
- Gender considerations; and
- Effect of host country policies.

The **limitations** of the desk review were:

- It was **limited in scope**. The purpose was not to conduct an exhaustive examination of the refugee livelihoods literature, but rather to focus on key documents selected in consultation with SI, PRM, and SI's external technical advisor.
- Not all of the documents selected related to livelihoods programing for refugees—several addressed livelihoods in the wake of humanitarian crises.
- The refugee literature is **relatively weak on studies and guidance related to rural or refugee camp settings**, as opposed to urban or returned refugees.

FINDINGS

Question 1: Types of Livelihoods Assistance

The livelihoods activities in Burundi and Ethiopia primarily fell into two categories: in-kind contributions and trainings. There were a few other activities such as short-term hiring and grant provision.

Burundi

In-kind donations were prevalent in Burundi. Programs provided participants with commodities intended to promote agricultural livelihoods and food security, including seeds, livestock, and tools. The CORD and FH programs sought to improve food security through the distribution of livestock. For example, CORD distributed several hundred goats each year, following completion of stable construction, planting of fodder grass, and digging of compost units. The goats' offspring were distributed in a "solidarity chain" to groups of beneficiaries.¹¹ CORD also distributed seeds and cuttings to restart agricultural production. WR distributed chickens for food security (direct consumption) and

¹⁰ See Annex IV for the Program Summary Template used to abstract the program documents.

¹¹ CORD 2009, Project Narrative, pg. 6

income generation (the sale of chickens and eggs).¹² WR also distributed medicine for the chickens. WR distributed seeds and tools, and created a “solidarity chain” through the provision of millions of plant cuttings, as well as fruit trees and cassava, to targeted participants.¹³ Finally, FH distributed tree seeds to nurseries in the first year as part of its environmental protection objective, with the hope that the nurseries could become an income source over the long-term. Notably, FH was the only NGO implementer that provided start up grants for micro- and small businesses.¹⁴

In Ethiopia, NRC provided refugees with seeds, livestock, and fisheries to build agricultural livelihoods, and in some instances, facilitate business start-up.¹⁵ However, the only other organization to provide in-kind goods was IRC, who provided materials and facilities for the production of school uniforms as part of a training for tailors.

Vocational and skill trainings were all related to agriculture in Burundi. FH supported farmer training through farmer groups, providing training on beekeeping, palm oil extraction, animal rearing, and fruit multiplication.¹⁶ The trainings facilitated knowledge-sharing by creating farmer associations; training for the leaders; and skills-building in improved techniques like composting and organic manure use. WR’s capacity building activities included training of trainers among community group leaders, and field visits and exchanges, as well as training on land and soil management, food production, use of compost, balanced diets, and household seed production. Follow-up included distribution of vouchers for seeds and fertilizer.

Ethiopia

In Ethiopia, all livelihoods activities focused on *vocational trainings or business and life skills training*. JRS offered least in the way of livelihoods activities. Specifically, they provided a training for refugees to become officiators of youth sports games.¹⁷ FY 2011 program documents also briefly mentioned a community counselor training and employment for eight leaders, although no other details were available. While IRC program documents reveal few livelihoods activities initially, the number of livelihoods activities increased every year. As mentioned previously, IRC conducted trainings for tailors to produce school uniforms. IRC also provided trainings on hairdressing, electric installation, carpentry, plumbing, and vocational computer skills.

Of the six programs reviewed, NRC in Ethiopia implemented the most livelihoods-oriented activities, particularly in the Assosa settlements. Livelihoods activities centered on backyard gardening programs in which participants learned to cultivate vegetables, the surplus of which could be sold.¹⁸ The program facilitated an apprenticeship to train both refugees and host community members in basic construction, shelter maintenance, and school renovation.¹⁹ In addition, NRC conducted youth education pack (YEP) programs in several locations, which aimed to equip “refugee and host community youth with functional literacy, life skills including entrepreneurship and vocational skills.”²⁰ Vocational skill trainings associated

¹² WR 2009, Revised Proposal, p. 2

¹³ WR 2010, Revised Proposal, p. 2

¹⁴ FH 2010, Proposal Narrative, p. 6

¹⁵ NRC 2013, Dollo Ado Final Report, p. 2

¹⁶ FH 2010, Proposal Narrative, p. 6

¹⁷ JRS 2012, Quarter 4 Report, p. 3

¹⁸ NRC 2013, Assosa Final Report, p. 2

¹⁹ Ibid, p. 8

²⁰ NRC, Market Assessment report for Assosa, p. 3

with the YEP programs included metal works, furniture making, food preparation and hotel management, electronics and electricity and general construction, among others.²¹ Outside of Assosa, a number of general activities involved construction work for shelters, which provided opportunities to train and hire refugees for short-term work, providing them with both income and marketable skills for the future. The NRC program documents do not state whether these cash-for-work opportunities were part of a formal program or if they were informal options for income generation. In one camp, NRC also helped rebuild a market in the community, contributing to “numerous and integrated trading activities,” supporting diverse livelihoods.²²

Based on these findings, in the field-based work, we intend to explore the following questions:

- 1) How did the short-term work/cash-for-work program work? Were refugees hired in short-term positions? Any host population beneficiaries?
- 2) Was the short-term work intended as part of the program and activities set up accordingly, or was it happenstance that these opportunities came up around the same time that the trainings were occurring?
- 3) In programs that were not specifically livelihoods-oriented, such as community services, are there opportunities to train people for skills-based employment? E.g. the JRS intramural sports program in My’Ayni camp could train coaches and referees, and IRC’s home-based care program could train nurses, etc. We will explore the possibilities of such ‘add-ons’.

Question 2: Recipients of Livelihoods Assistance

Burundi

The programs took place in rural areas that experienced large-scale repatriation of refugees from camps in Tanzania. Groups with different needs were targeted: refugees who repatriated within the year, refugees who repatriated more than one year ago, and the host community. All three programs included, as a percentage of the targeted recipients, the most vulnerable members of the host community, so as to avoid jealousy, conflict, and resentment within the communities.”²³ Each accounted for recipient communities’ demographic information within program documents, demonstrating knowledge of gender, age, and the distribution of individuals with varying repatriation statuses throughout the communes and locations served.^{6,8,24}

WR utilized self-targeting processes to select program beneficiaries.^{25,26} At the beginning of every project, WR organized inclusive sensitization meetings in which the attendees elected committees to determine the selection criteria for program beneficiaries following set quotas for recent returnees, other returnees, and host community members. The committee positions included a person representing the local administration, a representative of homeless people from the host community, a representative from the returnees in the area, and a women’s representative. WR staff worked closely with these committees throughout the project implementation. Similarly, CORD also used self-targeting processes by electing committees to select the beneficiaries. The selection committees were composed

²¹ NRC 2012, Shire Final Report, p. 2

²² NRC 2012, Dollo Ado Final Report, p. 2

²³ CORD 2010, Project Narrative, p. 4

²⁴ FH 2010, Proposal Narrative, p. 5

²⁵ WR 2009, Revised Proposal, p. 3

²⁶ CORD 2009, Project Narrative, p. 4

of representatives of local administration, representatives of the host community, and returning refugees. The beneficiaries' representatives were elected by their peers at an election facilitated by CORD. Unlike WR's system, the committees' duties ended after the public validation of the list of beneficiaries and subsequently disbanded.

FH did not employ selection committees. Their "eligibility preferences" included "recent returnees, women-headed households, and households who received a plot of land from the Government of Burundi (GoB) and had an able-bodied household member with the physical strength required for the agricultural activities."⁴ In addition, FH supported beneficiaries in and around "the four peace villages and surrounding host communities," which were designed under a peacebuilding initiative set up by the GoB, with support from UNHCR, to "encourage returnees and host communities to live together peacefully."²⁷

Ethiopia

The programs in Ethiopia largely served refugee camps around the country. The refugees' countries of origin varied by camp location. In the Tigray/Shire region, the majority of refugees come from Eritrea; in Assosa, most are Sudanese; and in Dollo Ado, the majority of refugees come from Somalia. In most cases, programs invited members of the host communities to participate.

IRC and JRS implemented their programs in the northern Tigray region; IRC in the Shimelba, My'Ayni, and Adi Harush camps, and JRS in My'Ayni camp only. As mentioned above, the recipients are refugees from Eritrea—mostly Tigrigna, or members of the Kunama and Saho clans. Most recipients of IRC and JRS assistance were male, due to a higher percentage of males in the camps, and also due to sociocultural norms that discourage women from participating in community activities. These programs did not have selection criteria, but they attracted particular demographic cohorts. For example, the JRS intramural sports activities in My'Ayni camp were open to any willing participants, but generally attracted young males. The recipients of IRC's home-based care program, considered by IRC to be a livelihoods activity, were mostly elderly refugees or disabled men, women, and children.

NRC program recipients varied. In the Tigray, 80% of the population was male, many of which was single, young, and educated,²⁸ whereas, in Dollo Ado, female-headed households constituted 72% of NRC shelter beneficiaries.²⁹ Some programs did not target or reference demographics in program documents, such as those in Shire and Gambella. However, Assosa targeted "elderly, people with disabilities, and large family size households,"³⁰ using "vulnerability selection criteria developed by NRC and agreed upon between all relevant stakeholders"³¹. Dollo Ado programs targeted their training on the main Refugee Central Committee in both camps, and then extended to individuals in positions of leadership such as members of the Women's Association and the Youth group, who could in turn reach vulnerable populations.³² Programs in Dollo Ado and Assosa developed eligibility criteria through community mobilization and engagement with relevant stakeholders, which notably included the host

²⁷ FH 2010, Proposal Narrative, p. 3

²⁸ NRC 2012, Shire Final Report, p. 7

²⁹ NRC 2013, Dollo Ado Final Report, p. 2

³⁰ NRC 2013, Assosa Final Report, p. 3

³¹ NRC 2014, Assosa Final Report, p. 3

³² NRC 2012, Dollo Ado Final Report, p. 2

community who participated in the YEP programs.^{33,34} All programs except the one in Gambella defined and targeted vulnerability, demonstrating special attention and support for youth, women-headed households, the elderly, and people with disabilities.³⁵ NRC's programs on vulnerability and targeting are further discussed in the Gender and Diversity section below.

Based on these findings, the field-based work will explore the following questions:

- How effective is livelihoods as a protection mechanism versus livelihoods as an income generation mechanism? Did including the most vulnerable succeed in both accounts? If so, should livelihood programs be designed (and measured) differently depending on the intent?
- How effective were program based on self-targeting processes, where refugee committees determined the selection criteria and selected the beneficiaries? How were committees elected?
- To what extent did community service or youth programs and other non-livelihood programs have livelihood consequences? E.g. did sports programs train participants to move into positions as coaches, referees, etc. to earn a living?

Question 4: Best Practices, Program Design, and Implementation

This section reviews the literature on in livelihoods programming primarily, though not exclusively in refugee settings. While few documents actually identify “best practice,” we gleaned several themes of recommended practices or characteristics that appeared throughout reviewed. Here were outline these themes and the extent to which the six PRM-supported programs in Ethiopia and Burundi used these practices.

Use of Assessments

It is widely recognized in both the humanitarian and development literature that livelihood programs should be based on assessments not only of the needs and capacities of the target population, but also the wider legal and socio-economic context. (In the SLF, this is referred to as the PIPs box— Processes, Institutions and Policies). Assessment is one of UNHCR's key principles, and UNHCR calls for *“comprehensive livelihood assessments based on socio- economic profiling [so as to] define a strategic plan on the basis of quality data. [It is crucial to] identify the policy environment as well as institutions and programmes, and understand economic diversity in the refugee population.”*³⁶ A comprehensive livelihoods assessment includes a market assessment, a capacity and competencies assessment, a gender analysis, and a contextual analysis.

The **market assessment** should identify market niches and service sectors that are capable of absorbing labor, either of which could suggest livelihoods programs or employment opportunities.³⁷ For instance, in tourist areas where refugees are allowed to work the hospitality sector offers livelihood opportunities. A market assessment should “develop a comprehensive multi-year strategic plan comprising short and long term objectives and related activities.”³⁸

³³ NRC 2012, Dollo Ado Final Report, p. 3

³⁴ NRC 2013, Assosa Final Report, p. 3

³⁵ NRC 2012, Assosa Final Report, p. 3

³⁶ UNHCR 2011, p.5

³⁷ “Building Livelihoods: A Field Manual for Practitioners in Humanitarian Settings.” WRC, 2009. p. 316

³⁸ UNHCR, 2011. p. 6

A **capacity and competencies assessment** of the refugees' existing skills, preferences, and knowledge ensures that programs reinforce or build existing skills and knowledge, and take refugees' preferences and understanding of what is possible for them into account. Implementing organizations often focus on immediate needs, and thus ignore the existing capacity and skills among refugee populations. In the absence of a population capacity assessment, programming is designed without these considerations. Populations fleeing from regions with agriculture-based economies will often have strong capacity in the agriculture sector, but livelihoods programming in host camps where they settle may focus solely on computer skills training or other vocational skills trainings. Although building these kinds of skills is useful, human capacity is wasted when existing skills and expertise are not considered in program development.

Capacity and competencies assessments are best done using profiling or other participatory methodologies, i.e. those which include the perspectives of host communities and refugees. Interventions that take existing skills and capacity into account can reduce financial cost and ensure that skills or knowledge is not lost during protracted displacement. Involving participants can also increase buy-in.^{39,40}

A **gender analysis** can identify needs, improve gender awareness and promote participation. The gendered context of refugee camps is well known and there is wide reference in the literature to the value of prioritizing gender considerations throughout the programming cycle. Absent this, programming could risk inflicting harm on an already vulnerable population—for instance, excluding men from programming may generate resentment, which could, though does not necessarily, result in retaliation against women.⁴¹ Likewise, programs must understand women's responsibilities as caretakers so as to avoid overly burdening them—women who often bear much of the responsibility for domestic work, may prefer for men to participate because men may have more time to do so.⁴² In some settings, targeting women may be more productive, however, “even where women may offer the most promising opportunities for success, men should not be excluded.”⁴³ More evidence of how gender dynamics between men and women in different circumstances is necessary to better understand likelihood of participation in activities focused on one sex or on both.

A **contextual analysis**, i.e. the “needs, priorities, resources, conflict dynamics, vulnerabilities and socioeconomics of a particular community or target group” allows the implementing partner to tailor an intervention for the population so as to promote sensitivity to culture and values and encourage participation and community ownership of a program.⁴⁴ Understanding the host government official policies and general regard to target populations is important, as some host governments believe refugees can contribute to the development of their host communities.⁴⁵

³⁹ UNHCR 2011, p. 101; Betts, Alexander, et al. “Refugee Economies Rethinking Popular Assumptions.” University of Oxford, Refugee Studies Center. 2013. p.16

⁴⁰ UNHCR 2011 , p. 61

⁴¹ Azorbo, Michele. “Microfinance and refugees: lessons learned from UNHCR’s experience.” UNHCR. 2011. p. 7

⁴² Interview with Dale Buscher.

⁴³ De Vriese, Machtelt. “Refugee Livelihoods: Review of the Evidence.” UNHCR. 2006. p. 29

⁴⁴ WRC, 2009 p. viii

⁴⁵ According to the Government of Uganda, “When empowered with resources and the capacity to be actively involved with the prioritization and implementation of their own development agenda, [refugees] can play a key role in their own socio-economic development and contribute to the development of their host communities.”

In active and post-conflict situations conducting a **conflict analysis** can help mitigate the exacerbation of conflict drivers and “gauge the stability of the setting for livelihood interventions.”⁴⁶ As with market assessments, various conflict assessment tools have been developed for this purpose. For refugee livelihoods programming, it is important to understand the history and dynamics of the conflict and the security environment, both of which can influence the program’s success. Conducting a rolling analysis can help programs respond quickly and appropriately.

Generally speaking, for refugee situations, it is important to have answers to the following questions:

“What priority goods and services are available? Which goods are bought most often? How has conflict affected the availability and the purchase of these goods? Where do people buy goods? How many buyers are there in a market compared to sellers? Are wholesalers and traders able to respond to an increase in demand for their goods? What are the government policies and restrictions that affect the market economy? What is the rate of inflation?”⁴⁷

Implementers may not have to conduct their own assessments if recent and reliable secondary data is available. Market assessments can serve as baseline data for prices of goods and services, income sources, and business assets, and can indicate cash transfers, vocational training, microfinance or other programming is appropriate. Market assessments can also help determine the kind of programming that is most appropriate for a given situation, e.g. cash transfers, vocational training, microfinance, and others. A wide variety of market assessment tools and frameworks exist and can be adapted to be more or less resource intensive depending on the programs’ budgets and needs.

Assessment in Program Documents

Burundi

The program documents from each of the six organizations reviewed reference various forms of assessments, formal and informal.

In Burundi, each of the implementers conducted some form of contextual assessment, though no robust examples were evident in the program documents. CORD noted that staff visited the Rutana province each year to conduct informal needs assessments in collaboration with UNHCR, the results of which focused mainly on food security and shelter provision. WR documents reference conducting a needs assessment, though there was no indication of the subject or findings of this exercise. FH did not conduct a market assessment or a capacities assessment; however, they also undertook a needs assessment, which appears to have been comprehensive and participatory. Livelihoods assistance (seed distribution, livestock provision, and farmer training) sought to promote food security by promoting agricultural self-reliance. The program documents state, “The project involved the community from the

Cited in Meyer, Sarah. “The ‘Refugee Aid and Development Approach in Uganda: Empowerment and Self-Reliance of Refugees in Practice.” University of Oxford, 2006. p. 7

⁴⁶ “Local Economic Recovery in Post-Conflict: Guidelines.” International Labour Organization. 2010. P. III

⁴⁷ “Building Livelihoods: A Field Manual for Practitioners in Humanitarian Settings.” Women’s Refugee Commission, 2009. p. xiv

beginning and included various areas of intervention, including food security, education, livelihoods and WASH. This has been effective in that visible change could be observed.”⁴⁸

There was no evidence in the program documents that any of these assessment findings were used to inform programmatic design or management decisions.

Ethiopia

There were several markets/livelihoods assessments conducted in the Ethiopian camps either by the programs themselves, or in conjunction with UNHCR.⁴⁹ Among the available assessment reports, each identified existing skills and assets in the camps as well as the communities’ self-proclaimed needs and desires and made recommendations for adjusting program activities to align them more closely to these realities. The assessments noted the differences in these findings by sex.

JRS designed their intervention based on a UNHCR needs assessment that showed many refugees suffering from depression, substance abuse, feelings of boredom and worthlessness, and a lack of alternative recreational opportunities to alcohol consumption. JRS therefore focused their intervention on community engagement and youth involvement in social programs. The program documents suggest that the intervention had a positive effect on refugee morale, but little is documented about the refugees’ ability to become more self-reliant. It is possible that the low self-worth mentioned in the needs assessment stemmed from the refugees’ inability to provide for themselves being forced to rely on external assistance to meet their most basic human needs. Income-generating livelihoods activities may have proven more effective than additional recreational opportunities, both in improving refugees’ self-reliance and in fulfilling JRS’ mission of ensuring that all refugees can “live a decent and dignified life in the camp.”⁵⁰ This is corroborated by their report that refugees were uninterested in cultural activities, and longed to learn income-generating skills.

JRS referenced gender broadly in programming, stating that the culture and humanities programs provide an opportunity for “both male and female camp population to jointly maintain their positive cultural identity,”³⁵ but make no mention of their livelihoods programming.

IRC conducted a limited participatory needs assessment around September each year, to identify new and recurring needs. These assessments showed need for assistance in the health, sanitation, and education sectors, which IRC considered when designing their interventions. IRC’s needs assessments consistently discussed gender and vulnerabilities. For example, in FY 2010, the program assessed “women’s marginal access to services and traditional dependency on male family members [as] exacerbated by a skewed population dynamic.”⁵¹ In FY 2011, the needs assessment included in its results a “lack of women- and girl-focused services,” “sexual harassment against women and girls,” “stigmatization of survivors of sexual assault,” and a “lack of secure housing (many women living alone

⁴⁸ FH Quarter 4 Report, 2009. p. 14

⁴⁹ These include: UNHCR-led Participatory Assessments in Shire 2011-2013; IRC’s Participatory Market Assessment in Adi Haroush, 2011; NRC’s Labour Market Assessment in Tigray, July 2012; UNHCR et al’s Joint Education Assessment in Dollo Ado, June 2013; NRC’s Education Baseline Assessment and Market Survey in Dollo Ado, May 2014; and NRC’s market assessment in Assosa, August 2014

⁵⁰ PRM Proposal Narrative, Jesuit Refugee Service, 2011. p. 2

⁵¹ IRC Proposal for PRM Funding. IRC. 2010. p. 4

in basic plastic tents.)”⁵² In FY 2013, the needs assessment results included the observation of the ongoing consequences that “continued physical and emotional abuse against women and girls as well as other acts of GBV” have on these women.⁵³

NRC conducted at least four market and baseline assessments that examined market demands and existing skillsets and informed their programming in Assosa, Tigray, and Dollo Ado. A 2014 assessment in Assosa revealed that the market was already saturated with agricultural commodities, clothing shops, and food and grocery shops and hence, NRC should not support any businesses of buying and selling such commodities.⁵⁴ NRC’s programs involved camp management, and many activities addressed immediate needs, such as shelter construction and WASH. However, the market assessments point to a longer-term vision of refugee self-reliance. Indeed, “self-reliance and livelihoods improved” is an objective of their 2014 program in Assosa.⁵⁵ NRC also sought to promote youth education to build self-reliance, and to build relationships with the host communities.

NRC implemented several programs that also took the vulnerability of women into account. During FY 2014, the Assosa program showed contextual understanding that girls and women desperate for livelihoods might turn to prostitution.⁵⁶ In FY 2013 in Dollo Ado, the program documents reference low female student retention due to early marriage and household responsibilities.⁵⁷

Characteristics of Livelihoods Programs

Several issues arise in the design of livelihood programs, and here we address the length of programs and whether there should be conditionality, the difficulty of appropriately and accurately targeting the most vulnerable, whether there is too much focus on basic needs, and the lack of exit strategies or transition plans. However, in most cases, there is insufficient evidence to definitively state whether commonly held views regarding these subjects are truly “best practices” or “recurring mistakes.”

Length and Conditionality

Two issues arising in the literature concern the length of livelihood interventions or programs, and whether they should be conditional or not. UNHCR and others make assertions and claims about what should happen, however there is little evidence on which to base or define best practice. In its Operational Guidance in urban areas, UNHCR’s view is that self-reliance is promoted when “Cash / food / rental assistance delivered through humanitarian agencies [is] short-term and conditional and gradually lead to self-reliance activities as part of longer-term development.”⁵⁸ Ideally, activities such as advocacy and social protection remain constant throughout the program, while interventions such as cash transfers, grant assistance, and microfinance schemes gradually diminish over time.⁵⁹ In the short-term, capacity building activities and cash transfers to cover immediate needs can be employed to reach

⁵² IRC Revised Shire Narrative. IRC. 2011. p. 3.

⁵³ IRC Revised Shire Narrative: Needs Assessment. IRC. 2013. p. 3

⁵⁴ NRC Assosa 2013, Market Assessment p. 2

⁵⁵ NRC Assosa 2014, Project Performance Report, p.6

⁵⁶ NRC 2014, Assosa Proposal Description, p. 2

⁵⁷ NRC 2013, Dollo Ado Final Report, p. 2

⁵⁸ UNHCR 2011, p.8

⁵⁹ UNHCR, 2011. p. 15

the most vulnerable population. However, the paucity of evaluations of livelihood programs in refugee camps means there is no solid evidence as to whether self-reliance is boosted when assistance is short term and conditional.

Length and Conditionality in Program Documents

Burundi

The program documents suggest that one implementer, WR, designed livelihoods assistance to be short term and conditional. WR provided families chickens, with the understanding that they would not receive an indefinite supply. Rather than killing chickens immediately for food or sale, beneficiaries were encouraged to harvest eggs so that the intervention would remain sustainable. Additionally, a transition from giving chickens to individual families, to giving chickens to community associations sought to ensure that the beneficiary population would later collaborate to maintain the benefits of the assistance. It is unclear from the documents if this has ultimately been successful.

Ethiopia

There is little mention of the short term or conditional assistance among the programs in Ethiopia. NRC, which provided the most in-kind assistance to participants lists “# of [people of concern] receiving conditional grants for business start up” as a performance indicator for its programs in Dollo Ado and Assosa, though the documents offer no additional details on these grants.

Targeting Gender, Diversity, and Vulnerability

One dilemma facing livelihoods programs is whether to target particular groups and who they should be. It is standard practice to emphasize vulnerable groups (assumed to be women headed households, youth, and the elderly) with distribution of humanitarian assistance. Livelihoods programs often target vulnerable groups so as to empower them with income generation capabilities. However, there are many problems with this approach. First, defining vulnerable groups by category can create incentives to cheat (households claiming to be female headed, etc.), and can miss others who are more vulnerable (teenage boys at risk for forced recruitment into gangs or militia). One argument is that livelihoods assistance is more effective when it targets economically active individuals, rather than the most vulnerable populations. Giving assistance in the form of small business grants or access to work permits to economically active individuals, will have knock-on effects, such as enabling them to assist or even employ more vulnerable people. Again, the absence of evaluations means we have no evidence that targeting livelihood assistance to some groups is more effective.

If not done thoughtfully, targeted interventions can create resentment and even put individuals at risk.^{60, 61} Gender assessments help implementing partners understand these dynamics and design programs accordingly. For example, women’s heavy domestic burdens, including child care, affects their participation in livelihoods programs—limitations which gender assessments can help uncover. Child care support can be a powerful enabler of women’s participation, and offers work opportunities for the elderly and disabled who can provide childcare.^{62,63} Additionally, the location of program activities may

⁶⁰ “Local Economic Recovery in Post-Conflict: Guidelines.” International Labour Organization. 2010. p. 55

⁶¹ Azorbo, Michele. “Microfinance and refugees: lessons learned from UNHCR’s experience.” UNHCR. 2011. p. 7

⁶² “Building Livelihoods: A Field Manual for Practitioners in Humanitarian Settings.” Women’s Refugee Commission. 2009. p. 33

⁶³ Ibid, p. 76

limit participation if it is unsafe for women to travel to and from the areas where the activities take place.⁶⁴ Another factor that may preclude women, the elderly, and the disabled from participating is the nature of the livelihood activities. Those requiring strenuous physical activity (i.e. construction or activities involving heavy equipment) may not be suitable for them.⁶⁵ However, examples of thoughtful integration in such programs for people with particular needs were evident in the larger literature review. One livelihoods program that worked with farmers in Angola, for instance, employed women-only meetings, focused on women's leadership, organized seed banks and savings groups for women, and thereby successfully increased the role of women in the production and marketing of agricultural livelihoods products.⁶⁶

Targeting Gender, Diversity, and Vulnerability in Program Documents

Burundi

As mentioned above, programs in Burundi used participatory mechanisms to ensure participation of vulnerable community members. Programs used additional measures to include women generally. For example, CORD established an annual quota of two women per water committee in their WASH programming.⁶⁷ In 2009, WR mandated women's participation in all five-person local committees that determined the targeting of livelihoods activities.⁶⁸ A similar quota continued for the subsequent two years in WR programming for the shelter-building component, but not for the livelihoods components. FH progressively increased gender integration between 2009 and 2011. In 2009, FH used an eligibility preference to include woman-headed households among other vulnerable groups such as recent returnees.⁶⁹ FH set a target for 60% women's participation in the agricultural livelihoods activities of growing vegetable gardens and participating in association leadership: these indicators were exceeded in the initial year.⁷⁰ Monitoring indicators were disaggregated by sex, tracking women's participation in the livelihoods programming: "more than 85% of the selected associations' cashiers are women and 55% hold leadership responsibilities in the associations."⁷¹

Ethiopia

In Ethiopia NGO partners also targeted women in addition to other vulnerable groups. For example, IRC provided training and capacity-building to service providers—in FY 2012, the SGBV program was specifically targeted to include women of reproductive age and SGBV survivors.⁷² IRC reported "mobiliz[ing] refugee men and women to take action to improve the status of women and girls."³³

For JRS's PRM-funded programming, all three program years included participant data disaggregated by age and sex. JRS noted men and women's participation in livelihoods-related activities, along with the factors and consequences of that participation. In FY 2011, there was low female participation in counseling trainings due to "cultural barriers and cultural taboos that still discourage many women from

⁶⁴ "Local Economic Recovery in Post-Conflict: Guidelines." International Labour Organization. 2010. p. 56

⁶⁵ "Building Livelihoods: A Field Manual for Practitioners in Humanitarian Settings." Women's Refugee Commission. 2009. p. 76

⁶⁶ Norell, Dan and Margie Brand. Integrating Very Poor Producers into Value Chains." World Vision, 2013. p. 133

⁶⁷ CORD 2011, Narrative Quarter Four, p. 11

⁶⁸ PRM Revised Proposal. WR. 2009. p. 10

⁶⁹ PRM Program Narrative. FH. 2009. p. 4

⁷⁰ PRM Quarter 4 Report. FH. 2009. p. 3 and 5

⁷¹ PRM Quarter 4 Report. FH. 2011. p. 6

⁷² IRC Revised Shire Narrative: Needs Assessment. IRC. 2012. p. 8

engaging in public participation.”⁷³ However women’s participation in sport trainings was high. JRS reported a positive impact on men by providing them with a “viable alternative to drinking establishments and adult movie halls.”⁷⁴

NRC projects in some cases carried out campaigns to identify vulnerable members of the refugee and host communities for participation in livelihoods activities. In addition, they conducted women-specific outreach to boost female participation in certain activities. As one example, they engaged the Women’s Association to assist with recruitment for a mud plastering training.⁷⁵ Some NRC programs responded to the inequalities regarding the gender context by targeting different sub-groups of women. For example, the FY 2012 Shire program, for which the majority of shelter project beneficiaries were women including girls, pregnant mothers, and female-headed households.⁷⁶ Other projects attempted equitable sex distributions between males and females in their activities, either aiming for half participation per sex or by favoring women: in both Assosa and Shire, both held the aim of boosting women’s participation, but did not fully reach their targets due to the skewed demographics of predominantly male refugees in the camps.^{77, 78}

Prolonged Focus on Basic Needs and Lack of Exit Strategies or Transition Plans

Humanitarian assistance in camps tends to emphasize refugees’ basic needs, often resulting in a lack of diversity in programming. Multiple organizations or donors provide services without properly identifying unmet needs or gaps, and they neglect opportunities to support livelihoods by providing employment.⁷⁹ Creative approaches to programming include incorporation of livelihoods into different sectors (such as WASH, education, health, nutrition, sport) and even reduce funding in these sectors to support livelihoods. Optimally, programs should find ways to address the long-term desiderata of capacity development and self-reliance while concurrently addressing immediate needs.⁸⁰ Livelihood programs that promote growing of food, skills development and business development can potentially do this.

A common feature in livelihoods programming is a lack of a feasible and timely exit strategy. Implementers seem to lose sight of their objective to no longer be necessary.⁸¹ With the goal of promoting refugee self-reliance, programs tend to broaden their scope rather than focus on sustainable and durable solutions. For example, in November 2000, Cairo was chosen as a case study for UNHCR’s 1997 policy on refugees in urban areas. However, rather than developing programs that phased out and decreased dependence on external assistance, the program in Cairo became “an open-ended care and maintenance operation.”⁸² A transition from “care and maintenance” to education and training would

⁷³ PRM Quarter 4 Report. JRS. 2011. P. 14

⁷⁴ JRS Proposal for Funding. JRS. 2011. p. 5

⁷⁵ NRC 2012, Dollo Ado Final Report, p. 2

⁷⁶ NRC 2012, Shire Final Report, p. 3

⁷⁷ NRC 2013, Shire Final Report, p. 3

⁷⁸ NRC 2013, Assosa Final Report, p. 3

⁷⁹ “Women’s Refugee Commission, 2009. p. xvi

⁸⁰ Conway, Carrie. “Refugee Livelihoods: A Case Study of the Gambia.” UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit, 2004. p. 16

⁸¹ Meyer, Sarah. “The ‘Refugee Aid and Development Approach in Uganda: Empowerment and Self-Reliance of Refugees in Practice.” University of Oxford, 2006. p. 62

⁸² Sperl, Stefan. “Evaluation of UNHCR’s Policy on Refugees in Urban Areas: A Case Study Review of Cairo.” UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit, 2001. p. 13

have increased the refugees' self-reliance. Programs that lack a clear exit strategy cannot be sustainable for the implementers, the beneficiaries, or PRM.

Focus on Basic Needs and Lack of Exit Strategies in Program Documents

Burundi

Most of the Burundi programming was oriented towards preparing refugee returnees and host communities for life beyond the interventions. The FH documents describe several livelihoods programs in Burundi that aimed to cultivate returnee self-reliance rather than a prolonged focus on immediate needs. The program articulated an exit strategy, wherein FH will connect the beneficiary farmers to a Provincial Agricultural Service if they require further assistance after FH has transitioned off the program. Similarly, WR's program documents describe several livelihoods activities that promote returnee self-reliance. WR did not focus exclusively on immediate needs, the program built on community capacity and defined an exit strategy. WR made their assistance short-term and conditional. Families were given chickens, with the understanding that they would not receive an indefinite supply. Beneficiaries were encouraged to harvest eggs so that the intervention would remain sustainable.

However, CORD's program documents describe health and sanitation activities, indicating a focus on basic needs with few livelihoods activities and no ostensible route to promoting self-reliance. Rather, CORD improved infrastructure, access to clean water, and sanitation facilities. By 2011, the third year of the Burundi program, there was no evidence of capacity building programs for more long term needs. However, CORD did reference a planned exit strategy to pass ownership of program activities to the community after training to improve food security.

Ethiopia

The programs in Ethiopia were more focused on addressing immediate needs and documents scarcely mentioned transition plans. IRC's few livelihoods programs in My'Ayni and Shimelba camps from 2010-2013 are examples of a prolonged focus on immediate needs. Latrines were built without transitioning ownership of these activities to the local population, thereby prolonging dependence on IRC assistance. Although IRC trained refugees through on-the-job coaching to construct latrines in the camps, IRC continued to build additional latrines without transitioning the construction function to the trained refugees. JRS and NRC's programs had significant components focused on immediate needs. None of the documents reviewed revealed exit strategies or transition plans. Rather, IRC and JRS documents cite ongoing need for external assistance in the camps due to the limited availability of income-generating activities. However, though NRC's documentation did not suggest a specific exit plan, activities did appear to be more oriented towards long-term needs given the emphasis on livelihoods, particularly in Dollo Ado and Assosa.

Promoting Flexibility and Adaptability

Markets and socioeconomic conditions change over time, and programs should be able to adapt to changes.

One trend in livelihoods programming is the use of cash grants or transfers, which are considered "dignified and flexible," insofar as they can be used for various purposes as recipients' needs change

(vouchers tend to restrict the types of goods that recipients can purchase)⁸³. A cash program for Syrian refugees in Lebanon by IRC, although not in camps, was one of the few such programs that has been properly evaluated by an external consultant, using rigorous methods.⁸⁴ However, there might be times when it is advisable to switch to in-kind donations, for instance, “if local prices rise more rapidly than regional or international prices, or if there are large exchange rate fluctuations.”⁸⁵ The literature advises regular monitoring of markets.

Strong M&E systems allow “livelihood programs to remain responsive and flexible to changes and provide space for redesign.”⁸⁶ Flexibility and adaptation in programming can yield results when warranted and permitted through arrangements with the donors. However, implementing partners face constraints in changing budget lines that allow inter-changes between issuing grants, loans, and other mechanisms as deemed appropriate by the project.⁸⁷ Implementers are reluctant to change their approach midstream if they will be held to the outcomes and targets laid out in their logical frameworks or M&E plans, and this can stifle innovation and adaptation. It may be effective and appropriate for donors to allow change within a program, as long as goals stay the same.⁸⁸ However, PRM is, like other donors, constrained by federal regulations and funding requirements, and is often unable to be flexible or to adapt to changing markets and environments. Donors prefer livelihoods programs that can adapt to changing markets without having to continuously overhaul their activities and indicators.⁸⁹

Much of the literature lamented the constraints of short and inflexible programming imposed by donor agencies. Short timelines limit the types of programs and activities and often result in sacrificing activities that take resources from more “urgent” and “life-saving” needs. Similarly, there is a bias towards programs that reach the maximum number of beneficiaries possible, rather than programs that target a limited number of participants, as noted previously.⁹⁰ The tendency to focus on basic needs reduces opportunities to follow-up with program participants and shore up gaps in capacity or other resources that increase the likelihood of sustainable results. Conducting one-off activities with limited time and resources can do more harm than good if they raise participants’ expectations about outcomes.⁹¹ However, according to PRM, its “partners have a multi-year option for their proposals. But often proposals are not strategic with each year building off the previous...nor are such multi-year options often utilized yet.”

⁸³ Harvey, Paul and Sarah Bailey. “Cash Transfer Programming for Emergencies: Good Practice Review #11.” Minimum Economic Recovery Standards, p.12

⁸⁴ IRC, 2014. Winter Cash Assistance to Syrians Refugees in Lebanon

<http://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/resource-file/Emergency%20Economies%20Evaluation%20Report%20FINAL%2009.09.14%20%282%29.pdf>

See also: CALP, Cross-sector cash assistance for Syrian refugees and host community in Lebanon: an IRC programme, <http://www.cashlearning.org/resources/library/410-cross-sector-cash-assistance-for-syrian-refugees-and-host-communities-in-lebanon-an-irc-programme>

⁸⁵ Ibid, p.90

⁸⁶ “Women’s Refugee Commission, 2009. p. 145

⁸⁷ Norelli and Brand. “Integrating Very Poor Producers into Value Chains: Field Guide.” World Vision, 2013. P. 49

⁸⁸ SEEP Network, 2007. p. 25

⁸⁹ PRM comment, 12/8/14

⁹⁰ SEEP Network, 2007. p 9.

⁹¹ Interview with Karen Jacobsen

Flexibility and Adaptability in Program Documents

Burundi

The document review did not yield any particular examples of adaptation in the Burundi programs. This could serve as an area to explore further in the evaluation fieldwork.

Ethiopia

In general, there was little evidence of adaptation in the programs reviewed. In Ethiopia, some programs reported adjustments to WASH and infrastructure components of their programming based on changing volumes of refugees entering the camps and weather-related conditions. In response to a large influx of unaccompanied minors in 2011, IRC developed a school feeding program. In its final report that year, JRS noted, “The increase in the number of unaccompanied minors in our program...exceeds the original planning figures. If alternative funds can be secured, there will be a change in the project design. Since the conception of the project, there has not been a significant change to the program design or operation.” As JRS suggests, major contextual changes were usually not addressed until the following years of funding.

Most often, programs either scaled back or scaled up livelihoods activities based on participant demands. For example, IRC originally intended to target the Kunama population for hand-knitting training in the Shimelba camp, but decided to cease the activities upon learning that they were uninterested in the program. When demand for NRC’s YEP program grew, the program expanded in 2013. For both IRC and NRC programs it was unclear from the documentation how the demand was assessed, but it did not appear to be based on any formal assessment. There was one documented case of adapting programs based on market assessment: Based on a market assessment done the previous year, IRC reported that graduates of their vocational training in plumbing, tailoring, and carpentry “had limited economic success and that course offerings were not in line with labor market demands” and therefore partnered with another program to provide entrepreneurship skills, such as customer service, profit-loss, calculation, and other business-related items, as well as “life skills,” such as goal-setting and problem solving; in addition, IRC provided “start-up kits” for graduates who developed promising business plans. However, this example was an anomaly.

Addressing Legal and Non-legal Barriers

The wider legal, institutional, and socioeconomic context of a country can constrain the programs’ ability to assist refugees in the pursuit of livelihoods. This context includes legal and non-legal barriers to refugees’ ability to work.

Many host governments, including those party to the international refugee conventions, restrict the movement of refugees within their countries and ban them from working in the formal sector or accessing land – but on the latter, there are some exceptions, such as Uganda, Ethiopia, and Tanzania. Other host governments differentiate between refugees with specific skills sets, and grant permits based on local needs. They may have policies which make it illegal for refugees to work, own property, or own businesses without work permits or other forms of personal documentation such as a passport, birth certificate, or UN laissez-passer. These practices limit refugees’ ability to support themselves, or to

contribute positively to the local economy.⁹² Although many host governments have characterized refugees as a burden on economies, a growing body of evidence challenges this notion and instead demonstrates that they make positive contributions to local economies.⁹³ Though empirical evidence on this subject is relatively scarce, a recent study finds that refugees contribute to economies in myriad ways, including buying and selling goods and services; providing human capital; and in some cases, generating employment.⁹⁴ Furthermore, even in the wake of a humanitarian crisis, host community economies may benefit from the arrival of international NGOs and other actors whose staff and partners who join markets as additional consumers, which has been recently observed in Turkish border areas affected by the current crisis in Syria.

Legal barriers concern the host government's willingness not only to allow refugees to work,⁹⁵ but also to facilitate the process of applying for and obtaining work permits.

Negotiating with host governments to grant work permits to refugees and providing legal and financial assistance in support of refugees' applications for work permits are important roles for implementing partners focusing on livelihoods programming. UNHCR and its partners can advocate for the right of refugees (both in and outside of camps) to work; however, best practices on this subject are not well-documented.⁹⁶

Advocacy can occur "on a case by case basis by securing licenses for micro-credit schemes as well as targeted attempts to secure work permits for a selected number of beneficiaries." However, this tactic is most successful when employed on a large scale. A blanket issuing of work permits is optimal, but the targeted approach can be a step in the right direction. For example, in October 2013, the Transitional Solutions Initiative (a collaboration between UNHCR and the World Bank), Sudan's Commission for Refugees signed an agreement to issue work permits to 30,000 Eritrean refugees in Kassala State, eastern Sudan.⁹⁷ UNHCR then worked with the Sudanese Labor Office to inform refugees about their rights to prevent exploitation by their employers. The Labor Office "streamlined procedures for issuing work permits to refugees and enhanced its ability to gather information about the labour market."⁹⁸

Assistance by UNHCR and implementing partners can assist refugees to obtain work permits. Such assistance may take the form of:

- Providing information about the work permit application process;
- Helping refugees meet the requirements for a work permit, including legal help; and
- Providing financial support such as cash assistance during the period of waiting for a work permit and securing employment. Cash support enables refugees to meet basic needs and

⁹² Umlas, Elizabeth. "Urban Refugees, the Right to Work, and UNHCR's Advocacy Activities." UNHCR, 2011. p.1

⁹³ Betts, Alexander, et al. "Refugee Economies Rethinking Popular Assumptions." University of Oxford, Refugee Studies Center. 2013. p.16

⁹⁴ Ibid, p. 19

⁹⁵ The 1951 Refugee Convention sets out refugees' right to work in Articles 17, 18, and 19 and 24. However, refugees, asylum seekers, stateless people, and other displaced groups are often prevented from exercising this right.

⁹⁶ Umlas, 2011. p. 23

⁹⁷ Pattinson, Lisa. "UNHCR signs agreement to grant work permits for 30,000 refugees in east Sudan." UNHCR, 2013.

⁹⁸ Ibid

maintain existing skills that may be marketable to future employers. Candidates can be selected from a target population based on their existing skillset and their opportunity for employment in the formal sector.

Non-legal barriers include remoteness of refugee settlements, restrictions imposed by local authorities, language differences, lack of skills, lack of tools or start-up capital, and xenophobia towards refugees.⁹⁹

Access to employment is often hindered by discrimination by employers and harassment by police or immigration authorities. These problems and how to overcome them are quite well-documented in urban settings, but much less is available when it comes to camp settings.¹⁰⁰ Lack of documentation means refugees frequently face employers and landlords who make it difficult to find employment or housing. Even in settings where refugees are legally allowed to seek employment, discrimination by the host population is a frequent problem and refugees may be effectively excluded from prestigious or high paying professions such as medicine or law, relegated instead to unskilled work.

Additionally, refugees often experience discrimination or harassment by local law enforcement and immigration authorities, which hinders their ability to seek employment opportunities. Refugees must often pay bribes to immigration authorities and police at roadblocks or checkpoints. This adds to the financial burden on refugees, and perpetuates corruption in law enforcement systems. Landlords and other vendors may take advantage of refugees by requiring higher rents or additional fees. In circumstances where it is already difficult to find decent employment, this discrimination can add to their financial troubles.

Livelihoods interventions that target refugees can generate resentment, which can be mitigated by including the host community in programming. Programming that involves both refugees and host community offers three advantages:

- Host governments are more likely to look favorably on such programs;
- Bringing nationals and non-nationals together increases opportunities for networking and developing mutual understanding between groups; and
- “Joint programming can reduce antagonism and resentment on the part of the host community”.¹⁰¹ Programs that address the needs of refugees and host communities are more likely to generate buy-in.¹⁰²

Burundi

As citizens, repatriated refugees in Burundi are able to seek employment with no legal restrictions. However, returnees frequently face the issue of loss of former assets and property. To resolve this, many refugee returnees in Burundi received a small plot of land, usually no greater than half a hectare,

⁹⁹ De Vriese, Machtelt. “Refugee Livelihoods: Review of the Evidence.” UNHCR. 2006. P.10

¹⁰⁰ Sperl, Stefan. “Evaluation of UNHCR’s Policy on Refugees in Urban Areas: A Case Study Review of Cairo.” UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit, 2001. p. 3

¹⁰¹ Feinstein International Center, Tufts University. “Refugee Livelihoods in Urban Areas: Identifying Program Opportunities.” 2012, p. 4

¹⁰² Jacobsen, Karen. “Livelihoods in Conflict: The pursuit of livelihoods by refugees and the impact on the human security of host communities.” Feinstein International Center, 2002. p. 20

from the GoB upon returning¹⁰³. For FH's agriculture program, one of the eligibility criteria was "households who have received a plot of land from the GoB and have an able-bodied household member with the physical strength required for the agricultural activities." Households who did not receive land from the GoB or who lacked an able-bodied household member were excluded from participation in the agriculture program. Discrimination towards refugee returnees was not mentioned in the program documents, though it but may exist.

Ethiopia

The IRC and NRC program documents refer only to livelihoods and development programs within camp settings, with no direct mention of refugees' ability to work legally. However, some Eritrean refugees, particularly those in My'Ayni camp were departing the camps in search of employment opportunities. JRS reported

*"High secondary movement and population smuggling to other countries from the camp. The slow resettlement process discourages refugees from remaining in the camp. While resettlement is a solution, it is an extremely slow process and many ...young people become extremely frustrated by their socioeconomic situation."*¹⁰⁴

It is unclear from the program documents whether this movement is legal or encouraged.

NRC reported host community members participating in the YEP program in Dollo Ado, and several hundred host community members joined the gardening projects in Assosa. These measures contributed to promoting co-existence between refugees and host communities. The NRC project in Gambella also tried to include local Ethiopians but the host population reportedly opted to work in the nearby gold-mining sector, which was more profitable.¹⁰⁵

Monitoring & Evaluation, and Reporting

In addition to conducting a full set of assessments and contextual analyses prior to program design, as discussed above, monitoring and mid-term assessment enables programs to be responsive. Mid-term assessments of changing conditions and market fluctuations—likely events in uncertain environments—can indicate the need for mid-course adjustments.

The guidance on livelihoods programming indicates that performance monitoring in humanitarian settings should track processes, efficiency, and effectiveness in order to help donors and implementers understand if and how programs are functioning as intended. This information should indicate which program components are performing well and could be scaled up, or where mid-course corrections for non-performing program components should be made. For example, one project that promoted women's and girl's livelihoods in Zambia used methods for monitoring to maximize learning and refine

¹⁰³ Kamungi, P. M. J.S Oketch, and C. Huggins, 'Land Access and the Return and Resettlement of IDPs and Refugees in Bwdi'. In *From the Ground Up*, eds. C. Huggins and J. Clover. Nairobi: Institute for Security Studies & African Centre for Technology Studies. pp. 198, 236

¹⁰⁴ JRS 2013 Quarter 3 Report, p. 8

¹⁰⁵ NRC Gambella Final Report 2013. p. 2

programming. The methods included value chains and girls' situational analysis; baseline and endline surveys; ongoing focus group interviews; and other participatory methods.¹⁰⁶ This robust feedback loop helped the implementing organization understand that beneficiaries needed supplemental training and developed an unplanned, yet ultimately successful mentorship program accordingly.¹⁰⁷ Participatory methods for M&E can increase stakeholder buy-in and generate the most useful data possible.

Methodologies for collecting monitoring data include the WRC's *"Building Livelihoods"* manual, the SEEP guide of *Minimum Economic Recovery Standards*, Oxfam's *Cash Transfers in Emergencies*, the ILO's *Local Economic Recovery in Post-Conflict*. Livelihoods indicators to be tracked include changes in income, market access, employment, etc. PRM and OFDA are developing standardized sets of indicators for use in their livelihoods programming.¹⁰⁸

Monitoring data provides an important input for evaluation. Like monitoring, evaluation serves an important role for both learning and accountability, so that future programs can leverage lessons learned and maximize their efficiency and effectiveness. This is important for all stakeholders, "a culture and system of learning and knowledge sharing, within and among all organizations engaged in the response, is also critically important."¹⁰⁹

There is widespread agreement that assessments and M&E are cornerstones of effective programming, and humanitarian and development programs develop M&E plans, if only to meet donor requirements. However, the purpose of collecting and analyzing performance data is sometimes lost. Many programs state intentions to carry out M&E in proposals and reports, but then fail to use the monitoring data generated and the resources used to collect the information are wasted. One report spoke of "the general weaknesses of the international humanitarian system in evaluating impact and considering whether alternative interventions could have been more effective."¹¹⁰

Ethiopia and Burundi

Each of the projects PRM funded included M&E plans in their proposals as PRM requires. However, the rigor of the M&E systems varied by organization. In Ethiopia, the only use of rolling assessments reported was from NRC's 2013 Assosa program.¹¹¹ Through several needs assessments over the year, NRC determined that it overestimated the needs in the camps, though the documentation does not indicate if or how this influenced their programming.¹¹² IRC's proposals referenced the organization's commitment to ongoing monitoring in the various camps including visits with feedback sessions, focus group discussions, general observation, and mid- and/or post-project evaluations to be reviewed by staff at the field and country levels. IRC also laid out a learning agenda to "identify priority learning topics across all sectors" for periodic review to guide programming and disseminate knowledge for future programs.¹¹³ There was evidence in the reporting that IRC used routine monitoring data to make

¹⁰⁶ Norelli, Dan and Margie Brand. "Integrating Very poor Producers into Value Chains: Field Guide." World Vision, 2013. p. 110

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, p. 112

¹⁰⁸ Interview with USAID staff.

¹⁰⁹ "Nourse, Tim, et al. "Market Development in Crisis Affected Environments: Emerging Lessons for Achieving Pro-Poor Economic Reconstruction." SEEP Network, 2007. pp. 12-13

¹¹⁰ "Minimum Economic Recovery Standards." SEEP Network, 2010. p 31

¹¹¹ NRC Assosa 2013 Final Report

¹¹² Ibid

¹¹³ IRC Proposal, FY 2013

simple adjustments in its programming, though no examples specific to the livelihoods components were observed, there did appear to be a general commitment to use of M&E data for problem identification and analysis.

Robust M&E systems were not evident in program proposals or final reports in the other Ethiopian or the Burundian programs. JRS, NRC, CORD, FH, and WR all mentioned that monitoring data and visits would help ensure their programs were on track and included general information about how the information would be used, i.e. to identify lessons learned and unintended consequences. However, there did not appear to be any systematic use of the data.

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions are drawn from the review of program documents for PRM-supported activities in Burundi and Ethiopia, as well as from literature reviewed. Based on these conclusions, we provide recommendations for PRM, NGO partners, and other stakeholders to encourage

Types of Assistance

Though none of the programs were exclusively focused on promoting livelihoods, NGOs conducted different types of livelihoods activities with varying degrees of emphasis within the larger programs. Most were in the form of capacity building or in-kind donations. Several of the activities described by NGOs as relating to livelihoods did not appear to have direct connections to earning a living. Though knowledge of and experience with such programming varied greatly among NGOs, this suggests confusion among certain grantees regarding both the definition of “livelihoods” and how to enable refugees to build them.

- PRM should establish a working definition of livelihoods and communicate it among NGO partners to ensure mutual understanding of what does or does not constitute a livelihoods activity. PRM should continue to encourage grant seekers and grantees to draw on existing guidance about conducting refugee livelihoods programming. However, PRM should not be overly prescriptive about the types of activities that occur within larger programs. Instead, grantees should continue to seek out emerging evidence about various types of activities and their suitability for different contexts, as the appropriateness of activities depends on a host of factors that can be determined through myriad assessments.

Recipients of Assistance

The primary difference between the types of targeted participants was the emphasis on returned refugees in Burundi rather than refugees from several neighboring countries in Ethiopia. Another difference observed in the documents reviewed was the manner in which programs recruited participants, which appears to have been more participatory in Burundi, whereas the activity types determined the composition of participants in Ethiopia. Nevertheless, there were significant similarities in the types of recipients of assistance despite the considerably different contexts. Most programs exhibited a preference or concerted effort to include the most vulnerable community members such as single women-headed households and the elderly, though few projects articulated vulnerability criteria. In most cases, programs sought to include host community members in activities to mitigate resentment and/or stimulate integration.

- In keeping with best practice, PRM should continue to require grantees to involve host communities in program activities. Where possible, programs should avoid creation of parallel systems that prioritize refugee needs and instead avoid designation of refugee-specific services. Equal access to and use of such services may not be likely or possible in remote areas, though it should be sought. PRM should also encourage grantees to reflect critically on the traditional assumptions of who constitutes the most vulnerable in a particular setting and most importantly, how to ensure that proper mechanisms are in place to facilitate participation of vulnerable people, e.g. provision of childcare.

Use of Assessments

Various assessments can serve as important livelihoods diagnostic tools and should guide the design of interventions. Implementing organizations reviewed in this study do not uniformly engage in recommended assessment processes. Programs in Ethiopia which undertook assessments appeared to be considerably stronger than those conducted in Burundi, but market assessments were a weakness across nearly all organizations. In Burundi, all three implementing partners referenced informal or formal needs assessments for their programs. However, no partner conducted market assessments and only one conducted gender, capacity, and vulnerability assessments. The use of assessments was more pronounced in Ethiopia, with all three partners conducting participatory needs assessments. In assessments, information was often solicited regarding preferences, capabilities, and vulnerabilities. All three programs provided information about gender specific needs and barriers. Only one partner conducted a market assessment.

- We recommend that all livelihood programs be preceded by a full set of assessments and analyses, including:
 - A **market assessment** that ensures livelihoods programs and interventions are grounded in market realities, and can identify market niches and service sectors that could suggest livelihoods programs or employment opportunities. As markets fluctuate regularly, it is advisable to conduct multiple assessments throughout the life of the project.
 - A **capacity and competencies assessment** of refugees' existing skills, preferences and knowledge that will inform program design. Such an assessment should identify the relative vulnerabilities and assets of men and women, as well as the young and elderly, and other potentially vulnerable groups. It is critical that refugees be viewed as individuals with assets and skills rather than individuals who are continuously in need.
 - A **vulnerability analysis** that will identify groups with specific forms of vulnerability. This should include a comprehensive gender analysis that focuses on both men and women of different age groups. It is important that livelihoods programs reflect information gathered from the gender assessment, and shy away from simply creating special programs for women. Assessments should include a clear definition of vulnerability and an explanation of the ways in which identified groups are vulnerable.
 - A **contextual analysis** to provide information about the needs, priorities, resources, conflict dynamics, and socioeconomic profiles of refugee and host populations. In active and post-conflict situations a **conflict analysis** can identify conflict drivers and gauge the stability of the setting for livelihood interventions.
- PRM should ensure that such assessments are comprehensive in design and use participatory methods as much as possible. Assessment can help promote sensitivity to culture and values, and encourage participation in, and community ownership over programs. Implementers may not have to conduct their own assessments if recent and reliable secondary data is available. PRM should promote coordination and information sharing between implementing partners whenever possible.

Characteristics of Livelihoods Programs

As noted above, there is a dearth of sound evidence to corroborate several of the predominant views regarding the ideal characteristics of refugee livelihoods programming, including those espoused by certain UNHCR guidance documents. This is particularly true for camp-based settings, which are contextually very different than the more researched urban settings. As such, it can be problematic to identify some characteristics as “best practices” and others as “recurring mistakes.”

Length and Conditionality

In general, most of the PRM-funded programs reviewed did not appear to be deliberately short term or provide assistance on a conditional basis. The paucity of evaluations of livelihood programs in refugee camps and for returnees means we have little solid evidence on which to base recommendations. There is little established “best practice”, although many assertions are made about what boosts self-reliance. One is that self-reliance is supported when assistance is short term and conditional.

- Without demonstrated evidence of this claim, we are unable to recommend short-term and conditional assistance for work with returnees or camp-based refugees.

Targeting the Vulnerable

Most programs surveyed made concerted efforts to involve the vulnerable in livelihoods or other activities. Although evidence is lacking, it may be the case that livelihoods assistance is more effective and has wider reach when it targets economically active individuals, rather than the most vulnerable populations. Assistance in the form of small business grants or access to work permits to economically active individuals, might enable them to assist or even employ more vulnerable people. Evidence in the form of evaluations or other research could provide a basis on which to decide whether targeting livelihood assistance to non-vulnerable groups is more effective.

- We recommend adopting a more carefully considered approach to the usual targeting of vulnerable populations for livelihood programs. However, PRM should encourage future grant applicants to explore factors of vulnerability in assessment activities, and also document the intended and unintended consequences of involving the vulnerable in livelihoods programs as part of routine reporting.

Targeting Gender and Diversity

All of the program documents reviewed revealed a minimum understanding of the need for including women and disaggregating data by sex where applicable. However, this does not necessarily indicate that NGO partners are maximizing the benefits of these PRM requirements. Successful integration of gender and other diversity markers is not merely a question of adding women to activities, but ensuring that they benefit as their male counterparts and in some cases, being to transform gender and cultural norms. Although one example of male engagement in gender issues emerged from the documentation, this appeared to be a unique circumstance; however, given the rigidity of gender and cultural norms in some of the particular locations examined, expectations for such occurrences may need to remain lower than in other parts of the world.

- PRM should continue to encourage implementing partners to collect disaggregated data and analyze it to determine if and how women, men, and other groups do or do not benefit differently from program activities. PRM should also consider making resources available to assess or evaluate these differences by budgeting for internal or external evaluations and/or research efforts that focus specifically on issues of gender and diversity. This may be particularly instructive for camp settings where there is a relative lack of evidence on the methods to integrate diversity and what results integration may yield.

Prolonged Focus on Basic Needs and Lack of Exit Strategies or Transition Plans

Half of the programs reviewed exhibited a prolonged focus on basic needs and no exit plan, which may threaten their sustainability. Humanitarian assistance provided in camps tends to emphasize refugees' basic needs, which often results in a lack of diversity in programming. Also, the emphasis on basic needs also leads to missed opportunities for supporting livelihoods.

- PRM should work with UNHCR and NGO partners to identify mechanisms for coordination among entities to address the long-term development needs concurrently addressing immediate needs. Branches of the United Nations' Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs usually hold routine planning meetings that are well-suited for this purpose.
- We recommend that PRM support livelihoods programming that includes a transition plan that promotes self-reliance and has a feasible and timely exit strategy. Even in protracted refugee situations where it may be difficult to identify opportune timelines or milestones to transition the project, PRM should require implementers to begin planning for sustainable results at the project design stage and conduct all project activities with sustainability in mind throughout the life of the project. In cases where refugees' rights to work or move is limited, such efforts may be complemented with advocacy among host communities and governments.

Promoting Flexibility and Adaptability

Few examples of adaptation were evident during the review, though it is unclear if this was due to a lack of ability to change, lack of need to change, or other reasons. Markets and socioeconomic conditions change over time, and programs should be responsive and flexible to changes and provide space for redesign. Though cash grants and transfers were hardly observed among the program documents surveyed, they are considered "dignified and flexible," insofar as they can be used for various purposes as recipients' needs change. However, there remains little systematic evaluation on the utility of cash programs in camps.

Though flexibility and adaptability are ideal for livelihoods programs so that they can react appropriately to market changes and other shocks, short funding cycles and inflexible programming, and short timelines limit the diversity of programs and activities, as well as the ability to change activities mid-course. PRM, like other donors, is constrained by federal regulations and funding requirements, and is generally unable to be flexible or to adapt to changing markets and environments. However, PRM's option for two or three-year funding cycles opens up the possibility of making more timely adjustments during the lives of the programs and seeing more enduring benefits.

- PRM should make potential NGO implementers aware of longer-term funding cycles and possibilities that such cycles offer for activity selection or even modifications to plans outlined in the proposal based on changing circumstances. PRM should invite grantees to propose changes to implementation if they are within reason and justified by sound data.

Addressing Legal and Non-legal Barriers to Livelihoods

PRM's can promote protection goals through livelihood programming if their programs also address de facto and de jure forms of discrimination against refugees in the workplace. There are various potential ways in which PRM and its partners can combat such discrimination, including:

Advocacy with the host government to grant work permits to refugees

The review did not reveal any examples of advocacy among the six programs. Nevertheless, it is ideal for UNHCR to negotiate with host governments to grant work permits to refugees in order to expand the possibilities and sustainability of livelihoods. Implementers can supplement such efforts with provision of legal and financial assistance to support refugees' applications for work permits. However, a clearer understanding is needed of how implementers can support UNHCR in their efforts, and how other donors can assist as well.

- PRM should continue to encourage UNHCR and other appropriate partners to continue advocating on behalf of refugees for permission to work legally. PRM should also contribute to and leverage of the growing body of evidence about the positive economic consequences of allowing refugees to participate in the workforce.
- We recommend that PRM invest in research that seeks to understand 1) the ways in which implementing partners can best work with governments to grant work permits to refugees and 2) the benefits of refugee participation in the workforce.

Promoting the inclusion of host communities to discourage discrimination

Though no examples were explicitly described in the program documents reviewed, discrimination against refugees by members of host communities often presents a formidable challenge, even in settings where refugees are legally allowed to seek employment. It is critical that livelihoods interventions avoid exacerbating discrimination or generating resentment among host communities by targeting only refugees. Inclusion of the host community in programming is an important mitigation strategy for this issue. It appears from the documentation that most of the programs reviewed actively engaged host community members.

- NGOs offering livelihood-specific training and capacity building should issue certificates of completion and authority for various trades and skills that are marketable within the camp economy and/or surrounding local economy.
- PRM should require that programming be open and accessible to both refugees and host communities, promoting equal and equitable access to the extent possible.

Monitoring & Evaluation and Reporting

Program documents suggest varying degrees of sophistication with M&E, though no programs appeared to use innovative or non-traditional methods of M&E. Effective monitoring, evaluation, and reporting is vital not only for management of individual programs, but also for building the body of evidence on what works for refugee livelihoods programming. The intention to carry out M&E was often stated in proposals and reports in line with PRM requirements, but it was hardly apparent if any implementers used the required monitoring data to make program adjustments. Obtaining relevant and timely data is not only important for the beginning and end of programs, but throughout their lifetimes. Mid-term assessments of changing conditions complemented with market data can inform programs of needed mid-course adjustments.

- PRM should encourage implementers to use M&E data for management, decision-making, and improvements to projects and programs. PRM should promote the use of standardized indicators listed in its NGO guidance to ensure consistency across programs and help build the capacity of organizations with less familiarity with such tools. This review did not uncover any standardized indicators that we can recommend at this junction, though PRM and USAID's current projects may soon change this. However, in the meantime, PRM should encourage these organizations to use existing M&E guidance and tools developed by other donors and implementing organizations
- Nevertheless, PRM should not discourage innovation in M&E approaches, particularly if proposed tools are more conducive to unique contexts found in refugee camps. Developmental Evaluation is one example of an approach to M&E that allows for adaptation and flexibility. Developmental Evaluation is a process in which an evaluator is embedded within a project team, and is charged with "bring[ing] evaluative thinking into the process of development and intentional change," that is, to encourage routine assessments of how projects are going and in what ways they may be improved.¹¹⁴ Given the complex and evolving settings in which these programs take place, non-traditional M&E practices may be more suitable for measuring their progress and success.
- In addition to conducting a full set of assessments prior to program design, monitoring as well as mid-term and project end evaluations should be prioritized. Evaluations may be internal or independent depending on available budget and scope of the evaluation; the time intensiveness of developmental evaluation may often lends itself to internal staff, though the role can also be filled or complemented by external people.¹¹⁵ Nevertheless, PRM should require that entities conducting the evaluations are able to undertake them in an objective, systematic, and rigorous manner.

¹¹⁴ Gamble, J. A. A., "A Developmental Evaluation Primer." Montreal, Canada: J.W. McConnell Family Foundation, 2008. p. 19

¹¹⁵ Ibid, p. 37

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Livelihoods Programs for Refugees and Refugee Returnees in Burundi and Ethiopia

NATURE AND PURPOSE

The purpose of this solicitation is to obtain the services of a contractor to carry out an evaluation, lasting up to 10 months, of livelihoods programming supported by the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) for refugee populations in targeted countries. The evaluation will consist of: (1) a comprehensive desk review and analysis of best practices and recurring issues regarding the implementation of livelihoods programming for refugees, global in scope, including but not limited to Africa; (2) field-based evaluations in two countries (Burundi and Ethiopia) where PRM has made significant investments in refugee livelihoods programs; and (3) elaboration of guidance that can be used in future evaluations of livelihoods proposals and programmatic outcomes. Both the desk review and the field-based evaluations should prioritize identifying: (1) the qualities of successful refugee livelihoods programs; (2) whether PRM-supported programs were designed and implemented using best practices; (3) whether PRM-supported livelihoods programs promoted self-sufficiency; (4) whether self-sufficiency was a realistic objective; and (5) the secondary benefits/impact, if any, of participation in livelihoods programs. The evaluation will also analyze the economic, social and legal factors that influence the success or failure of livelihoods programs in refugee settings. Recommendations should be concrete, actionable, and provide guidance, checklists, and indicators for PRM to consider when: (1) writing requests for proposals that include livelihoods components; (2) reviewing proposals with livelihoods components; (3) monitoring livelihoods programming in the field; and (4) engaging host governments, multilateral partners and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) on refugee livelihoods. The contractor will coordinate with PRM, UNHCR, and NGOs.

BACKGROUND

PRM's mission is to provide protection, ease suffering, and resolve the plight of persecuted and uprooted people around the world on behalf of the American people by providing life-sustaining assistance, working through multilateral systems to build global partnerships, promoting best practices in humanitarian response, and ensuring that humanitarian principles are thoroughly integrated into U.S. foreign and national security policy. The United States government, through PRM, is the largest bilateral donor to UNHCR as well as the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), and among the largest bilateral donors for the International Organization for Migration (IOM). PRM funds NGOs to fill critical gaps in programming by international organizations and host governments. It is important to note that the Bureau considers its humanitarian diplomacy to be as important as its programming.

Securing durable solutions for refugees is a PRM priority. It is generally accepted that there are three durable solutions for refugee populations: (1) safe and voluntary return to country of origin; (2) local integration in country of asylum; and (3) resettlement to a third country. Refugees are often outside of their country for many years before safe, voluntary return is possible. Further resettlement is possible only for a limited number of refugees. It is generally believed that refugees with access to livelihoods

are better able to care for and protect themselves and their families. Therefore, promoting livelihoods, and thus self-sufficiency/self-reliance to the extent possible, is important for both refugee protection and assistance. From a legal perspective, the 1951 Refugee Convention/1967 Protocol confer on refugees the right to seek employment, to engage in other income-generating activities, to own and dispose of property, to enjoy freedom of movement and to have access to public services such as education (though these may be constrained in practice by host governments even when those governments are a party to the Convention). From an economic perspective, if refugees are able to exercise these rights, they are better able to establish sustainable livelihoods, to become more self-sufficient, and to become less dependent on humanitarian assistance.

Approaches to promoting livelihoods may vary dramatically upon whether a refugee is residing in a camp or a city. In camps, livelihoods are often impeded by restrictions the host government has placed on travel, denial of ability to work in the formal sector, and/or use of available land for farming. In camp settings, refugees are often more dependent on the international humanitarian community for food, shelter, and other basic necessities of life. While refugees in cities may face formal restrictions on their ability to work, many still find livelihoods in the informal sector allowing them to be more self-sufficient than they otherwise would be in camps. However, commodities are often more expensive in urban areas and poverty for urban refugees is an enormous challenge. Research commissioned by PRM indicates that the ability of urban refugees to become more self-sufficient is strongly influenced by their integration into surrounding host communities over time. This includes research conducted by Church World Service on promoting access to protection and basic services for urban refugees and the Women's Refugee Commission research on promoting access to livelihoods in cities with large populations of urban refugees. Links and summaries of these and other research projects and evaluations, including an impact evaluation of PRM humanitarian assistance for the repatriation and reintegration of Burundi refugees, are available at: [http://www.state.gov/j/prm/...](http://www.state.gov/j/prm/)

The contractor will:

- **Conduct a global desk review;** analyzing best practices/recurring mistakes in implementing livelihoods programs for refugees worldwide in order to contextualize the evaluation. The evaluation will include but not be limited to Africa and should take into account gender dynamics. The evaluation team should draw from both grey and white literature, discussions with key stakeholders, and research to determine where livelihoods promotion with refugees in Africa and the rest of the world has and has not been successful and reasons why. The review should take into account how limitations imposed by various host governments on the ability of refugees to work, farm, or travel affects livelihood interventions.
- **Carry out field-based evaluations in Burundi and Ethiopia,** where PRM has supported livelihoods programming with refugee populations. Field evaluations will assist in determining to what extent PRM-supported programming has been successful in promoting livelihoods over the long term. The evaluations should answer the following questions with an emphasis on developing best practices, lessons learned, and actionable recommendations to inform the programming and diplomacy of PRM and its partners.
- Were PRM-supported programs designed and implemented using best practices? How, for example by conducting market and livelihoods assessments?

- What were the types of livelihoods assistance provided (e.g. technical/vocational training; business training; access to finance; cash grants; in-kind items)? To what extent did these meet beneficiary needs and preferences for assistance?
- What were the characteristics of refugees received livelihoods assistance? How well did partners reach members of vulnerable groups (e.g. women; female heads of household; older persons; youth; persons with disabilities) with livelihoods assistance?
- What percentages of beneficiaries are still continuing in the livelihoods activities for which they received assistance? In other words, if someone was trained as a tailor in 2009, is s/he a tailor at present?
- Did beneficiary incomes or asset holdings increase after receiving livelihoods assistance? If so, what is the range of percentage increases, and what is the average amount of time it took to improve self-reliance? For how long were increases sustained?
- Is there a difference in the success of the livelihoods programs according to the year/period of the beneficiaries' repatriation?
- Where beneficiary incomes/assets did not noticeably improve, what are potential reasons for this lack of improvement? Are there demographic differences (e.g., by gender) in the outcomes of livelihoods programming? Elaborate.
- Did PRM-supported livelihood programs promote self-sufficiency? In other words, did PRM livelihoods programs enable beneficiaries to meet more of their basic needs than would have been able to otherwise possible? If so, how? What percentage did and for how long?
- How many graduates of the livelihoods programs are employed in the formal sector v. the informal sector?
- What indicators should PRM use to measure the efficiency and effectiveness of the livelihoods programming it supports?
- What were the secondary benefits/impact of participation in livelihoods programs, if any? For example, did refugee livelihoods participants feel they were less vulnerable to sexual abuse and exploitation and/or gender-based violence?
- Based upon the available evidence as well as the literature review, what are the qualities of successful refugee livelihoods programs? What are recommendations to PRM and other donors for future livelihoods programs?

ANNEX II: DESK REVIEW WORKS CITED

Azorbo, Michele. "Microfinance and refugees: lessons learned from UNHCR's experience." UNHCR. 2011.

"Building Livelihoods: A Field Manual for Practitioners in Humanitarian Settings." Women's Refugee Commission, 2009.

Buscher, Dale. Personal Interview.

"Cash-Transfer Programming in Emergencies." Oxfam GB, ed. Pantaleo Creti and Susanne Jaspars, 2006.

Chambers, R. and G.R. Conway. "Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century." Institute of Development Studies, 1991.

Conway, Carrie. "Refugee Livelihoods: A Case Study of The Gambia." UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit, 2004.

CORD. Program Documents. (see below for complete list)

De Vriese, Machtelt. "Refugee Livelihoods: Review of the Evidence." UNHCR. 2006.

Feinstein International Center, 2012. "Refugee Livelihoods in Urban Areas: Identifying Program Opportunities. Recommendations for programming and advocacy."

Food for the Hungry. Program Documents. (see below for complete list)

Gamble, J. A. A., "A Developmental Evaluation Primer." Montreal, Canada: J.W. McConnell Family Foundation, 2008.

Guterres, Antonio. Foreword, "Solidarity and Burden-Sharing: Background Papers for High Level Segment." UNHCR, 2013.

Harvey, Paul and Sarah Bailey. "Cash Transfer Programming for Emergencies: Good Practice Review #11."

International Refugee Committee. Program Documents. (see below for complete list)

IRC, 2014. Winter Cash Assistance to Syrians Refugees in Lebanon
<http://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/resource-file/Emergency%20Economies%20Evaluation%20Report%20FINAL%2009.09.14%20%282%29.pdf>

Jacobsen, Karen. Personal phone interview.

Jacobsen, Karen. "Livelihoods in Conflict: The pursuit of livelihoods by refugees and the impact on the human security of host communities." Feinstein International Famine Center, 2002.

Jesuit Refugee Services. Program Documents. (see below for complete list)

Kamungi, P. M. J.S Oketch, and C. Huggins, 'Land Access and the Return and Resettlement of IDPs and Refugees in Bwidi'. In *From the Ground Up*, eds. C. Huggins and J. Clover. Nairobi: Institute for Security Studies & African Centre for Technology Studies. pp. 198, 236

Kibreab, Gaib. "Displacement, host governments' policies, and constraints on the construction of sustainable livelihoods." UNESCO, 2003.

"Local Economic Recovery in Post-Conflict: Guidelines." International Labour Organization. 2010.

Meissner, Laura. Personal interview.

Meyer, Sarah. "The 'refugee aid and development' approach in Uganda: empowerment and self-reliance of refugees in practice." 2006.

"Minimum Economic Recovery Standards." SEEP Network, 2010.

Norwegian Refugee Council. Program Documents. (see below for complete list)

Norell, Dan and Brand, Margie. "Integrating Very Poor Producers into Value Chains: Field Guide, Second Edition." World Vision. 2013.

"Nourse, Tim, et al. "Market Development in Crisis Affected Environments: Emerging Lessons for Achieving Pro-Poor Economic Reconstruction." SEEP Network, 2007.

Pattinson, Lisa. "UNHCR signs agreement to grant work permits for 30,000 refugees in east Sudan." UNHCR, 2013.

"Promoting Livelihoods and Self-Reliance: Operational Guidance on Refugee Protection and Solutions in Urban Areas." UNHCR, 2011.

"Solidarity and Burden-Sharing: Background Papers for the High Level Segment." UNHCR, 2013.

Sperl, Stefan. "Evaluation of UNHCR's Policy on Refugees in Urban Areas: A Case Study Review of Cairo." UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit, 2001.

"Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets: Framework." Department for International Development (DFID), 1999. <http://www.eldis.org/vfile/upload/1/document/0901/section2.pdf>

Umlas, Elizabeth. "Urban Refugees, the Right to Work, and UNHCR's Advocacy Activities." UNHCR, 2011.

"Universal Declaration of Human Rights," Article 23.1. 1948.

Women's Refugee Commission. "Livelihoods: Promoting Economic Opportunities for Refugee Women and Youth." <https://womensrefugeecommission.org/resources/download/1>

World Bank & Danish Refugee Council, *Livelihoods Support Projects for Displaced Persons: Global Expertise and Lessons Learnt. Draft April 2014*

World Relief. Program Documents. (see below for complete list)

Program Documents

Table of Program Documents Reviewed			
Country	NGO Implementing Partner	Type of Document	Year
Burundi	CORD	Q4 Progress Report	2009
Burundi	CORD	Q3 Progress Report	2009
Burundi	CORD	Q2 Progress Report	2009
Burundi	CORD	Q1 Progress Report	2009
Burundi	CORD	Interim Program Evaluation	2009
Burundi	CORD	Proposal for PRM Funding	2009
Burundi	FH	Q4 Progress Report	2009
Burundi	FH	Q3 Progress Report	2009
Burundi	FH	Q2 Progress Report	2009
Burundi	FH	Q1 Progress Report	2009
Burundi	FH	Proposal for PRM Funding	2009
Burundi	FH	Interim Program Evaluation	2009
Burundi	World Relief	Q4 Progress Report	2009
Burundi	World Relief	Q3 Progress Report	2009
Burundi	World Relief	Q2 Progress Report	2009
Burundi	World Relief	Q1 Progress Report	2009
Burundi	World Relief	Proposal for PRM Funding	2009
Burundi	World Relief	Interim Program Evaluation	2009
Burundi	CORD	Q4 Progress Report	2010
Burundi	CORD	Q3 Progress Report	2010
Burundi	CORD	Q2 Progress Report	2010
Burundi	CORD	Q1 Progress Report	2010
Burundi	CORD	Proposal for PRM Funding	2010
Burundi	CORD	Interim Program Evaluation	2010
Burundi	FH	Q4 Progress Report	2010
Burundi	FH	Q3 Progress Report	2010
Burundi	FH	Q2 Progress Report	2010
Burundi	FH	Q1 Progress Report	2010
Burundi	FH	Proposal for PRM Funding	2010
Burundi	FH	Interim Program Evaluation	2010
Burundi	World Relief	Q4 Progress Report	2010
Burundi	World Relief	Q3 Progress Report	2010
Burundi	World Relief	Q2 Progress Report	2010
Burundi	World Relief	Q1 Progress Report	2010
Burundi	World Relief	Proposal for PRM Funding	2010
Burundi	World Relief	Interim Program Evaluation	2010
Burundi	CORD	Q4 Progress Report	2011
Burundi	CORD	Q3 Progress Report	2011
Burundi	CORD	Q2 Progress Report	2011
Burundi	CORD	Q1 Progress Report	2011
Burundi	CORD	Proposal for PRM Funding	2011
Burundi	CORD	Interim Program Evaluation	2011
Burundi	CORD	Annual Program Evaluation	2011

Burundi	FH	Q4 Progress Report	2011
Burundi	FH	Q3 Progress Report	2011
Burundi	FH	Q2 Progress Report	2011
Burundi	FH	Q1 Progress Report	2011
Burundi	FH	Interim Program Evaluation	2011
Burundi	FH	Proposal for PRM Funding	2011
Burundi	FH	Annual Program Evaluation	2011
Burundi	World Relief	Q5 Progress Report	2011
Burundi	World Relief	Q4 Progress Report	2011
Burundi	World Relief	Q3 Progress Report	2011
Burundi	World Relief	Q2 Progress Report	2011
Burundi	World Relief	Q1 Progress Report	2011
Burundi	World Relief	Interim Program Evaluation	2011
Burundi	World Relief	Proposal for PRM Funding	2011
Burundi	World Relief	Annual Program Evaluation	2011
Ethiopia	IRC	Q4 Progress Report	2010
Ethiopia	IRC	Q3 Progress Report	2010
Ethiopia	IRC	Q2 Progress Report	2010
Ethiopia	IRC	Q1 Progress Report	2010
Ethiopia	IRC	Interim Program Evaluation	2010
Ethiopia	IRC	Proposal for PRM Funding	2010
Ethiopia	JRS	Q4 Progress Report	2011
Ethiopia	JRS	Q3 Progress Report	2011
Ethiopia	JRS	Q2 Progress Report	2011
Ethiopia	JRS	Q1 Progress Report	2011
Ethiopia	JRS	Interim Proposal Evaluation	2011
Ethiopia	JRS	Proposal for PRM Funding	2011
Ethiopia	IRC	Q4 Progress Report	2011
Ethiopia	IRC	Q3 Progress Report	2011
Ethiopia	IRC	Q2 Progress Report	2011
Ethiopia	IRC	Q1 Progress Report	2011
Ethiopia	IRC	Interim Proposal Evaluation	2011
Ethiopia	IRC	Proposal for PRM Funding	2011
Ethiopia	JRS	Q4 Progress Report	2012
Ethiopia	JRS	Q3 Progress Report	2012
Ethiopia	JRS	Q2 Progress Report	2012
Ethiopia	JRS	Q1 Progress Report	2012
Ethiopia	JRS	Interim Program Evaluation	2012
Ethiopia	JRS	Proposal for PRM Funding	2012
Ethiopia	IRC	Q4 Progress Report	2012
Ethiopia	IRC	Q3 Progress Report	2012
Ethiopia	IRC	Q2 Progress Report	2012
Ethiopia	IRC	Q1 Progress Report	2012
Ethiopia	IRC	Interim Program Evaluation	2012
Ethiopia	IRC	Proposal for PRM Funding	2012
Ethiopia	NRC	Assosa Narrative Report	2012
Ethiopia	NRC	Dollo Ado Narrative Report	2012
Ethiopia	NRC	Shire Narrative Report	2012
Ethiopia	NRC	Assosa Final Report	2012
Ethiopia	NRC	Dollo Ado Final Report	2012

Ethiopia	NRC	Shire Final Report	2012
Ethiopia	NRC	Shire Market Assessment Report	2012
Ethiopia	JRS	Q4 Progress Report	2013
Ethiopia	JRS	Q3 Progress Report	2013
Ethiopia	JRS	Q2 Progress Report	2013
Ethiopia	JRS	Q1 Progress Report	2013
Ethiopia	JRS	Interim Program Evaluation	2013
Ethiopia	JRS	Proposal for PRM Funding	2013
Ethiopia	NRC	Assosa Agreement	2013
Ethiopia	NRC	Dollo Ado Agreement	2013
Ethiopia	NRC	Gambella Agreement	2013
Ethiopia	NRC	Shire Agreement	2013
Ethiopia	NRC	Assosa Final Narrative Report	2013
Ethiopia	NRC	Shire Final Narrative Report	2013
Ethiopia	NRC	Dollo Ado Final Narrative Report	2013
Ethiopia	NRC	Gambella Final Narrative Report	2013
Ethiopia	NRC	Dollo Ado Joint Education Assessment Report	2013
Ethiopia	NRC	Assosa Final Project Performance Report	2014
Ethiopia	NRC	Assosa Program Description	2014
Ethiopia	NRC	Market Assessment Report	2014
Ethiopia	NRC	Dollo Ado Education Baseline Assessment and Market Survey	2014

ANNEX III: UNHCR STANDARDS FOR REFUGEE LIVELIHOODS PROGRAMMING

Protection: Livelihoods programs will respect human rights and will be designed to support an interventions' overarching protection strategy and priorities. Livelihoods programs will protect and foster individuals' dignity as it is linked with economic independence and self-reliance.

Age, Gender and Diversity (AGD): Livelihoods programs will ensure the active participation of diverse and representative groups of refugees and the inclusion and accessibility of specific groups of concern.

Equity: Opportunities for participation in livelihoods programs will be equal among refugees with vulnerable people prioritized where possible. Activities will maintain the goal of enabling self-reliance in the wider economy and should not foster dependency.

Access: Refugee access to local services and programs will be in parity with the host community. Programs and services should be extended to host communities and refugees alike.

Sustainability: Livelihoods programs should be planned for long-term self-reliance to help people build the knowledge and skills pertinent to their mid-term and long-term goals. Programs should seek to provide the resources necessary to sustain processes until their completion.

Community Empowerment: Refugees and host communities should participate in all stages of planning, needs assessment, implementation, monitoring and evaluation to design appropriate and sustainable programs. Interventions should build upon the knowledge, skills, and resources present, and aim to enhance them further while strengthening community leadership and integration.

Appropriateness and Reliability: Livelihoods programs should be appropriate and tailored to the context. They should be targeted to people best able to achieve self-reliance goals, consistent in their approach and delivery, and take into consideration the economic status and interests of the local population.

Enhance Local Markets: Livelihoods programs should strive to strengthen the local market providing an injection of labor, consumers, and traders. Programs should work with local governments, businesses, trade and labor associations to build on existing market opportunities, benefitting both refugees and host communities.

ANNEX IV: DESK REVIEW PROTOCOLS

Protocol for International Guidelines

Desk Review Protocol: Guidelines	
Document Reviewed	
Title:	Document #:
Author:	Publication Year:
Focus Area: <input type="checkbox"/> Refugee livelihood programming <input type="checkbox"/> Self-sufficiency <input type="checkbox"/> Benefits and secondary impact <input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain)	
Overall Summary: (about 4-5 lines).	
Key recommendations:	
Type of Livelihood Programs addressed: <u>Specify:</u> Comments:	
Target Refugee Group: <input type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> Adult (female) <input type="checkbox"/> Child (female) <input type="checkbox"/> Adult (male) <input type="checkbox"/> Child (male) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain) Comments:	
Type of Programming: <u>Employment:</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Urban <input type="checkbox"/> Camp <input type="checkbox"/> Integration into local communities <input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain) <u>Income-generating:</u> <input type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> Urban <input type="checkbox"/> Camp <input type="checkbox"/> Legal <input type="checkbox"/> Security <input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain) Monitoring and documentation <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Comments:	
Includes guidance for effective livelihood programs: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

Summary:

Includes self-sufficiency strategies in livelihoods programming: Yes No

Other Notes:

Protocol for Peer Review Grey Literature

Document Reviewed	
Title:	Document #:
Author:	Publication Year:
Focus Area: <input type="checkbox"/> Refugee livelihood programming <input type="checkbox"/> Self-sufficiency <input type="checkbox"/> Benefits and secondary impact	
Overall Summary: (about 4-5 lines).	
Key findings and recommendations:	
<i>Findings:</i>	
<i>Recommendations:</i>	
Type of Livelihood Programs addressed: <input type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> Other	
<i>Comments:</i>	
Target Refugee Group: <input type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> Adult (female) <input type="checkbox"/> Child (female) <input type="checkbox"/> Adult (male) <input type="checkbox"/> Child (male)	
<i>Comments:</i>	
Type of Programming:	
<u>Employment:</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Urban <input type="checkbox"/> Camp <input type="checkbox"/> Integration into local communities <input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain)	
<u>Income-generating:</u> <input type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> Urban <input type="checkbox"/> Camp <input type="checkbox"/> Legal <input type="checkbox"/> Security	
<u>Evidence of program monitoring</u> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Comments:</i>	
Includes guidance for effective livelihood programs: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<i>Summary:</i>	
Includes guidelines for monitoring of Livelihood programs: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<i>Summary: (3-4 lines max)</i>	
Includes self-sufficiency strategies in livelihoods programming: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Other Notes: None	

Protocol for Ethiopia/Burundi Program Documents

Country:		Location:		Implementer:
Evaluation Question	Desk Review	Source documents and page number	Notes	
Q1 Type of Assistance				
Q1 (a) What were the types of livelihoods assistance provided?	According to review of project proposals, UNHCR and NGO reports, and other written documents including program work plans, M&E documents, and quarterly reports, did the partners specify the types of livelihood assistance provided?			
Q1 (b) To what extent did these meet beneficiary needs and preferences for assistance?	According to available documentation, what were the barriers to implementation of program activities?			
Q2 Recipients of Assistance				
Q2 (a) What are the characteristics of refugees who received livelihoods assistance?	According to available documentation, are the eligibility criteria included?			
Q2 (b) How well did partners reach members of vulnerable groups with livelihoods	Does the available documentation list the types of assessments performed before			

Country:		Location:		Implementer:
Evaluation Question	Desk Review	Source documents and page number	Notes	
assistance?	designing, planning, and implementing the program to ensure outreach to vulnerable groups?			
Q2 (c) What percentages of beneficiaries are still continuing in the livelihoods activities for which they received assistance?	How does the available documentation describe continuation of livelihood activities (as opposed to self sufficiency)?			
Q2 (d) Did beneficiary incomes or asset holdings increase after receiving livelihoods assistance? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If so, what is the range of percentage increases? • What is the average amount of time it took to improve self-reliance? • For how long were increases sustained? 	How does the available documentation measure and report income or asset holding increases or decreases of beneficiaries?		Range of increase:	
			Average amount of time:	
			Length of time:	
What was the Effect of the Assistance?				

Country:		Location:		Implementer:	
Evaluation Question	Desk Review	Source documents and page number	Notes		
Q3 (a) Is there is a difference in the success of the livelihoods programs according to the year/period of the beneficiaries' repatriation?	How does the available reporting document livelihood success for repatriated refugees?				
Q3 (b) Where beneficiary incomes/assets did not noticeably improve, what are potential reasons for this lack of improvement? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there demographic differences (e.g., by sex) in the outcomes of livelihoods programming? Elaborate. 	Does the documentation suggest any causes or factors that explain intended or unintended positive or negative consequences?		Factors:		
			Causes:		
Q3 (c) Did PRM-supported livelihood programs promote self-sufficiency? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did PRM livelihoods programs enable beneficiaries to meet more of their basic needs then would have 	Does the documentation describe how the livelihood programs allowed beneficiaries to meet more of their basic needs? If there are data describing "before" and "after" the livelihoods program intervention, please		Before	After	

Country:		Location:		Implementer:
Evaluation Question	Desk Review	Source documents and page number	Notes	
<p>been able to otherwise possible, if so, how?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What percentage did and for how long? 	describe.			
<p>Q3 (d) How many graduates of the livelihoods programs are employed in the formal sector v. the informal sector?</p>	Does the project proposal and program documentation indicate the extent to which livelihood graduates have full or part-time employment?		Formal sector:	
			Informal sector:	
<p>Q3 (e) What were the secondary benefits/impact of participation in livelihoods programs, if any?</p>	Does the available documentation describe secondary benefits? Does it describe mitigation of potential sexual abuse, exploitation, or gender-based violence?			
Were PRM-Supported Programs Designed and Implemented using Best Practices?				
<p>Q 4 (a) Did IPs conduct baseline assessments such as market and livelihoods assessments?</p>				

Country:		Location:		Implementer:
Evaluation Question	Desk Review	Source documents and page number	Notes	
Q 4 (b) What indicators should PRM use to measure the efficiency and effectiveness of the livelihoods programming it supports?	Does the available documentation provide indicators that describe efficiency and effectiveness? How are these two attributes defined?		Efficiency indicators: Effectiveness indicators:	
Q 4 (c) Based upon the available evidence as well as the literature review, what are the qualities of successful refugee livelihoods programs? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are recommendations to PRM and other donors for future livelihoods programs? 			Specific qualities:	
			Recommendations for future support:	

U.S. Department of State
2201 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20520