

## Annex B: Evaluation Methodology

1. The methodological approach developed during the inception phase of this evaluation (January-February 2019) is summarised in this annex.

### Evaluation approach

2. Overall, the study was designed as a formative and process-oriented evaluation, rather than a summative or outcome focused evaluation. The evaluation was geared towards drawing out lessons in progressing towards achieving the overarching goals of the Global Compact for Refugees.

3. The evaluation was carried out in **three main phases** (inception, implementation and reporting), each with their own activities and deliverables. Table 1 below summarizes the activities carried out in each phase, the deliverables produced and the interaction with the ERGs.

### Phases of the evaluation

| Phase   | Key events and activities   | Deliverables  |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Inception Phase</b><br>Jan-Feb 2019                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Inception mission to UNHCR in Geneva (9-11 January 2019)</li> <li>● Inception mission to Kenya (Nairobi and Turkana) (21-25<sup>th</sup> January 2019)</li> <li>● Stakeholder mapping</li> <li>● Context analysis</li> <li>● Evaluation methodology and evaluation workplan</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Debriefing at end of inception mission to Kenya</li> <li>● Inception Report</li> <li>● Debriefing with Geneva ERG</li> </ul> |
| <b>Implementation Phase</b><br>Mar-May 2019           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Literature Review</li> <li>● Field visits to Kenya (March 2019) to conduct (i) KIIs with national and local stakeholders, (ii) FGDs with affected populations, (iii) direct observation of field activities</li> <li>● Visits to Geneva (April 2019) to conduct KIIs with UNHCR, other UN agencies and the MFA</li> <li>● Additional remote interviews (April 2019)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Debriefing Kenya ERG (on preliminary findings at end of field mission)</li> <li>● Debriefing with Geneva ERG</li> </ul>      |
| <b>Analysis and Reporting Phase</b><br>May -July 2019 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Map and analyse stakeholders' engagement with KISED</li> <li>● Reconstruct engagement timeline.</li> <li>● Consolidation of evidence in the Evaluation Grid</li> <li>● Team workshop to confirm findings and identify emerging conclusions and recommendations</li> <li>● Drafting of Evaluation Report</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evaluation Report</li> <li>● Debriefing with Geneva ERG</li> <li>● Validation Workshop in Kenya</li> </ul>                   |

4. Regular interactions took place with key stakeholders throughout the process, specifically including Evaluation Reference Groups (ERG) formed in Kenya and in Geneva/Copenhagen. They provided inputs to the design of the evaluation during the inception phase and in validating the *preliminary findings* of the evaluation after the field work phase. The *preliminary answers to*

*evaluation questions, conclusions and recommendations* were presented to an ERG meeting in Geneva and a validation workshop in Kenya, where stakeholders helped craft and target the recommendations.

5. The evaluation approach built a number of **core principles** into the design building on the OECD/DAC quality standards for evaluation. These are outlined in the table below and complement adherence to the UNEG ethical standards as presented in the Table below.

### Evaluation Principles

| Principle                | Explanation  | How built in to evaluation design   |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Independence</b>      | Evidence that is objective and credible. Independent from programme design, management and implementation. Evaluations carried out by knowledgeable experts with high integrity that are independent of those responsible for the design, planning and implementation of the intervention. | The evaluation team are fully independent with no previous involvement with the KISEDIP. The transparency and traceability of evidence was ensured - within the boundaries of ethical standards, below. Stakeholder engagement (to promote utility) was balanced with maintaining independence. |
| <b>Minimal footprint</b> | To reduce pressures on busy staff, the evaluation needs to maximise coordination and information sharing.  | The design made efforts to ensure that data was shared/made maximum use of, and that field time spent with hard-pressed staff was maximized for its value (e.g. high levels of preparation, to ensure that fieldwork did not cover ground already available from documentation).                |
| <b>Transparency</b>      | Evaluations must be made publicly available for sharing lessons more widely and for accountability purposes. Disclosure will also allow review and test of the analysis and the methodologies used by other evaluators and researchers.  | The evaluation team developed a communication plan for the evaluation and engaged in its implementation as required.  |
| <b>Participation</b>     | Where possible the evaluation and the evaluation process must be designed to ensure that direct beneficiaries (women and men) of the development intervention under evaluation are consulted and have opportunity to bring forward views and suggestions for improvements.                 | Different categories of affected populations were engaged in the evaluation process, principally through focus group discussions.   |

6. The evaluation process and its products were designed and implemented with the clear purpose of being useful for decision makers. This implied focusing on forward-looking analysis that can contribute to future planning at both strategic and operational levels.

7. The evaluation placed a strong emphasis on the **integration of gender issues** in its design. This is reflected in:

- a) The mainstreaming of gender and protection throughout the evaluation matrix;
- b) Embedding gender- and protection-related questions into enquiry tools;
- c) Disaggregation of quantitative data, where possible, by sex and groups that are vulnerable or particularly at risk;

- d) Ensuring that the methodology contains a gender-sensitive approach e.g. separate focus groups for women;

## Evaluation questions

8. The evaluation is structured around the three main areas of enquiry:
- lessons in the development of the KISED model,
  - lessons on the architecture used for delivery, and,
  - lessons on promoting inclusion and equality of access to basic services and livelihood opportunities for both refugees and the host community.
9. These three broad areas of enquiry were developed into a set of nine Evaluation Questions (EQs) and further refined into a number of sub-evaluation questions (see Table 3) and corresponding sources of evidence into an evaluation matrix which guided the evaluation process.
10. Key issues for the evaluation concern ‘where are we’ and ‘how did we get here’, ‘what has worked and what has not worked’, ‘what are barriers, drivers and opportunities’ and ‘where do we go from here’.
11. The EQs were found to remain relevant and broadly sufficient in scope during the evaluation field work, although there was some refinement at the level of sub-questions. Consequently, these EQs have been maintained as a framework for the presentation of the findings.

## Evaluation Matrix

| EQs                    | Sub-Questions   | Policies, Strategies and Operational Plans | Monitoring and Evaluation Data and Reports | Key Informant Interviews | Affected Population |
|------------------------|---|--|--|--------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>The KISED model</b> |   |  |  |                          |                     |
| 1.                     | How does the KISED model align with the policies and interests of different stakeholders?   |  |  |                          |                     |
|                        | What is the KISED model?  | 1  |  | 1                        | 1                   |
|                        | How does it align with the policies and political priorities of the national Government?  | 1  |  | 1                        |                     |
|                        | How does it align with the political priorities of the County Government?   | 1  |  | 1                        |                     |
|                        | How does it align with UNHCR policies and strategies, including the Global Compact on Refugees?                                   | 1  |  | 1                        |                     |
|                        | How does it align with UNCT strategy and with other UN agency level policies and mandates?  | 1  |  | 1                        |                     |
|                        | How does it align with donor political, humanitarian and development strategies?  | 1  |  | 1                        |                     |
| 2.                     | What were the barriers, drivers and opportunities to developing a multi-agency plan to deliver integrated solutions for refugees? |  |  |                          |                     |
|                        | Who provided leadership to developing the KISED model, and what were the associated advantages and disadvantages?                 |  | 1  | 1                        |                     |

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| How and when were different stakeholders included in the KISED DP planning process? With what consequences?               |   | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| How were trade-offs between different stakeholder agendas managed? What are the lessons                                   |   | 1 | 1 |   |
| How was the KISED DP approach harmonised with - or into - other humanitarian and development plans?                       | 1 |   | 1 |   |
| 3. What risks are associated with the KISED DP model and what has been learnt on how to mitigate these risk factors?      |   |   |   |   |
| What are the major risk factors associated with the KISED DP?   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| What lessons have been learnt on how to identify relevant risks?  |   |   | 1 | 1 |
| What lessons have been learnt on mitigating these risks?  |   |   | 1 | 1 |
| <b>The architecture</b>   |   |   |   |   |
| 4. What factors have promoted and enabled partnerships in delivering the KISED DP?  |   |   |   |   |
| Who are the main actors in the KISED DP? What are their main roles and responsibilities?                                  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| How have Government authorities engaged with the KISED DP? What factors encouraged or discouraged their participation?    |   |   | 1 | 1 |
| How have development actors engaged with the KISED DP? What factors encouraged or discouraged their participation?        |   |   | 1 | 1 |
| How has the private sector engaged with the KISED DP? What factors encouraged or discouraged their participation?         |   |   | 1 | 1 |
| How have humanitarian actors adapted their activities to contribute to the longer-term goals of the KISED DP?             | 1 |   | 1 | 1 |
| 5. What factors have promoted effective coordination amongst KISED DP partners?   |   |   |   |   |
| What are the main coordination needs and priorities?  |   | 1 | 1 |   |
| What coordination structures have been established for the implementation of the KISED DP? What functions do they fulfil? |   | 1 | 1 |   |
| What factors have either enabled or discouraged positive coordination between stakeholders?                               |   |   | 1 |   |
| 6. What factors have promoted adequate and appropriate financing of KISED DP objectives?                                  |   |   |   |   |
| What channels are used to finance KISED DP activities? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each?                 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |
| What factors influence the willingness of donors and other social financiers to support the KISED DP?                     |   |   | 1 |   |
| What factors influence the willingness to use development funds to support the KISED DP?                                  |   |   | 1 |   |
| What are the barriers and opportunities for private sector investment?  |   |   | 1 | 1 |
| 7. Where does accountability for the KISED DP rest and how is it fulfilled?   |   |   |   |   |

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| What monitoring, evaluation and learning processes have been established?   |   | 1 | 1 |   |
| What has been learnt and agreed about the criteria for success of the KISED DP model?   |   | 1 | 1 |   |
| Who is responsible for M&E? What are the accountability frameworks? What are the advantages and disadvantages of these arrangements?                                  |   | 1 | 1 |   |
| <b>Inclusion and equity</b>   |   |   |   |   |
| 8. What factors influence the inclusion and equality of access by refugees and host communities to basic services?  |   |   |   |   |
| What factors have promoted or inhibited access by refugees to Government basic services (including education, health and water)?                                      |   | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Has access to protection (in line with international law) to all refugees been maintained under the KISED DP? What factors have influenced this?                      |   | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| How have the implications for quality standards of adopting an inclusive approach been managed?   |   |   | 1 | 1 |
| What steps have been taken to harmonise humanitarian assistance with national services? What has worked and what has not?   |   |   | 1 | 1 |
| How has the host community been defined within the KISED DP? How has this influenced implementation?  | 1 |   | 1 | 1 |
| What factors have promoted or inhibited equality of access by host communities to services?   |   | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 9. What factors influence the inclusion and equality of refugees and host communities in access to employment and livelihood opportunities?                           |   |   |   |   |
| What elements of KISED DP have encouraged or discouraged livelihoods of refugees or host communities?   |   | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| What considerations underlie private sector investment in Turkana West? What factors have encouraged and discouraged this investment?                                 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| What factors have positively or negatively influenced changes enacted in relevant legal frameworks and policies?  | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |
| What factors have influenced equitable access to appropriate financial services including banking and micro-credit, for members of both host and refugee communities? | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

## Data collection

12. The evaluation used secondary qualitative and quantitative data through a comprehensive desk review, complemented with primary data collection as necessary and feasible. The main sources of information for the evaluation include:

- National and international stakeholder views: UN, Kenyan authorities, donors; international and national NGOs, community-based organisations, other International Organizations and the private sector.
- Views of affected populations: KISED P beneficiaries, other refugee and host community members collected through Focus Group Discussions.
- Desk review of policies, strategies and operational plans: International and regional legal and policy frameworks for refugees, UNHCR Corporate Policies, Strategies and SOPs; Government Policies and Strategies including the County Integrated Development Plan; UN Strategies and Plans; KISED P Operational Plans and Project Documents, Donor Strategies.
- Monitoring and evaluation data and reports: Programme Monitoring briefs, updates, factsheets; feedback and complaints data; evaluations and audits.

13. Data from these sources were collected through a number of instruments.

14. A **stakeholder analysis** was conducted during the inception phase to identify Key Informants. This included stakeholders at international, Nairobi and Turkana levels. This was used to help identify, and to ensure an appropriate balance among, stakeholders for interview during the evaluation phase.

15. A primary source of data for this study was **Key Informant Interviews** with stakeholders (KIIs). KIIs have been conducted in Kenya during a field mission in March 2019, in Geneva in April 2019 and through follow-up calls in April 2019. All KIIs were treated as confidential. The evaluation conducted a total of 109 semi-structured interviews with 206 key internal and external stakeholders (see Annex C for a list of stakeholders interviewed).

16. A **literature review**, encompassing research, policy and programming documents at the global, regional and national levels. The relevant evidence was extracted against the evaluation questions into an evaluation grid. Approximately 250 documents have been gathered for review (see the library list in Annex D).

17. The literature review contributed to developing a full **context analysis** to understand the extent to which the environment promotes or inhibits the realisation of KISED P goals.

18. Relevant secondary sources of **quantitative data** were also utilised. Secondary data from the recently completed mid-term evaluation of the EUTF programme provided detailed information on progress against results. In addition, information from established programme budgeting, monitoring and reporting systems were drawn on by the evaluation. The evaluation drawn on UNHCR datasets, and data from other implementing partners.

19. Given UNHCR's AAP commitments, the evaluation methodology included a strong focus on affected people throughout the evaluation process. Information from affected populations, both refugees and host populations, was systematically captured and analysed. A total of 24 **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)** were conducted in Turkana amongst refugee and host communities in Kakuma and Kalobeyei. This included the perspectives of affected populations, both beneficiaries in different activities and non-beneficiaries, and the views of both women and men.

## Focus Group Discussions by Location and Group Members

|                     | Kakuma   |                | Kalobeyi |                |
|---------------------|----------|----------------|----------|----------------|
|                     | Refugees | Host Community | Refugees | Host Community |
| Leaders             | 1        | 1              | 1        | 1              |
| Women               | 1        | 1              | 1        | 1              |
| Youth               | 1        | 1              | 1        | 1              |
| Entrepreneurs       | 1        | 1              | 1        | 1              |
| Vulnerable groups   | 1        | 1              | 1        | 1              |
| CBO representatives | 1        | 1              | 1        | 1              |

20. Finally, the methods included **direct observation of activities and facilities**. The ET carried out field visits to meet beneficiaries and inspect or observe the activities and outputs of operations, including service delivery and livelihood activities.

21. The evaluation was **conducted in full adherence to the UNEG Ethical Guidelines** for Evaluation in the UN System, and all evaluation team members had full access to, and apply, the Guidelines. Key standards applied are shown below.

### UNEG Ethical Guidelines

| Issue                                | Standards to be Applied  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <i>Honesty and integrity</i>         | Evaluation team members commit to adherence to the UNEG Code of Conduct for evaluators in the UN system, and to accurately presenting procedures, data and findings, including ensuring that the evaluation findings are transparently generated, have full integrity and are unbiased.  |
| <i>Rights of participants</i>        | Prospective interviewees and participants in focus groups will be given the time and information to decide whether or not they wish to participate. Informed consent will be sought in all cases. Efforts will be made to ensure that marginalised or otherwise excluded groups are represented.   |
| <i>Anonymity and confidentiality</i> | All those providing information for this evaluation – whether beneficiaries or stakeholders – will be informed how that information will be used and how their anonymity will be ensured so that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluation team members will respect people's right to provide information in confidence. |
| <i>Data protection</i>               | All data generated by the evaluation team, including that collected from focus groups, will remain internal to the evaluation, and will not be shared without the express consent of participants.   |

22. The evaluation took place amid highly sensitive environments, and its design included focus groups with vulnerable beneficiaries. Accordingly, ethical concerns required particular consideration. The rights and dignity of all involved in an evaluation were respected. Confidentiality and anonymity of participants were respected. All data collection was conducted in line with ethical principles, explaining the limits to confidentiality and seeking informed consent of informants. Focus group discussions were organised with regard to differences in gender and ethnicity.

### Analysis and reporting

23. The evaluation adopted a systematic approach to analysis, ensuring validity and transparency in the relationship between findings, conclusions and recommendations. Findings from diverse evidence streams were consolidated in a structured way, through an evaluation grid that triangulated the findings from different sources against the questions in the evaluation matrix.

24. Triangulation methods included, both (i) the use of different team members to explore the same aspect of the evaluation and ensure that findings are fully endorsed by all team members rather

than being the ‘province’ of one particular area of specialism; and (ii) the use of different methods to explore the same aspect, and the use of multiple sources of data. Moreover, the use of structured tools ensured that findings were directly traceable to evidence, while any tensions or contradictions within the evidence were transparently recorded.

25. Validation also took place through dialogue with key stakeholders with findings tested, nuanced and discussed with the evaluation’s interlocutors throughout the evaluative process. Regular briefings were held to ensure stakeholders’ strong and continued engagement in the process. This included:

- Consultation of stakeholders in the evaluation design during the inception phase in February 2019;
- A meeting with the Evaluation Reference Groups (ERG) in March 2019 to discuss and refine the inception report;
- A presentation to UNHCR Kenya in April 2019 to validate the findings following the evaluation field mission to Kenya;
- A preliminary findings and conclusions paper was shared and discussed with UNHCR, DANIDA and the ERG in May 2019;
- A validation workshop with a cross section of stakeholders organised in Kenya in June 2019;

26. On the basis of the cross-checked evaluation findings, the team formulated answers to the evaluation questions, overall conclusions where appropriate, and recommendations derived from specific conclusions. The team provided practical, operational recommendations for future adjustments and actions. Each recommendation traces back to the answers to EQs and overall conclusions, which in turn is traceable to evaluation findings per EQ. Dialogue with key ERG stakeholders – both in the preliminary debrief and the validation workshop – enhanced the phrasing and targeting of recommendations. “Lessons learned” presents selected good practices based on key findings and conclusions and assesses their general relevance and wider applicability.

27. ADE applied rigorous internal peer review practice to this policy evaluation. All draft products were subject to internal peer review within the evaluation team. The Quality Assurance Manager and Business Integrity Manager for this study was Edwin Clerckx – current Managing Director of ADE.