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### Abbreviations & Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3RP</td>
<td>Regional Refugee and Resilience Response Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAP</td>
<td>Accountability to Affected Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALNAP</td>
<td>Active Learning Network on Accountability and Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAC</td>
<td>Children Affected by Armed Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Complex Adaptive Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC’s</td>
<td>Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHF</td>
<td>Common Humanitarian Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;A Report</td>
<td>Data and Analysis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIDA</td>
<td>Danish International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>United Kingdom’s Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG ECHO</td>
<td>European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSOC</td>
<td>Economic and Social Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>The Food and Agriculture organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEROS</td>
<td>Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus / Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRBA</td>
<td>Human Rights Based Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRI</td>
<td>DARA’s Humanitarian Response Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRP</td>
<td>Humanitarian Response Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>International Committee of the Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG</td>
<td>The World Bank’s Independent Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>Information Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSMS</td>
<td>World Bank Living Standards Measurement Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEL</td>
<td>Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOPAN</td>
<td>Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVA</td>
<td>Multi-Variate Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODI</td>
<td>The Overseas Development Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT</td>
<td>Occupied Palestinian Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Randomized Control Trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRI</td>
<td>DARA’s Refugee Response Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARP</td>
<td>Syria Humanitarian Assistance Response Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>Sweden International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPM</td>
<td>Third Party Monitoring (Monitors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRWA</td>
<td>United Nations Relief Works Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, sanitation and hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS</td>
<td>World Humanitarian Summit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Overview

1.1 Purpose of this Inception Phase Report

This inception phase report provides an overview of the evaluation’s purpose and sets out a methodological approach to guide all aspects of the evaluation, including a theory of change, evaluation questions, analytical framework, data collection and analysis tools, and principles and ethical considerations. The report includes initial issues or observations that inform the evaluation’s approach. In this sense, it is a guide for how the evaluation will be conducted.

This report is based on a review of relevant documentation, discussions with persons involved in the No Lost Generation (NLG) initiative, the evaluation team’s experience and insights, and standards and best practices associated with an evaluation of this type. (Please see Annex 7.3.)

1.2 Description of the Object of the Evaluation

Launched in October 2013, the NLG was a “strategy” to focus resources on ensuring that children and young people affected by the crisis in Syria and Iraq have access to “education, protection, and opportunities to engage positively in their community and society.”

The NLG Strategic Overview for October 2013 – December 2014 established three programmatic areas:

- Providing children with access to learning opportunities (education);
- Providing children with access to a protective environment (child protection); and
- Providing children and adolescents with initiatives to broaden their opportunities (youth engagement, amongst others).

That first strategy states that the NLG was designed:

- “To be collaborative, by encompassing many different partners and stakeholders. (partnership)
- To act as a platform to gather momentum behind existing initiatives and response efforts. (coordination & knowledge management)
- To bring attention to a long undervalued and yet strategic aspect of the crisis. (advocacy/accountability)
- To illustrate a powerful and practical way to bridge humanitarian and development responses. (advocacy)
- To raise more resources for all partners involved to fully invest in children’s futures.”

In 2018, the NLG had set out a workplan and performance monitoring matrix with five objectives:

- Positive and lasting changes for children and young people in No Lost Generation countries are supported as a result of regional-level strategic efforts to influence decision-makers towards No Lost Generation advocacy objectives. (advocacy)
- The funding level for programmes under No Lost Generation pillars in each of the 6 No Lost Generation countries is at least 60% of appeal target. (fundraising / accountability)
- Programmatic responses at country level have been strengthened as a result of regional level strategic direction-setting and knowledge management for cross sector programmes, emerging areas and innovations (support for cross-sector programming, emerging programme areas and innovation)

---

1 We have not included a brief on the operating context for the NLG in this report as it is included in the initial proposal and is included in most documentation reviewed as part of this inception phase. The context is considered in relation to the methodological design, especially in relation to the theory of change. (See Section 2.1)

2 This section draws from: Woel, Brigitte. “Evaluability Assessment of the No Lost Generation Initiative.” January 2018.

3 “Terms of Reference for Service Contracting (ToR) for the Evaluation of the No Lost Generation (NLG) Initiative. LRPS No. 9140589 Annex B” UNICEF; Section 1.

4 IBID.

The voices of children and youth in No Lost Generation countries are raised at all levels through communications and participation in high level events. (ensuring the voices of children and young people are heard at all levels.)

Country level practitioners in No Lost Generation programme areas have access to relevant resources and are guided by strategic frameworks for cross sector programmes, emerging programme areas and innovations (knowledge management; facilitation of partnerships and other support for cross-sector programming, emerging programme areas and innovation including technology).\(^6\)

The performance matrix includes activities, indicators, means of verification, and other relevant data. While having a performance matrix is surely important, the targets included here, and in “No Lost Generation Updates,” tend to conflate broader regional (3RP/SHARP/RRP) and country (UNDAF/HRP) targets with those that have a direct link with NLG activities.\(^7\) If the NLG tethers itself to these broader programming results, then one may assume that it is also culpable for any failures in those results. As the following figure represents: “Around 2.8 million school-age Syrian children (36 per cent) remain out of school in Syria and the five host countries.

How does the NLG align with these broader results and how can the evaluation determine how the NLG contributes to the successes and failures associated with these results? This implies one of the central tenets of this evaluation: given that the NLG has consistently focused on advocacy, knowledge management, and partnerships/coordination, in different ways during the crisis, how does one assess the intended results of such activities, mainly:

- Children and youth have access to certified quality education;
- Children have access to quality protection services;
- Adolescents and youth are supported to contribute to resilience and social cohesion in their communities.\(^9\)

---

6 “NLG 2018 Performance Monitoring” & “2018 NLG Workplan.” Internal NLG documents. The 2018 NLG Workplan includes additional/complementary goals for phase II: Children and youth have access to certified quality education; Children, including adolescents, benefit from a protective environment; Adolescents and youth are supported to contribute to resilience and social cohesion in their communities; and in line with national legislation frameworks, youth have expanded livelihoods opportunities. The evaluation will seek to present a harmonized set of proposed objectives as a key output, including those for the NLG more broadly and for the NLG working group. In this context, the primary issue remains: what is the link between specific NLG activities and these intended results.

7 Let alone national plans, like Lebanon’s Ministry of Education and Higher Education’s (MEHE) “Reaching All Children with Education” (RACE) national education strategy, amongst other relevant national plans.


9 The agreed upon outcomes cited in No Lost generation Updates and other materials.
In essence, the NLG is designed to influence a variety of actors toward these results. How much influence it yields, at different times and in different ways, seems central to this evaluation. Establishing links between partnership, coordination, knowledge management, advocacy, and resource mobilisation—the NLG’s strategic intentions—and tangible results for children, youth, and adolescents requires a breadth of analysis, especially in establishing how and if the NLG influenced and possibly changed these programmatic areas. Essentially, did NLG partnership/coordination, knowledge management, advocacy, and resource mobilisation activities influence different actors, collectively and individually, towards more and better education, child protection, and youth and adolescent programming?

Given these considerations, the purpose of this evaluation, the first of the NLG, is to answer that fundamental question. The evaluation aims to do that through a comprehensive assessment of different aspects of the NLG, including its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coordination, potential impact, and sustainability. Additionally, the evaluation will establish lessons and best/emerging practices that can inform decision-making about the NLG going forward as well as similar initiatives in other contexts.

The evaluation’s scope includes the time period from inception (October 2013) to the present (November 2018) as well as activities at global, regional, and country levels, including Syria, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt and Turkey, as so described in the original ToR. In this sense, the evaluation is comprehensive, taking in the entire scope of the NLG and how it evolved and changed since 2013. This implies not simply detailed analysis of what may have worked or not, but also themes, trends, and lessons that can inform the NLG and similar initiatives globally.

1.3 Establishing a Primary Theory

One of the key facets of an evaluation of this type is to establish the primary theory that will guide subsequent data collection and analysis. Using the fundamental question from above, the theory is:

- The NLG DID influence different actors to deliver more and better education, child protection, and youth and adolescent programming for children and youth affected by the Syria crisis.

The theory is that it did have some influence and that this influence, in turn, created changes that led to better programming for children, youth and adolescents. This basic assumption will be tested, in various ways, during the course of the evaluation. The theory is also designed to be broad enough to cover all relevant aspects of the NLG without being overly prescriptive. While there could be additional theories concerning NLG results, this would expand the evaluation in ways that could exceed reasonable resources and analytical depth. Thus, the evaluation has developed this theory to be comprehensive while still allowing enough focus to enable effective analysis.

“Influence” is difficult to measure. It depends on both subjective evidence from stakeholders, e.g. their opinions about the value and merit of various NLG activities, and on links between their opinions and ways that the NLG has prompted them to make changes in their decision-making, programming and activities, etc. The latter, of course, could demonstrate exceptional value and yet the ability to transfer the influence on individuals to actual operational changes depends on a range of variables that lie well beyond any possible NLG influence. This implies that a lack of links between NLG influence and actual changes is not a deficiency but instead indicate areas where NLG influence prompted broader and more tangible results and thus a possible model for moving forward.

The other aspect of this driving theory is that “more and better” programming does not necessarily work in tandem. Higher quality programming may imply reaching fewer people and, conversely, reaching more people with slightly less quality may be preferable, especially in emergency response.

10 We are using the term “coordination” in reference to the NLG’s working group and other ways that it may have supported broader coordination in other structures, such as the UN Country Team/Humanitarian Country Teams (UNCT/HCT).
11 These conform with OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and the United Nations Evaluation Group’s (UNEG) norms and standards.
programming. The evaluation will seek examples of such prioritization and decision-making while, again, seeking, links to different aspects of NLG influence.

As such, this leads to a number of questions and assumptions:

- If the NLG did influence different actors, how did this result in actual programming changes?
- How much influence can be said to be attributed to the NLG and how much to other factors, from the pace, scale and complexity of the crisis and the geopolitical reactions to the crisis to the economic, political and social conditions in Syria and host countries, amongst so many other intervening variables?
- To what extent did primary NLG activities, including advocacy, knowledge management, and partnerships/coordination, create synergies that, taken together, created more influence than they may have in isolation?
- Did the NLG enable and sustain resource mobilisation and programming approaches for education, child protection, and youth engagement, in ways that may not have been achieved otherwise?
- How does one calculate the “return on investment” associated with the NLG given the complexity of linking its primary activities to expected results?

These and the questions included in the Terms of Reference (ToR), seek to test the theory and to establish what worked, what didn’t and what could be different.

1.4 Evaluation Audience and Stakeholders

The primary stakeholders for the evaluation are the NLG partners. In essence, the NLG stands as a platform that serves these partners and other organizations who have been involved in the Syria response. This does not include affected populations or direct beneficiaries of the response.

The evaluation will seek to interview all of those indicated by the NLG as stakeholders and others who have been identified as having been involved with the NLG. These are all staff members and employees of humanitarian organizations, including UN, NGO, and donor organizations.

The final audience for the evaluation will also be NLG partners and others involved in the Syria response.

2 Methodology & Tools

This section describes the methodological approach and tools proposed for the evaluation. These are based on common evaluation standards, ethical standards, and adherence to gender equality and human rights-based approaches, and other guiding principles. Descriptions of these are included in the original proposal and we do not foresee the need to alter these. They are included in the Annexes.

The primary approach rests on a trajectory of analysis for the evaluation framework:
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Figure 2: Steps in creating the evaluation architecture

This begins with the theory, as articulated in Section 1.3 which in turn informs the theory of change. The theory of change establishes the links between inputs, outputs/activities, and expected outcomes and
impact. As described in Section 3.2, this includes particular attention to the NLG’s “sphere of influence” and the intervening variables that may have affected the NLG’s influence on different parties at different times. The evaluation questions are based on those from the ToR, with slight modifications and additions. The analytical framework, data collection tools, and analytical tools establish the precise ways in which these questions are answered.

2.1 Theory of Change

The following figure includes the various elements and linkages in the proposed theory of change:
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**Figure 3: Theory of change for NLG evaluation**

1. As described, the fundamental question, or theory, for the evaluation is that the NLG influenced actors to deliver more and better programming. This is slightly less ambitious than actually causing actors to delivery more and better programming and yet establishing actual causality would be nearly impossible, given the intervening variables and the timeframe. Influence, on the other hand, can be measured and one can create reasonable links between levels of influence over time.

2. This leads to the depiction of the NLG’s “sphere of influence.” This includes actors/processes at global, regional and country levels, over which the NLG can be assumed to have had some influence if it was to achieve “more and better” programming for children, youth, and adolescents. The size/shape of the spheres correspond to assumptions about how much influence the NLG may have had, with larger spheres indicating more possible influence. The evaluation will seek to establish these “levels of influence” and, importantly, how these may have changed from 2013 to the present.

This includes certain cohorts where, the evaluation recognizes, NLG influence may have been minimal. For instance, the government of Syria and host governments are certainly integral to how education, child protection, and youth and adolescent programming may have been conducted and yet their interaction with and knowledge of the NLG may be minimal. As in other areas, the evaluation will seek links between how the NLG influenced different actors and how this may have given them approaches and messaging that they in turn used with government actors.

3. As if the complexity of levels of influence over different actors in different periods of the crisis were not complex enough, the evaluation must also consider a range of intervening variables that could influence these same actors at different times. As described in Section 7.4.1, contribution analysis will facilitate this. This includes assessing diverse data sets to see if links can be established and how these
may have changed over time. This will be further supported through qualitative data analysis, including data from semi-structured interviews. All of these data sets will be assessed for areas of convergence/divergence, e.g. if all data sets indicate that the NLG did influence actor(s) at a particular point in the crisis, then we will assume that this is likely to be conclusive.12

The figure shows the different NLG activity areas and the three primary programming areas. As based on relevant documentation, there are ample examples of which activities NLG carried out when and with whom. These will be analysed to see how and if they led to different degrees of influence (outcomes) and what may have contributed or limited these results. The evaluation will be especially focused on establishing activities that may have been repeated (replicability) or that increased in scope in some way (scalability). These will allow the evaluation to move beyond important, albeit anecdotal, examples and towards trends and lessons that may have broader implications.

As with all development cooperation and humanitarian action activities, we should adhere to the highest guiding principles and standards, using these to frame relevant aspects of our work. This includes gender equality, human rights-based approaches, humanitarian principles and other more operational standards like SPHERE. These underpin our work, as described in Section 7.3. The evaluation will explore how these informed NLG activities at different times and the links between these and global fora, polices, and decision making.

The evaluation will also consider how and if inputs, individually and collectively, were sufficient for noted activities and thus expected outputs. These inputs include knowledge/comparative advantages, leadership, financial and human resources, and structures and systems. This will be the basis for establishing return on investment, e.g. were some of these inputs more important/impactful than others in how activities were chosen, prioritised, and conducted? Were there specific limitations (constraints/dependencies) associated with these inputs that led to weaker performance? This will allow the evaluation to establish parameters not simply for performance but also in relation to return on investment, e.g. these activities had a lower cost and greater potential for impact and so they may be more attractive going forward.

This theory of change and its subsequent analysis will also provide the basis for establishing a more comprehensive theory of change that may be used for decision making and performance management. As Figure 4 shows, this results in an assessment of activities (outputs) and where they lie between a low/high probability of success or impact. This can then lead to strategic decision making about which outputs should receive the most focus and which, perhaps, should be deprioritized. As in Figure 4, one should also consider “unicorns,” those untested and innovative activities that may thus have a low probability of success and yet the potential for a high degree of impact.

---

12 While we may deploy systems approaches to this analysis, like Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS), this is wholly dependent on a sufficient level of data from multiple sources to establish a reasonable level of trends. See Section 7.4.2.
2.2 Evaluation Questions

The theory and elements presented in the theory of change presented in Section 3.1 will constitute the broad framework for the evaluation. It will examine each of those areas in different ways, along with standard evaluation questions for each evaluation level.

Based on this analysis and the evaluation questions provided in the ToR, the evaluation would like to suggest the following changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0 Relevance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 How aligned are the stated or apparent intentions of the NLG multi-agency, multi-country and multi-sector initiative with the human rights of children and young people - girls and boys affected by the Syria and Iraq crises?</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 To what extent did the NLG identify gaps to relevant actors at different times in the response?</td>
<td>Revised slightly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 How far are the stated or apparent intentions of the NLG initiative aligned with partners’ strategic objectives?</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 How relevant is the NLG initiative to other humanitarian responses? Is there a model that could be used in other responses?</td>
<td>New.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.0 Effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 To what extent have the commitments, intended results, and/or articulated targets mentioned in the NLG vision and strategic documents been achieved in regard to:</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Policy/legal framework changes in the affected countries to develop a protective and more enabling environment for children and youth;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Increasing funding levels for No Lost Generation programming over time;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Scope and quality of the humanitarian response under No Lost Generation pillars in No Lost Generation countries and reaching the most vulnerable boys and girls with appropriate access to formal and non-formal learning opportunities, access to protective environment, broadening opportunities for adolescents and youth, and the intersection between these pillars?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 To what extent did the NLG expand the number and type of actors it was influencing/changing? Did this contribute to better results and/or constrain/complicate NLG activities and approaches?</td>
<td>New.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 How did the NLG provide insight to and otherwise support how actors respect the rights of the child, gender equality, and human rights-based approaches?</td>
<td>New.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 What were the major factors in each phase and at each level, that contributed to the achievements of the initiative's intents or hampered achieving of those intents?</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.0 Efficiency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Considering the scope, objectives and composition of the NLG, was the chosen operational model the best fit to achieve influence and change?</td>
<td>Revised; “influence.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 How efficient was the NLG Secretariat chaired by UNICEF? What were the dedicated resources by the various agencies - members of the Secretariat? How efficient was the role of UNICEF as a lead? In what ways, could that role be made more efficient?</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Were efficiencies of scale reached by having a common framework (e.g. how much resources-human and financial- were put into NLG-specific activities and what were the immediate results from them)?</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 At global and regional level - what were the advantages of agencies' collaboration as an NLG coalition, compared to individual agencies' responses to the crises as it affects children and young people in the affected countries - especially for advocacy and resource mobilization?</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 At country level:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To what extent did being part of the initiative contribute to better programming and faster delivering of services to boys and girls in the programmatic areas under the three pillars, compared to other programmatic areas?</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inception Phase Report:
Evaluation of the No Lost Generation (NLG) initiative

- To what extent did NLG implementation promote synergy and facilitate cross-learning across the covered programmatic sectors?

3.6 Did the NLG have sufficient human and financial resources to capitalise upon opportunities as they arose? New

3.7 What is the value, in fiscal terms, of different aspects of NLG’s work? How should one consider the “return on investment” associated with such an approach? New

4.0 Platform for sharing knowledge

4.1 To what extent did the NLG initiative contribute to fostering synergies and avoiding overlaps/incoherent approaches between different sectors and partners? Revised slightly.

4.2 What is the value added of the coordination mechanism? No change.

4.3 At country level - were there any NLG coordination mechanisms and if so - how efficiently did they work? If not - why not? No change.

4.4 To what extent was the NLG initiative’s implementation coordinated with other relevant initiatives at all levels, such as Whole of Syria Forum for example? Are there any overlaps or existing gaps? No change.

5.0 Connectedness

5.1 How does the NLG initiative relate to UNICEF’s Gender Action Plan (GAP and other frameworks related to gender equality and human rights-based approaches? New.

5.2 How did the NLG consider both the short-term emergency needs of children, youth, and adolescents as well as longer-term programming and development needs in these areas at the country level? Did it influence different actors to consider the short and long term needs of children, youth and adolescents? New.

5.3 How, if, and when did the NLG make links to country, regional, and international forums related to education, child protection, and youth and adolescent programming? Were possible links missed and, if so, what was the consequence of such missed opportunities? New.

6.0 Intended and unintended results (potential impact)

6.1 Is there evidence that NLG initiative contributed to increased funding, accelerated programming and scaled-up programme interventions in the three programmatic areas, in response to the Syrian and Iraqi crises? No change.

6.2 What changes, relevant to children and young people affected by the conflict, does NLG initiative appear to have contributed to? No change.

6.3 Were there any unintended positive or negative effects of the initiative, either on the response to the Syria and Iraq crises at country level or on NLG partners at global and regional level, and if so what were these? (potential impact) No change.

7.0 Sustainability

7.1 What measures have been built into the initiative at national and regional level to sustain any positive elements, including emerging positive outcomes of NLG, and how could these be strengthened? No change.

7.2 In the participating countries, to what extent did NLG contribute to (or impeded) transition to sustainable long-term solutions to meeting the educational, protection and participation needs of children and youth? No change.

7.3 Could other locations/countries/regions benefit from an extension, replication, or modification of NLG, and if so, what are proposed modalities for doing so? No change.

---

13 As noted in “Constraints and Limitations,” the evaluation will seek to answer this given the availability of relevant information and standard approaches for calculating return on investment. If there is not enough information or if other constraints emerge in relation to answering this, the evaluation will inform the NLG.
2.3 Analytical Framework

Based on the evaluation questions, the analytical framework establishes how each question will be answered. This includes the analytical approach, relevant cohorts, sources of evidence, analytical tools, and any constraints or dependencies.

*The Analytical Framework is available in the Annexes and as a separate Annex.*

2.4 Case Study Selections & Content

The NLG covers Syria, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt and Turkey. The evaluation allows for three field visits to conduct specific case studies.

The evaluation would like to propose **Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey** as the case studies and as based on the following:

1. Access, unfortunately, is limited in Syria;
2. While important, Egypt and North Africa represent smaller proportions of refugees/displaced peoples.
3. While the situation in Iraq is different than in Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey and therefore might provide insights, the limited level of activity and the logistical challenges do not make it a good option for a field visit. Iraq was considered and yet the scope of NLG work there and the complexities of the broader conflicts make this an unattractive choice.
4. There will be remote interaction with partners in Iraq and Egypt to assess the situation in those countries.

The evaluation, as established in the ToR, will cover all countries and yet it will rely on remote interviews and documentary evidence for most of its analysis.

As case studies, this will include more in-depth qualitative assessments of how NLG activities have influenced country level actors (and regional actors in the case of Jordan). This will include the “story” associated with different activities in each country, e.g. the how, what, where, and when. However, we will choose activities based on the overall trends we see in each country context and their relationships with the evaluation criteria and questions.

In brief, we see the following elements included for each case study:

1. Country Context Overview
2. Summary of NLG Activities and Results
3. Analysis of country context, as based on documentary review, semi-structured interviews, qualitative data analysis, etc. (Findings)
4. Case 1: Examination of a representative activity that led to specific results. (Findings)
5. Case 2: Examination of a representative activity that had particular challenges or constraints. (Findings)
6. Case 3: To be determined as based on country context. (Findings)
7. Examination of what 3, 4, 5, & 6 above may illustrate about NLG’s performance at the country level and more broadly. (Conclusions)

These sections will be supported by appropriate Annexes and other information.
2.5 Data Collection Tools

2.5.1 Ethics & Standards (UNICEF Ethical Review Checklist)

As in all aspects of DARA’s work, we follow the strictest standards and ethics. (See Section 7.3.) In relation to specific cohorts or people with whom the evaluation will have any contact, we have conducted the Criteria for Ethical Checklist. (Section Error! Reference source not found.) Based on responses, we do not believe that the evaluation’s design or other aspects of the evaluation should be subject to ethical review.

This is based on the following:

✓ There will be no contact with affected populations.
✓ Primary evidence will be drawn from previously collected (secondary) information except for qualitative trend analysis and survey results from experts and/or administrators who will face no harm, risks, or benefits from the results of this research.
✓ Primary evidence collected from experts and/or administrators will not increases risks to the participants or the communities they serve.

We, of course, defer to UNICEF’s final estimation of whether an ethical review is necessary.

2.5.2 Data Collection: Sample, Methods, Utility, and Data Protection

The evaluation’s stakeholders include NLG partners and other staff/employees from relevant organizations involved in the Syria response. It does not include anyone from the general population, including children, adolescents or youth.

The NLG has provided a list of 203 persons with such an affiliation and the evaluation is confident that this represents a complete population of those involved with the NLG for the scope of the evaluation. (See Section 1.4) For semi-structured interviews and the survey, the evaluation will seek to have interviews with at least 30% of this population.

The evaluation will include a breakdown of gender and other demographics of the final respondent group, including organisation type (UN, NGO, donor, and government) but not by any other classification or strata.

The information from interviews and the survey will be used solely by the evaluation team to establish trends across respondent cohorts. Notes will be taken in writing (hand written and on tablets). All data will be destroyed after the finalization and approval of the final evaluation report. Confidentiality and anonymity are preserved and, given that there are no people form affected populations who will be interviewed their vulnerabilities will be minimal.

No questions will be asked regarding personal social, religious, or political views and if such issues arise, the interviewer will remind the respondent that such political statements are unnecessary for the evaluation and will not be included in any subsequent analysis.

If a subject discloses or is suspected to be at risk outside of the evaluation, these issues will be raised with the Evaluation Manager immediately and the evaluation and DARA will follow UNICEF guidelines for how and if such cases are addressed.

Any data or information collected during semi-structured interviews will be kept in hard copy format and destroyed once specific data is entered into the database for qualitative data analysis. This database will not include the name, title, or specific organisation of any respondent. This database will be destroyed upon the approval of the final report for the evaluation.

No one will be recorded using any multimedia device.
Data from the survey will be protected as based on SurveyMonkey’s industry standard encryption. Google Docs will be sued solely for planning and scheduling. No individualised data from surveys, interviews, or any other sources, will be stored in Google Docs. All other data that may be collected for the evaluation will be from publicly available sources and will not include any data sets that include information about specific individual.

All legal and financial risks are assumed by DARA as described in the terms and conditions of the contract for this work.

2.5.3 Semi Structured interviews

As indicated in the Analytical Framework (See Section 7.1), semi-structured interviews will be used across cohorts and to inform most of the evaluation questions. In some instances, information from these interviews will inform range of questions. In others, they information will be used as part of DARA’s qualitative trend analysis. (See Section 7.4.3.)

Semi-structured interview will be person-to-person, with a preference for only one respondent. Interviews will take place at respondents’ offices or at other places so chosen by the respondent so as to ensure a comfortable place for the interviews. Some respondents may wish others to present. The evaluation will cite the number of instances when this occurs in the final analysis.

The interviewer will maintain the highest degrees of professionalism, conducting themselves respectfully and courteously with all respondents, and conscious of any social or other condition that may make a respondent uncomfortable. If such risks are present, the interviewer will mitigate this by asking the respondent if there is another place that may be comfortable for them or by re-scheduling the interview.

As noted in the protocol, there are no potential benefits to respondents for their participation in the semi-structured interviews or through the provision of other information or services.

If any respondent is seen to be distressed in any way, the interviewer will stop the interview immediately. This will mitigate against any psychological risks.

2.5.4 On-line survey

The evaluation will use a survey to explore issues with a broader range of shareholders than may be possible in semi-structured interviews. The survey, as described in the draft protocol, (Section 7.6), will include rating/ranking questions mostly.

We recognize surveys as this type as a somewhat “weak” data set, as compared to that from semi-structured interviews and existing secondary sources of evidence. This is mostly due to the nature of this evaluation that seeks to establish how the NLG has influenced and changed a diverse range of actors.

Given this, we expect to conduct the survey after the field phase (January 2019). This will enable the evaluation to identify specific issues or areas where there may be gaps in data sets. The survey can thus be used to examine issues in more depth or to address any gaps that may exist.

The survey will be administered through SurveyMonkey with DARA branding. SurveyMonkey has the latest data security protocols. This includes ensuring that recipients of electronic invites to complete the survey can only complete the survey once. All data is subject to industry standard encryption.

Data from these surveys will only be used in the aggregate. This may include four independent organisational strata (UN, NGO, Donors, & Government.) No other strata will be used, including country/location as this may dilute anonymity.

As noted in the protocol, there are no potential benefits to respondents for participating in the survey.

2.6 Data & Analysis Tools
Given the considerations above and as indicated in the Analytical Framework, we will use a number of data and analysis tools. These are all based on leading practices and DARA and the team leader have used all of these in different contexts.

Relevant tools are referenced for each question in the analytical framework. A list of these tools is available in the Annexes.

3 Team

As described in the proposal, the evaluation team has the following structure and team members.

There are no changes from the proposal to the team members, their roles and responsibilities, nor in the number of days for each team member required to complete the evaluation. Please refer to the proposal for more information.

DARA’s internal management and quality assurance (IMQA) will include a third-party review of all materials, reports, and other products developed as part of the evaluation to ensure that these meet required standards. The IMQA also provides an independent assessment of how prescribed data and analysis tools are used, ensuring that this is according to best practices, and that if there are gaps or issues that these are sufficiently described in any final analysis.

4 Constraints & Dependencies

The proposal set out a range of risks and contingencies. The inception phase did not lead to any new issues. In fact, this inception phase report serves to reduce some noted risks, such as the lack of clarity about the evaluation’s objectives. There are a few items worth noting:

✓ **Documentary evidence seems relatively complete.** This includes all documents provided in the online drive as well as other documentation reviewed as part of the inception phase. There are some data and other evidence needed for specific evaluation questions noted in the analytical framework.

✓ **There may not be enough evidence for contribution analysis and complex adaptive systems analysis.** These two analytical tools are important for assessing the complexity associated with how the NLG influenced different actors and how this may have resulted in changes to programming. (See Section 7.4.1.) An initial assessment indicates that there may be, but this will need to be augmented with additional primary data collection during the field missions.

✓ **Communication channels and procedures with the Evaluation Manager and other stakeholders is in place.** UNICEF and the evaluation team have agreed on weekly meetings during the field phase.
with additional meetings before and after. There seems to be a fair and open rapport between the evaluation team and the evaluation team manager.

✓ **Planning and logistics for the field missions is critical.** As noted in the Workplan (Section 6), the evaluation team will start to organize the field missions upon submission of this draft report.

✓ **The timing of the Jordan-based data and analysis workshop needs to be decided.** Also associated with the workplan (Section 6), this report proposes two options, with a preferred option, for the Jordan Data & Analysis Workshop. This choice will influence how data collection is done.

✓ **Ensuring utilization/stakeholder ‘uptake’ is key.** We recognize that the value of an evaluation lies in the possibility to engage stakeholders throughout so that they understand and ultimately accept findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Thus far, we do not foresee any issues in this regard.

✓ **Measuring return on investment and overall NLG value.** While the evaluation questions include a specific question regarding the value, in fiscal terms, of different aspects of NLG’s work (EQ 3.7), this depends on the availability of relevant data and information for calculating return on investment. If there is not enough information or if other constraints emerge in relation to answering this, the evaluation will inform the NLG.

5 **Reporting**

After the field and analysis phases, the evaluation team will prepare a **Draft Evaluation Report**, following the structure provided in the ToRs, excluding the recommendations, which will present a comprehensive assessment of the NLG as described in this inception phase report.

The evaluation team will prepare a **presentation of preliminary findings** to the Steering Committee and all stakeholders that will be delivered in an on-line format to ensure a higher utilization of the evaluation results.

Once the feedback from the presentation is received, the evaluation team will prepare a **Second Draft Evaluation Report** that will include a preliminary set of SMART recommendations, which will be reviewed and commented on by the multi-stakeholder Steering Committee.

The team leader will deliver a **presentation of the Evaluation Report** at the stakeholders’ workshop in Jordan, remotely supported by the team members, which will help the team to finalise the recommendations. This presentation aims at sharing the findings and facilitating strategic reflection on the initiative and adopting useful lessons and recommendations.

As a key product, the **Final Evaluation Report** will incorporate responses to the comments of the Steering Committee members, as well as the feedback received during the stakeholders’ workshop, providing a comprehensive assessment of NLG results. It will include an Executive Summary and annexes detailing the methodological approach and analytical products developed during the evaluation.

The evaluation team will also provide support to communication products, for example a brief or brochure to support dissemination of evaluation findings to a broader audience.
6 Workplan

The following workplan includes the primarily activities and deliverables for the data collection, analysis, and reporting phases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases and Activities</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>WK 1</td>
<td>WK 2</td>
<td>WK 3</td>
<td>WK 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Field Work (25 Nov - 1 Dec; ALL TEAM MEMBERS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon Field Work (20 - 27 January; Martina Nicolls &amp; Douaa Hussein)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey Field Work (28 Jan - 4 Feb; Dorian LaGuardia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final D&amp;A Workshop (6 February; DLG in Amman; Other team members via videoconference)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report, including case studies/without recommendations. (14 February)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of preliminary findings to the Steering Committee (online/skype)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise draft Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised evaluation report, including recommendations (7 March)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of second draft report by the SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of conclusions and recommendations (Amman; via videoconference)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report (28 March)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Products (28 March)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

- **Field Work**: The evaluation team has already started travel logistics and planning for the field work in Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey and do not foresee any issue in finishing field work as per the schedule.

- **The first draft report**: As indicated, this will be presented without recommendations. Yet, the evidence, analysis, and conclusions will certainly suggest possible actions. The purpose of the subsequent Steering Committee meeting will be to refine recommendations to ensure that they are tailored to different actors and that they are realistic and achievable.

- **Communication products**: This will include a final presentation that will include primary findings, conclusions and recommendations, a 2-page brief on the same, and possible photos or other multi-media form the evaluation.

In addition to the work plan above, the following table describes the overall approach to the field missions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24-Nov</th>
<th>25-Nov</th>
<th>26-Nov</th>
<th>27-Nov</th>
<th>28-Nov</th>
<th>29-Nov</th>
<th>30-Jan</th>
<th>31-Jan</th>
<th>2-Feb</th>
<th>3-Feb</th>
<th>4-Feb</th>
<th>5-Feb</th>
<th>6-Feb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team arrives in Amman, Jordan</td>
<td>Kick off meeting</td>
<td>Key informant Interviews (5 * 3)</td>
<td>Key informant Interviews (5 * 3)</td>
<td>Key informant Interviews (5 * 3)</td>
<td>Kick off meeting</td>
<td>Key informant Interviews (5 * 2)</td>
<td>Key informant Interviews (5 * 2)</td>
<td>Key informant Interviews (5 * 2)</td>
<td>Preparation for D&amp;A Workshop</td>
<td>Key informant Interviews (5)</td>
<td>Key informant Interviews (5)</td>
<td>Key informant Interviews (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key informant Interviews (3)</td>
<td>Key informant Interviews (3)</td>
<td>D&amp;A Workshop (Lebanon)</td>
<td>Key informant Interviews (3)</td>
<td>D&amp;A Workshop (Turkey)</td>
<td>Preparation for D&amp;A Workshop</td>
<td>D&amp;A Workshop (Jordan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLG to Ankara</td>
<td>DLG to Amman</td>
<td>OPTION II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- **Number of interviews**: This schedule allows for a different number of key informant interviews for each country, with the most in Jordan (65 – 70) and the least in Turkey (25). These numbers are based on the total number of possible interviews and available team resources. As noted, the evaluation does not foresee the need to meet with affected populations. This represents a sufficient number of interviews based on a representative sample of informants, with the most people in Jordan given that this will include regional stakeholders, more in Lebanon, given the number of stakeholders there, and the fewest in Turkey, again taking into account a sufficient sample of respondents. These numbers represent a best-case scenario and may be adapted given people’s availability and overall logistics.

- **Kick off meetings**: These may establish measures of success for the field mission as well as to finalize any scheduling and logistics.

- **Data & Analysis Workshops (D&A Workshops)**: As described in Section 7.4.8, these are designed to share initial findings and trends from the field mission so that stakeholders can respond, indicate additional areas of possible analysis, and refute or agree with these findings and trends. This is a key element of our utilization approach.
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- Planning & Logistics: The methodology is based on a good sample of respondents across organizations and subjects. Given people’s availability, it can be difficult to schedule interviews. The evaluation team will start working toward scheduling these upon submission of this report to ensure that as many interviews are scheduled as possible.
7  Annexes

7.1  Terms of Reference

*Included as a separate Annex.*
## 7.2 Analytical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria &amp; Questions</th>
<th>Analysis Approach/Indicators</th>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Tools/ Approaches</th>
<th>Constraints/ Dependencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.0 Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 How aligned are the stated or apparent intentions of the NLG multi-agency, multi-country and multi-sector initiative with the human rights of children and young people - girls and boys - affected by the Syria and Iraq crises?</td>
<td>Multiple examples of how NLG aligns with gender equality and human rights-based approaches across countries with special treatment in the three case study countries</td>
<td>NLG Partners (ALL) UN/INGOs Donors UNCT/HCT Clusters</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews Survey NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs Standards &amp; Frameworks Comparative Evaluators Expertise</td>
<td>Contribution Analysis Prima facie evidence as based on best practices</td>
<td>Not possible to get representative sample of cohorts No clear linkages to influence or change No trend across case study countries/examples remain anecdotal Retroactive perspectives influenced by current context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 To what extent did the NLG identify gaps to relevant actors at different times in the response?</td>
<td>Convergence of NLG and other sources complicates contributions; for instance, if the NLG along with the HC/RC and host government all alert donors of an increased need, how does one assign effectiveness between these different sources? Will seek convergence and ‘first mover’ aspects, e.g. the NLG pressed an issue first, with others following suit.</td>
<td>NLG Partners (All) UN INGO Donors UNCT/HCT Clusters</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs Evaluators Expertise Other</td>
<td>Contribution Analysis Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) Qualitative Trend Analysis (D&amp;A) Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA)</td>
<td>Links between NLG activities and changes in programming/funding remain unclear Not possible to get representative sample of cohorts No clear linkages to influence or change Impact of intervening variables unclear No reasonable comparative No trend across case study countries/examples remain anecdotal Retroactive perspectives influenced by current context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 How far are the stated or apparent intentions of the NLG initiative aligned with partners’ strategic objectives?</td>
<td>Mapping of documentary content with some interpretation.</td>
<td>NLG Partners (UN) UN/INGO Donors Others</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 How relevant is the NLG initiative to other humanitarian responses? Is there a model that could be used in other responses?</td>
<td>Comparative analysis. Will compare with East Africa (South Sudan, Somalia, &amp; Egypt), Yemen, and Haiti, amongst possible others. Adequate comparatives will emerge during data collection phase. Will seek to include at least two other comparatives to draw out how the NLG might work there.</td>
<td>Evaluators’ experience and analysis of relevant comparatives.</td>
<td>All--integrated research from all other sources/activities.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.0 Effectiveness

*Increasing the impact of humanitarian action through proven practices & leading technology*
### Evaluation Criteria & Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>To what extent have the commitments, intended results, and/or articulated targets mentioned in the NLG vision and strategic documents been achieved in regard to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly achieved through an analysis of results-based reporting. Understanding the extent of the NLG's influence and how much can be attributed to its activities will depend on the convergence of documentary and qualitative (semi-structured interviews). Policy/legal framework changes have a range of intervening variables that may move beyond the influence of the NLG. &quot;First mover&quot; status may prove an important variable, e.g. NLG raised the issue first and then facilitated/supported during process and regardless, perhaps, of final result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervening variables, including donor interests, national politics, geopolitics, etc. will need to be considered. In some cases, will lead to evaluators best estimation of influence combined with qualitative trends from semi-structured interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>While 'quality' will be based on common standards and frameworks, including host government standards, the issue of quality may be viewed as a concept, e.g. the NLG promoted &quot;quality programming&quot; at all levels and this increased he focus of quality in different easy for different programmes/actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>To what extent did the NLG expand the number and type of actors it was influencing/changing? Did this contribute to better results and/or constrain/complicate NLG activities and approaches?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>review of how and when different partners joined NLG, citing exterior factors that any have elicited such interest in NLG and what this mean for other areas of analysis. Will include a timeline showing when partners joined and other relevant events. May compare with actors who have not or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs Evaluator Expertise Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution Analysis Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of quant data Not statistically significant data Not possible to get representative sample of cohorts No clear linkages to influence Unknown intervening variables Impact of intervening variables unclear Significant divergence between data sets No reasonable comparative Links between NLG activities and changes in programming/funding remain unclear No trend across case study countries/examples remain anecdotal Retroactive perspectives influenced by current context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria &amp; Questions</th>
<th>Analysis Approach/Indicators</th>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Tools/ Approaches</th>
<th>Constraints/ Dependencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 How did the NLG influence actors to abide by the rights of the child, gender equality, and human rights-based approaches?</td>
<td>The measurement of influence here will be difficult as one may assume that these partners were already guided by such principles. The test is how and when NLG raised related issues and respondent responses that confirm that these were useful 'reminders' or that they got them to focus ion programming in different ways. Will look for some trend--or lack of trend--across such examples.</td>
<td>NLG Partners (All) Other hum/dev actors Semi-structured interviews NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs Evaluator Expertise</td>
<td>Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) Qualitative Trend Analysis (D&amp;A) Other</td>
<td>Not possible to get representative sample of cohorts Unknown intervening variables Retroactive perspectives influenced by current context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 What were the major factors in each phase and at each level, that contributed to the achievements of the initiative's intents or hampered achieving of those intents?</td>
<td>Will be based on all other areas of analysis. Will include a timeline of how NLG contributed to or missed opportunities to improve programming and what the most significant intervening variables may have been.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Evaluator Expertise Other</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Analysis from other areas does not provide a sufficient foundation for answering this question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Considering the scope, objectives and composition of the NLG, was the chosen operational model the best fit to achieve influence and change?</td>
<td>Will be based on comparative analysis (structures, decision making, resources, processes) and what might have been most appropriate given needs/opportunities from 2013 - 2018.</td>
<td>NLG Partners (All) UNICEF Semi-structured interviews NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs Comparative Evaluator Expertise</td>
<td>Comparative Business process engineering (best practices/leading research) Other</td>
<td>Financial information is inadequate Information on business processes inadequate No clear linkages to influence or change Unknown intervening variables Impact of intervening variables unclear No trend across case study countries/examples remain anecdotal Retroactive perspectives influenced by current context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 How efficient was the NLG Secretariat chaired by UNICEF? What were the dedicated resources by the various agencies - members of the Secretariat? How efficient was the role of UNICEF as a lead? In what ways, could that role be made more efficient?</td>
<td>Will be based on basic gap analysis and noted efficacy gains/losses according to key respondents. Will include subjective views from semi-structured interviews and survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative Trend Analysis (D&amp;A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Criteria & Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria &amp; Questions</th>
<th>Analysis Approach/Indicators</th>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Tools/Approaches</th>
<th>Constraints/ Dependencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Were efficiencies of scale reached by having a common framework (e.g. how much resources-human and financial were put into NLG-specific activities and what were the immediate results from them)?</td>
<td>Will largely be based on level of influence demonstrated in other areas of analysis and compared with other mechanisms, like regional response plans, clusters, etc.</td>
<td>NLG Partners (All) UNICEF (Global) UNICEF (Regional) UNICEF (Country) Donors</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs Evaluator Expertise</td>
<td>Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) Qualitative Trend Analysis (D&amp;A) Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) Partnership Assessment Stakeholder mapping Process Mapping Other</td>
<td>Links between NLG activities and change in programming/funding remain unclear No clear linkages to influence or change Unknown intervening variables Impact of intervening variables unclear No trend across case study countries/examples remain anecdotal Retroactive perspectives influenced by current context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 At global and regional level - what were the advantages of agencies’ collaboration as an NLG coalition, compared to individual agencies’ responses to the crises as it affects children and young people in the affected countries - especially for advocacy and resource mobilization?</td>
<td>Partnership analysis will be used here, determining if partners could do more together than they could in isolation. While this will be largely subjective, the evaluation will seek trends across examples of their collaboration that demonstrate the issues noted by key respondents.</td>
<td>NLG Partners (ALL) UN (Education) UN (Child Protection) UN (Youth) INGO (Education) INGO (Child Protection) INGO (Youth) UNCT/HCT Clusters</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews Survey NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs Quant (existing) Qual (existing) Comparative Evaluator Expertise Other</td>
<td>Contribution Analysis Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) Qualitative Trend Analysis (D&amp;A) Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) Partnership Assessment Other</td>
<td>Links between NLG activities and changes in programming/funding remain unclear Not possible to get representative sample of cohorts No clear linkages to influence or change Unknown intervening variables Impact of intervening variables unclear Significant divergence between data sets No reasonable comparative No trend across case study countries/examples remain anecdotal Retroactive perspectives influenced by current context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 At country level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To what extent did being part of the initiative contribute to better programming and faster delivering of services to boys and girls in the programmatic areas under the three pillars, compared to other programmatic areas?</td>
<td>This will be done through classic contribution analysis with a focus on influence and change as described in the theory of change. Determining what effect the NLG had on the decision-making chain, from raising the need to actual programming changes (more or better) will be analysed.</td>
<td>NLG Partners (All) UN (Education) UN (Child Protection) UN (Youth) INGO (Education) INGO (Child Protection) INGO (Youth) UNCT/HCT Clusters</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews Survey NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs Quant (existing) Qual (existing) Comparative Evaluator Expertise Other</td>
<td>Contribution Analysis Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) Qualitative Trend Analysis (D&amp;A) Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) Partnership Assessment Other</td>
<td>Links between NLG activities and changes in programming/funding remain unclear Not possible to get representative sample of cohorts No clear linkages to influence or change Unknown intervening variables Impact of intervening variables unclear Significant divergence between data sets No reasonable comparative No trend across case study countries/examples remain anecdotal Retroactive perspectives influenced by current context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To what extent did NLG implementation promote synergy and facilitate cross-learning across the covered programmatic sectors?</td>
<td>This will be done through classic contribution analysis with a focus on influence and change as described in the theory of change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria &amp; Questions</td>
<td>Analysis Approach/Indicators</td>
<td>Cohorts</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Tools/ Approaches</td>
<td>Constraints/ Dependencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.6 Did the NLG have sufficient human and financial resources to capitalise upon opportunities as they arose?</strong></td>
<td>Based on analysis, especially from question 3.1, this will cite areas where the resources were maximized for a particular result or when there simply were not enough resources to pursue a notable opportunity.</td>
<td>NLG Partners (All) UNICEF</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs Comparative Evaluator Expertise</td>
<td>Comparative Business process engineering (best practices/leading research) Other</td>
<td>Financial information is inadequate Information on business processes inadequate No clear linkages to influence or change Unknown intervening variables Impact of intervening variables unclear No trend across case study countries/examples remain anecdotal Retroactive perspectives influenced by current context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.7 What is the value, in fiscal terms, of different aspects of NLG’s work? How should one consider the “return on investment” associated with such an approach?</strong></td>
<td>Will be based on models for ROI and the value of “influence” and “advocacy” as based on best practices and leading research.</td>
<td>NLG Partners (All) UNICEF</td>
<td>NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs Quant (existing) Qual (existing) Comparative Evaluator Expertise Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Financial information is inadequate Information on business processes inadequate No financial data No reasonable comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.0 Platform for sharing knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1 To what extent did the NLG initiative contribute to foster synergies and avoid overlaps/incoherent approaches between different sectors and partners?</strong></td>
<td>Will seek examples of synergies or other coordination activities that increased a more focused, consolidated, and coherent response.</td>
<td>NLG Partners (All) UNICEF UN (Education) UN (Child Protection) UN (Youth) INGO (Education) INGO (Child Protection) INGO (Youth) Donors UNCT/HCT Clusters</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews Survey NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs Qual (existing) Comparative Evaluator Expertise Other</td>
<td>Contribution Analysis Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) Qualitative Trend Analysis (D&amp;A) Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) Partnership Assessment</td>
<td>Not possible to get representative sample of cohorts No clear linkages to influence Unknown intervening variables Impact of intervening variables unclear Links between NLG activities and changes in programming/funding remain unclear No trend across case study countries/examples remain anecdotal Retroactive perspectives influenced by current context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2 What is the value added of the coordination mechanism?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3 At country level - were there any NLG coordination mechanisms and if so - how efficiently did they work? If not - why not?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLG Partners (All) UN/INGO Local NGO UNCT/HCT Clusters</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs Comparative Evaluator Expertise</td>
<td>Contribution Analysis Qualitative Trend Analysis (D&amp;A) Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) Partnership Assessment</td>
<td>Not possible to get representative sample of cohorts No clear linkages to influence Unknown intervening variables Impact of intervening variables unclear Links between NLG activities and changes in programming/funding remain unclear No trend across case study countries/examples remain anecdotal Retroactive perspectives influenced by current context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.4 To what extent was the NLG initiative’s implementation coordinated with other relevant initiatives at all levels, such as Whole of Syria Forum for</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLG Partners (UN) UNICEF (Global) UNICEF (Regional) Donors Others</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs Comparative Evaluator Expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation of the No Lost Generation (NLG) initiative

### Evaluation Criteria & Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria &amp; Questions</th>
<th>Analysis Approach/Indicators</th>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Tools/Approaches</th>
<th>Constraints/Dependencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>example? Are there any overlaps or existing gaps?</td>
<td>Will review NLG documentation and statements from NLG partners in relation to these standards.</td>
<td>NLG Partners (All) UNICEF (Global) UNICEF (Regional) UN (Education) UN (Child Protection) UN (Youth) INGO (Education) INGO (Child Protection) INGO (Youth)</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews NLG Documentation NLG Partner Docs Standards &amp; Frameworks Comparative Evaluation Expertise</td>
<td>Contribution Analysis Qualitative Trend Analysis (D&amp;A) Other</td>
<td>No reasonable comparative No trend across case study countries/examples remain anecdotal Retroactive perspectives influenced by current context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Connectedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 How does the NLG initiative relate to UNICEF’s Gender Action Plan (GAP) and other frameworks related to gender equality and human rights-based approaches?</td>
<td>Review of documentation to see how and where the humanitarian development nexus was mentioned and towards what effect. Mostly standard research techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Links between NLG activities and changes in programming/funding remain unclear No clear linkages to influence and change Unknown intervening variables Impact of intervening variables unclear Significant divergence between data sets No trend across case study countries/examples remain anecdotal Retroactive perspectives influenced by current context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 How did the NLG consider both the short-term emergency needs of children, youth, and adolescents as well as longer-term programming and development needs in these areas at the country level? Did it influence different actors to consider the short and long term needs of children, youth and adolescents?</td>
<td>Review of documentation to see how and where the humanitarian development nexus was mentioned and towards what effect. Mostly standard research techniques with input from semi-structured interviews.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No reasonable comparative No trend across case study countries/examples remain anecdotal Retroactive perspectives influenced by current context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 How, if, and when did the NLG make links to regional and international forums related to education, child protection, and youth and adolescent programming? Were possible links missed and, if so, what was the consequence of such missed opportunities?</td>
<td>Will be based on analysis from all other areas, combined with comparative analysis.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Intended and unintended results (potential impact)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Is there evidence that NLG initiative contributed to increased funding, accelerated programming and scaled-up programme interventions in the three programmatic areas, in response to the Syrian and Iraqi crises?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 What changes, relevant to children and young people affected by the conflict, does NLG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Increasing the impact of humanitarian action through proven practices & leading technology*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria &amp; Questions</th>
<th>Analysis Approach/Indicators</th>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Tools/Approaches</th>
<th>Constraints/Dependencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Were there any unintended positive or negative effects of the initiative, either on the response to the Syria and Iraq crises at country level or on NLG partners at global and regional level, and if so what were these?</td>
<td>Will be based on analysis from all other areas, combined with comparative analysis.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Changes in crisis shift role of NLG beyond evaluation's analysis Changes in regional/national politics beyond evaluation's analysis Changes in geopolitical situation affects NLG beyond evaluation's analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 What measures have been built into the initiative at national and regional level to sustain any positive elements, including emerging positive outcomes of NLG, and how could these be strengthened?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 In the participating countries, to what extent did NLG contribute to (or impeded) transition to sustainable long-term solutions to meeting the educational, protection and participation needs of children and youth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Could other locations/countries/regions benefit from an extension, replication, or modification of NLG, and if so, what are proposed modalities for doing so?</td>
<td>Will be based on analysis from all other areas, combined with comparative analysis. See especially EQ 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 Standards, Ethics, & Principles

7.3.1 Evaluation Standards

The methodological approach described in this section is based on OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, as well as additional criteria. This includes the common principles and the common framework for evaluations in humanitarian contexts. ALNAP’s “Evaluation of Humanitarian Action Guide” from 2016 stands as an important and useful resource for guiding this evaluation.

7.3.2 Ethical Standards

DARA confirms that it has read UNICEF’s Policy on Conduct Promoting the Protection and Safeguarding of Children. DARA will ensure that all team members understand the notification requirements expected of them and will establish and maintain appropriate measures to promote compliance with such requirements. DARA will further cooperate with UNICEF’s implementation of this policy.

The evaluation will be conflict sensitive and ethical considerations will be respected in all cases and with particular sensitivity when undertaking country field visits. The evaluation team will strictly abide by the UN requirements for ethical behaviour of evaluators, in line with the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System, and to UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research and Evaluations. Considering the vulnerability of the affected populations, specific considerations to the local context will be anticipated by the team, including potential assessment fatigue of the affected population, vulnerable groups, including children, as well as using sensitive indicators concerning Gender Based Violence (GBV), trafficking, etc.

Ethical considerations also refer to the confidentiality of the encounters and data gathered from respondents. The highest ethical standards and principles guide all of our interactions, including special considerations and specialized approaches for children.

In general, the team will ensure that participants understand that their participation is voluntary and that the information shared with the team will remain confidential and will not allow to attribute any information to a specific individual. Special attention will also be dedicated to UNEG guidance and principles of ‘do no harm’.

Additionally, the evaluation will adhere to the UNEG guidance on integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluations. The team will explain confidentiality and seek the informed consent of each interviewee through an introductory opt-in/opt-out question. Interviewees will also have the opportunity to suspend the interview or opt-out of specific questions for any reason they feel necessary. Surveys will preserve anonymity, with any results made public in the aggregate. DARA acknowledges that all data collection instruments and guidance will be subjected to a review by an Independent Ethical Review Board, before their administration for data collection.

---

7.3.3 Gender Equality

Effective gender-responsive evaluation assesses the way programming affects women and men differently, recognizing the different needs and priorities of crisis-affected populations. The evaluation will take a gender responsive approach, promoting accountability towards commitments of gender equality, women’s rights and the empowerment of women into all aspects of the process. This informs both what the evaluation examines and the way in which the evaluation is conducted, with a goal of demonstrating the changes in gender and power relationships resulting from any relevant aspect of the NLG.

Throughout the evaluation, DARA will be using a gender-sensitive approach. This means, for example, ensuring that the evaluation explores whether and how the NLG Initiative has affected women, men, boys and girls differently. It also entails examining how protection strategies against sexual and gender-based violence have been incorporated into the NLG Initiative and the extent of women’s participation in humanitarian assistance at all levels. We will also strive to ensure that all data is disaggregated by age and gender, to allow gender-sensitive analysis and identification of gaps and recommendations specific to women, men, boys or girls.

7.3.4 Human Rights Based Approach

The evaluation also includes a human rights-based approach (HRBA). This assumes there is an underlying international framework that identifies commonly agreed rights. This is a central tenet of UNICEF’s work with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC)\(^2\) and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)\(^3\). It puts people at the centre of the work as rights holders, highlighting the importance of empowerment and advocacy towards the securing of those rights. Children, as rights holders, have claims on those with obligations to ensure the fulfilment of those rights. The obligation to protect children from all forms of violence, exploitation, abuse and neglect rests upon governments. However, in addition to governments, parents, communities, NGOs and others have duties. At the same time, parents and other duty bearers also may have unfulfilled rights, for example due to poverty or exclusion. This approach also assumes there is a sufficiently functioning state against which rights can be demanded and protected. This highlights a common element between Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) and gender equity theory, which is that humanitarian action and development do not happen in a vacuum but rather in a political and politicized context.

7.3.5 Other Principles

One of the fundamental aspects of an effective evaluation is to understand the distinct elements that contribute to expected results. As per the TOR, the evaluation will analyse to what extent the No Lost Generation Initiative has achieved the objectives of its three pillars:

- Increased access to education;
- Protection; and
- Opportunities to engage in the community and society.

To achieve this, DARA applies common standards and best practices in all evaluations and exceed these to ensure that the evidence tells the story. DARA also uses a range of proven tools for extracting and analysing diverse data and information. DARA then triangulates data, seeking convergence across data sets and, where there isn’t convergence, use subject matter expertise and comparative analysis to understand the divergence.

**A Focus on Learning:** All of DARAs’ evaluation work is based on enhancing opportunities for learning and positive change. The first and most basic step for this is to collect, organise, analyse and present sound evidence. This provides valid findings and prevents objections about veracity. Practical and useful insights

---


\(^3\) United Nations General Assembly Resolution 34/180. The *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women* (18 December 1979)
then leap out from the evidence and analysis. This provides the basis for learning. People can assess how they have done things, compare this with the analysis, and then take practical steps to improve.

**Advocacy:** One way to examine the advocacy efforts done both at global and regional level is to focus on the main question as to whether UNICEF and the NLG partners can help transform policies to support the protection of child rights. For UNICEF, advocacy is seen as the deliberate process, based on demonstrated evidence, to directly and indirectly influence decision makers, stakeholders and relevant audiences to support and implement actions that contribute to the fulfilment of children’s and women’s rights.24

Common elements of different frameworks for advocacy and policy work include the following outcomes: shifts in social norms; strengthened organizational capacity; strengthened alliances; strengthened base of support; improved policies; and changes in impact. Moreover, the policy process is influenced by many factors and advocacy strategies and objectives are rarely static and typically evolve over time as they can shift quickly depending on changes in political opportunities, making organizational flexibility an aspect of utmost importance in the organization advocacy efforts.

**Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP):** The principle of accountability requires that humanitarian actors involve affected people meaningfully in key decisions and processes that impact them. This includes involving refugees and including refugee voices in the evaluation and ensuring that the response takes due account of the needs, views, and capacities of crisis-affected people. Efforts to link the perceptions and knowledge of refugees to wider strategic and policy process theory has the potential to add significant value to NLG initiative, be it its advocacy efforts or its effects on each pillar. It also functions as a form of empowerment for the latter by taking refugee views seriously.

---

7.4 Proposed Data Analysis Tools

7.4.1 Contribution Analysis

Contribution analysis is an important methodology for determining attribution along a causal chain, e.g. a logical framework, and when there are not definitive baseline/end-line surveys or when the context is highly dynamic. Contribution analysis involves testing the causal chain, e.g. the proposed Theory of Change, and reducing uncertainty about specific contributions to results from outputs to impact.

This helps to determine attribution through an increased understanding of why results have occurred (or not) and how important any internal or external factors have been. This provides evidence (and reasoning) from which a plausible conclusion can be drawn that the intervention has made a significant contribution. Contribution analysis requires a diverse set of cohorts, tools, and data sets that can be analysed individually, comparatively and holistically. In essence, we will collect data from various cohorts and use different tools to see why the expected results occurred (or not) and what the main enabling/hindering factors were. While contribution analysis removes the necessity of precise baselines or counterfactuals, our approach will also include a limited set of counterfactuals as possible.

7.4.2 Complex Adaptive Systems

Measuring the NLG’s spheres of influence and the pace and scale of the crisis presents a considerable level of complexity. Given available data, the evaluation may use Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) as a theoretical framework and as a practical tool for answering questions that include multiple perspectives and a lack of quantifiable data.

As pioneered by Jay Forrester at MIT, CAS provides a framework for measuring the variance between outputs and other variables that is as essential as the linear relationships between outputs and outcomes. To apply this in the evaluation, we will develop a model of system-level variables/indicators (the basis of which is already included in the proposed theory of change), including those that are dynamic or considered *ceteris paribus*. We will then refine these by testing related data collection methods and data efficacy.

7.4.3 Qualitative Data Trend Analysis

DARA and Dorian LaGuardia, team leader, have developed a proprietary approach to collecting and analysing discrete qualitative data from semi-structured interviews. This includes the collection of key comments, phrases, and issues that respondents provide during the interview and then putting these into a database to identify trends across different cohorts and as linked to specific evaluation questions. This technique has been used in over 20 evaluations included complex evaluations for the EC, DFID, SIDA, UNHCR, UNRWA, UNICEF, WHO, and others.

There are a few things to keep in mind about qualitative data:

Qualitative data is based on summaries of what people said, using verbatim statements as relevant and possible. These are organized according to the EQs. These may be further analysed and divided into additional evaluation questions as part of the final analysis and thus presented in this Final Report.  

![Figure 6: Sample qualitative data analysis graph showing trends across cohorts.](image)

---


Qualitative data is based on the perceptions of respondents at the time of the interviews. This implies that their responses may be influenced by what is going on at the time of the interview and may draw more heavily on examples from the recent past.

Qualitative evidence is inherently messy. Sometimes people say things that are seemingly un-related to the question. These are included from time to time and ranked according to the context and the overall interview. Some data points are repeated when multiple respondents state the same thing and when they apply to different evaluation questions.

Qualitative data points are ranked according to positive, neutral and negative. The original interviewer does the first categorization and then the Team Leader reviews this. Reasonable people could arrive at different rankings. However, they do reflect the insights of the evaluation team who conducted the interviews and thus the general intent of each respondent. This is only the first stage of analysis.

Contextual analysis is conducted to identify common themes and subjects and qualitative graphs are used to further indicate trends. This evidence is then compared with that from other sources and then further assessed through documentary and subject matter expertise. Findings are based on an examination of all these data sets and their strength, or the correspondence between data sets.

7.4.4 Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA)

MCA is useful when comparing multiple interventions/solutions across a multiple set of criteria. MCA is also used to prioritize interventions/solutions applied to solve different problems that should, ideally, work toward the same objective. MCA also allows for a mix of quantitative and qualitative criteria.

The steps used in MCA include:

1. Establish the decision context. What are the objectives and performance criteria and who are the decision makers and other key players?
2. Identify comparatives, e.g. what would happen if there was nothing done or a suitably different alternative that is demonstrably less costly/more efficient/more effective.
3. Identify the criteria. In this case these would be included in the evaluation’s theory of change, evaluation questions, and the analytical framework.
4. Describe the expected performance of each option against the criteria.
5. Assign weights for each of the criteria to reflect their relative importance to a decision.
6. Combine the weights and scores for each of the criteria to derive and overall value.
7. Examine the results. This would lead to the noted Data & Analysis Report.
8. Share preliminary results with the primary evaluation stakeholders for their insights, questions, or issues. Consider these as part of the final analysis.
9. Conduct final analysis and use as a basis for final reporting.

7.4.5 Partnership Assessment

There are many best practices, leading research and guidelines related to the nature of effective partnerships as well as to the role of complex coordination as done by the NLG. Our approach rests on the inter-personal contingencies for effective partnerships as well as coordination and the broader systemic variables that support and/or hinder each.

We will draw on these best practices and leading research when developing approaches, protocols, and other tools to evaluate both coordination and partnership, how these differ in different arrangements, e.g. between NLG Partners, UN agencies, NGOs, donors, governments, and others. These are included in the proposed theory of change.

7.4.6 Stakeholder Mapping Tools

Drawing from Social Network Analysis at the micro level and strategic approaches at the macro level, Dara will indicate where, when, and under which conditions the NLG came together and the results of those collaborations.

---
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This will be used to highlight intersections where collaboration and partnership enables expected results and where it is much more fraught or complicated. Dara does not expect to present UNICEF or the NLG with actual maps of these types of interaction. Instead, this is a tool for us to assess how different interests coalesce or diverge. The output will be practical examples of what to know, what to avoid, and what might be a “promising practice” that can be analysed further.

7.4.7 Process Mapping

This includes a mapping of processes based on documents and clarified through stakeholder interviews of the actual work steps and workflow. Primarily, we will use this tool for tracking the NLG’s structural set-up and working mechanisms. We may also use mapping in stakeholder interviews to better understand specific processes and their value.

7.4.8 Data & Analysis Report (D&A Report)

The D&A Report will include top-level findings but not conclusions and recommendations. This will include the qualitative data from semi-structured interviews, documentary, comparative and quantitative data sets to be used in findings and stakeholder workshops. DARA proposes to prepare a D&A Report for each field mission as well as final report incorporating all data sets from the field missions. In brief, these D&A Reports will include all data and preliminary analysis so that stakeholders can review this, confirm key findings and/or offer other issues for consideration. This is an important element in both our utilisation-focused approach and in ensuring that solid evidence underpins all findings and subsequent conclusions and recommendations.

7.4.9 Utilization focus

The evaluation will take a utilization-focused approach, of which the Data & Analysis Report is a primary element. A utilisation-focused approach is based on the principle that an evaluation should be judged on its usefulness to intended users. This encourages participation and is sensitive to context and innovation, ensuring that all relevant stakeholders are involved in each step of the process in ways that support their learning and facilitate interaction and real-time feedback throughout the process. As such, consideration needs to be given to the issues of cultural validity, reliability and feasibility. Cultural validity means that the concepts and ideas being asked make sense to people in that context and relate to local concerns and priorities. Reliability focuses on whether measures provide a consistent, coherent, trustworthy basis for drawing conclusions. Good reliability is crucial in evaluation studies, where sensitivity to change over time is required. Lastly, feasibility should refer in this case to whether the tools and methods applied are feasible given the institutional scope (multi-stakeholders), the geographic coverage (global, regional, and country level), the various programmatic focus and the wide timeframe covered by the evaluation.

7.4.10 Data Synthesis & Triangulation

This includes ensuring that each data set is as complete as possible, ensuring e.g. appropriate sample size, no significant gaps, contradictions, or other peculiarities, and that the evidentiary trends contribute to answering all Evaluation Questions. Once this is established, DARA checks these against existing counterfactuals and then triangulate the data so that there is a reasonable level of convergence across different data sets to fully demonstrate a conclusion. For instance, at least three different data sets should demonstrate the same conclusion. This will allow the team to fully demonstrate causation, distinguishing between whether there is singular or multiple causation.

The final report will include a reference marker as to whether conclusions are based on a convergence of evidence from the three primary sources, mainly documentary (D), qualitative (Q), and survey (S). This provides a shorthand of how and if all data sources were used. These are summarized as being either Grey (no data), Amber (some data), or Green (sufficient data). Examples of this include:

- This example shows that there is some documentary evidence and sufficient levels of qualitative and survey data to support the conclusion.

- This example shows that there is some documentary evidence, sufficient levels of survey data, and no qualitative data to support the conclusion.
Inception Phase Report:
Evaluation of the No Lost Generation (NLG) initiative

7.5 Semi-Structured Interview Protocol

Name: (OPTIONAL)  Title: (OPTIONAL)
Organisation:
Time/Date:

Informed Consent (To be read aloud to participant immediately after introductions.)

“The overall purpose of this evaluation is to assess how and if the No Lost Generation (NLG) initiative influenced different actors to deliver more and better education, child protection, and youth and adolescent programming for children and youth affected by the Syria crisis. Your insights and comments are important for establishing whether there are trends across different respondents concerning key questions about the NLG.

We never quote anyone or provide other direct attribution in any report, presentation, or any other materials, without the prior written consent of the person(s) involved. We cannot absolutely guaranty confidentiality as one may draw correlations from the evaluation to different people. We are required to report any abuse or severe neglect.

Your participation is voluntary, and you are welcome to respond or not respond to any question or to end the interview at any time. We accept any decision along these lines; it will have no penalty or loss for you. Conversely, there are no risks or possible benefits associated with your involvement in this interview.

We expect the entire interview to take no more than 1 hour to conduct the survey, answer formal questions, and address any other issues you may deem relevant. We will describe the process and reporting timeline at the end of the conversation as well as to answer any questions that you may have.

If you have any questions about the evaluation, please contact Robert Stryck at rstryk@unicef.org.

Overview of NLG (Will be described in more detail upon informed consent.)

In 2018, the NLG included five objectives:

✓ Positive and lasting changes for children and young people in No Lost Generation countries are supported as a result of regional-level strategic efforts to influence decision-makers towards No Lost Generation advocacy objectives. (advocacy)

✓ The funding level for programmes under No Lost Generation pillars in each of the 6 No Lost Generation countries is at least 60% of appeal target. (fundraising / accountability)

✓ Programmatic responses at country level have been strengthened as a result of regional level strategic direction-setting and knowledge management for cross sector programmes, emerging areas and innovations (support for cross-sector programming, emerging programme areas and innovation)

✓ The voices of children and youth in No Lost Generation countries are raised at all levels through communications and participation in high level events. (ensuring the voices of children and young people are heard at all levels.)

✓ Country level practitioners in No Lost Generation programme areas have access to relevant resources and are guided by strategic frameworks for cross sector programmes, emerging programme areas and innovations (knowledge management; facilitation of partnerships and other support for cross-sector programming, emerging programme areas and innovation including technology)
Overview of Evaluation Approach

The evaluation is designed to test the following “theory”:

✓ The NLG DID influence different actors to deliver more and better education, child protection, and youth and adolescent programming for children and youth affected by the Syria crisis.

Field Schedule

Key Dates in Evaluation Process

✓ Draft report, including case studies/without recommendations. (13 January)
✓ Presentation of preliminary findings to the Steering Committee (online/skype)
✓ Revise draft Evaluation Report
✓ Revised evaluation report, including recommendations (7 February)
✓ Review of second draft report by the SC
✓ Presentation of conclusions and recommendations (Amman; via videoconference)
✓ Final Report (28 February)
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Respondent’s Questions

Would you like to make any comments, or do you have any questions before we begin?

Survey

We invite you to answer the following questions on a scale of 1 - 4. The survey is designed to get a “snap shot” of key issues before more detailed discussions. (References to specific evaluation questions are included.)

1--Not at all 2--Somewhat 3--Significantly 4— Completely  Don’t Know (DK)

Relevance

1. Did the NLG identify gaps in education, child protection, and youth/adolescent programming to relevant actors? (1.2)

2. Is the NLG aligned with the human rights of children and young people - girls and boys - affected by the Syria and Iraq crises? (1.1)

3. Is the NLG relevant or a model for other humanitarian responses? (1.3)

Effectiveness

4. Has the NLG influenced policy/legal framework changes in the affected countries to develop a protective and more enabling environment for children and youth? (2.1)

5. Has the NLG influenced increasing funding levels for education, child protection, and youth/adolescent programming? (2.1)

6. Has the NLG influenced the scope of education, child protection, and youth/adolescent programming? (2.1)

7. Has the NLG influenced the quality of education, child protection, and youth/adolescent programming? (2.1)

Efficiency

8. Considering the scope, objectives and composition of the NLG, was the chosen operational model the best fit to achieve influence and change? (3.1)

9. Was the NLG Secretariat chaired by UNICEF efficiently managed? (3.2)

Coordination

10. Did the NLG initiative foster synergies and avoid overlaps/incoherent approaches between different sectors and partners? (4.1)

Connectedness

11. Did the NLG make links to regional and international forums related to education, child protection, and youth and adolescent programming? (5.3)

12. Did the NLG influence different actors to consider the short and long term needs of children, youth and adolescents? (humanitarian/development nexus) (5.2)

Thank you for taking this brief survey. As mentioned, this is a simple way to get a sense of the issues under review. We are grateful for your input.
Qualitative Evidence

As a primary means for collecting qualitative evidence, the evaluation team will ask standard questions of all respondents. We do this to examine patterns across different groups of respondents rather than being overly biased by the responses of any single respondent.

In practice, the interview will focus on 1 or 2 questions per evaluation criteria. These will be selected as based on the respondents’ roles and responsibilities. Questions may be also tailored for specific respondents. Specific examples will be elicited as often as possible. References to specific evaluation questions are included.

As noted in the analytical framework, some questions are meant to be exploratory and/or to solicit examples of best/emerging practices or challenges. Others are specific to our Qualitative Data Trend Analysis, the latter of which are identified by an “*”.

Overall
1. Please describe your role and the primary aspects of your work that relate the NLG initiative.

Relevance
2. How aligned are the stated or apparent intentions of the NLG multi-agency, multi-country and multi-sector initiative with the human rights of children and young people - girls and boys - affected by the Syria and Iraq crises? (1.1)
3. To what extent did the NLG identify gaps to relevant actors at different times in the response? (1.2) *
4. How relevant is the NLG initiative to other humanitarian responses? (1.4)

Effectiveness
5. Describe how the NLG has achieved: (2.1)
   - Policy/legal framework changes in the affected countries to develop a protective and more enabling environment for children and youth;
   - Increasing funding levels for No Lost Generation programming over time;
   - Scope and quality of the humanitarian response under No Lost Generation pillars in No Lost Generation countries and reaching the most vulnerable boys and girls with appropriate access to formal and non-formal learning opportunities, access to protective environment, broadening opportunities for adolescents and youth, and the intersection between these pillars?
6. How, if at all, did working in the NLG partnership contribute to better results and/or constrain/complicate NLG activities and approaches? (2.2) *
7. How, if at all did the NLG influence actors to abide by the rights of the child, gender equality, and human rights-based approaches? (2.3) *
8. What were the major factors that contributed to the achievements of NLG’s intents or hampered achieving of those intents? (2.4)
9. What else contributed to or constrained the NLG’s effectiveness?

Partnership
10. To what extent did being part of the initiative contribute to better programming and faster delivering of services to boys and girls in the programmatic areas under the three pillars, compared to other programmatic areas? (3.5) *
11. At global and regional level, what were the advantages of an NLG coalition, especially for advocacy and resource mobilization? (3.4) *
12. How efficient was the NLG Secretariat chaired by UNICEF? How efficient was the role of UNICEF as a lead? In what ways, could that role be made more efficient? (3.2) *
Coordination

13. To what extent did the NLG initiative contribute to foster synergies and avoid overlaps/incoherent approaches between different sectors and partners? (4.1) *

14. What is the value added of the coordination mechanism? (4.2) *

15. To what extent was the NLG initiative’s implementation coordinated with other relevant initiatives at all levels, such as Whole of Syria Forum for example? Are there any overlaps or existing gaps? (4.4) *

Connectedness

16. How did the NLG consider both the short-term emergency needs of children, youth, and adolescents as well as longer-term programming and development needs in these areas at the country level? Did it influence different actors to consider the short and long term needs of children, youth and adolescents? (5.2) *

17. How, if, and when did the NLG make links to regional and international forums related to education, child protection, and youth and adolescent programming? Were possible links missed and, if so, what was the consequence of such missed opportunities? (5.3) *

Efficiency

18. Did the NLG contribute to more efficient ways of working between and beyond partners? Please provide some examples. (3.3)

19. Did the NLG facilitate efficiencies of scale by having a common framework? (3.3)

Potential Impact

20. Were there any unintended positive or negative effects of the initiative, either on the response to the Syria and Iraq crises at country level or on NLG partners at global and regional level, and if so what were these? (6.3)

Exploratory Questions
The evaluation team will then ask any follow-up questions where additional detail or more clarity would be useful.

Closing

21. Is there anything we haven’t discussed that you expected we would discuss? Any other points you’d like to raise?

22. What are your expectations for this evaluation?

23. Do you have questions you would like to ask me?

24. Follow-up on any documentation or evidentiary sources that could be helpful for evaluation.

25. Describe process: Once the review team’s field visits are completed, we will hold an informal workshop where the team presents what it has learned and asks partners to provide feedback and clarification.

Thank you.
7.6 Survey Protocol (Draft)

Overview

Informed Consent (provided on the first page of the survey. It will include a check box stating “Do you agree to continue with this survey? (yes/no).” If checked yes, the survey will move to the first set of questions. If checked “no” the survey will end and respondents will be sent to the DARA home page.

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to assess how and if the No Lost Generation (NLG) initiative influenced different actors to deliver more and better education, child protection, and youth and adolescent programming for children and youth affected by the Syria crisis.

We never quote anyone or provide other direct attribution in any report, presentation, or any other materials, without the prior written consent of the person(s) involved.

Your participation is voluntary, and you are welcome to respond or not respond to any questions in the survey. There are no risks or possible benefits associated with your completing this survey.

If you have any questions about the evaluation, please contact Robert Stryck at rstryk@unicef.org.

Who is being asked to complete the survey?

All staff who have worked with the NLG from 2013 to 2018 in the countries affected by the Syria crisis.

What is it going to be used for?

The survey results will be treated as specific data set in how the evaluation answers different questions.

Completing the Survey

The survey consists of 17 questions that are being answered by all respondents and then separate sections for different respondent types. We expect that the survey will take between 5 - 10 minutes to complete. Once you have started the survey, we advise that you work through to the end, as it will not be possible to come back to the survey to pick up where you left off.

Demographics

Name (voluntary) 
Title (voluntary) 
Gender: 
Organisation:

Country: 
Type of Office: (HQ; Regional; Country; Sub-office) 
Time in Position: 

Organisation Type

NLG Partners (UN) 
NLG Partners (INGO) 
NLG Partners (Donors) 
NLG Partners (Others) 
UNICEF (Global) 
UNICEF (Regional) 
UNICEF (Country) 
UN (Education) 
UN (Child Protection) 
UN (Youth)

INGO (Education) 
INGO (Child Protection) 
INGO (Youth) 
Donors (Non-NLG) 
UNCT/HCT 
Clusters 
Host Gov’ts 
Gov’t (Other) 
Other
Inception Phase Report:
Evaluation of the No Lost Generation (NLG) initiative

General

1. For how long have you worked in the Syria crisis? (Scale: 1. 0 - 6 months; 2. 6 – 12 months; 3. 1 – 2 years; 4. 3 – 5 years; 5. more than 5 years)

2. The No Lost Generation initiative influenced different actors to deliver more and better education, child protection, and youth and adolescent programming for children and youth affected by the Syria crisis. ²⁸ (Scale: 1. Strongly disagree; 2. Disagree; 3. Neutral; 4. Agree; 5. Strongly Agree; 6. Not applicable.)

3. Please choose a few words that describe your work with the NLG. (Open ended)

Please rate the following questions on this scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Not at all</th>
<th>2 - Somewhat</th>
<th>3 - Significantly</th>
<th>4 - Completely</th>
<th>Don't Know (DK)/Not relevant (NR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Relevance

4. Did the NLG identify gaps in education, child protection, and youth/adolescent programming to relevant actors? (1.2)

5. Is the NLG aligned with the human rights of children and young people - girls and boys - affected by the Syria and Iraq crises? (1.1)

6. Is the NLG relevant or a model for other humanitarian responses? (1.3)

Effectiveness

7. Has the NLG influenced policy/legal framework changes in the affected countries to develop a protective and more enabling environment for children and youth? (2.1)

8. Has the NLG influenced Increasing funding levels for education, child protection, and youth/adolescent programming? (2.1)

9. Has the NLG influenced the scope of education, child protection, and youth/adolescent programming? (2.1)

10. Has the NLG influenced the quality of education, child protection, and youth/adolescent programming? (2.1)

Efficiency

11. Considering the scope, objectives and composition of the NLG, was the chosen operational model the best fit to achieve influence and change? (3.1)

12. Was the NLG Secretariat chaired by UNICEF efficiently managed? (3.2)

Coordination

13. Did the NLG initiative foster synergies and avoid overlaps/incoherent approaches between different sectors and partners? (4.1)

Connectedness

14. Did the NLG make links to regional and international forums related to education, child protection, and youth and adolescent programming? (5.3)

15. Did the NLG influence different actors to consider the short and long term needs of children, youth and adolescents? (humanitarian/development nexus) (5.2)

²⁸ If “strongly disagree” or “strongly agree”, skip logic will move to a few control questions to assess potential respondent bias.
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Closing

16. Are there any issues that this survey has neglected or that deserve more attention?

17. Do you have any other comments about the NLG?

Thank you very much for completing this survey.
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