



International Organization for Migration (IOM)  
Organisation internationale pour les migrations (OIM)  
Organización Internacional para las Migraciones (OIM)

**Evaluation of IOM Contribution to the Project**  
**“Enhancing the Response to Displacement – Improving**  
**Management and Coordination in CCCM”**

Office of the Inspector General

August 2016

# Table of Contents

Acronyms .....	3
Executive Summary .....	3
1. Introduction and Context .....	6
1.1. Overview of CCCM .....	7
1.2. Scope and purpose of the Evaluation and Methodology .....	7
1.3. Limitations of the Evaluation .....	8
2. Evaluation Findings:.....	8
2.1. Project Design and Relevance.....	8
2.1.1. Link between Phase I and II of the Project .....	9
2.1.2. Relevance to CCCM Cluster and humanitarian response architecture .....	10
2.1.3. Logical Framework Design .....	13
2.1.4. Division of responsibilities within the project .....	14
2.2. Project performance .....	15
2.2.1. Grant Holder Role/Coordination Role of IOM .....	15
2.2.2. Direct implementation.....	17
2.2.3. Management through Headquarters.....	27
2.2.4. Mainstreaming gender and protection.....	28
2.3. Achievements .....	30
3. Summary of Key Findings and Recommendations .....	32
3.1. Key Findings .....	32
3.2. Recommendations .....	33
Annex 1 – Terms of Reference.....	34
Annex 2 – List of Interviewed People .....	37
Annex 3 – Interview and Focus Group Discussion Guide .....	38
Annex 4 - Documentation Review .....	42
Annex 5 - Detailed Analysis of Logical Framework Indicators .....	44

## Acronyms

AAP	Accountability to Affected Population
CCCM	Camp Coordination Camp Management
CCCMCAP	CCCM Capacity Roster
CMT	Camp Management Toolkit
CP	Civil Protection
DOE	Department of Operations and Emergencies
DTM	Displacement Tracking Matrix
ECHO	Directorate General for the European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
ERC	Enhanced Response Capacity
GBV	Gender-based violence
HQ	Headquarters
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
IOM	International Organization for Migration
MEND	Mass Evacuation in Natural Disasters
MoV	Means of verification
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NORCAP	Norwegian Capacity
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
OCHA	UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OIG	Office of the Inspector General
PRD	Preparedness and Response Division
RO	Regional Office
RRT	Rapid Response Team
SAG	Strategic Advisory Group
SO	Strategic Objective
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
SRP	Strategic Response Plan
TA	Transformative Agenda
TOR	Terms of Reference
UDOC	Urban displacement and out of camps
UNHCR	UN High Commissioner for Refugees

## Executive Summary

The evaluation focused on the International Organization for Migration’s (IOM) contribution to the Camp Coordination Camp Management (CCCM) Project “Enhancing the Response to Displacement – Improving Management and Coordination in CCCM” funded by the Directorate General for Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) from 2014-2015 as Phase II. The project provided funding to be shared between the two co-leads of the CCCM Cluster, IOM and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC). Overall management of the project’s Phase II was under IOM’s responsibility.

The main objective of Phase II was *“guaranteeing quick and sustainable responses to emergencies which contribute to the protection of displaced communities in camps as well as in outside camp and urban displacement settings”*,

with the specific objective *“to provide support to Camp Coordination and Camp Management systems at the country/regional level and effective coordination during major emergencies.”* The following four results were expected to be achieved during Phase II: 1) Maximizing roster administration, use, and sustainability to enhance ability to respond to large-scale emergencies and enable rapid and expert emergency support to field operations; 2) Refining the inter-cluster and inter-sector coordination to better link strategic and operational levels of coordination, in collaboration with the UN Office of Coordination for the Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), other clusters and sectors, and through engagement with existing and new partners; 3) Improving response to urban displacement and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) outside camps; and 4) Engaging national authorities and actors to build better response capacity.

As per its Terms of Reference (TOR), the evaluation of the project focused on IOM’s role as administrator of the grant and its contributions to the achievement of the results. The objective was *“to evaluate the relevance and achievements of the project for an improved management and coordination of the CCCM Cluster, as well as IOM’s contributions to the overall performance of the project.”* Given that there were three other concurrent CCCM reviews, one on the impact of capacity building efforts, another on the co-leadership structure and the third on Gender-based Violence (GBV) mainstreaming in CCCM, this evaluation did not extensively cover areas that fell under the scope of the other evaluations and focused specifically on IOM’s role in the project, using, when relevant, the information available through the other reviews.

## **Findings**

The evaluation analyzed the project design and relevance to the CCCM Strategy and the humanitarian response architecture. The evaluation found that the design of Phase II was a continuation of the initial Phase and that there was a logical flow between both phases. Furthermore, the evaluation found that the project was strongly tied to the CCCM strategy; all project components were included in the strategy and helped to contribute towards it. The evaluation also analyzed the link between the project and the Inter-agency Standing Committee (IASC) Transformative Agenda (TA) and noted that the project addressed the three key areas of the TA: better leadership, improved accountability to stakeholders and improved coordination. The evaluation analysed the logical framework applied to the project making some recommendations on improvements of the indicators, noting overall that the framework was well developed. One finding was that the indicators of the project were different from those in the CCCM strategy and they could have been better streamlined. Finally, the division of labour between the three agencies was in line with their respective areas of expertise and interest; the project was designed so that most of the activities of each result could be implemented independently of the other results or contributions from the other agencies, with the notable exception of Result 2 which was implemented by both IOM and UNHCR.

The evaluation assessed the project performance first by evaluating IOM’s coordination role as a grant holder within the project and then the achievement of each result, with a particular focus on IOM’s assigned results. The evaluation concluded that, as a global support project, it benefited from centralized management from Headquarters (HQ) and managed to address most financial or administrative challenges they faced. Overall IOM’s coordination role as grant holder has been effective; the identification of a focal point in each agency was seen as a positive contribution to improving joint cluster programming. The narrative and financial reporting coordinated by IOM with the other two partners and then submitted to ECHO was successfully done. Some aspects of coordination, such as sharing more information on each of the components, could have been improved in order to streamline the activities and identify lessons learnt that could be relevant for the Cluster as a whole. However, these minor coordination gaps had no impact on the overall delivery of the project.

With regards to the surge capacity (Result 1), the implementation was viewed as effective by all interviewees. The Cluster was able to send experts to Country Offices requiring cluster support that did not have the technical knowledge or financial means to do so. This was consistently commended as a valuable support and added-value of the project to emergency and preparedness operations worldwide. Based on the input from Global Team members, the evaluation recommends to better define selection criteria to maximize the benefits and prioritize deployments.

Under Result 2, the secondment of a CCCM-staff to OCHA was successful as it strengthened the partnership with OCHA and formally analysed how the coordination under CCCM and OCHA's inter-cluster responsibilities converged and differed. However, the matrix developed as a result of the secondment requires further adjustment to make it a more effective tool for the field. The other component of Result 2 was the strengthening of CCCM partnerships. Engagement of partners is primarily at the local level and there has been a shift in the type of stakeholder as fewer international organizations are involved in direct camp management; new partners, such as civil society, faith-based organizations and national authorities, are taking on this role. The challenge is for the Cluster to reflect the priorities of these new camp managers and also to identify opportunities to engage these stakeholders so they can benefit from global support or guidance. The agreement to create a Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) in 2016 is a positive step towards increasing and strengthening partnerships.

As Result 3 implementation is under UNHCR's responsibility, a detailed analysis of its performance was not conducted. In addition to the pilot approach in urban and outside camp displacements within the project, there are other out-of-camp methodologies which together should be compiled to provide a more holistic picture and lessons learnt.

Result 4, engaging national authorities, was under the responsibility of IOM. Activities have proceeded as planned, the Mass Evacuation in Natural Disaster (MEND) guide being almost finalized at the time of the evaluation. A positive outcome of the development of the MEND is its contribution to build partnerships with civil protection (CP) agencies in over 15 countries and to build the capacities of national authorities to address preparedness for natural disasters. Whilst matching civil protection with CCCM expertise has proven challenging at times, civil protection has been identified as integral to humanitarian assistance. CCCM should capitalize on its current efforts with CP partners to ensure that, during evacuations, displacement is well managed.

Finally, the evaluation concludes that the four results were in the process of being achieved and the project has contributed to an extent to the management of the Cluster such as with the manuals produced. In addition, there have been some positive steps towards addressing coordination for example the co-lead assessment funded by the project, and the agreement to include a SAG. Cluster team members maintained good working relations and technical exchanges, correcting any potential delays or coordination gaps and ensured that results were met on time.

## 1. Introduction and Context

The Camp Coordination Camp Management (CCCM) global Cluster, co-led by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), received funding to support the CCCM Cluster through the Directorate-General for the European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) under their Enhanced Response Capacity (ERC) fund. The first grant<sup>1</sup> was provided to UNHCR, with IOM, Shelter Center and the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) as partners. As a follow-up to Phase I, a second grant called “Enhancing the Response to Displacement – Improving Management and Coordination in CCCM” was provided to IOM, with UNHCR and NRC as partners. Phase II was scheduled to end December 2015, after 24 months of implementation and forms the basis for this evaluation.

The main objective of Phase II was “*guaranteeing quick and sustainable responses to emergencies which contribute to the protection of displaced communities in camps as well as in outside camp and urban displacement settings*”, with the specific objective “*to provide support to Camp Coordination and Camp Management systems at the country/regional level and effective coordination during major emergencies.*” Four results are to be achieved during Phase II:

- 1) Maximization of roster administration, use, and sustainability to enhance ability to respond to large-scale emergencies and enable rapid and expert emergency support to field operations;
- 2) Refining of inter-cluster and inter-sector coordination to better link strategic and operational levels of coordination, in collaboration with the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), other clusters and sectors, and through engagement with existing and new partners;
- 3) Improvement of responses to urban displacements and IDPs outside camps; and
- 4) Engaging national authorities and actors to build better response capacity.

The funding was received under ECHO’s Enhanced Response Capacity (ERC) which had the following overall rationale:

*“that the investments through humanitarian Enhanced Response Capacity funding to the global humanitarian system lead to more rapid and more cost-effective humanitarian responses – to forgotten and protracted crises as well as new emergencies - allowing better and broader humanitarian coverage. [...] Selection of humanitarian assistance tools has to stem from these strategies, from credible governance structures, and on the basis of a clear situation and response analysis. Where this approach is constrained by the limited experience or skill-sets of humanitarian actors, DG ECHO recognizes the need to invest in strengthening the capacity of the humanitarian system to deliver more varied and appropriate forms of assistance.”*<sup>2</sup>

The ERC funding supports global initiatives for strategic approaches. The funding is separate from country-specific funding in order to avoid competition for resources. Through the interview with ECHO, four key factors necessary to support clusters were cited: 1) clear leadership; 2) strong leadership that brings together and represents the entire cluster rather than individual agencies; 3) strategic direction and strong mitigation against challenges; and 4) global support to country operations. During Phase I of the CCCM project, funding was aimed at getting the appropriate tools developed, strengthening field activities, and maintaining close engagement with lead agencies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Initially from September 2012 to December 2013 but extended until February 2014.

<sup>2</sup> [http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/ERC\\_en\\_0.pdf](http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/ERC_en_0.pdf)

Under Phase II, each agency was tasked to achieve specific results and allocated a budget. IOM was responsible for grants management during the implementation of the project; this decision was made as UNHCR had been the grants manager during Phase I.<sup>3</sup> Whilst the project proposal was finalized and agreed to in July 2014, due to ongoing emergencies which needed to be supported, the project already started in January 2014 to avoid an implementation gap between Phases I and II.<sup>4</sup>

## 1.1. Overview of CCCM

The CCCM Cluster is one of the 11 clusters created in 2005 during the Humanitarian Reform. Under this reform, the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) endorsed three pillars: 1) more adequate, timely and flexible humanitarian financing; 2) a strengthened Humanitarian Coordinator system; and 3) the implementation of the cluster approach to build capacities in gap areas (OCHA 2006).<sup>5</sup> The CCCM Cluster's overall goal is *"to improve the living conditions of internally displaced persons by facilitating the effective provision of protection and services in camps and camp-like settings, advocate for durable solutions and ensure organized closure and phase-out of camps upon the IDPs' relocation, return, resettlement or local integration."*<sup>6</sup> The CCCM Cluster is co-led by IOM for natural disasters and UNHCR for conflict-induced internally displaced persons (IDP) situations.

## 1.2. Scope and purpose of the Evaluation and Methodology

The Department of Operations and Emergencies (DOE) and the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) agreed on an evaluation conducted by OIG based on the benefits that can stem from analyzing performance and adapting lessons learnt to other ongoing or future projects. The overall objective of the evaluation aimed *"to evaluate the relevance and achievements of the project for an improved management and coordination of the CCCM Cluster, as well as IOM's contributions to the overall performance of the project."* The Terms of Reference were developed with the DOE team and had been shared with both project partners, NRC and UNHCR, for comments (Annex 1).

The report focuses on IOM's performance and does not intend to cover an assessment of the effectiveness of UNHCR's and NRC's contributions in implementing the components assigned specifically to them. The evaluation briefly reports on the performance of those components assigned to the other partners based on the perceptions of the implementing agencies, mainly through interviews with UNHCR and NRC staff and their submitted reports. It is important to note that there were also two external reviews<sup>7</sup> being undertaken concurrently under the ECHO project and this internal evaluation benefited from these results, avoiding encroachment on or duplication of their respective areas of analysis.<sup>8</sup> In addition, a third review was also being undertaken for a different project on gender-based violence mainstreaming within CCCM and Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM).

The methodology of the evaluation consisted of a documentation review of all project-related documents as well as other document sources related to CCCM. In addition, extensive interviews were conducted with IOM staff in

---

<sup>3</sup> Based on interviews.

<sup>4</sup> There was subsequently an error noticed after the project was approved in that it said it was an 18-month project when in fact it was a 24 month project. In January 2015 a no-cost extension was developed to rectify this error.

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.unocha.org/annualreport/2006/html/part1\\_humanitarian.html](http://www.unocha.org/annualreport/2006/html/part1_humanitarian.html)

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.globalccmcluster.org/about-us>

<sup>7</sup> An impact evaluation on "CCCM Capacity Development" and an assessment of the co-leadership of the CCCM.

<sup>8</sup> The three evaluators discussed findings and met in order to ensure synergies where relevant.

Headquarters (HQ) and field locations. Interviews were conducted with staff from UNHCR and NRC as well as with other entities such as OCHA and ECHO. Furthermore, a focus group discussion was conducted with IOM field staff who participated in the CCCM annual retreat in Geneva from 13–14 October 2015. A full list of people interviewed and the interview guidelines can be found in Annexes 2 and 3, respectively. The full list of documents reviewed is in Annex 4.

Interviews conducted in this evaluation were semi-structured, with a series of questions developed for each type of interview and modified then adapted as the discussion progressed. Follow-up discussions took place with some interviewees when additional information or confirmation was required. No field visits took place throughout the course of the evaluation. Interviews with stakeholders outside of Geneva were conducted via phone or skype or during the annual 2015 CCCM retreat.

The evaluation focused on 18 key questions pertaining to relevance, performance and achievements. Throughout the document, key findings and recommendations are highlighted. Key findings refer to salient points worth mentioning on specific sections of the report but may not necessarily be included in every section. Recommendations refer to specific areas for improvement. Some of these recommendations may be useful at a cluster level and in further joint cluster projects that agencies may implement together. A summary of the key findings and recommendations is also included in the report under Section 3.

### **1.3. Limitations of the Evaluation**

The evaluation faced some challenges that need to be highlighted. The first and most important one was evaluating a project focused on Cluster management without evaluating the Cluster as a whole. Distinguishing between project-level or Cluster-level information was at times difficult; the Evaluator nonetheless highlighted potential areas of convergence with the Cluster or commented on what would be needed for further exploration. Secondly, the Cluster project has three partners in total, yet it is only evaluating the performance of one of the partners, noting however that each expected result is clearly assigned. There are also recommendations and findings that may be relevant for the other partners and worth sharing; it was sometimes difficult to separate comments that were specific to IOM, or solely attributed to IOM, versus those that may relate to either co-lead or NRC. These constraints are highlighted in the relevant sections when required.

## **2. Evaluation Findings:**

### **2.1. Project Design and Relevance**

The analysis of the design of the project is divided into five sub-components:

1. The link between the two project phases;
2. The link with the CCCM global strategy;
3. The relevance to the CCCM Cluster and humanitarian response architecture;
4. The Logical Framework; and
5. Division of responsibilities within the project.

Overall the project fell within the ECHO ERC strategic direction, focusing on initiatives that could only be done at the global level with the possibility of offering the largest impact to field operations (in the medium to long-term).<sup>9</sup> Phase II provided the opportunity to further refine, test and strengthen tools and approaches of the CCCM Cluster, including those developed under Phase I, with the potential of further strengthening the Cluster and providing consistent support at the field level.

### 2.1.1. Link between Phase I and II of the Project

Phase II of the project was built upon the results achieved during Phase I (17 months) which had been managed by UNHCR. The development of Phase II project proposal occurred over the course of several months, from October 2013 until May 2014 through exchanges between the three agencies and ECHO. Based on the review of project documents and interviews with stakeholders, a strong link between Phases I and II existed. The previous results were maintained, with slight variations and additions due to a change in context and achievements during phase I. The table below shows the relationship per result in each phase.

Phase I	Phase II	Relationship
Result 1: CCCM Rapid Response Teams (RRT) and CCCM Capacity Roster (CCCMCAP) are developed to improve cluster surge capacity in providing rapid and expert emergency support to field operations	Result 1: Roster administration, use and sustainability are maximized to enhance ability to respond to large-scale emergencies and enable rapid and expert emergency support to field operations	In phase II, this result was further refined to ensure sustainability of the surge capacity, which was initially developed under Phase I. Phase II focused on strengthening this approach. In addition, in Phase II, an impact evaluation “CCCM Capacity Development” was also included, which is a positive addition, in light of 10 years of capacity development undertaken by the Cluster.
Result 2: Tools and guidance required for the effective management and coordination of CCCM responses are developed and shared with stakeholders	Result 3: Response to urban displacement and IDPs outside the camp is improved	One of the tools developed in Phase I <sup>10</sup> was a desk review of the work done to support IDPs outside camps. In Phase II, Result 3 was refined to focus solely on the strengthening of this tool. The suggested approach for urban displacement and out of camp (UDOC) settings developed within the UDOC document were tested in Phase II.
Result 3: Improved capacity at country level to manage displacement, adapted to national actors managing large-scale displacement caused by natural disasters	Result 4: Engaging national authorities and actors to build better response capacity	Under Phase I, the Mass Evacuation in Natural Disasters (MEND) was developed under Result 2 (development of tools and guidance); under Result 3, tools and training materials were developed for national authorities. In Phase II, Result 4 concentrated on further refining the MEND guidelines and piloting them through workshops and simulation exercises specifically with national authorities or civil protection agencies. Furthermore, during Phase II, ECHO agreed that funding could be used to hire a civil protection expert, which was considered a positive addition to further strengthen the work in

<sup>9</sup> As understood through interviews and the ERC 2014 document (see footnote 2).

<sup>10</sup> Tools developed under phase I include the Guidelines on Camp Closure, Collective Centre Evacuation Guidelines are available on the CCCM website <http://www.globalccmcluster.org/tools-and-guidance/publications?page=1>

		natural disasters. Besides the simulation exercise, the large-scale training of trainers focusing on national authorities which took place in Phase I was not continued during Phase II. Under Phase I, a guidance note was developed on how to train national actors in managing large-scale displacement with the intention that field operations would then develop country-specific training materials. <sup>11</sup>
No parallel results	Result 2: Inter-cluster and inter-sector coordination is refined to better link strategic and operational levels of coordination, in collaboration with OCHA, other clusters and sectors, and through engagement with existing and new partners	This standalone result in Phase II was based on previous discussions between OCHA and the CCCM co-leads and a recommendations from the former global Inter-cluster Coordinator (2011) who stated that inter-cluster coordination could benefit from learning from camp-level operational coordination which camp managers do with service providers. This was also discussed with ECHO who expressed interest to see more collaboration with OCHA and other clusters. This result was also meant to ensure usage of existing tools by improving the CCCM website, developing a communications strategy as well as reviewing the existing co-leadership structure.

The evaluation found that overall there was a logical flow between Phases I and II. In Phase I, Result 3 *“improved capacity at country level to manage displacement, adapted to national actors managing large-scale displacement caused by natural disasters”* was no longer a focus in Phase II. However according to IOM staff, this aspect of capacity building was funded under different sources at global and country levels. Instead, Result 3 in Phase II, concentrated on the refinement/pilot for mass evacuations only, specifically when engaging with national authorities.

### 2.1.2. Relevance to CCCM Cluster and humanitarian response architecture

To determine relevance of Phase II of the project to the Cluster and the humanitarian architecture, the Evaluator explored the link with the CCCM strategy and the IASC Transformative Agenda.

#### CCCM Strategy

The project document clearly states that *“the proposed [project] takes into account the Cluster’s three year strategy and the five key priorities set by the Global CCCM Cluster for 2014-2016 (improved implementation, preparedness, awareness, accountability, holistic community support), which have emerged on the basis of priorities established by the IASC’s transformative agenda process.”* Upon analysis of the strategic framework for 2013–2016<sup>12</sup> presented during the 2015 CCCM global retreat, the Evaluator was able to conclude that the ECHO project is linked and related to this strategic framework; all ECHO-related results were included in the strategy. The table below provides further details based on all four project results.

ECHO Result	Related Strategic Outcome or Output	Comment
-------------	-------------------------------------	---------

<sup>11</sup> This evaluation did not analyze to what extent this is happening in specific countries as this initiative was part of Phase I.

<sup>12</sup> The dates in the project proposal vary from the dates of the Strategic Frameworks however it was confirmed that the framework is indeed 2013-2016.

<p><b>Result 1: Roster administration, use and sustainability are maximized to enhance ability to respond to large-scale emergencies and enable rapid and expert emergency support to field operations</b></p>	<p>Outcome 1: CCCM Cluster preparedness and response capacity is strengthened and consistently delivers quality programming (Output A <i>RRT and roster members with context-appropriate skills are available to support Country Offices and are deployed in a timely manner</i> and Output B1 <i>CCCM response staff are assessed and continual learning informs programme quality</i>)</p>	<p>All the ECHO project activities were included in the strategy.</p>
<p><b>Result 2: Inter-cluster and inter-sector coordination is refined to better link strategic and operational levels of coordination, in collaboration with OCHA, other clusters and sectors, and through engagement with existing and new partners</b></p>	<p>Outcome 1: CCCM Cluster preparedness and response capacity is strengthened and consistently delivers quality programming (Output C <i>CCCM partners play an active role in the cluster and partnership capacities increases</i>)</p> <p>Outcome 2: The CCCM Cluster delivers effective coordination services and tools at global and country levels</p> <p>Outcome 5: Greater engagement of stakeholders is the achievement of global strategic outcomes (Output B <i>The CCCM cluster effectively communicates its vision and strategic objective through a communications strategy</i>)</p>	<p>The ECHO result and related activities were found in the strategy. The Strategy focused more on active participation of partners which was not as developed in the proposal but could be covered in other CCCM-related projects by the co-leads or NRC.<sup>13</sup></p>
<p><b>Result 3: Response to urban displacement and IDPs outside the camp is improved</b></p>	<p>Outcome 2: The CCCM Cluster delivers effective coordination services and tools at global and country levels (output B <i>CCCM Cluster delivers tools and guidance</i>)</p> <p>Outcome 3: National capacity to prepare for and respond to internal displacement is improved (Output B <i>National actors are equipped with CCCM tools and guidance adapted to the displacement context in-country</i>)</p>	<p>Activities of Result 3 were in two parts of the Strategy. The out of camp and urban displacement approach was mentioned under Outcome 3 related to national authorities however the link between the UDOC and national authorities was not reflected within the ECHO project.</p>
<p><b>Result 4: Engaging national authorities and actors to build better response capacity</b></p>	<p>Outcome 3: National capacity to prepare for and respond to internal displacement is improved (output A <i>National actors are trained in CCCM through targeted, context-</i></p>	<p>Result 4 activities were all within Outcome 3. The activities linked to refining and piloting the MEND guidelines also fit within Outcome 2 as well.</p>

<sup>13</sup> These were not analysed under this evaluation.

	<i>appropriate capacity building initiatives and Output B National actors are equipped with CCCM tools and guidance adapted to the displacement context in-country)</i>	
--	---	--

There was a clear link between the most recent CCCM strategic framework and the ECHO project; further analysis about the project’s effective contribution to the Cluster is developed in section 2.2.2. Different opinions relating to the CCCM strategy benefits were expressed during interviews with global CCCM team members. Some criticism included that the strategy was not being used as a reference for the Cluster, or that there was no clear division of responsibility or defined timeframe. Analysis of these concerns was beyond the scope of the evaluation, and the issues raised did not impact the design of the ECHO project or the subsequent implementation of the results in view of the responsibilities assigned to each agency (see section 2.1.4).

### **Humanitarian Architecture**

In December 2011, the IASC adopted the Transformative Agenda (TA) which focuses on three key areas: better leadership, improved accountability to stakeholders, and improved coordination. A series of protocols were created to outline how to operationalize elements of the Agenda. Although better leadership in the TA is about the leadership role of Humanitarian Coordinators, the agencies did include efforts to improve their own leadership through the co-leadership assessment which was on-going at the time of this evaluation.

A key element of the ECHO project, particularly prevalent in Result 2, is the increase of partnerships in order to “*better link strategic and operational [...] coordination,*” another tenant of the TA. The project’s proposed engagement with OCHA specifically had the potential to improve coordination as seen in section 2.2.2.2. In addition, within Result 4, engaging with national authorities, also tied into an IASC TA recommendation as highlighted within the ECHO project proposal: “*[there is a need to work with an] extended group of actors, including national authorities and national disaster management agencies, in tackling these issues and strengthening preparedness. Better cooperation between different clusters and agencies benefits these actors as well as the affected populations. The humanitarian agenda highlights the need to link more closely with national authorities as a priority, and CCCM is at the forefront of this, as exemplified through initiatives such as the creation of the Steering Committee for the development of Guidelines for mass evacuation in natural disasters.*”

Accountability was highlighted as a key element of Phase II of the project. The first sentence in the narrative summary states “*the proposed [project] seeks to enhance accountability and the response to displacement by improving management and coordination in CCCM.*” The project proposal also referred to the need to formally clarify the roles and responsibilities, with OCHA (result 2) as a means of increasing accountability. Further, within the project, assessing benefits and disadvantages of the current cluster co-leadership structure is under Outcome 4 on Accountability in the CCCM strategy. Accountability is also being addressed in the Cluster through other efforts. For example the CCCM Cluster has engaged in practical ways to be more accountable to the affected populations (AAP),<sup>14</sup> particularly due to camp management and the feedback mechanism within camps. The Cluster is also represented in the IASC AAP Task Team and has included accountability within the CCCM training modules.

---

<sup>14</sup> Interview with CCCM global team member

### Key Finding

The project design is relevant to the existing 2013–2016 strategy and took into account the changes in the humanitarian architecture as adopted by IASC through the Transformative Agenda. However the project alone has not been developed for specifically implementing the strategy or addressing the TA within the Cluster; other cluster activities drive these forward as well.

### 2.1.3. Logical Framework Design

One element of analysis of the evaluation is a review of the logical framework particularly in terms of the link between the results and the specific objective and the indicators developed throughout the framework, as well as to determine if the beneficiaries selected were appropriate.

The target number of 50 beneficiaries comprised of stakeholders who could become members of the CCCM Cluster such as national authorities, local government, civil society, service-providing agencies, voluntary agencies, faith-based groups, community-based organizations, national and international NGOs, police forces, and academia. Within Phase II, beneficiaries were considered “self-selected” as the membership to the Cluster is open to all. The beneficiaries appeared to be relevant to the type of activities being implemented. More on the beneficiaries will be discussed under Result 2 (Section 2.2.2.2.).

Overall, there is a strong link between the four results and the specific objective (SO). The table below provides a more detailed analysis.

Specific Objective	Results	Analysis
<b>To provide support to CCCM systems at the country/regional level and effective coordination during major emergencies</b>	Result 1: Roster administration, use, and sustainability are maximized to enhance ability to respond to large-scale emergencies and enable rapid and expert emergency support to field operations.	Clear link between this result and the SO by providing direct support to field operations as needed.
	Result 2: Inter-cluster and inter-sector coordination is refined to better link strategic and operational levels of coordination, in collaboration with OCHA, other clusters and sectors, and through engagement with existing and new partners.	There was a clear link between this result and the SO however during the project, the focus was still at the global level in terms of developing relationships and partnerships which would require additional effort to trickle down to the country-level systems.
	Result 3: Response to urban displacement and IDPs outside camps is improved.	In the long term, improving response in urban displacement and out of camps and engaging national authorities can be useful for Country Offices; however, both results were still in the pilot stage and could have benefited from being more specific (to the countries where they are being piloted).
	Result 4: Engaging national authorities and actors to build better response capacity	

Based on interviews conducted with team members, the development of the indicators within the logical framework led to several discussions between the team and the donor who insisted on quantitative indicators, which were not always easy to measure. Interviewees expressed concerns about the difficulty of providing information at the interim reporting stages. In spite of this challenge, the indicators developed in the proposal were

deemed appropriate for the project by the Evaluator, with some requiring only slight modifications. However, the Evaluator did note that despite the link between the CCCM strategy and Phase II of the project, there were only a few indicators were the same in both the project and the strategy. Had this been considered during the development stages, similar indicators could have been used in both documents which would have simplified the monitoring. The detailed analysis of each indicator shows that possible changes to some of the indicators or their means of verification (MoVs) could have strengthened the logical framework, as they were limited in scope which reduced the ability to measure the actual progress of the project. For instance the indicators measured only the 14 clusters that were formally activated, while there were 21 additional countries where CCCM related activities took place that were supported by the Global Cluster. A more detailed analysis of each indicator can be found in Annex 5.

#### **Key finding**

The logical framework is well developed. The analysis shows that slight adjustments to the indicators could have strengthened them to better measure the progress of the results. Focus could have been placed not solely on activated formal clusters but also on operations where CCCM activities were also taking place, even if the cluster had not been formalized.

#### **Recommendation**

Consider developing one common CCCM Cluster monitoring framework (including common indicators) that can be used as a basis for tracking the strategy and joint CCCM projects thereby simplifying monitoring for the partners. This is also in line with one of the activities of the 2013–2016 CCCM strategy under Outcome 5.

### **2.1.4. Division of responsibilities within the project**

As a means of showing that the CCCM project was jointly implemented by the three agencies within the project proposal, there was no distinction between each agency's respective responsibilities within the project document. Internally, the agencies agreed on how to divide the results, or parts of the results, through separate agreements between IOM, as grant holder, and the other two agencies. Based on the interviews conducted and review of the agreements, the Evaluator found that the division of labour was well established, clear to all three agencies and was well suited to the areas of interest and comparative advantage of each agency, with NRC taking on leadership in the area of surge capacity (Result 1)<sup>15</sup>, UNHCR in the UDOC pilot (Result 3)<sup>16</sup> and IOM in the pilot and revisions of the Mass Evacuation in Natural Disasters (MEND) (Result 4). Result 2, on inter-cluster and inter-sector coordination, was the only one that required contributions from both IOM and UNHCR for its completion. The project was designed in a way that each agency could implement their individual responsibilities with little dependence on the other partners.

---

<sup>15</sup> IOM and UNHCR were responsible for the capacity building impact evaluation, and their respective missions for cost recovery of the deployments but for the most part, NRC was responsible for this result.

<sup>16</sup> Although Result 3 was also implemented with the support of NRC, the arrangement was done separately.

## 2.2. Project performance

### 2.2.1. Grant Holder Role/Coordination Role of IOM

In Phase II, IOM was designated as the grant manager of the project and therefore as the main focal point for ECHO, responsible for the submission of reports and deliverables, and for providing the funding to the other agencies. As a matter of administrative formality, ECHO requires that there be only one organization fully responsible for a specific grant and opted for a rotation; as UNHCR managed the first phase, IOM was requested to manage the second one. The approach of managing a grant given to the Cluster varies slightly from the more traditional grants given to agency projects; IOM, as a co-lead is an equal partner with UNHCR and NRC.<sup>17</sup> IOM adopted measures to adequately take on the role of grant manager and assigned a coordinating role to its focal point in charge of overseeing the project, coordinating work plans, meetings, and compiling information for reporting etc. The focal point has been highly praised by all interviewees who worked with her directly, as she was considered responsive and organized. The specific coordination role of the IOM focal point was seen as a positive element of Phase II in addition to being a lesson learnt from the first phase where no focal point had been assigned.<sup>18</sup>

Given that these three agencies worked together on many activities linked to CCCM, it was difficult to distinguish between the coordination that was *specific* to this project versus that for all cluster related activities. Up to the time of the evaluation, within the ECHO project coordination, two formal coordination meetings<sup>19</sup> had taken place with all three agencies. Furthermore, as required, the agencies liaised on specific activities or project requirements such as: planning the OCHA secondment, developing the project report or preparing the joint field visit. Ad hoc project-based discussions, meetings or email exchanges were held bilaterally with either NRC or UNHCR, depending on the needs. Interviewees did highlight that this project encouraged stronger collaboration and was a positive contribution to the Cluster.

Whilst there were many ways through which the agencies coordinated, concerns were raised about the communication remaining largely bilateral, i.e. IOM with the donor or IOM with each individual partner, or of communication being specific to an activity or result, rather than being more inclusive and holistic in approach. There could have been a more formalized approach to exchanging information on the project as a whole to update all the agencies on its progress.<sup>20</sup> For instance it was highlighted that the partners were not aware of the progress of Result 4, which IOM implements. ECHO also distinguishes administrative communication, which could remain between the grant holder (in this case IOM) and the donor, from other “content-specific” communication which should either be shared with all the partners or be limited but with the confirmation that the concerned partner agency was speaking on behalf of all. The donor commented that it was not always clear whether communication was in the name of an agency or the Cluster. Likewise, the distinction may not always be very clear or may shift, for example preparing for a field visit may initially be primarily administrative and then be more content-specific. As it is likely that IOM will continue to be involved in other projects as a lead or implementing agency, it would be advantageous to better define, from the start, the channels and content of communication within the project between partner agencies, as well as with the donor.

---

<sup>17</sup> Based on interviews

<sup>18</sup> The focal point was not fully dedicated to ECHO and had other responsibilities as well.

<sup>19</sup> Minutes available for one. To be noted also that one partner, NRC, is based in Oslo, Norway.

<sup>20</sup> There are no progress reports developed within the context of the project that could have been shared

On the reporting side, each agency reported on their respective areas of responsibility to IOM. IOM then compiled and submitted an interim report to ECHO based on their input. For financial reporting, partners provided IOM with their financial report for the period in question and IOM submitted one report for the project, with a delay of 5 days<sup>21</sup> due to review of the financial report (see section 2.2.3). All three agencies abided by General Conditions of the European Union (as written in each legal agreement).<sup>22</sup> The role of the IOM focal point was considered positive for the coordination of the administrative processes and the confirmation of results being implemented.

Some interviewees indicated that there could have been a more dynamic coordination of the implementation of the results. IOM could have provided more guidance and support for the implementation of individual results and activities, which in turn could have contributed to lessons learnt for the global CCCM Cluster approach. Guidance and support may be less relevant for a cluster project as there is an assumption that all partners know and understand their work; however providing the space for further discussion could have been useful for stronger collaboration and lesson learning, relevant for the Cluster as a whole.

Notwithstanding the long history of joint collaboration and challenges between IOM and UNHCR, the two cluster coordination teams managed to build a positive dynamic in the Cluster that led to this project being funded at a global level. During the initial discussions related to this project, co-leadership was questioned and the donor suggested a single agency lead which brought a level of external pressure to the two agency coordination teams. This inevitably had influenced the dynamics between both technical teams. Despite these challenges, the project was still able to reach its expected results, and delays reported could not be attributed specifically to communication or coordination issues.

#### **Key Findings**

Assigning a focal point for the project to support the Programme Manager/Co-lead was considered a positive addition to Phase II which helped to improve the coordination of the project.

IOM's role was seen as mainly administrative as this was considered by all agencies a Cluster project. IOM completed its administrative roles in line with ECHO requirements. There were aspects of coordination which could have been improved in order to streamline the activities, and identify lessons learnt that could be relevant for the Cluster as a whole.

#### **Recommendation**

Other ways for improved information sharing, coordination, and reporting could be explored that could lead to stronger increased opportunities for joint learning and reflection beneficial for the CCCM approach and decision-making processes. Examples could be:

- Regular meetings of the three agencies to provide quick updates on their results and responsibilities and share lessons learnt;
- Brief monthly reports to share with the team;
- Agreed procedures on donor communication;
- TOR specific to the project that outlines procedures as to how the partners will work together; and
- Sharing or having combined work plans.

---

<sup>21</sup> Report due 30 April and submitted on 5 May.

<sup>22</sup> General Conditions Applicable to Humanitarian Aid Actions Financed by the EU under an IMDA.

## 2.2.2. Direct implementation

IOM was responsible for the delivery of some activities under Result 1, a significant portion of Result 2 (together with UNHCR) and all of Result 4. As IOM was the grant manager during Phase II, the evaluation also analysed how effective IOM was in contributing to the achievement of the other components implemented jointly with its partners. Each result will be analysed separately, referring either to the direct implementation or to IOM’s contribution.

### 2.2.2.1. Result 1 – Roster capacity to field operations

Under Result 1, the project proposal stated “Roster administration, use and sustainability are maximised to enhance *ability to respond to large-scale emergencies and enable rapid and expert emergency support to field operations.*” This result, accounting for 60% of the total project budget and was primarily implemented by NRC (accounting for 87% of the Result 1 budget) with support from UNHCR and IOM. Activities were distributed as follows:

Activity	Agency responsible	Status of IOM support
1.1 Maintain / administrate CCCM Cap	NRC	IOM Country Offices may benefit from these deployments; IOM had two RRT members under ECHO <sup>23</sup> based in Geneva. All deployments for IOM should technically be approved by the Global Cluster Co-lead at IOM.
1.2 Maintain Rapid Response Team (RRT) standing capacity	NRC	
1.3 Review RRT activities from 2013 to develop lessons learned	NRC	
1.4 Develop and adopt staff assessment methodology	NRC	
1.5 Foster cross-cluster skills transfer	NRC	
1.6 Capacity building and mentoring of CCCM experts	NRC, IOM, UNHCR	This is on-going and capacity building and mentoring activities continue to take place with all three agencies.
1.7 Self-funding and cost-recovery from Country Offices	IOM, UNHCR	Under the responsibility of the field office
1.8 Monitor and evaluate the impact of CCCM capacity building projects to national authorities and partners	IOM, UNHCR	Nearly completed as a consultant has submitted a draft evaluation report.

This result allowed the CCCM Cluster to send experts to Country Offices requiring cluster support that did not have the technical knowledge or financial means to hire support. This was consistently commended as a valuable support and an added-value of the CCCM Cluster to emergency and preparedness operations worldwide. Based on interviews and documentation review, the result was being implemented, with significant NRC deployments. In addition NRC had been able to secure funding to support the surge capacity, reducing the dependency on ECHO funding; by the interim reporting stage, NRC had spent 36% more than the allocated budget from ECHO showing positive contributions from other donors and reimbursement of costs from Country Offices. Cost recovery was ongoing and being encouraged and, according to interim report findings, had been achieved for 12% of the

<sup>23</sup> Currently, there are no more RRTs at IOM under the ECHO project; the rapid response team members now are all under IOM contracts.

deployments<sup>24</sup>. The impact evaluation on capacity building previously mentioned was funded through Result 1 and was nearing completion at the time of the evaluation.

During the focus group discussions, most of the IOM Country Offices who received surge capacity through the NRC administered CCCM roster or the Rapid Response Team (RRT) members were satisfied with the support<sup>25</sup>. According to the interim report, surge capacity was provided within 72 hours in 80% of the newly activated clusters.<sup>26</sup> In the remaining 20% however, the deployment of CCCM roster staff (CCCMCAP) took longer due to the processes required: identification of staff, terms of reference, visa requirements and other logistical arrangements that could be lengthier depending on the country. When compared to other internal staff that can support IOM CCCM deployments, RRTs were able to be deployed quicker as they were based in Geneva, and DOE had the authority to decide where and when.

One key activity implemented by NRC under this result involved a feedback mechanism after deployment. This evaluation did not, however, include an analysis of the NRC CCCMCAP assessment system based on their Norwegian Capacity (NORCAP) experience. While staff deployed formally by NRC as part of the CCCMCAP went through a formal end of mission reporting and debriefing, this did not apply to RRTs. The RRTs however did provide informal updates upon return to IOM Headquarters usually through “brown bag lunches”. IOM also did not receive on a systematic basis the end-of-mission reports from staff deployed by NRC to IOM Country Offices which would also have been beneficial. Capturing the opportunities, challenges and learning from each deployment in a more systematic manner remains a key recommendation for IOM.

Further discussions emerged on the issue of deployments which included the distinction between a *cluster* and *sector* response; currently surge capacity efforts were provided to a wide range of emergencies from refugee to IDP situations. Some interviewees argued that as the CCCM is a cluster for internal displacement only, support to IDP operations should be prioritised as funding is already limited,<sup>27</sup> whereas others highlighted that there is a responsibility of CCCM as a *sector* to provide the guidance and technical support as required to displacement settings regardless of the legal status of the caseload and irrespective of whether it is in an internal displacement setting or a refugee context. Whilst in the Phase I final report, there were references to support provided to refugee crises, in neither of the phases’ proposals were refugee operations listed specifically. In Phase II, the only reference to refugee operations remained relatively vague and was mentioned only once “*Whereas the CCCM Cluster’s mandate as established by the IASC, is for internally displaced people, the cluster acknowledges that operational realities mean in its work it can be confronted by affected populations who are mixed (including refugees).*” Since the CCCM Cluster was already considered one of the least funded clusters,<sup>28</sup> there was concern that spreading its technical support beyond internal displacement could be detrimental to its success and function.

Deployments were based on requests that come from the field and ideally should have been based on criteria that maximised resources for use of funded deployments that were considered priority. This was done in most cases,

---

<sup>24</sup> Likely to rise in the final report given funding allocated to NRC for specific crises.

<sup>25</sup> This analysis refers only to IOM supported countries and not to the surge capacity for UNHCR or other cluster members. Analysis on the implementation of Result 1 is limited given that it has been mostly implemented by NRC and not included in the evaluation scope.

<sup>26</sup> This information was only based on the 5 activated clusters and not all the deployments that may be undertaken.

<sup>27</sup> The global source of information on funding the Financial Tracking Services (FTS) cannot provide a breakdown of funding requested by cluster and received globally, which makes it difficult to provide proof of this; however this was stated regularly in interviews.

<sup>28</sup> Based on interviews with various CCCM staff.

but primarily on an ad hoc basis; interviewees noted that it would be beneficial to better define specific criteria to prioritise support as needed. Criteria could include, amongst others, the type of displacement, the level of emergency or preparedness and the funding status of the requesting office.

Given that the CCCMCAP has been ongoing for three years, IOM staff was acquainted with the system and NRC staff and might have, in some cases, directed requests to NRC without consulting HQ CCCM focal point for deployments. This happened in a limited number of cases; IOM should circulate the existing Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) that exist for Standby Partner deployments that stipulate the process.

The table below highlights the number of deployments undertaken during this project period, from ECHO or other funding to support Result 1 as well as those specific to IOM Country Offices. In addition, based on the information collated by the impact evaluation on capacity building, the evaluator was able to surmise that more than half of the staff deployed were trained in CCCM and 61% of those who were deployed for IOM field locations. A total of 16 countries were supported.<sup>29</sup>

By project/IOM	Number of deployments	Number of experts covering the deployments	Number of countries supported	Number trained in CCCM <sup>30</sup>
Reported under ECHO	78	58	16	31
Specific to IOM	25	18	7 <sup>31</sup>	11

Under Phase II, there were two RRT members within the IOM CCCM Geneva team supported through the ECHO budget.<sup>32</sup> According to focus group discussions with IOM field staff, the RRTs deployed by IOM were considered high calibre staff who immediately provided support to the field due to their vast experience in responding to emergencies. In general, IOM (or UNHCR) RRTs were only deployed to their own respective agency operations as CCCM RRTs; however, particularly in cases of co-leaderships at the field level, the RRT would inevitably liaise with the co-lead. There are varying opinions as to whether the CCCM RRTs should only be deployed within their “own” agency, all the while supporting cluster activities. Exchanges between IOM and UNHCR were tested previously in other projects, but were found not to be successful.

#### Key Finding

Deployments under CCCMCAP were beneficial and highly welcomed by Country Offices who have benefited from them; however, the CCCM may benefit from Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) that can ensure that decisions are based on agreed processes and selection criteria for maximum benefit.

#### Recommendations

The existing SOPs could be recirculated to ensure that agreed processes are followed.

<sup>29</sup> This does not cover the whole period of implementation, up to August 2015. Total number of deployments will be available in the final report to ECHO.

<sup>30</sup> A brief comparison was made from the master list of trainers and participants over the last 10 years in either training of trainers or training courses in the framework of the Impact evaluation and the list of CCCM deployments under the ECHO project.

<sup>31</sup> Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti, Iraq, South Sudan, USA and Yemen.

<sup>32</sup> They are no longer covered under the ECHO funding but still maintain their responsibilities as RRTs.

Criteria should be developed for CCCM-related deployments by partner agencies to help identify priorities for requests.

The debrief mechanism for IOM RRT staff and CCCMCAP staff deployed to IOM Country Offices should be formalised in order to capture opportunities for improvements and lessons learnt.

### 2.2.2.2. Result 2: Inter-cluster and inter-sector coordination

Result 2 states “Inter-cluster and inter-sector coordination is refined to better link strategic and operational levels of coordination, in collaboration with OCHA, other clusters and sectors, and through engagement with existing and new partners.” All activities were implemented by both IOM and UNHCR either directly or through a secondment. A brief overview of the activities are below.

Activity	Agency responsible	Status of IOM support
2.1 Expand applications, accessibility, and promotion of Global CCCM Website and associated information management tools	IOM, UNHCR	Review of the website was done in part by the Impact Evaluation and hence not reviewed in great detail here <sup>33</sup> .
2.2 Standardise OCHA/CCCM roles related to inter-cluster and inter-sector coordination	IOM, UNHCR	This was completed.
2.3 Produce and disseminate a document on "Camp management, CCCM operational structures outside camps and inter-cluster coordination" as well as coordination matrixes	IOM, UNHCR	This was completed.
2.4 Develop new and/or adapt existing tools and methodologies to ensure they can be used to serve partners working in sites and on CCCM or CCCM related issues	IOM, UNHCR	This was ongoing through the development of other tools and the finalization of the CM toolkit.
2.5 Assess benefits and disadvantages of the current cluster co-leadership structure	IOM, UNHCR (outsourced)	Assessment was on-going.
2.6 Develop and implement Global CCCM Communications Strategy	IOM, UNHCR	The strategy was developed and used by the communications focal point (at UNHCR) but had not been formally endorsed. It would need to be reviewed as it was not based on the current CCCM strategy. <sup>34</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Please see Annex F of the Impact Evaluation with a full list of recommendations which included, amongst others, ensuring that the site is easily readable in mobile view as that would be the most beneficial in the field.

<sup>34</sup> The Strategy has a concise table to show how the communications strategy aligns with the CCCM strategy; however another version of the strategy was used. For instance, in the 2013-2016 CCCM strategy, outcome 1 is “CCCM Cluster preparedness and response capacity is strengthened and consistently delivers quality programming”; however in the Communications Strategy is reads “Strategic Objective: Improve field response in camps and camp-like settings by: maintaining the surge mechanism and Rapid Response Mechanism (1); updating and creating new practice (2); monitoring and evaluating (3); engaging with partners (4).”

2.7 Collaborate with partners for research and to feed into policy-level analysis	IOM, UNHCR	Was progressing as per the interim report.
2.8 Increase the number of active partnerships	IOM, UNHCR	It has not been possible within this evaluation to quantify the increase in number of active partnerships.

One of the newest elements of this action, which did not feature in Phase I, was the mechanisms to strengthen and formalize the relationship with OCHA. CCCM identified the need to improve links with inter-cluster coordination and thereby with OCHA as it acknowledged *“the lack of more formal relations between CCCM and OCHA inter-cluster coordination is an impediment to the implementation of system-wide approaches (...).”*<sup>35</sup> This effort strengthened the cooperation with OCHA and the Cluster; it was also the first time that a cluster had a staff member seconded to OCHA. The process was seen by the CCCM and OCHA as a successful way to formally analyse similarities and differences between their respective coordination mechanisms.

As this was a new activity, the CCCM Cluster and OCHA tried to identify how their functions and responsibilities coincided and could be formalized in the field; this required a non-prescriptive approach where the NRC-seconded consultant who had extensive CCCM experience was to define the process upon taking up her duties. The Terms of Reference (TOR) were jointly produced by IOM, OCHA and UNHCR; several coordination meetings were held to develop these TORs. All four agencies, IOM, NRC, OCHA and UNCHR, had to overcome many administrative obstacles in order to have a secondee based in the building of the United Nations Office in Geneva where the OCHA office is located. Initially the intention was to have the consultant seconded directly from NRC to OCHA; however OCHA in Geneva cannot receive secondments from NGOs. It was equally important that the consultant be neutral, representing the Cluster and not a specific agency; finally the consultant had to be seconded from NRC to IOM and then to OCHA. The partners were able to successfully come together, showing their commitment to strengthening and formalizing the coordination.

Once in place, the consultant was able to determine how best to define the coordination structure, and to this end, guidelines were developed based on the five elements<sup>36</sup> of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle. Furthermore, other key areas related to CCCM were also included similar to the CCCM training modules (such as: information management, coordination, the camp cycle and accountability). The role of CCCM cluster coordination, inter-cluster coordination and camp management was defined in relation to each thematic area.<sup>37</sup>

The drafting process was based on discussions and documentation review, three rounds of comments at the global level and an initial round of comments at field level. Furthermore, the matrix was presented and discussed during a panel discussion at the October 2015 retreat. The current document included a level of detail beneficial for initiating practical discussions, and strategic developments between the CCCM cluster and OCHA functions in inter-cluster coordination. It will require further work to simplify components that are relevant for practical interaction between CCCM and inter-cluster coordination teams in the field.<sup>38</sup> Potentially, as a start, the matrix could be sent to field offices facing possible challenges between OCHA and CCCM coordination, to determine if it would be useful

<sup>35</sup> Phase II proposal.

<sup>36</sup> Needs assessment and analysis, strategic response planning, resource mobilization, implementation and monitoring and operational review and evaluation.

<sup>37</sup> One key element missing from the matrix is out of camps which was supposed to have been included in the document according to Activity 2.3 within the proposal. According to one interviewee this was not discussed from the beginning perhaps as the out of camp approach is still relatively new for CCCM.

<sup>38</sup> Based on interviews and discussions at the CCCM annual retreat

or how it could be adapted to suit their context. The overall purpose of the secondment and matrix was to improve inter-cluster and inter-sector coordination and a tangible use of the matrix would maximize its value at the field level.

OCHA expressed satisfaction with the process as it served to identify some gaps such as in monitoring. It was reported that the product will be used as OCHA develops an inter-cluster handbook for its staff. Another positive outcome of this effort is that it strengthened the relationship between OCHA and the CCCM at the global level. It was further noted that this was the first time that a cluster expert had ever been seconded to OCHA. The relationship was seen as very positive and successful by the parties involved, which may help to strengthen these types of activities in the future.

Other elements of Result 2 involved increased partnerships, including at cluster level. Within the project, there was no documentation to support how the project intended to increase partnerships. Similarly, it was not clear what the strategy for building CCCM membership was. That said, due to the nature of its work, the engagement of partners is primarily at the local level: camp managers, camp authorities or camp coordinators, making it difficult to quantify these members at the global level. Currently global membership was being quantified based on annual CCCM retreats;<sup>39</sup> although IOM global CCCM staff agreed that this did not provide an accurate picture as it did not take into account the local level partners, partner academic institutions or private companies (such as Deloitte or Oxford Brookes) or others (such as Civil Protection agencies or DTM-related partners) that are relevant for the Cluster. There were potentially two levels of partnership to consider: one that provided the technical support to strengthen the Cluster; and a second which implemented CCCM efforts at the local level.

At the local level, the involvement of global partners (such as international NGOs) in direct camp management had decreased; camp managers were more and more represented by civil society, faith-based organizations or national authorities. Given the shift in the type of camp management stakeholder, the challenge was for the Cluster to reflect the priorities of these new camp managers and also to identify opportunities to engage these stakeholders so they can benefit from global support or guidance. The Cluster was well aware of these challenges and was identifying ways to overcome them, adapting to this change in context. The 2015 CCCM retreat theme “Localising CCCM Responses: Promoting local and national CCCM action” was aimed at discussing more local response and camp management. During this retreat, a hotel manager in Nepal who managed a camp was invited to speak as were the national authorities from the Philippines who had been involved in the response to Haiyan.

It is important to highlight the discussion which ensued concerning the Strategic Advisory Group (SAG). Interviewees’ opinions about the purpose of the SAG varied with some equating the relationship between NRC and the two co-leads as a SAG in itself. However, prior to the CCCM 2015 Retreat, a written request was made by the Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED), the Danish Refugee Council and NRC to review the current governance structure of the cluster; during the discussion at the retreat, a SAG was discussed as an option for the structure that may facilitate the ability to increase membership and improve inter-cluster coordination and engagement with existing and new partners<sup>40</sup>.

---

<sup>39</sup> There have been fluctuations in the number of members/attendees since 2011. In 2011, there were six partners and in 2012, this membership jumped to 25; however, attendance subsequently decreased to 14 in 2013 and 20 in 2014; there were 19 partners in attendance in 2015.

<sup>40</sup> The Cluster has confirmed that it will be putting in place a SAG in 2016 as a result of a Global CCCM Cluster Governance Meeting on 7 December 2015.

### Key Findings

The combined efforts to strengthen coordination by CCCM and OCHA were praised for being an innovative approach as no other cluster had ever seconded cluster staff to OCHA. The partners were able to successfully come together, showing their commitment to strengthening and formalizing the coordination.

The camp management stakeholders have changed from representing international NGOs to being more locally based such as civil society, faith-based organizations or national authorities. This has created a challenge for the global cluster to provide support and guidance to this new membership base that may never have the opportunity to engage in global efforts (or retreats).

### Recommendations

The CCCM cluster should work towards determining how best to use the OCHA-CCCM matrix for the global and field-based operations. Different methods for this could be:

- Identifying Country Offices where there are potential coordination challenges with OCHA to determine how the matrix can be used; and
- Requesting Country Offices to pilot or review the matrix with their OCHA counterparts and provide feedback on how they could adapt it.

There could be a document outlining the CCCM approach for engaging existing and new partners. The agreement to have a SAG for CCCM may also strengthen governance, coordination and the inclusion of different partners.

### 2.2.2.3. Result 3: Response to Urban Displacement and Out of Camps

The result “Response to urban displacement and IDPs outside camps is improved” is fully under UNHCR’s responsibility, though NRC had also been part of the implementation of the component. In line with the ToRs, the analysis is based primarily on how IOM has been involved as grant manager and as the CCCM global co-lead. Under this result, the following activities were defined:

Activity	Agency responsible <sup>41</sup>
3.1 Increase consultation and coordination with relevant stakeholders to advocate for a better response to outside camps displacement needs through advocacy events	UNHCR
3.2 Pilot outside camp approaches, including Centers for Communication and Community Management and Displacement Management Focal Points	UNHCR
3.3 Engage in a multi stakeholder working group to develop a training with CCCM practitioners on outside camp displacement	UNHCR

The Urban Displacement and Out of Camps (UDOC) methodology was being piloted with support from NRC in three different displacement settings, Gaza, Lebanon and Myanmar. The UDOC methodology was borne out of Phase I which involved a desk review leading to several key recommendations, one of which was to pilot the suggested

<sup>41</sup> The status of these activities are not being analysed.

model of the *centre for communication and community management*. In addition, other recommendations included building and strengthening partnerships with OCHA and other clusters' in out of camp contexts<sup>42</sup>.

Within the Result 3, after several attempts to hold pilots in other countries such as the Philippines, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and South Sudan, various conditions and operational priorities in those countries were not conducive to carry out the pilot mission<sup>43</sup>. Finally, Myanmar, Gaza and Lebanon were selected and these were all NRC-related operations. Besides Myanmar where the pilot was taking place in an internal displacement context, the two other selected displacement settings of Gaza and Lebanon were refugee situations. According to several interviewees, it was suggested that it would have been better to select three internal displacement settings that were more in line with the CCCM mandate. One interviewee commented that it may have been useful to have all three agencies engage in strategic planning for this result earlier in the process. There were many factors that influenced the final outcome but NRC field operations were finally selected for the pilot. With such decisions, IOM (or UNHCR) may not fully take advantage of the learning or participate in a decision-making process beneficial to the cluster for which they co-lead. Furthermore, NRC functions differ significantly from IOM and UNHCR ones; consequently, lessons learned by NRC may not necessarily be transferrable to IOM and UNHCR operations or other CCCM operations.

During Phase I, IOM contributed to the development of the UDOC document. Although IOM's formal role in the current pilot was limited (within the three selected countries), IOM continued working with the Displacement Focal Points in the Philippines which was also cited as an example of an out of camp methodology within the UDOC document. Some interviewees highlighted that Result 3 could have provided an opportunity to compare various methodologies and also address other recommendations ensuing from Phase I, particularly with regard to strengthening the coordination with the other clusters and actors that may contribute to the support of IDPs outside camps. As the grant holder, IOM could have guided this reflection and suggested more inter-cluster coordination under Result 3. One suggestion provided by a global CCCM team member was for the cluster to help strengthen the coordination between clusters and OCHA for out-of-camp displacement at the global level. It should be noted that under Result 2, reviewing the coordination of displacement outside camps was to be included in the CCCM-OCHA matrix; however this was not done though it could have been an opportunity to support the UDOC recommendation mentioned above.

IOM invited the consultant in June 2014 to present the UDOC findings during an internal IOM CCCM retreat. This was considered positive by several of the interviewees, since field staff from IOM Country Offices were in attendance and able to reflect on the methodology.

#### **Recommendations**

Lessons learnt from both IOM and NRC pilots could be compiled and discussed within the cluster to help define out-of-camp strategies.

---

<sup>42</sup> CCCM "Urban Displacement and Out of Camp Review- Provisional release for field testing".

<sup>43</sup> Other countries were also considered such as South Sudan; however the evaluator focused on these two countries given the specific opportunity they presented for IOM and the Cluster.

#### 2.2.2.4. Result 4: Engaging with national authorities

The result “Engaging with national authorities and actors to build better response capacity” was fully implemented by IOM as an extension of Phase I, with the development of the Mass Evacuation in Natural Disasters (MEND) Guide. Under this result, the following activities were identified and are progressing.

Activity	Agency responsible	Status of IOM support
4.1 Pilot the MEND Guide	IOM	The Guide is nearly finalized.
4.2 Conduct disaster response simulation exercises for national actors and Cluster partners	IOM	Two simulation exercises conducted in Bangladesh and the Philippines.
4.3 Hold consultative workshops with national authorities and Cluster partners	IOM	One held in Nepal; another will be held in the Americas <sup>44</sup> A workshop was also held with European Union Civil Protection representing 21 countries on CCCM and convergence with civil protection.
4.4 Conduct joint deployments of national authorities/partners and CCCM experts	IOM	3 deployments (Cabo Verde, Nepal and Ecuador).

IOM had made adjustments to the MEND Guide and determined how it could be used by different operations; in addition, under this project, IOM engaged with national authorities and facilitated the deployment of trained national authorities to conduct training or help with natural disaster response.

The MEND Guide was adapted following feedback received, which highlighted that the Guide was too lengthy and did not always provide the right information for practical use in the field.<sup>45</sup> The MEND had a Steering Committee which included 15 members;<sup>46</sup> the CCCM team had tried to identify countries that are prone to natural disasters and representative of different geographical regions. Despite multiple efforts, presently the Steering Committee does not have an African-based member; however CCCM had actively tried to engage with different African civil protection agencies to join the Committee<sup>47</sup>. The Steering Committee was responsible for reviewing the MEND guide and annexes; regular teleconferences were held every six weeks. At the time of the evaluation, the minutes of the meetings were not shared with the larger CCCM team yet could have contributed to improving information sharing. The Steering Committee, under Phase I, was responsible for writing part of the MEND guide. In Phase II, the MEND was piloted through simulations and workshops and adapted based on these exercises. All modifications of the MEND then pass through the Steering Committee for their approval and final endorsement.

<sup>44</sup> Following the completion of the evaluation, this workshop was not held but conducted via teleconference and the workshop planned for February 2016.

<sup>45</sup> Inputs from interviews.

<sup>46</sup> Chile, Cuba, Cyprus, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Malta, Nepal, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States, Vanuatu.

<sup>47</sup> The objective of the MEND guide and its Steering Committee was to compile lessons learnt from civil protection agencies that can be used in locations where assistance is required. Finding focal points for all regions was difficult as each country had its own procedures making it challenging at times to identify a specific person who can collaborate on this initiative.

IOM conducted two simulation exercises in Bangladesh and the Philippines; one was also planned in Nepal, however, due to the earthquake, the activity was adjusted to two consultative workshops instead. According to the interviews, the translation of technical terms related to evacuations was challenging, as the experience in Bangladesh showed. In the Philippines, the exercise was conducted in English and therefore did not require translation of the technical terms.<sup>48</sup> In Nepal, two one-day workshops were conducted to discuss lessons learnt from the April and May 2015 earthquakes and aftershocks.

Under Phase I, the Steering Committee defined the scope of the MEND to be focused on natural disasters and, as IOM was responsible for natural disasters in the CCCM, it was responsible for the Guide. UNHCR did provide feedback on the initial drafts and was also a member of the Steering Committee showing that this remains a CCCM cluster product.<sup>49</sup> Under Phase II, it was noted by different interviewees that not all partners or team members knew the status of Result 4 or felt that this product remained an IOM initiative versus a CCCM one. Overall, matching civil protection professional interventions with CCCM expertise has proven to be arduous at times, given the varying backgrounds and the perceptions of humanitarian structures versus government led civil protection initiatives; however, CP had been identified as key in the integration of humanitarian assistance within national structures and was also discussed during the World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016. It was noted by some interviewees that depending on the perspective by which mass evacuations are approached, the MEND work may be seen as separate from that of CCCM and it would be beneficial to revisit the approach to identify the commonality of the approaches related to mass evacuation and CCCM to then build upon those. Furthermore, the CCCM can help to coordinate efforts between partners involved in evacuations to better manage displacements.

The identification of CP experts was challenging and it was evident from the start that seconded staff would not be available for the entire project duration. IOM first received support from the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB) for the project set-up who later was replaced by a former UN Disaster Assessment and Coordination (UNDAC) staff. Inevitably, some of the approaches differed, and the initial training approach gradually changed and was subsequently more adapted to each specific context.

These efforts related to mass evacuation have led to further interest in working with CCCM from other stakeholders. IOM was also approached by EU Civil protection (CP) agencies through ECHO to provide training on CCCM and to explore ways for a possible convergence between the CP efforts that are deployed during a disaster and the work of CCCM<sup>50</sup>. Twenty-one countries were represented in November 2015 during the training conducted in Austria. This was a positive move forward to expand potential partnerships, by including Camp Managers who were involved in the current migrant crisis in Europe and also to highlight the importance of preparedness by working with these types of agencies.

Overall, the development of the MEND was a positive approach as it has built partnerships with civil protection agencies in over 15 countries and developed innovative partnerships important for natural disaster management. Furthermore, the approach strongly contributed to building national capacities besides addressing preparedness. There are clear links between the CCCM approach and the search and rescue operations that CP agencies are

---

<sup>48</sup> Evaluator was given the Philippines training report along with the analysis from participants; the report for Bangladesh had not been completed yet.

<sup>49</sup> The MEND is also referenced in the UNHCR, NRC and the Nansen Initiative report called "Planned relocation, disasters and climate change: consolidating good practices and preparing for the future" which uses the MEND and CCCM definition for evacuation.

<sup>50</sup> The deployments for this activity were not funded through the ECHO project.

involved with in international natural disaster situations. Their experiences should continue be harnessed and their participation in the CCCM should be further strengthened.

#### **Key Finding**

The MEND approach remained focused on natural disasters; it brought together different CCCM and civil protection expertise. Its challenge was to gather lessons learnt and identify commonality as well as the differences. IOM and the CCCM cluster should continue to coordinate between actors involved in evacuations to better manage displacement.

### **2.2.3. Management through Headquarters**

To implement projects smoothly out of Headquarters, structural adjustments were required. DOE, through other funding sources, hired a resource management staff to assist with financial tracking and also identified a focal point within DOE to assist with the human resources angle. At the time of the evaluation, these new systems were in place and working well.

Following discussion and analysis, there remains little doubt that this global cluster project should be housed and managed from Headquarters, given that most the Global Clusters are based in Geneva. Furthermore, humanitarian architecture is shaped in Geneva, making it essential for IOM to have staff available to participate in discussions, to strategize and ensure that IOM and CCCM are part of the ongoing dialogue.

Discussions had taken place to move some of the RRT staff members to Regional Offices (ROs). A previous attempt had been done with a Shelter Rapid Response Officer but the experience was not considered successful, given that the staff member in question was supervised by a Chief of Mission rather than by DOE, thereby limiting the ability for rapid deployment as the staff member was also engaged in other activities in the country office. Overall, the value of the RRT's support to the Cluster and the Organization, as a whole, far outweighed the financial cost of having the RRTs based in Geneva.

#### ***Programmatic and Administrative management with Partners***

The process of review and implementation and the partnership with IOM Brussels under this project also differed from other country-level projects funded by ECHO. On the programmatic level, given that the Preparedness and Response Division (PRD) managing the implementation was usually in charge of endorsing projects, there was a certain degree of leeway given by RO Brussels as they considered the global CCCM team was best placed to negotiate directly with ECHO. RO Brussels had been kept in copy in the communication and was pleased with the process.

On the financial side, one interim report was required as per the agreement with ECHO and it was submitted. During the time of submission, both partners submitted their respective financial reports to be duly consolidated by IOM's DOE using the ECHO format and shared with RO Brussels. Internal procedures of this cluster-level Headquarter-based project were similar to those followed in Country Offices which can be more burdensome in Headquarters, given that Divisions are more involved in global support than project-level support and do not necessarily have the resources to implement these type of procedures. Given the nature of these global cluster grants or grants managed at Headquarters, the internal review procedures could be improved as they were initially intended for country-level implementation. Following discussions with relevant staff, IOM's share of funds, representing 18% of the budget, was spent according to the work plan.

There were delays in signing the partnership agreement between IOM and UNHCR as the latter needed further clarification before agreeing on some key clauses. Following this process, a decision was made between the legal offices at UNHCR and IOM to develop a common template that can be used when entering into future agreements together.<sup>51</sup> The agreement with NRC was signed in October 2013 and the one with UNHCR was signed in February 2014.

As a multi-donor project, each partner has to identify co-funding in support of the project. The overall budget is €3 million (80% from ECHO and 20% as co-funding); however at the end of the negotiation process and due to financial constraints, ECHO only covered 73% of the budget, which meant that each agency was requested to increase their co-funding contribution to meet the figure of 27% proportionately to the amount that each agency received. There were disagreements with ECHO’s decision to reduce its contribution, subsequently requiring each agency to increase respective amounts; finally, IOM as grant holder decided to increase its contribution to 35% instead of the required 27%. IOM made efforts to absorb part of the increased cost-sharing, which should have been covered by UNHCR. See the table below with the breakdown per agency<sup>52</sup>.

	Total	NRC	UNHCR	IOM
<b>Total funding</b>	3,000,000	1,680,000	715,000	605,000
<b>ECHO</b>	2,200,000	1,232,000	572,000	396,000
<b>Other sources of funding by agency</b>	800,000	448,000	143,000	209,000
<b>% of co-funding</b>	27%	27%	20%	35%

NRC received additional funds for its surge capacity response and UNHCR used its own agency-funding, while IOM acquired co-funding support from other funded IOM CCCM-related projects. There were strong links between the three projects, which contributed to strengthening the mainstreaming of gender-based violence (GBV) into CCCM capacity building.

The project benefited from additional funding support through the identification of a total co-funding of 27%, which was not initially planned, and this can be considered a rewarding contribution and benefit. In addition, only a small percentage of ECHO’s funding was used for Staff and Office costs (16% for staffing across all three agencies and 0% for office) ensuring that the vast majority was used to implement the four sought after results.

**Key finding**

Although there were some challenges to financially and administratively manage the project from Headquarters, IOM addressed most of these shortcomings effectively, confirming that a global support project can also benefit from a centralized management from Headquarters.

**2.2.4. Mainstreaming gender and protection**

The CCCM’s mission statement was to “provide equitable access to services and protection for displaced persons living in communal settings”. Protection was seen as a major element of the CCCM Cluster and mainstreaming

<sup>51</sup> Representatives of both legal teams will begin to work on this in 2016.

<sup>52</sup> Based on the interim report.

protection is part of the ECHO project's overall objective. Likewise, the CCCM Cluster continued to strengthen its approach toward gender and GBV. Subsequently, in 2015 and into 2016, the IOM CCCM team was also working on the implementation of three other projects, all with strong components on GBV mainstreaming. The Cluster's efforts and work in protection and gender were also visible in other projects and activities, which are however beyond the scope of the project.<sup>53</sup>

More concretely, through the deployment of staff to support CCCM operations worldwide, the project contributed to the protection of displaced communities. Deployments ranged from CCCM Coordinators to camp managers, site planners or combined cluster coordinators for CCCM, shelter and non-food items; roles which all contributed to protection of affected displaced populations. Specifically in the project, staff secondments also supported the Cluster's efforts in mainstreaming gender. For example, the team was able to combine the expertise and knowledge of other projects dedicated to gender and GBV with efforts undertaken through this project. One such example was that staff members were deployed simultaneously from the ECHO project and the gender-related project: one deployment provided the expertise on GBV and child protection in Nepal to set up relevant structures and a CCCM deployment through Result 1 helped to maintain it. The deployments through ECHO were necessary to follow up on or implement what was developed in other projects. Furthermore, within IOM, some of the RRTs were also involved in Areas of Responsibilities specific to GBV and child protection as members of steering committees or task teams.

In addition, the manuals and tools developed to support the Cluster and programming also included mainstreaming of protection and gender. The Cluster developed Protection Tips within the Camp Management Toolkit (updated in 2015) and protection was also addressed in the MEND Guide and annexes. Likewise, gender was included in the CCCM training modules and has been a recurring theme in the CCCM retreats since 2011. In examining gender mainstreaming within the new annexes of the MEND,<sup>54</sup> in Annex 1.3 - Evacuation Planning and Early Warning Systems, there was only one reference that stated that there was a need to consider gender in community vulnerability without providing some examples of *how* this could be done. Within the Shelter Evacuation Annex, there was no reference to gender, yet protection issues were mentioned. It is recommended that additional information be made available in addition to more practical examples of how this can be accomplished to strengthen the gender element in the MEND documentation.<sup>55</sup> Within the CCCM-OCHA Matrix "Who does what in Humanitarian Coordination" both protection and gender were covered in specific topics but it also cut across the different responsibilities within the Humanitarian Programme Cycle and other key areas.

**Key Finding**

Both protection and gender were key thematic areas and cross-cutting themes within the CCCM Cluster that were addressed within the ECHO project through the deployments and the materials developed. In addition, IOM's gender-related projects, which were being implemented at the same time, helped to reinforce initiatives that were directly linked to the ECHO project.

---

<sup>53</sup> In addition, the document entitled "Evaluation of the IOM Project: Promoting the Reduction of and Improving the Operational Response to Gender-Based Violence through the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) and Camp Management" may also provide more in-depth recommendations which could be useful.

<sup>54</sup> Gender was not analyzed within the products developed by UNHCR or NRC.

<sup>55</sup> Further analysis on gender was not conducted.

## 2.3. Achievements

Through the project, the CCCM Cluster was expected to provide surge capacity to CCCM operations worldwide and improve the coordination and management through strengthened partnerships, developing and piloting new approaches and products. The improvements made by the Cluster through the ECHO contribution (phases I and II), particularly in the development of tools, guidance and surge capacity,<sup>56</sup> were noticeable. Team members worked hard to maintain good working relations and technical exchanges in correcting any potential delays or coordination gaps and ensuring that results would be met in time.

The surge capacity (Result 1) was viewed as positive by all interviewees. The project was able to support over 78 deployments to 16 countries<sup>57</sup> and support countries that otherwise may not have had the means or expertise to maintain the cluster or manage displacement. The involvement of the NRC was seen by interviewees as a significant reason for the success of this support, given their vast experience and ability to deploy experts within CCCM operations.

Significant efforts have been made to develop technical support and guidance to help country efforts, which cut across both phases of the ECHO project. This was reflected in the question asked in the same survey: *“How well does the Global CCCM Cluster provide support to field operations (tools, guidance and capacity building)”*. On average, respondents reported that the Cluster carried out this function well. IOM field staff interviewed were generally positive about the guidance received from the Global CCCM team, notably the surge capacity as well as the tools and one-on-one support provided. One area of potential improvement highlighted was to have more formalized communication between IOM’s Global Cluster team and the field operations as this was perceived as somewhat ad hoc rather than conducted through a systematized approach. At the global level, interviewed team members also acknowledged that it was not always easy to see the effects of the guidance on the ground and this could be improved through more systematic communications with the field.

The documentation and tools created under both phases of the ECHO project were relevant; the ECHO baseline survey showed that field operations used them. The percentages on the use of the UDOC and MEND Guide were low, 20% and less than 10% respectively. Given that the Guide was new and implemented as a pilot, and each one applied to specific contexts, these figures are not surprising.<sup>58</sup>

The extent to which the project improved the management and coordination of the CCCM Cluster is harder to ascertain as there were many other factors that can affect the functioning of the Cluster. Based on the findings from the survey conducted under the co-leadership assessment, when asked if participants were *“satisfied with the functioning at the Global level of the CCCM cluster”*, 47% (17 out of 36) reported being *“somewhat”* or *“very dissatisfied”*, while 36% (13 out of 36) reported being *“somewhat”* or *“very satisfied”*. Those who had experience with the Cluster prior to the start of the ECHO-funded project highlighted that despite the current challenges, the Cluster was functioning better than it did before the ECHO project.<sup>59</sup> Part of the challenge of assessing the achievements related to the management and coordination of the Cluster was also related to shifting environments, for example, the increase in local partners on the ground (civil society or national authorities) for roles that were

---

<sup>56</sup> The Impact evaluation on capacity building will speak more to this as it was beyond the scope of this evaluation.

<sup>57</sup> Figure based on the interim report.

<sup>58</sup> At the time of the evaluation, a 2<sup>nd</sup> survey had not yet been implemented but evaluator was informed that this would be done.

<sup>59</sup> Interviews.

initially held by international NGOs. This required the Cluster to adjust the way in which it supported and coordinated with localized partners. Furthermore, the Cluster had increased its efforts to reach out and work with other partners such as civil protection institutions and experts which also required an adjustment for the Cluster to help coordinate the partners to manage displacement.

Overall, the four results were being accomplished by the project at the time of the evaluation, and contributed to some aspects of the management of the Cluster. The evaluations undertaken under this project namely, the co-leadership assessment and the impact evaluation on capacity building were positive indications that the Cluster was keen to address potential weaknesses and continue to improve the Cluster. Furthermore, the decision taken by the Cluster at the end of 2015 to include a SAG and develop a governance structure was another positive effort to strengthen the Cluster.

### *Sustainability of action*

The efforts to have Country Offices reimburse surge capacity through cost-recovery mechanisms was seen as a tangible step towards sustainability. However it will, of course, still require further donor funding (either globally or through the Country Offices). Interviewees indicated that fundraising was still ongoing for the UDOC pilot. As for the MEND, IOM was already engaging in fundraising to continue the process of strengthening its partnerships with national authorities. The CCCM's efforts to pilot its tools as well as the impact evaluation on capacity development and the co-leadership assessment show the Cluster's commitment to continue to learn and improve. Efforts will need to be continued in order to implement the recommendations from the various evaluations and reviews executed.

Surge capacity and capacity development<sup>60</sup> emerged as areas which should benefit from joint fundraising by all three agencies yet other donors should also be engaged to support these efforts. Furthermore, in light of the decision to develop a SAG and improve CCCM's governance, the Cluster should identify which areas may need further funding based on its current strategy and as it develops its new strategy, together with the SAG, for 2017 onwards. In addition, the contributions that the individual agencies have sought for CCCM-related activities, such as IOM's mainstreaming of GBV within DTM and CCCM can benefit the Cluster as a whole. Irrespective of whether joint funding is sought or received, if the global partners can agree on their priority areas, this will also help to determine how to streamline fundraising.

#### **Key finding**

The expected results were being achieved effectively and have concretely supported CCCM operations through surge capacity and technical guidance. Based on efforts of the Cluster to assess its structure of co-leadership and engage with an advisory board, there were strong indications of a commitment to improve the coordination and management of the Cluster.

#### **Recommendations**

Action plans can be developed based on the adopted recommendations provided in the different reviews and evaluations of the CCCM for IOM's role in the CCCM, to determine which area will be taken forward and how.

The soon-to-be formed SAG could be approached to identify priority areas for fundraising within the current CCCM strategy, which could either be used for joint funding or designated to a specific agency for follow up.

---

<sup>60</sup> The Impact evaluation on capacity building will speak more to this as it was beyond the scope of this evaluation.

## 3. Summary of Key Findings and Recommendations

### 3.1. Key Findings

1. The project design is relevant to the existing 2013–2016 strategy and took into account the changes in the humanitarian architecture as adopted by IASC through the Transformative Agenda. However the project alone has not been developed for specifically implementing the strategy or addressing the TA within the Cluster; other cluster activities drive these forward as well.
2. The logical framework is well developed. The analysis shows that slight adjustments to the indicators could have strengthened them to better measure the progress of the results. Focus could have been placed not solely on activated formal clusters but also on operations where CCCM activities were also taking place, even if the cluster had not been formalized.
3. Assigning a focal point for the project to support the Programme Manager/Co-lead was considered a positive addition to Phase II which helped to improve the coordination of the project.
4. IOM's role was seen as mainly administrative as this was considered by all agencies a cluster project. IOM completed its administrative roles in line with ECHO requirements. There were aspects of coordination which could have been improved in order to streamline the activities, and identify lessons learnt that could be relevant for the Cluster as a whole.
5. Deployments under CCCMCAP were beneficial and highly welcomed by Country Offices who have benefited from them; however, the CCCM may benefit from Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) that can ensure that decisions are based on agreed processes and selection criteria for maximum benefit.
6. The combined efforts to strengthen coordination by CCCM and OCHA were praised for being an innovative approach as no other cluster had ever seconded cluster staff to OCHA. The partners were able to successfully come together, showing their commitment to strengthening and formalizing the coordination.
7. The camp management stakeholders have changed from representing international NGOs to being more locally based such as civil society, faith-based organizations or national authorities. This has created a challenge for the global Cluster to provide support and guidance to this new membership base that may never have the opportunity to engage in global efforts (or retreats).
8. The MEND approach remained focused on natural disasters; it brought together different CCCM and civil protection expertise. Its challenge was to gather lessons learnt and identify commonality as well as the differences. IOM and the CCCM Cluster should continue to coordinate between actors involved in evacuations to better manage displacement.
9. Although there were some challenges to financially and administratively manage the project from Headquarters, IOM addressed most of these shortcomings effectively, confirming that a global support project can also benefit from a centralized management from Headquarters.
10. Both protection and gender were key thematic areas and cross-cutting themes within the CCCM Cluster that were addressed within the ECHO project through the deployments and the materials developed. In addition, IOM's gender-related projects, which were being implemented at the same time, helped to reinforce initiatives that were directly linked to the ECHO project.
11. The expected results were being achieved effectively and have concretely supported CCCM operations through surge capacity and technical guidance. Based on efforts of the Cluster to assess its structure (co-leadership) and engage with an advisory board, there were strong indications of a commitment to improve the coordination and management of the Cluster.

## 3.2. Recommendations

1. Consider developing one common CCCM Cluster monitoring framework (including common indicators) that can be used as a basis for tracking the strategy and joint CCCM projects thereby simplifying monitoring for the partners. This is also in line with one of the activities of the 2013–2016 CCCM strategy under Outcome 5.
2. Other ways for improved information sharing, coordination, and reporting could be explored that could lead to stronger increased opportunities for joint learning and reflection beneficial for the CCCM approach and decision-making processes. Examples could be:
  - Regular meetings of the three agencies to provide quick updates on their results and responsibilities and share lessons learnt;
  - Brief monthly reports to share with the team;
  - Agreed procedures on donor communication;
  - TOR specific to the project that outlines procedures as to how the partners will work together; and
  - Sharing or having combined work plans.
3. The existing SOPs could be recirculated to ensure that agreed processes are followed.
4. Criteria should be developed for CCCM-related deployments by partner agencies to help identify priorities for requests.
5. The debrief mechanism for IOM RRT staff and CCCMCAP staff deployed to IOM Country Offices should be formalised in order to capture opportunities for improvements and lessons learnt.
6. The CCCM Cluster should work towards determining how best to use the OCHA-CCCM matrix for the global and field-based operations. Different methods for this could be:
  - Identifying Country Offices where there are potential coordination challenges with OCHA to determine how the matrix can be used; and
  - Requesting Country Offices to pilot or review the matrix with their OCHA counterparts and provide feedback on how they could adapt it.
7. There could be a document outlining the CCCM approach for engaging existing and new partners. The agreement to have a Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) for CCCM may also strengthen governance, coordination and the inclusion of different partners.
8. Lessons learnt from both IOM and NRC pilots could be compiled and discussed within the Cluster to help define out-of-camp strategies.
9. Action plans can be developed based on the adopted recommendations provided in the different reviews and evaluations of the CCCM for IOM's role in the CCCM, to determine which area will be taken forward and how.
10. The soon-to-be formed SAG could be approached to identify priority areas for fundraising within the current CCCM strategy, which could either be used for joint funding or designated to a specific agency for follow up.

## Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

### EVALUATION OF IOM CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROJECT “ENHANCING THE RESPONSE TO DISPLACEMENT – IMPROVING MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION IN CCCM”

#### 1. BACKGROUND

In 2012-2013, the Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster work has been greatly strengthened through the support of an 18-month ECHO funded project. However, many of the achievements gained during that funding period required to be sustained and further developed.

The new phase proposed action was a combination of priorities set by the Global CCCM Cluster for 2014/2015 at the Global CCCM Cluster Retreat in Geneva, and those established by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee's (IASC) Transformative Agenda. It also took into account the Cluster's three year strategy and the five key priorities set by the Global CCCM Cluster for 2014-2016 (improved implementation, preparedness, awareness, accountability, holistic community support). The CCCM Cluster conducted also a desk review on outside camps displacement to determine areas of work where CCCM could offer its expertise based on the gaps identified, best practices and brainstorming sessions with CCCM experts.

Throughout the first phase, the Cluster has been actively engaged in updating CCCM tools and technical guidance, information management systems, training packages and improving Cluster surge response capacity. The project led to the development of new practices and approaches to improve the understanding of and responses to multiple and preventative displacement situations, which were requiring however further investment based on the following needs analysis:

- 1) New displacement realities showed an increasing need for technical camp management and coordination support and for CCCM expert capacity to be deployed on short notice;
- 2) Within the Global Cluster, the need for better links between frontline service providers and to improve inter-cluster coordination communication with other Global Clusters were identified as priorities, as well as the analysis of the most adequate coordination architecture for the Global Cluster management, including the co-leadership structure;
- 3) The issue of displaced populations in urban settings and/or outside camps was becoming more pressing as statistics were suggesting that up to 80% of IDPs live outside camp-like settings. Substantial gaps remained in terms of determining the Cluster architecture to find adequate leadership for coordinated approaches and ways in which the Cluster system may respond to situations taking into consideration the strategies and tools developed by CCCM practitioners. A joint effort and better collaboration bringing together the activities of different Clusters was to be established;
- 4) The ways in which the humanitarian community interacts with national response and coordination structures in situations of large scale displacement caused by conflict or natural disasters, remained a source of difficulties and challenges. The humanitarian agenda highlights the need to link more closely with national authorities as a priority and CCCM is at the forefront of this.

The main objective of the project is “guaranteeing quick and sustainable responses to emergencies which contribute to the protection of displaced communities in camps as well as in outside camp and urban displacement settings”, and the specific objective “to provide support to Camp Coordination and Camp Management systems at the country/regional level and effective coordination during major emergencies”.

UNHCR, the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) and IOM participated to the implementation of the first phase and were again selected for implementation of the new phase. Four results were to be achieved for this second phase:

- 5) Roster administration, use, and sustainability are maximised to enhance ability to respond to large-scale emergencies and enable rapid and expert emergency support to field operations;
- 6) Inter-Cluster and inter-sector coordination is refined to better link strategic and operational levels of coordination, in collaboration with OCHA, other Clusters and sectors, and through engagement with existing and new partners;
- 7) Response to urban displacement and IDPs outside camps is improved;
- 8) Engaging national authorities and actors to build better response capacity.

A specific budget was allocated to each of the agencies assigned with a leadership role for implementing the components, IOM being also tasked with a leadership role in the overall coordination of project implementation.

## **2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

The overall objective of the evaluation is:

*To evaluate the relevance and achievements of the project for an improved management and coordination of the CCCM Cluster, as well as IOM's contribution to the overall performance of the project.*

Being an internal evaluation conducted by the Office of the Inspector General, the report will not cover an assessment of the effectiveness of UNHCR and NRC contribution in implementing the components assigned solely to them and will not draw conclusions on it. The evaluation will however report on the global performance of those components based on the perceptions of the implementing agencies, mainly through interviews with UNHCR and NRC staff, and on the reports that they have submitted.

It is also important to mention that the co-leadership management of the CCCM Cluster by IOM and UNHCR will not be analysed as an external evaluation to be implemented before project completion will be conducted in coordination with the donor.

More specifically, the evaluation will analyse the following:

### Relevance:

- Is the second phase as developed relevant: i) to the needs analysis conducted at the end of the first phase; ii) to the strategy and objectives of the CCCM Cluster and; iii) to the recent emergencies covered by the project and identified in the project document?
- Are the indicators and results relevant to measure progress and to contribute to the achievement of the overall objective of the project? Are the beneficiaries identified relevant to the specific objectives of the project?
- Are the roles assigned between the three partners reflective of the balance required to maintain a complex cluster relationship?
- Are the initiatives undertaken under the project strategic and relevant for the CCCM cluster in relation to the broader humanitarian architecture?
- From the perspective of IOM, what are new relevant areas emerging from the current project?

### Performance:

- Is IOM's leading role effective in coordinating action and in reporting on the progress of implementation?

- Is IOM effective in implementing the components which are under its leadership?
- Is IOM effective in contributing to the implementation of the components which are implemented jointly with its partners?
- Is the coordination and information sharing between the three implementing agencies effective?
- Is the work of the project effective, as well as cost-effective, in reinforcing the management and coordination of the CCCM Cluster and in liaising with other Clusters?
- How effective is the overall implementation of the four components in reaching the specific objectives and in producing expected results?
- Is IOM's leading role efficient for the financial management of the project, including for budget endorsement and funds disbursement, and are the amounts allocated to each component relevant?
- Did the implementing agencies manage to receive additional contributions to the project and to implement complementary activities funded by other sources?
- Is Gender dimension properly integrated into the project and what are the effective results specifically related to it? Are human rights issues properly considered in the development of the project and during implementation?
- Was there a need of specific systems for the management through Headquarters, and which if any challenges were encountered?

Achievements:

- Are the outcomes of the project in line with the specific objectives and its components? What are the major changes that can be attributed to each of the components?
- Did the project take into account sustainability of its actions and were steps undertaken to guarantee it?
- What could be the overall impact attributed to the project?

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

The methodology will mainly consist of a documentation review of the reports and documents produced by the project, and of a series of interviews with the staff of the three agencies tasked with implementation, as well as with the donor. The evaluation will also make an extensive use of the surveys that were conducted during implementation and of any other reports related to the CCCM Cluster covering the emergency responses in the countries identified. Additional interviews will be discussed with the Department of Operations and Emergency (DOE) at the start of the evaluation, and when identified during the evaluation exercise.

The Department of Operations and Emergency (DOE) at IOM Headquarters will be in charge of providing the necessary documentation related to project implementation as well as documentation specific to the CCCM Cluster management that is related to the components of the project. It can include regular activity/monitoring reports, letters, notes for the file of meetings, reports related to staff deployment and performance, Memorandum of Understanding between the three agencies (and with various partners when relevant to the analysis), official exchanges with national authorities involved in CCCM activities in their country and any other documentation that DOE considers worth sharing.

No Field visits are foreseen for the evaluation. The conduct of a survey will be examined at the first stage of the evaluation depending on the documentation that will be made available and the content of the surveys already conducted.

### **4. RESOURCES AND TIMING**

The cost of the evaluation will be borne by the Office of the Inspector General and a draft report should be made available to DOE and to the implementing agencies by mid-November 2015 at the latest.

## Annex 2 – List of Interviewed People

Name	Title	Methodology
<b>ANTOLIN, Jean-Philippe</b>	CCCM Rapid Response Officer,	Interview
<b>BAARS, Margo</b>	Rapid Response Officer, DOE/PRD	Interview
<b>BAKER, Karl</b>	IOM South Sudan	FGD
<b>BARONI, Gina</b>	CCCM Secondment to UNOCHA	Email communication (unable to communicate via Skype or telephone)
<b>BECK Albrecht</b>	Global CCCM Civil Protection Specialist	Interview
<b>BOHARA Jitendra</b>	IOM Nepal	FGD
<b>BUSO Paola</b>	EU Financial Liaison, Brussels	Skype interview
<b>CHAKOWA, Jade</b>	ECHO focal point at UNHCR	Interview
<b>CLAUSS, Daniel</b>	ECHO Policy Officer	Interview
<b>CUSACK, Andrew</b>	CCCM Rapid Response Officer	
<b>FEDERICI, Giovanna</b>	CCCM Cluster Consultant Urban Displacement & Outside Camps	Skype interview
<b>FOSTER Tim</b>	CCCM Capacity development impact evaluation	Discussion and brainstorm
<b>FUJIMURA Yoko</b>	IOM Chad	FGD
<b>GASHI Burim</b>	Emergency Resources Management Officer	Skype interview
<b>GOLDSCHMIDT Vera</b>	Senior Emergency & Post-Crisis Specialist, IOM Brussels	Skype interview
<b>GONZALEZ TEJERO Debora</b>	ECHO focal point for IOM	Introductory meetings and interview
<b>HIEBER GIRARDET, Loretta</b>	Chief, Inter-Cluster Coordination Section	Interview
<b>KVERNMO Jennifer</b>	CCCM RRT	Interview
<b>LAMBERT, Bobby</b>	CCCM Co-leadership assessment	Discussion and brainstorm
<b>MARFIL Christy</b>	IOM Philippines	FGD
<b>MASKUN Izora Mutya</b>	IOM Myanmar	FGD
<b>MOCHIZUKI Daihei</b>	IOM Iraq	FGD
<b>NAVIDAD, Conrado</b>	IOM Philippines	Interview
<b>NUNES, Nuno</b>	Global CCCM cluster coordinator IOM	Interview
<b>ODUWA, Ben</b>	IOM Democratic Republic of Congo (NRC Secondment)	FGD
<b>ØWRE, Jørn-Casper</b>	CCCMCAP PM / Adviser NORCAP	Skype interview
<b>PASCUAL, Natalia Pascual</b>	CCCM Training Coordinator	Skype interview
<b>PORTEAUD, Dominique</b>	Global WASH Cluster Coordinator	Telephone interview
<b>REICHENBERG, Anna</b>	Consultant, IOM	Interview
<b>ROBERSON, Kimberly</b>	Global CCCM Cluster coordinator UNHCR	Interview
<b>TAKAHASHI Miwa</b>	Legal Officer IOM	Skype interview
<b>THURIAUX Damien</b>	IOM Ecuador	Interview
<b>YUEN Lorelle</b>	Program Support Officer (previously based in DOE)	Skype interview

## Annex 3 – Interview and Focus Group Discussion Guide

### Interview Guide:

The questions below have been separated by different thematic areas and results to facilitate response based on interviewees' roles and responsibilities. These questions were used as a guide but, depending on the interviewees, additional follow-up questions were asked during the interviews.

Interviews should from 45-60 minutes and follow up conversations should take place for further clarification or additional information as required.

### Introduction:

Can you tell me what your role has been within the ECHO project for the CCCM?

### **Overall coordination of the project:** *[all relevant staff involved in the project]*

1. Do you think that the divisions of roles and responsibilities within the project was properly defined and then carried out by the different partners?
2. Where the roles within the project reflective of the approach within the cluster?
3. How has the coordination of the project been throughout this phase? Can you describe the coordination process of this Phase? How did you see the coordination taking a lead of the project?
4. Do you have dedicated staff working on the ECHO project?
5. Opinion on the flow from Phase I to Phase II in terms of approach?
6. During the implementation of the project, were there many disagreements that had to be discussed in the implementation of the components with the other two partners. How did you handle the disagreement? Did you solve it? Did it affect the outcome? Delay implementation? Did you consider this as a tripartite management or refer to IOM as a lead implementer?

### **General questions on CCCM and ECHO:** *[for all stakeholders directly involved]*

1. In the prodoc, reference is made to the protection of the displaced communities– what is your understanding of how the project contributes to the protection of the displaced communities?
2. How do you consider that ECHO project is integrated into the CCCM strategic approach?
3. In your opinion, has this project helped to strengthen the management of CCCM or coordination of the cluster. And if so, how?
4. Do you consider that this project has been effective in reaching expected results? What has been some negative or positive impact? Are there any improvements that you like to bring to my attention that was were not properly addressed?
5. What do you think of IOM's leadership within the project? What do you think of assigning a leadership role to one agency for the project (eg. Phase I and II)?
6. I have noticed that there is a requirement for co-funding and that each agency must bring its own co-funding – what can you tell me about this – what activities did you consider under co-funding? What are the sources that you brought in?
7. Do you consider a 3<sup>rd</sup> phase to be necessary and relevant? If so, what?

**Questions specifically on IOM's role as grant manager and responsible for Result 4 [UNHCR and NRC colleagues involved in the project]**

1. Have you benefited from the result that IOM is directly implementing – Result 4 and if so, how?
2. Have you needed to request specific support from IOM as the coordinator of this project? If so, how did it happen?
3. In your opinion has the financial management been properly organized? Disbursement of funds?
4. How did you address gender issues within the project?

**Questions specific to IOM on the management of this project [Questions were asked to different people based on their roles and responsibilities]**

1. Was there a risk in not designating funding specific to the Programme Manager within this project?
2. CCCM's community centered approach – more about it.
3. Review of the results framework:
  - a. Where does protection come in? How is that being measured? How do you think that the project contributed to the protection of beneficiaries? How do you see this reinforcement?
4. Which countries benefited directly from ECHO?
5. Is management by HQ the most effective way of implementing this project? In an organization where HQ is not used to implementing projects, how did you overcome this challenge? What difficulties did you have? Enough dedicated staff?
6. Finance:
  - a. How the reporting is being undertaken? Any elements of concern?
  - b. Co-funding (DFID/Canada)?

**Result 1: [Asked to NRC and relevant IOM staff]**

1. Trainings that were undertaken (Result 1) all paid for by this project? Or required funding from the Country Offices too?
  - a. Do findings indicate that this global support has minimized the need for financial support in the field?
  - b. Is there a link between the funding that is used by global CCCM and the training implemented by the field office. How do they contribute to the success of each other? Mechanisms of complementarity? Exchange of information – is there a link?
  - c. Can you explain a bit more how NRC coordinates the self-recovery process?
2. Why the effort/additional emphasis on national authorities (IASC recommendation to expand stakeholders)?

**Result 2: [IOM, UNHCR and Consultant]**

1. What was the basis in which to put a CCCM secondment inside OCHA?
2. Would this be something that other sectors require or specific to CCCM/OCHA?
3. To what extent has the coordination here also improved the coordination in the field?
4. How were the areas of work selected? What was the most difficult element to distinguish?
5. Why no out of camp setting analysis?

6. Has the secondment helped the collaboration between OCHA and the Cluster?
7. Will the approach taken in the project (the development of the matrix) help to improve coordination in order to, overall, reach goals of improved access to services?
8. How do you think that this type of project can better contribute to the management of the CCCM?
9. How do you see the contribution of the secondment in terms of contribution to CCCM and Clusters in general? Would this be something that other sectors require or specific to CCCM/OCHA?

**Result 3 [UNHCR, NRC and IOM]**

1. Background on the UDOC process and decisions taken concerning the lead and implementation.
2. What role did IOM take?
3. How has IOM supported/not supported this result? Could IOM have brought in added expertise in this?
4. Has out-of-camp displacement methodologies been tested by IOM? Please provide further information.

**Result 4 [IOM]**

1. Please provide more information about the trainings, the pilots and different stimulation exercises?
2. How are the pilots and the simulation exercises different?
3. What needed refining within the MEND guide and why?
4. In your opinion does this address the IASC Recommendation for preparedness and response?
5. How do you think the result “engaging national authorities and actors to build better response capacity” has been achieved?
6. How gender is mainstreamed into the MEND and/or trainings? Is this sufficient?

**ECHO:**

1. Please provide background on the decision of which agency would lead Phases I and II?
2. How do you think the approach from Phase I to II has gone?
3. Do you think the project is reaching its objective? And why? How?
4. Do you think that the project is relevant for advancing /contributing to CCCM’s relevance and [efforts] within the broader humanitarian architecture? And is in line with the IASC transformative agenda?
5. What is the role of the leading agency of the Phase? How has IOM fared in this role?
6. Are there already lessons learnt that you can share about the implementation of this project considering phase I and Phase II. Does one of these lessons encourage you for an extension?
7. Has there been any issues/information that you have questioned?
8. As ECHO, what do you see as strategic to funding CCCM globally and how should it impact on the field-level operations? Based on your vision of results of project, do you consider this investment as cost effective in helping the CCCM to organize itself?
9. Co-funding –why the variation of cost, anything specific. Anything linked to phase I?

## Focus Group Discussions

These are guiding questions to facilitate the focus group discussions with IOM Country Offices during the October CCCM retreat.

1. IOM is conducting an evaluation of the IOM role in an ECHO funded project: have you heard/are you aware of the objectives and components of the ECHO project designed to support the CCCM cluster? (depending on the answers, to try to have further relevant information such as 'which components', 'assignment of roles', 'first phase'; if 'no' is the answer, then you can briefly explain the objectives so they can adjust their answer accordingly, taking however into account the following question)
2. Overall, do you feel that the support provided has helped IOM and/or the CCCM Cluster within your respective Country Offices? *State type of support received.*
3. To what extent do you think that such a project is relevant and useful for supporting CCCM activities around the world/rapid response?
4. Deployments:
  - a. What has been the process?
  - b. What are the strengths of the deployments? Weaknesses?
5. Do you think that there is confusion (at times) between the role of OCHA and CCCM and that such a project can be instrumental in avoiding any confusion if the case?
6. Do you feel that the global support from CCCM has provided you with the sufficient tools for you to deliver on your CCCM commitments at field level?
7. Are there other elements that you require from the Global CCCM that you have a) requested but not received or b) would like to see added or c) that could justify a similar project of support to CCCM?

## Annex 4 - Documentation Review

Title	Brief description or accessibility
<b>Project Related</b>	
Agreement between IOM and NRC on Enhancing the Response to Displacement – Improving Management and Coordination in CCCM, October 2014	ECHO project related
Agreement between IOM and UNHCR on Enhancing the Response to Displacement – Improving Management and Coordination in CCCM, February 2015	ECHO project related
CCCM. Annex I. Dashboard - CCCM Cap and RRT support (1/01/2014 – 28/02/2015)	Submitted with the Interim Report for the Project
CCCM. ECHO baseline survey: Analysis, 2014.	
CCCM. ECHO CCCM Final report Phase I	
CCCM. ECHO CCCM Interim report Phase II	
CCCM. MEND Annex 1.1 Components of a National Emergency Law relating to the evacuation cycle, 2015.	
CCCM. MEND Annex 1.2: Evacuation Planning and Early Warning Systems, 2015.	
CCCM. MEND Annex 1.3 Information Management and Public Information, <i>Final Draft</i> , 2015.	Final Draft
CCCM. MEND Annex 2 EVACUATION SHELTER, 2015	
CCCM. The MEND GUIDE - Comprehensive Guide for Planning Mass Evacuations in Natural Disasters 2015	Draft Guide
CCCM. Who Does What in Humanitarian Coordination, <i>Inter-cluster Coordination, CCCM Cluster Coordination and Camp management Matrix</i> , CCCM and OCHA, 2015.	Draft Matrix completed under Result 2 of the Project and Final notes on the Matrix
Database of CCCM deployments version 1	Provided by NRC to IOM
DISPLACEMENT FOCAL POINTS (DFPs) – The Tacloban Experience	Philippines model of displacement focal point approach for natural disasters
ECHO Official budget for Project	Project budget
Enhancing the Response to Displacement – Improving Management and Coordination in CCCM, June 2014 Proposal version	Proposal
Enhancing the Response to Displacement – Improving Management and Coordination in CCCM – PowerPoint Presentation	Presentation of the mid-year review of the ECHO CCCM project
Extract of people trained in CCCM over the last 10 years	Taken from database and provided by Tim Foster
Global Camp Management and Camp Coordination (CCCM) Cluster. Strategic Advisory Group - Establishment and proposed Terms of Reference, 22 January 2016	Notes and draft TORS
IOM. MEND Training and workshops in 2015	Overview of the trainings and workshops conducted in 2015
IOM. MEND Workshop and Simulation Exercise – Easter Samar, Philippines June 8-11, 2015 Borongan, Eastern Samar	Training report
IOM. Mission Report Cidade da Praia and Ilha do Fogo, Cabo Verde, 21-28/12/14 Vera Goldschmidt	Linked to Result 4
IOM. SECONDMENT REQUEST: STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES and Request Template, 15 January 2015	
IOM. Training on Mass Evacuation Planning and Preparedness – A training guide based on the Comprehensive Guide for	Draft training guide

Planning Mass Evacuations in Natural Disasters – the MEND guide, CCCM cluster, 26 January 2015	
List of CCCM Partners 2011-2014	Based on those present during the retreats in 2011-2014
Overview of activities – ECHO CCCM 2014-2015	Overview of the activities under the ECHO CCCM project including who is responsible out of the three agencies.
Package of documents related to Result 1 including CCCM training reports, project notes from NRC, email correspondence between NRC and IOM	
Package of documents related to Result 3 including UDOC consultant TOR, context assessment guidance for piloting UDOC, and Assessment plan	
Spreadsheet of CCCM presence globally, version 8, CCCM	
<b>CCCM related</b>	
CCCM. Camp Management Toolkit, June 2015	<a href="http://www.cmtoolkit.org/">http://www.cmtoolkit.org/</a>
CCCM. Desk Review Urban Displacement and Out of Camp Review Provisional release for field testing, 2014.	<a href="https://www.dropbox.com/sh/489lzpo8ojtvdyg/AABMIKv2R8CgzXYP8dY_s0Y7a/UDOC%20Desk%20Review_Digital%20publishing.pdf?dl=0">https://www.dropbox.com/sh/489lzpo8ojtvdyg/AABMIKv2R8CgzXYP8dY_s0Y7a/UDOC%20Desk%20Review_Digital%20publishing.pdf?dl=0</a>
CCCM. Global CCCM Cluster Annual Retreat report, 2013	
CCCM. Global CCCM Cluster Annual Retreat report, 2014	
Global CCCM Cluster Governance Meeting Agenda and Draft Minutes from 7 December 2015	
<b>Other Related Documents</b>	
ECHO. Enhanced Response Capacity Funding, Technical Annex, Year 2014, 22/10/2013	
ECHO. General Conditions Applicable to Humanitarian Aid Actions Financed by the European Union under an Indirect Management Delegation Agreement, <i>Annex II to FPA IOM, April 2014</i>	
ECHO. Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP) Enhanced Response Capacity Funding Year 2014, 17/09/13	
IASC. IASC Guidance note on using the cluster approach to strengthen humanitarian response, 24 November 2006	<a href="https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/working-group/documents-public/guidance-note-using-cluster-approach-strengthen-humanitarian-respon-0">https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/working-group/documents-public/guidance-note-using-cluster-approach-strengthen-humanitarian-respon-0</a>
IASC. IASC Guidance note on using the cluster approach to strengthen humanitarian response, 24 November 2006	<a href="https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/working-group/documents-public/guidance-note-using-cluster-approach-strengthen-humanitarian-respon-0">https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/working-group/documents-public/guidance-note-using-cluster-approach-strengthen-humanitarian-respon-0</a>
IASC. IASC Reference Module for Cluster Coordination at country Level, revised July 2015	Part of the IASC protocols for the Transformative Agenda
IASC. IASC's Reference Module for Cluster Coordination at Country Level (revised July 2015)	<a href="https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/iasc-transformative-agenda/documents-public/reference-module-cluster-coordination-country-level">https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/iasc-transformative-agenda/documents-public/reference-module-cluster-coordination-country-level</a>
IASC. Review of the IASC Protocols that support the Transformative Agenda.	Part of the IASC protocols for the Transformative Agenda
Knox Clarke, Paul and Campbell, Leah. Exploring Coordination in Humanitarian Clusters, ALNAP Study, 2015	
UNHC, NRC and Nansen Initiative “Planned relocation, disasters and climate change: consolidating good practices and preparing for the future”, March 2014.	

## Annex 5 - Detailed Analysis of Logical Framework Indicators

Results	Indicators	Analysis
<b>Specific objective – To provide support to CCCM systems at the country/regional level and effective coordination during major emergencies</b>	# of newly activated Clusters T: 5 IR: 4	Indicator had limited scope. The challenge in this indicator was that there are 14 CCCM formally activated clusters yet an additional 21 countries <sup>61</sup> where CCCM Cluster or sector related activities or informal activation may have taken place. These are equally important to capture as activities that CCCM implemented with a formal sector (e.g. preparedness training) are relevant to the Action but may not necessitate the formal activation of a cluster. Consider expanding this indicator to include cluster-like activities/activation.
	% of newly activated CCCM clusters with capacity to cover coordination and camp management needs T: 80%	Indicator was not precise enough to provide sufficient opportunity to measure progress. The sources of verification (CCCM Cluster Evaluation and the report from the Global retreat) did not provide the necessary information to provide a percentage. This information can be measured based on a perception survey conducted at the field level.
	% of newly activated CCCM Clusters in which a trained and experienced coordinator is deployed at most 72 hours after UNHCR/IOM have been appointed as cluster leads	Indicator had limited scope. Given that surge capacity deployment was not limited to formally activated clusters, a significant amount of information was not be captured by this indicator. The means of verification (field reports) may not capture the deployment time.
	% of newly activated CCCM clusters in which provisional surge capacity is substituted by long-term capacity within six weeks T: 80%	Unclear link to the specific objective as this would have implied that the Global cluster could have facilitate this (fundraised) for the field operations which may not have necessarily been possible. This was more linked to sustainability of the RRT support which was listed under Result 1.
	% of newly activated CCCM clusters led by UNHCR or IOM that provide a clear analysis of needs, capacities and gaps and the budget required to address the gap T: 70%	This indicator was appropriate. The MoV should have been the Strategic Response Plans (SRP) which should have been able to provide the necessary information, including at the mid-term review of the SRP.
	% of CCCM Cluster partners, including government counterparts, who supporting the findings on the benefits and disadvantages of the current cluster co-leadership T: 80%	This indicator may have provided information on how co-leadership was perceived however to be targeted more specifically to the SO, the indicator could be linked to the perception of co-leadership with regards to ability to support field/country level operations. The MoV “feedback from partners during the Retreat”, was not the appropriate means of measuring this information; however the on-going assessment

<sup>61</sup> Based on information provided to evaluator on CCCM global presence – this number can change.

		of the co-leadership could have provided the necessary information.
	% of newly activated CCCM Clusters lead by UNHCR/IOM for which joint assessments are publicly available within phase 3 to inform strategy, project development and the SRP T: 70%	The challenge in measuring this indicator was related to the 2 <sup>nd</sup> part “to inform strategy, project development and the SRP” it would have required further analysis of the assessments and the links to these three elements.
	% of activated CCCM Clusters with a Strategic Response Plan inclusive of outside camp approaches T: 70%	This indicator was appropriate. Analysis was feasible and required only one means of verification – Strategic Response Plan. However knowledge of the context would have been necessary to determine if an out of camp approach was relevant.
<b>Result 1</b>		
<b>Roster administration, use, and sustainability are maximized to enhance ability to respond to large-scale emergencies and enable rapid and expert emergency support to field operations.</b>	Hours within which rapidly deployable emergency response capacity is available T: 72	This indicator did not measure what percentage of deployments were taking place in the expected 72 hours which was more important to indicate whether deployment was rapid or not. However, the interim report did provide this level of analysis.
	% of assessments which show satisfactory performance of staff deployed T: 90	The indicator was appropriate to measure this result.
	% of Roster deployments with self-funding and cost-recovery from missions T: 50	This was an appropriate indicator to measure sustainability of the support.
	The Rapid Response Team (RRT) standing capacity is maintained to maximise core coordination and response resources T: 96	The explanation provided in the comments within the action clarified the first part of the indicator; however, it was unclear how the 2 <sup>nd</sup> element “maximize core coordination and response resources” would be measured. This section could be left out. Perhaps another measurement could have been the percentage of person-weeks that the 4 RRTs were being deployed to measure the full benefit.
	% of CCCM capacity building projects for national authorities and partners for which an impact evaluation is available T: 75	It would appear that this indicator was related to the capacity building impact evaluation however the purpose of capturing the percentage of projects was unclear. Another alternative indicator could have been “ <i>Impact evaluation captures recommendations on how to maximize the benefit of capacity building for national authorities and partners.</i> ”
<b>Result 2</b>		
<b>Inter-cluster and inter-sector coordination is refined to better link strategic and operational levels of coordination, in collaboration with OCHA, other clusters and sectors, and through</b>	% of cluster members and NGO partners who have applied information management and CCCM Cluster tools available on the Global CCCM Website T: 80	This indicator was based on a survey and thus would have been best written as “% of cluster members and NGO partners who report that they have applied information management and CCCM tools available on the Global CCCM website” otherwise the “application” would have

<b>engagement with existing and new partners.</b>		to be further defined. It was unclear however how this was linked to the result.
	% of respondents confirming improved CCCM-OCHA cooperation at the field level T: 70	Given that during this action, the primary activity was the secondment of CCCM staff to OCHA, there was a risk that these efforts would not trickle down to the field until some other efforts had taken place.
	% of newly activated CCCM operations where within 6 months satisfactory cluster performance is measured using the Cluster Performance Monitoring Tool (CPMT) T: 80	In the interim report, the CCCM team already recommended adjusting the indicator: " <i>% of newly activated CCCM operations where within 6 months satisfactory cluster performance is measured through real time evaluations, operational peer reviews, OCHA updates on progress made against the SRP, or similar tools.</i> " This was better suited to provide more rich analysis and not be limited by one tool.
	% of respondents who express increased satisfaction with communication between cluster leads, field operations, donors, partners, and affected populations T: 60	The indicator was appropriate to measure this result.
	# of active partnerships with NGOs and research institutions T: 35	The revisions recommended in the interim report " <i># of active partnerships with NGOs, research bodies and public or private sector institutions</i> " was also an appropriate indicator.
<b>Result 3</b>		
<b>Response to urban displacement and IDPs outside camps is improved.</b>	% of CCCM operations where outside camp and urban displacement approaches are strengthened through the adaptation and development of policy, tools, and guidance on CCCM work in such contexts T: 100	This indicator would be hard to measure as a) the out of camp approach was still being piloted and therefore this indicator may not be attained or easily attributed and b) it was not clear how "strengthened" will be measured. The given means of verification, i.e. policy, tools and guidance, would not provide the necessary information for the individual operations.
	# countries in which Centres for Communication and Community Management and Displacement Management Focal Points are set up to test the CCCM outside camp approach T: 2	The indicator was appropriate to measure this result.
	# of training package pilot version available for outside camps capacity building for CCCM practitioners T: 1	This indicator was appropriate.
	% of pilot users who react positively to the pilot training package for outside camps capacity building T: 80	Measurement should be clear and perhaps instead of "react positively", it could have read "report satisfaction" so it would have been based on their perception.
<b>Result 4</b>		

<b>Engaging national authorities and actors to build better response capacity</b>	# of countries engaging in the piloting and refining of the MEND Guide T: 15	The indicator could have been clearer by splitting piloting and refining as not all countries would have piloted the Guide but they could have provided inputs to refine it.
	% of national actors and cluster partners satisfied with simulation exercises to prepare them for responses to natural disasters and/or camp management in urban displacement scenarios T: 80	The first part of the indicator " <i>% of national actors and cluster partners satisfied with simulation exercises to prepare them for responses to natural disasters</i> " was clear, the 2 <sup>nd</sup> part was not related to result 4 or the activities under this result.
	% of participants who find consultative workshops useful T: 75	The indicator was appropriate to measure this result.
	# of joint deployments with CCCM experts and national authorities/partners T: 3	The indicator was appropriate to measure this result.
	% of national authorities and actors who confirm utility of joint deployments with CCCM experts in preparing them for emergency responses T: 80	The indicator was appropriate to measure this result.

