Joint IDP Profiling Service

Pilot Phase Evaluation

Khalid Koser

26 November 2012

Contents

List of Abbreviations

AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BPRM	Bureau for Population, Refugees, and Migration
CAR	Central African Republic
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
DR Congo	Democratic Republic of Congo
ECHO	European Community Humanitarian Office
JIPS	Joint IDP Profiling Service
IDMC	Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IOM	International Organization for Migration
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OPT	Occupied Palestinian Territories
PARK	Profiling and Assessment Resource Kit
UN	United Nations
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHCR	Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees

Executive Summary

1. This is an independent evaluation commissioned to consider the results and progress of the **three-year pilot phase** of the Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS), and to make recommendations regarding how JIPS should develop.

2. The evaluation is based on an **extensive document review, interviews with a range of stakeholders, and direct feedback from the JIPS team and Steering Committee**. A number of methodological limitations apply to the evaluation and its findings and recommendations.

3. In reviewing the *inputs* into JIPS, **this evaluation found a clearly formulated and justified problem statement; and a comprehensive strategy and funding proposal**. It makes specific recommendations about the current composition of the JIPS team, and also recommends that internal management processes including Terms of Reference and commitment to career development be updated and implemented. The evaluation finds that the governance of JIPS is effective, but informal, and recommends that the Steering Committee reviews its oversight and governance role. The evaluation identifies as a key funding challenge the need to attract core (as opposed to project) funding and makes specific recommendations for trying to achieve this.

4. Regarding the *activities* of JIPS in supporting country operations, the recommendations in this evaluation focus in particular on the following issues: the **demand-driven** model for JIPS may need to be reviewed; more work is required in **raising awareness** of JIPS both internally and externally, and explaining the profiling process; **accountability** should be built into all JIPS missions; a **focused advocacy** strategy is required; **monitoring and evaluation** of field missions should be a priority; and an **academic review** of the methods promoted and adopted during field missions should be considered.

5. Regarding the *outputs* of JIPS during its pilot phase, **this evaluation notes an impressive range of outputs,** and makes specific recommendations concerning greater transparency and wider dissemination of these outputs. Regarding *outcomes*, the evaluation considers that **JIPS has made good but uneven progress in achieving each of its five objectives**, and recommends that these objectives are

clearly prioritized for the next phase. Regarding *impact*, the evaluation concludes that **JIPS has made significant progress towards achieving its overall aim,** in particular through strategic partnerships. Its provisional recommendation is that JIPS continues to focus on IDP Profiling, rather than extending its activities to other populations.

6. The evaluation distils the following lessons from the three-year pilot phase. Significant *strengths* of the JIPS process are its **inter-agency character**, its definition and delivery of profiling as a **holistic process,** and its flexibility to be **context-specific**. *Weaknesses* identified include the sustainability of the current **staffing model**, some elements of **governance and oversight**, and systematically maximizing the sustainability of **impact** in the field. Potential *opportunities* are to **promote the JIPS model**, extend **the profiling process to other populations** (by disseminating knowledge and skills rather than necessarily undertaking these activities), and more **comprehensive missions**. Possible *threats* to JIPS are identified as its **demand-driven** model, the potential for **staff turnover**, and an overall lack of **critical reflection**.

7. For a small and largely experimental initiative, **the progress and achievements of JIPS during its three-year pilot phase have been very impressive indeed,** ranging from a **well-developed internal management system**, through a significant **number of supported operations**, to a comprehensive set of **concrete outputs** - complemented by extensive and effective **advocacy and lobbying**. The proven reputation of JIPS to deliver, its well-developed series of practical tools, and strong support by its sponsoring agencies, all provide good foundations for its future development. In this context, the overall conclusion of this evaluation is that JIPS transitions from its pilot phase, what is required is further professionalization, systematization, and prioritization, across a range of areas, to support its expansion.

1. Background and Introduction

The Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS) was established in 2009 as a 'common humanitarian service' to provide support to country operations planning for and implementing profiling exercises in internally displaced person (IDP) situations. JIPS was established as an inter-agency service with a Steering Committee comprising the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the Danish Refugee Council (DRC), the Norwegian Refugee Council-Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC-IDMC), and later joined by the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). It has been hosted both physically and administratively by UNHCR during its pilot phase and has received funding from the European Community Humanitarian Office (ECHO), the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAid), the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (BPRM), as well as UNHCR, DRC and NRC-IDMC.

JIPS was initially established on the basis of a three-year pilot phase from 2009-12. In 2011 JIPS developed a three-year strategy intended to systematise and clarify its vision, mission, framework and future plans. In addition JIPS has recently developed a draft two-year funding proposal (2013-14) which builds on the 2011-14 Strategy, but also includes some specific proposals going forward, for example relating to the JIPS strategic orientation, its institutional location, and staff capacity and profiles.

This independent evaluation has been commissioned as the original three-year pilot period draws to an end, in order to inform decisions regarding whether and how JIPS should grow. It also makes reference to the 2011-14 strategy and draft 2013-14 funding proposal, and is intended to inform the updating and revision of these documents as appropriate. The evaluation was commissioned on 18 October 2012 with a deadline for a first draft report on 12 November 2012, and a deadline for the final draft on 23 November 2012.

As stated in the Terms of Reference, the overall objective of the evaluation has been to evaluate results and progress made to date against the objectives set out in the logical framework of the project (incorporated in the original proposal and endorsed by the strategy). The scope of the evaluation was defined as covering, but not being limited to, the following issues: project relevance; project

governance/structure; field support; training and capacity building; information management/tool development; collaboration and partnerships; communication/advocacy; and impact and sustainability. A list of specific questions under each of these headings was also identified for the evaluation. The full Terms of Reference for the evaluation are attached as Annex 1.

This report has five main sections. In the next section the methodology for the evaluation is briefly described; and the limitations of this evaluation, its findings, and its recommendations, noted. The third section describes and analyses the main findings of this evaluation, distinguishing inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impact. The fourth section briefly reflects on some wider lessons learned, including concerning the extent to which the JIPS model and method may be more broadly applicable. The report ends with a brief Conclusion.

2. Methodology

This evaluation has depended on three data collection methods: a document review; interviews with key informants; and direct feedback on the first draft by the JIPS team and members of the Steering Committee.

An initial package of documents was provided by the JIPS team at the start of the consultancy on 18 October 2012. Further documents were requested at an initial meeting with the JIPS team on 24 October 2012. The documents received and consulted were reviewed at a progress meeting with the JIPS team and Steering Committee on 2 November 2012, and further documents identified and subsequently shared with the consultant. At a meeting on 16 November 2012 to discuss the first draft of the report, further relevant documents were identified and subsequently provided. A full list of the documents reviewed is provided in Annex 2.

At the beginning of the evaluation the Steering Committee provided a list of 56 key informants, covering the JIPS team; JIPS Steering Committee members; contacts from JIPS supported operations (in Afghanistan, Burundi, Colombia, Central African Republic - CAR, Democratic Republic of Congo – DR Congo, Serbia, Uganda and Yemen); JIPS partners; and JIPS donors. An additional four names were

provided by key informants themselves whom they felt may have more up to date information or a relevant perspective on the evaluation.

At the 2 November 2012 progress meeting it was agreed that it would not be feasible to contact and interview all these key informants, especially multiple contacts among Steering Committee and partner agencies, or from single supported operation. For expediency it was agreed to ensure that the following key interviews took place: the entire JIPS team; the entire Steering Committee; at least one respondent from each of the support operations; all JIPS partners; and all JIPS donors. The total number of priority interviews was 32.

Contact has been made with all these 32 informants, by e-mail, between 18 October and 22 November. By 23 November interviews have taken place with the entire JIPS team (combined), representatives from four of the seven Steering Committee member agencies, representatives from seven of the eight targeted supported missions, one of the five JIPS partners, and two of the six JIPS donors. A list of individuals interviewed is included in Annex 3.

The final data source has been feedback provided on the first draft report, both at the meeting on 16 November 2012, and subsequently in writing. Where this feedback has corrected factual mistakes or provided new information it has been fully incorporated. In most cases specific requests for expanded recommendations and options have also been dealt with. In some cases the feedback indicated that some of the recommendations provided in the first draft report are already under consideration, and these recommendations remain as they are still relevant and can inform ongoing planning. In this regard I confirm that I have found process for this evaluation to be legitimate and objective.

While a comprehensive set of documents has been provided, and the JIPS team, Steering Committee members, and interviewees have been very generous with their time and provided valuable insights and feedback, it is important to acknowledge that this has been a limited evaluation. Neither the budget nor time has been available for an extensive evaluation. In addition the evaluation has had a wide scope, covering the entire set of policies, procedures, programmes and projects appertaining to and undertaken by JIPS, with the result that in depth analysis across all these areas has not been possible. As a result the recommendations made in this evaluation are presented in a more discursive than prescriptive manner, in recognition that they emerge from findings that are provisional and have not

always been verified. Additionally specific areas are identified where separate evaluations or assessments may be worth conducting.

3. Findings

This section is structured in five parts, considering in turn the inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts of JIPS during its pilot phase. For each of these components respectively the following key question is addressed: To what extent are appropriate plans and funding in place? To what extent is implementation happening as planned? To what extent are outputs effective? To what extent have JIPS's objectives been met? To what extent has the desired impact occurred? Table One depicts the structure for this section, the key question addressed, and the distribution across these sections of the review questions identified for this evaluation.

3.1 Inputs

3.1.1. Problem formulation and statement

The need to collect and analyze more complete data on IDPs is clearly explained and justified, and just as importantly is presented consistently, across all the documents that I have seen. I have been slightly surprised not to come across any reflection in these documents or during interviews with the JIPS team and Steering Committee members on valid reservations concerning the entire activity of data collection on vulnerable populations like IDPs. Relevant questions include: Can surveys increase the vulnerability of people by raising their profile? How are data used? Who uses the data? It was explained at the 16 November 2012 meeting that at a conference planned for 2013 some of the ethical issues arising from profiling will be considered. I recommend that discussion of the ethics of data collection and research among vulnerable populations is included in training for all JIPS team members. It may be worth circulating within the team an article written on some of the pitfalls of data collection among refugees, many of which also apply to IDPs[1].

---

[1] Jeff Crisp (1999) 'Who has counted the refugees: UNHCR and the politics of numbers', New Issues in Refugee Research, 12, http://www.unhcr.org/3ae6a0c22.pdf

3.1.2 Strategy and business plan

The 2011-14 JIPS strategy document is comprehensive and coherent. It contains all the elements of a strategic plan that donors and evaluators typically look for, including an internal and external logic, a clear statement of the relevance of the project to needs, a practical explanation on implementation capacity, a monitoring and evaluation timetable, alignment and harmonization with existing activities and initiatives in the field, clear links between the problems being addressed and the key objectives for the project, and a realistic budget.

The strategy refers to two examples of monitoring and evaluation. The first is an independent review of JIPS supported profiling processes to date, which is being fulfilled by this evaluation report. The second is periodic monitoring and evaluation of JIPS supported profiling processes. I have reviewed the template for JIPS Country Reports which form the basis for periodic monitoring and evaluation for field support, and the only omission that I noted in the template was any indication of the budget and total expenditure for the mission. <u>I recommend that the template is updated to include financial performance indicators</u>. I have also reviewed specific Country Reports for eleven countries (see Annex 2) and found these to have been comprehensive and detailed. My conclusion is that the monitoring and evaluation aspect of the strategy is being appropriately implemented.

I have not had access to detailed accounts or an expenses forecast, and I have not conducted a financial audit. It was explained to me at the 16 November 2012 meeting that JIPS projects are subject to a financial audit by the relevant donor agency, and that UNHCR regulations apply to all non-project related expenses, including authorization of travel requests, and so it appears that an adequate financial audit system is in place.

I have reviewed the 2013-14 draft funding proposal with budget and thought it was well-written and convincing and contained the appropriate information for potential donors. The only section that raised a question for me concerned the 'need for more diverse support capacity' where it is stated that 'A diversification of JIPS support capacity is part and parcel of the suggested activities in this proposal'. The limited findings from this evaluation indicate significant reservations on the part of those interviewed about whether JIPS should extend its activities beyond IDPs, for example to migration and refugee contexts. Certainly to respect its commitment to being a largely demand-driven initiative, as well as to attract donor support, JIPS should demonstrate a clear need for profiling in these other contexts before

expanding its remit, and be specific about what these contexts are. <u>I recommend that the Steering Committee considers carefully the proposal to extend the JIPS remit beyond IDPs before approving the 2013-14 draft funding proposal, including on the basis of the findings of this evaluation.</u>

With regard to the draft 2013-14 budget, my only comment was that behind staff costs, by far the largest budget line is for field missions. As discussed in more detail below (Section 3.4.2), this reflects an uneven focus on one objective above the other four identified for JIPS, which needs to be justified. My immediate reaction was that 34 international flights and 820 days of DSA were excessive, and I suspect some donors may agree. <u>I recommend that the funding proposal makes a stronger case for why so much international travel, and so many days in the field, are required to fulfill JIPS's aims and objectives.</u> I also wondered at the high cost for renting a conference venue – is it not possible for one of the supporting agencies to provide a venue for JIPS conferences free of charge?

As I see it the main funding challenge for JIPS is to attract core funding (as opposed to project funding). I have not seen the list of potential donors to whom the draft funding proposal (2013-14) will be targeted, but needless to say <u>I recommend that the proposal is disseminated widely</u>. In reality it is unlikely to succeed without active lobbying at a senior level, and <u>I recommend that the Steering Committee considers how to raise awareness of the proposal at the appropriate level in their respective agencies</u>. One strategy may be to submit a proposal in partnership, for example with the Special Rapporteur. Another may be to convene a joint donor conference around IDPs with a specific segment on JIPS and the importance of profiling. The alternative will be for the partner agencies in JIPS to back stop the initiative, in particular to cover staff costs, while the team raises project funds. This is probably not a sustainable funding model, and it may be that the Steering Committee wishes to consider an incentivization scheme to encourage JIPS to raise core funds, for example by a staged withdrawal of core funds.

While JIPS has proved successful in raising project funds to date, clearly this needs to be maintained. One sign of progress would be for JIPS to be commissioned by agencies other than the partner agencies and some specific recommendations in this regard are made below (Section 3.2.1). It will also be important that full project costs are covered by agencies requesting JIPS support. <u>I recommend that the Steering Committee sets specific targets and benchmarks for fundraising activities.</u>

3.1.3 Human Resources

As part of this evaluation I reviewed the Terms of Reference for the six current JIPS team positions – Coordinator (Senior Profiling Advisor), Profiling Advisor: Information Management Specialist, Profiling Advisor, Training and Capacity Building Specialist, Profiling/Information Management Advisor, and Administration/Reporting Officer. I noted some inconsistencies both within and between the Terms of References (different structures and some inconsistencies in the job title used). <u>I recommend that the Term of Reference are reviewed for consistency, and in particular that every Terms of Reference includes a detailed description of the qualifications required for the position. I also recommend that each Terms of Reference includes an approximate indication of the percentage of time allocated to each of the main responsibilities identified.</u>

It seems to me that the responsibilities required for the position of Coordinator (Senior Profiling Advisor) are unrealistic. They include JIPS Development and Project Management; Field Support Functions; Products Development Functions; Human Resource Management Functions; and Resource Mobilization, Liaison and Representation Functions. Interviewees especially from supported field operations have indicated that the current position holder's skills are particularly appreciated in the field, which presumably increases the amount of time that he needs to allocate to Field Support Functions, as well as to training other team members. I have (appropriately) not had access to annual appraisal reports for any of the JIPS team, but <u>I recommend that at the next evaluation for the Coordinator specific attention is paid to the extent to which he is able to fulfill all the responsibilities listed in his Terms of Reference.</u> A number of options may be suggested for reducing the requirements on this particular position, ranging from the appointment of a new team member, to sharing some of the current responsibilities among other team members. It seems to me that there is a logical division of labour between the strategic and oversight responsibilities (external relations, donor relations, team management, reporting to the Steering Committee etc.) and the profiling responsibilities (identifying opportunities, supervising field support, development of technical tools etc.)

There is also some ambiguity in the Terms of Reference for the Coordinator (Senior Profiling Advisor) as regards reporting lines. It is stated that the performance evaluation review is undertaken by the Steering Committee, and that on a day-to-day basis the position-holder refers to the Chief of Section at FICSS, UNHCR. <u>I recommend that the reporting lines for and supervision of this position are clarified in the Terms of Reference.</u>

11

Besides reviewing the Terms of Reference I also had the opportunity to meet the entire JIPS team together. I noted a very positive team spirit. This reflects the values laid out in the document 'The Way We Operate', and also speaks to the management skills of the team leader. In my opinion it also places special emphasis on recruitment procedures, as in such a small and close-knit team, personality and commitment to a team ethic become very important characteristics. I also suggest that this team spirit has been fostered through the single location for the team, allowing for example for regular face-to-face contact. Physically to separate out the team would most likely affect the team dynamic, and this is one strong reason to recommend that the entire team continues to be co-located.

Second, although (again appropriately) I did not see individual team members' contracts, I understand that most of the team members are on short-term renewable contracts. Recognizing funding constraints, I would suggest this is not a sustainable model either for retaining current team members, or attracting excellent new team members. I recommend that consideration is given to enhancing the job security contained in team members' current contracts. Finally, it was not clear to me to what extent the current structure allows for any professional development of individual team members, although I recognize that there is 'on the job' training especially during missions. The current job descriptions also appear to be 'static', in that there is little scope for upward advancement within the team. 'The Way We Operate' document places considerable emphasis on 'valuing individuals' and at least part of this process should to be to allow professional development and career advancement. Given the importance of staff retention for JIPS, I recommend that the Steering Committee develops a policy on professional development and career advancement.

3.1.4 Governance

I also reviewed the Terms of Reference for the Steering Committee. My main observation on this document is that the oversight role of the Steering Committee is not as explicit as it should be. In the section on 'The Purpose of the Steering Committee' 12 specific tasks are listed, most of which relate more to supporting JIPS than overseeing it. The Steering Committee minutes of which I have had sight (27 March 2012, 23 May 2012, 21 September 2012, 1 November 2012) also leave me with the impression that these meetings are more concerned with receiving updates on activities and approving the strategic direction for JIPS, than explicitly on providing oversight.

I suggest that one of the key roles for the Steering Committee, especially during the pilot phase and transition years for JIPS, should be to provide oversight, ranging from fulfilling commitments to professional development for team members, to monitoring and evaluating outcomes and impact, to reviewing progress on the stated objectives for JIPS, to actively maintaining accountability. My interviews and review of the documents to which I had access suggested that while JIPS has been monitored, at times quite closely, this has not been on a systematic or formal basis. I recommend that the Terms of Reference for the Steering Committee be amended to make explicit reference to its responsibility as regards oversight. Specifically, the Terms of Reference might make explicit reference to:

- Providing guidance to the Coordinator in developing and continuing the relevance of JIPS
- Ensuring that all activities are conducted at a high level of quality
- Ensuring open access to all JIPS products and reports
- Overseeing the financial management of JIPS

At the same time the Steering Committee needs to avoid becoming over-bureaucratic, micro-managing, and more concerned with institutional politics than people. In achieving the right model, I recommend that the Steering Committee reviews governance structures for other inter-agency initiatives and processes to ensure that JIPS is subject to appropriate governance. It may be that the role of the Steering Committee evolves over time, and that as JIPS becomes a more consolidated and systematic service, its oversight role can transform into a support role. But I would suggest that it is too early for this transition to take place now.

Beyond adjusting the Terms of Reference, there is the question of implementing the responsibility to oversee JIPS. Interviews with various Steering Committee members suggested to me that there are different levels of commitment to the Steering Committee among members – in terms for example of attendance at Steering Committee meetings at the appropriate level. I was also surprised by the decision made at the Steering Committee meeting on 23 May 2012 to reduce the number of Steering Committee meetings per year. I recommend that the Steering Committee reviews its constituency and meeting schedule to ensure that it is in a position effectively to fulfill its governance role. One option discussed with one interviewee was the possibility of distinguishing a core group within the Steering Committee with direct responsibility for oversight of JIPS, from a wider reference group. The risk would be to alienate certain Steering Committee members, and to undermine the inclusivity of the inter-agency approach that underpins JIPS. But at this stage, as JIPS transitions out of its pilot phase, I would

argue that strong governance is critical, and I believe that this risk of splintering the Steering Committee is outweighed by the need for a committed core group.

3.2 Activities

One of the significant achievements of JIPS has been to define profiling as a comprehensive process, entailing the following key steps: (i) the need for profiling; (ii) advocacy and lobbying; (iii) process management; (iv) methodology; (v) questionnaire and analysis plans; (vi) data collection and field organization; and (vii) data processing and reporting. This section considers an analysis of available documents, along with feedback from interviewees, to begin to answer the question to what extent is implementation happening as planned?

3.2.1 The need for profiling

JIPS identifies itself as a demand-driven initiative and during interviews with people directly involved with various supported operations (specifically Afghanistan, Colombia, CAR, Uganda, Burundi, and Serbia) an initial question concerned why JIPS became involved there. It is noteworthy that the answer to this question varied widely, from a commitment to follow-up made during an earlier agency mission, through the need to clarify a particular registration or profiling issue (disagreement over numbers, need for more sophisticated data), to the need to encourage a political process. On the one hand this speaks to the wide demand for and potential impact of JIPS. On the other hand – and this is a risk inherent with any demand-driven approach – there is the possibility that the JIPS strategy becomes led – and deviated - by demand, especially where the underlying reason to commission JIPS clearly varies significantly across contexts.

The procedure for applying for JIPS support has been reviewed during 2012 – I have seen a concept note, process and question guide, instruction sheet, and brief evaluation report. There is no need to review this procedure again, but I felt that the identified assessment criteria addressed well some of the shortcomings in earlier JIPS missions of which I have been made aware, relating to multi-stakeholder interest and support, expected impact, availability of resources, and feasibility of JIPS support. In this regard the review and application process are good evidence that JIPS is identifying and building on lessons learnt, and adjusting processes accordingly. The assessment criteria and prioritization included in the review and application process also to an extent also alleviate the demand-driven risks identified

above, and <u>I recommend that the application procedure is fully implemented and followed up through monitoring and evaluation.</u>

I think a question worth reflecting on as JIPS looks forward is to what extent JIPS should continue to be a responsive initiative, or more proactively seek out situations where its technical expertise might make a contribution (of course the two are not mutually exclusive). As explained above (Section 3.1.2), for now I suggest that JIPS still focuses its profiling on IDPs. I believe there may be a case for JIPS to undertake scoping and desk-research to identify opportunities, although I recognize the need for broad political consensus before any assistance is provided. <u>I recommend that the Steering Committee considers as an agenda item in a forthcoming meeting the relative merits of a responsive and proactive approach by JIPS.</u>

If the decision is that JIPS should primarily maintain a demand-driven and hence largely responsive stance, then success to a significant extent depends on potential customers actually knowing that JIPS exists and what is can offer. A fairly common response in this regard was that JIPS is not well-known – either in the headquarters of certain partner agencies, or among these partner agencies in the field. If this is the case, it may be expected that JIPS is even less well known among agencies not directly involved in supporting it. While a variety of methods have been adopted to raise awareness of JIPS, including through strategic partnerships and active advocacy, the Steering Committee also has a number of specific purposes (as identified in its Terms of Reference) in this regard, relating to advocacy, dissemination, and identifying new opportunities for JIPS. <u>I recommend that the Steering Committee considers how it can fulfill these commitments to raise awareness of JIPS in a more systematic manner, both within their respective agencies, but also externally.</u> Some specific suggestions in this regard are provided in Section 3.1.2 above.

3.2.2 Advocacy and lobbying

It is very clear from interviews with respondents from supported operations that advocacy and lobbying are critical before, during, and after the completion of data collection, in order to resolve differences in approach, reassure stakeholders (especially governments), and reinforce the purpose of profiling.

Several respondents reported that the JIPS team members had successfully navigated some quite difficult political and diplomatic waters in helping build confidence for the profiling exercise, both at

headquarters level in Geneva, but more commonly in specific countries. A term that recurred during interviews was that JIPS had managed to 'depoliticize' data collection and profiling.

In addition, it is clear from the interviews that the time required to undertake in-country consultations should not be underestimated, and these need to be well-prepared in advance, preferably via a scoping mission. Subsequent to the 16 November 2012 meeting I understand that Terms of Reference for scoping missions are prepared in advance with partners in the target country and in consultation with the Steering Committee. I have not seen an example of these Terms of Reference and so I cannot comment for example on their content or structure. Neither am I aware of the extent to which the Steering Committee is directly involved in their preparation and approval. I recommend that Terms of Reference are prepared in advance of all scoping missions for approval by the Steering Committee.

One or two respondents for this evaluation expressed some concern that JIPS has become more concerned with advocacy and lobbying than with providing technical advice. While it is clear to me, including through much of the documentation, that advocacy and lobbying are an integral part of the overall profiling process and are usually needed to establish effective collaborative data collection, this apparently is not always clear to others. I recommend that the JIPS team and Steering Committee continue to emphasize the integrated nature and overall purpose of the profiling process in its advocacy and lobbying.

3.2.3 Process management

The main steps entailed in process management, and the obstacles encountered, are well documented in the mission reports that I have seen, and do not need to be revisited in detail here. Process management includes, for example, defining a work plan; establishing and maintaining collaboration between relevant stakeholders at the political and technical levels; developing appropriate tools; negotiating agreement on implementation and budget; and providing training on data collection. Common obstacles encountered are reported to include a lack of dedicated staff, unclear lines of communication and authority between various partners, and delays in formalizing agreements and confirming budgets. I have also reviewed the 'step-by-step' and 'profiling process' flow diagrams which reassure me that process management is appropriately systematized.

One or two respondents expressed a concern that this process management took place on the initiative of the JIPS team, and without clear reference to relevant agencies in the particular country concerned. Clearly this is unusual, as there is ample evidence of consultation for example through regular bilateral meetings and workshops, but it raises the question of accountability. It is not clear to me to what extent a JIPS mission is accountable to the Steering Committee, or a designated partner agency represented in the specific country, during a mission. I recommend that Terms of Reference for missions make reference to the management of accountability and performance monitoring.

3.2.4 Methodology; questionnaire and analysis plans; and data collection and field organization

None of the respondents to this evaluation were able to provide detailed information or comments on the specific data collection methodologies developed with the assistance of the JIPS team in various supported operations. They all nevertheless said that they thought the methodology was appropriately tailored to the local context, and that in terms of the data collection an appropriate number of IDPs (or relevant targeted population) was covered in the right locations. Neither could they comment in detail (other than generally being positive) about the questionnaire and analysis plans developed, or about the training, data collection, or field organization. I have had the opportunity to review a range of methodology documents from various supported operations, although it is difficult for me to assess their value and effectiveness without understanding how they have been used in the field. Equally I have seen several reports on training sessions provided to supported operations, which seem to have been well evaluated. Following up on a recommendation made above (Section 3.1.1), I recommend that training in the field also includes some discussion on the ethics of profiling.

This may be a level of detail that was not intended for this evaluation, but it strikes me as important that a review of the research method and design adopted in supported operations is undertaken, preferably by an academic social scientist. It is well understood that data collection is only one part of a wider profiling process; that the eventual research method and design adopted may need to be negotiated with other stakeholders; and that JIPS usually does not have the capacity actively to oversee the data collection. Still the reputation of JIPS depends on its promotion of and support for a robust and legitimate research method and design. Issues range from practical considerations such as identifying target populations and sampling frames, to ethical issues including empowering respondents during the interview procedure. I recommend that the Steering Committee considers commissioning an academic

review of the research method and design adopted in selected supported missions. The current JIPS partnership with Tufts University on urban profiling may provide the opportunity for such a review.

3.2.5 Data processing and reporting

I saw less reference in either the periodic reports or mission reports to data processing and reporting than to the other steps in the profiling process as described in this section. An immediate implication is that reporting on this final step needs to be improved. It seems to me that a simple way to achieve this is to develop a common structure for all country reports that follows the structure of the profiling process (need for profiling, advocacy and lobbying, process management, methodology, questionnaire and analysis plans, data collection and field organization, and data processing and reporting), identifying specific achievements and obstacles at each step. I recommend that the Country Report template is updated to cover the main steps of the profiling process.

The wider observation that arose during interviews with respondents associated with several different supported operations was that direct support was not always provided by JIPS during the data processing and reporting phase (although direct support during the reporting phase was provided in Burundi, CAR, DR Congo, and Uganda). This poses a dilemma. On the one hand JIPS cannot maintain a constant field presence, or provide constant distance support, and developing the capacity of local partners is part of the objective of the JIPS process. On the other hand if data are not fully processed, and final reports delayed or even not produced, then the main purpose of the JIPS mission – to provide data to improve assistance, protection, and durable solutions – is undermined.

First, it is important to manage local expectations by being clear from the outset what level of support can be expected from JIPS. Second, it may be worth developing internal guidelines defining criteria for the withdrawal of JIPS support – combining practical considerations such as budget or human resources demands, with more process-oriented considerations such as the achievement of particular objectives. Third, although I have seen two examples, I have not seen handover notes prepared for every supported operation covered by this evaluation, and the structure of those that I did see was not standard. Clear handover notes are important. Finally, JIPS may need to review its procedures for providing distance support, especially regarding how much staff time is allocated to maintaining contact with a particular supported operation. The overall recommendation is that the process of withdrawing or reducing JIPS support and handing over responsibility to local partners needs to be clarified and systematized.

18

Overall, the right balance needs to be struck between initiating a profiling process in lots of countries, which is important for awareness-raising, and completing the profiling process in a smaller number, which is important for sustainability. <u>I recommend that as JIPS transitions out of its pilot phase, it may be worth re-orienting its strategy to target fewer missions but in a more comprehensive manner.</u>

3.3 Outputs

This brief sub-section focuses on the concrete outputs produced by JIPS, recognizing that these are an integral component of the field support covered in the preceding section. It is clear that a significant amount of staff time and resources have been expended on these outputs over the last three years, and they form the basis for the advocacy and lobbying undertaken in support of JIPS. I have consulted the JIPS website (www.jips.org), reviewed the final report on the 'Needs Beyond Numbers' IDP Profiling Conference (23-24 May 2011), read the Profiling and Assessment Resource Kit (PARK), read the internal report prepared by Samantha Newman on the JIPS Profiling Coordination Training (PCT) conducted from 15-20 July 2012, and included in my discussions with various key informants questions about how accessible and useful they have found JIPS tools and products.

An initial observation is that I thought the JIPS website contained useful information, was clear, and easy to navigate, and as far as I could tell it was up to date (the links worked, the most recent reports have been posted and so on). Reflecting observations made above, what was not clear to me from the website is how JIPS is overseen – I found one short reference to the Steering Committee. <u>I recommend that the website provide a clear explanation of the governance structure for JIPS.</u> A second and related observation was that there is no record that I could find on the website of Steering Committee meetings. I wonder whether it is worth posting the minutes of these meetings, or at least a short summary, to promote transparency.

Similarly I found the PARK database to be an impressive product, which clearly has required a significant investment of time and resources, and provides a good foundation on which JIPS can now build. In particular I thought the side tabs on 'latest additions', 'best rated', and 'most downloaded' were helpful. I have seen statistics on the PARK website indicating 3250 visitors (of which 2537 are unique visitors) in 2012 (to 28 October), and also demonstrating a steady month-on-month rise in visits to the website. My assessment is that these are significant numbers that demonstrate that the PARK database is widely

used, although it was not possible from the statistics provided to assess the geographical spread of the visitors.

The JIPS Profiling Coordination Training has already been evaluated, and I note the high feedback scores, as well as the consultant's specific recommendations on the length of the course, pedagogy, and team management. I did not see the PCT evaluation report on the website and I recommend that it is posted. In answer to the specific review question concerning training certainly this training course is reported to have been effective and well-targeted, although I have not reviewed the actual training materials or spoken to any of the participants. Given the positive feedback it would seem sensible to provide another training course, either in Geneva or in a regional hub, and I note that further training courses are planned are proposed on the 2013-14 funding proposal. I recommend that if possible this course is held on an annual basis, and that in due course consideration is given to hosting in a regional hub. As above, I have some questions about costs indicated for these conferences in the draft 2013-14 budget (see Section 3.1.2).

I have seen the training materials, and a written evaluation, for a few training courses on profiling provided to supported operations. If it does not already take place systematically, I recommend that written evaluations should be prepared as an integral part of training courses, and posted on the website alongside other information in support provided to operations.

A question that I cannot answer systematically is to what extent JIPS tools are disseminated effectively. All JIPS supported tool are on the JIPS website, although as indicated above some reports are missing. Unsurprisingly all the respondents for this evaluation said that they had used the JIPS website, but I cannot assess how widely the website is accessed.

3.4 Outcomes

There is substantial documented evidence that JIPS has significantly met its principal objectives, and this headline conclusion was largely endorsed by the respondents for this evaluation.

3.4.1 Raise awareness of the value of collaborative collection of disaggregated data and its analysis

It is always difficult to assess the extent to which awareness has been raised, and to attribute increased awareness to any single intervention. At a formal level, the inclusion of a reference to JIPS in the UN

General Assembly's Human Rights Council resolution (A/HRC/20/L.14) on the human rights of IDPs (July 2012), and the development of a collaboration agreement with the Special Rapporteur for the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons demonstrate that the value of JIPS and its activities are recognized with the UN system. This is a very notable achievement in the relatively short period that JIPS has been in existence.

It is also worth noting the very active advocacy that has clearly been undertaken by the JIPS team and that is well documented on the website, for example in terms of attending relevant meetings, organizing side-events and so on. As noted above, convening the 'Needs beyond Numbers' conference, and other JIPS outputs such as PARK are also key aspects of advocacy and awareness-raising. Several Steering Committee members have also undertaken advocacy and awareness-raising – DRC for example included a session on JIPS in the 2011 Annual Meeting of Director. <u>Given limited financial and human resources, I recommend that such advocacy needs to be clearly targeted and an advocacy strategy developed and approved by the Steering Committee.</u>

At the same time, as indicated above, it is not clear that JIPS and its outputs are widely known within the partner agencies, which can be important for raising financial or other support, as well as in promoting the services of JIPS. There may be lessons to learn from DRC in particular, where JIPS does appear to be well known. Possibilities might include ensuring that JIPS products are widely disseminated and available within the agency; hosting for example a lunchtime briefing for all staff; or directly raising awareness of JIPS through a submission to Senior Management Team.

3.4.2 Support country operations in planning and implementing profiling processes
During its pilot phase JIPS has provided direct support to 12 operations, including missions to support 10 profiling exercises. This is an impressive outcome during a three year pilot phase. Specific observations and recommendations concerning the implementation of these activities are contained in Section 3.2 above.

There is one observation from a respondent that is worth including here. This was the impression that JIPS has focused the majority of its resources and energy on country support operations, and as a result has paid less attention to achieving its other four stated objectives. It would be interesting to conduct a brief analysis of the extent to which this perceived bias is accurate – for example in terms of the

allocation of staff time or budget. As indicated above, the draft 2013-14 budget suggests that it is and will continue to be the case. On the basis of feedback provided after the 12 November 2012 meeting, I understand that this was a deliberate strategy on the part of the JIPS team and Steering Committee. Certainly some funding has been attached directly to profiling exercises (as I understand it ECHO identified three profiling exercises as a key grant deliverable). And there may well be a case that focusing initial activities on country support has been the best way to establish the relevance of JIPS, and to an extent achieving the other four objectives follows from effective country support. Nevertheless it would make sense to identify this prioritization clearly, to explain why this is felt to be the most significant objective, and to demonstrate how achieving the other four objectives flow from it. As JIPS plans its next strategy cycle, I would recommend that a priority list of objectives is developed and justified as part of the strategy implementation planning and funding proposal.

3.4.3 Improve coordination mechanisms, partnerships and networks at local, country and global levels to share experience of profiling

At a global level, it is clear that partnership-building has been significant, especially through the development and maintenance of formal relationships with Steering Committee member agencies (UNHCR, DRC, NRC-IDMC, IOM, UNFPA and OCHA), the office of the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs, Global Clusters, ACAPS, and international NGOs (NRC and HelpAge International). As detailed above (Section 3.1.4) there is a question in my mind about differing levels of engagement by the Steering Committee members. In addition as explained in Section 2 above, I have not been able to speak to representatives from most of the non-Steering Committee partners, and I cannot gauge to what extent these partners consider the partnership to be effective. In my experience partnerships, where carefully planned and managed, can be of significant strategic importance. It is not clear to me whether further partnerships are planned – one obvious target might be the African Union (AU) in light of the AU Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons - or how existing partnerships (especially with non-Steering Committee members) are managed. I recommend that strategic new partnerships are identified as part of the strategy implementation plan. I also recommend that sufficient resources are allocated to keeping current partnerships active.

As observed in Sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.4 above, it appears that networks and partnerships at the local level during missions to supported operations have been skillfully developed and managed, but as recommended, the process of networking and partnership may need to be more systematized.

3.4.4   Promote a systematic approach to plan, implement and utilize results from profiling processes

This limited evaluation suggests that of the five key JIPS objectives, this is the objective where least concrete progress has been made in particular as regards the utilization of results, This is important because in my reading this objective is most closely linked to the principle of achieving sustainable impact.

Focusing on some of the specific deliverables identified under this objective in the 2011-14 strategy in turn: As observed above (Section 3.2), information on profiling planning and programming has been effectively shared among key stakeholders within supported operations, but not always in a systematic manner according to my interviews. There is little evidence that stakeholders beyond the specific supported operations know about JIPS, or have a clear understanding of its methods and approach. It is clear that JIPS-developed profiling guidelines have been adapted to the local context and used to varying degrees of effectiveness in supported operations, but again I have come across no evidence that these guidelines are being used more widely. Accelerated uptake is an important indicator of success.

Equally it is important to acknowledge that there is clear evidence towards achieving other of the deliverables identified under this objective. There is evidence – in the periodic reports and country reports – that JIPS has developed its profiling interventions in a sequential manner, learning lessons from previous interventions. As noted above (Sections 2 and 3), I have also seen evidence that systematic monitoring and evaluation of JIPS support and profiling are taking place.

Depending on how important a priority promoting a systematic approach to plan, implement and utilize results from profiling processes is, I recommend that the Steering Committee pay particular attention to ensuring that appropriate resources and support are targeted on this objective.

3.4.5 Build capacity of relevant actors capable of planning and implementing profiling processes

In briefly assessing progress on this objective, it needs to be understood that JIPS has a limited role in capacity-building, although in the case of CAR in particular a fairly significant capacity-building process was supported. The documents I have reviewed and the interviews I have conducted suggest to me that the right steps have been taken towards developing local capacity, including raising awareness among governments and other stakeholders, employing and training local staff in the profiling process, and

23

where possible sensitizing relevant local statistical offices and other agencies to the purposes and methods of profiling. Equally it is important to note reservations expressed by some respondents concerning the loss of momentum after the end of the profiling exercise (see Section 3.2.5), for example as a result of delays in issuing a final report, or the loss of trained staff to other positions.

3.5 Impact

We need to be realistic in assessing the impact of a small process that has so far existed in a pilot phase for only three years, especially when its intended impact relates to improving assistance, protection and durable solutions for IDPs. One way to achieve this reality check is to recognize that profiling and data collection comprise only one small element of a much wider set of inputs for achieving these intended impacts. One respondent was clear that profiling can support the development of national laws and policies on IDPs, while also noting the many other factors entailed in this process. This was also a clear message from the interview with a representative of the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs, that JIPS is viewed as one way to achieve one component of a much broader set of inputs required to achieve his mandate.

Two implications arise. The first concerns the future focus for JIPS. Recognizing the position of JIPS and IDP profiling in a wider process for achieving IDP solutions in my opinion argues for the focus of JIPS to remain focused – on IDPs, and on profiling and data collection. To extend beyond IDPs may undermine a key component for achieving IDP solutions, and would also make JIPS part of a different configuration of inputs (for example on migration or refugees) where its added value and contribution to the overall goal is less clear. Clearly this is a strategic decision to be made by the Steering Committee, but my recommendation is that in the next three years JIPS maintains its focus on IDP profiling. A second implication of understanding how JIPS fits into a broader process is that this may be one way to guide the choice of strategic partnerships in the future (as recommended above in Section 3.4.3). It would make sense for me for JIPS to partner with agencies and services responsible for other components of the overall delivery of IDP solutions, in order to ensure coordination of efforts.

4. Lessons Learned

Besides the specific recommendations made in the preceding sections, a number of broader lessons learned can be discerned from the findings of this evaluation. These can be presented as a simple SWOT analysis, listing the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats associated with JIPS. <u>The overall recommendation that flows from this analysis is JIPS should build on its strengths, address its weaknesses, respond strategically to opportunities, and consider mitigation strategies against risks and threats.</u>

4.1 Strengths

In the course of this evaluation I have identified three specific strengths of the JIPS process.

4.1.1 The inter-agency approach

The inter-agency approach is clearly a strength of JIPS and its advantages are well explained in the 2011-14 strategy. Considering how to build on this strength, a number of issues need to be considered. The first, as indicated in the above analysis, is that in the next phase for JIPS, more may be expected of the current sponsoring agencies, ranging from funding, to promoting JIPS internally and externally, to identifying new opportunities for supported operations. The second concerns the merits of changing (either increasing or decreasing) the formal agency membership of JIPS, and how to strike the right balance between size and commitment. Is the real value of the inter-agency approach the number of agencies concerned, or the commitment of those involved?

4.1.2. Profiling as a process

A second strength in my assessment is the definition by JIPS of profiling as a process, starting with identifying the need for profiling and concluding with data processing and reporting. Defining profiling in this way has maximized the opportunity for JIPS to provide 'added value', for example in terms of helping diffuse political tensions over various IDP issues, and contributing towards local capacity. While this evaluation has identified some challenges concerning the full implementation of the process, the process itself in my opinion is well-tested, effective, and should be maintained.

4.1.3 Context specificity

Many respondents, particular with experience of supported operations, cited as a particular strength of the JIPS process its adaptability to the local political and operational context. Equally three challenges have been alluded to in this evaluation. First, does JIPS have an adequate complement of staff with the necessary combination to skills to undertake the political, diplomatic, and technical aspects of supporting operations? A second challenge is how to systematize JIPS interventions – for the reasons of predictability, accountability, and sustainability – without undermining adaptability. The third challenge is how to justify, in terms of the overall aims and objectives of JIPS, the relatively high staff and resource inputs required to be adaptable.

4.2 Weaknesses

4.2.1 Staffing model

The evaluation (Section 3.1.3) has identified a number of challenges relating to the human resourcing of the JIPS team, ranging from inconsistencies in Terms of Reference, to unrealistic expectations on one team member in particular, to risks of rapid staff turnover. I consider this an important weakness that needs to be addressed in planning the next stages of JIPS and a number of specific recommendations have been made above.

4.2.2 Governance

In Section 3.1.4 in particular, but also elsewhere in the evaluation, I have also referred to what I interpret as an unclear governance structure for JIPS and inadequately formulated oversight. The examples cited range from a lack of clear reporting lines for certain team members, to uneven commitment by Steering Committee members, to a lack of oversight especially during JIPS missions to supported operations. While good governance may exist informally and in practice, it is important that is formalized and made explicit, in order to reassure donors in particular about accountability.

4.2 3 Sustainability of impact

While acknowledging that to a significant extent both sustainability and impact are beyond the capacity of JIPS fully to influence or control, this evaluation has identified in some cases some weaknesses around sustainability, in particular as regards the completion of the entire profiling process, and the effective management of handing over responsibility to local partners after the withdrawal of direct JIPS support.

26

4.3 Opportunities

4.3.1 Promoting the JIPS model

In my assessment it is not just what JIPS does that is innovative, but also what it is. The model of an inter-agency service provider targeting a specific need and complementing the work of other humanitarian actors may not be absolutely original, but is still unusual. JIPS has achieved this model with significant success. I would encourage Steering Committee members to try to raise awareness not just of the importance of IDP profiling, but also of the potential of the JIPS model.

4.3.2 Extending the profiling method to other populations

As described above, in my view the profiling process is a significant strength. While the data gap may not be quite as large for most other vulnerable or mobile populations as it is for IDPs, and while in most other situations there are already agencies with at least some responsibility for registration, data collection, and sometimes profiling, I think there are lessons to learn from the JIPS profiling method for other populations. The key strategic decision concerns whether JIPS should consider extending its services to other population settings, or whether its tools should be disseminated to other agencies working in those settings. For the reasons outlined in various parts of this evaluation, my recommendation tends towards the latter.

4.3.3 Extending or following-up on missions

While sustainability has been identified as a weak link in the JIPS process, clearly this also presents an opportunity. While acknowledging certain donor pressures to support new operations, this evaluation leads me to suggest that there may be more value in focusing on fewer operations in a more sustainable manner, than covering a larger number of operations in a less satisfactory manner. This might entail more and longer missions, and overall more time and resources, dedicated to fewer operations where the potential impact of JIPS can be realized. The new review and application process can be a tool to achieve this opportunity.

4.4. Threats

4.4.1 The demand-driven model

As explained in various places in this evaluation, I consider there to be some risks relating to JIPS's focus on being 'demand-driven'. In particular there is a risk that its strategic direction may become distracted

27

or diverted by particular demands. This risk is already being addressed, and the review and application process now in place should help reduce it.

4.4.2 Staff turnover

In my assessment the current JIPS team combines very talented individuals with the right combination of skills who appear to work well as a team. Their current terms of employment make staff turnover a risk, and replacing them at the right level, with people with the appropriate skills set and personality, will be a challenge.

4.4.3 Lack of critical reflection

A final risk that I have identified may be termed a lack of critical reflection within JIPS. This has been identified in several ways, ranging from a lack of critical engagement with the overall value of IDP profiling, to inadequately formalized oversight by the Steering Committee, to biases towards certain objectives above others. Commissioning this independent review of JIPS is an important way to introduce a critical and objective perspective, and it is hoped that some of the observations and recommendations here can inform the development of JIPS.

5. Conclusions

For a small and largely experimental initiative, the progress and achievements of JIPS during its three-year pilot phase have been very impressive indeed, ranging from a well-developed internal management system, through a significant number of supported operations, to a comprehensive set of concrete outputs - complemented by extensive and effective advocacy and lobbying. The proven reputation of JIPS to deliver, its well-developed series of practical tools, and strong support by its sponsoring agencies, all provide good foundations for its future development. In this context, the overall conclusion of this evaluation is that JIPS transitions from its pilot phase, what is required is further professionalization, systematization, and prioritization, across a range of areas, to support its expansion.