

Making Displacement Safer Mid-term Review Report

Prepared for:

Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction

Prepared by:

Mollie Pepper, PhD and Mallory Carlson
Carlson Pepper Collaborative

September 2022



Acknowledgements

First and foremost, we would like to extend our thanks to the implementing member representatives, global partners, displaced community members, and local government officials and academics who offered to share their time and expertise with us in interviews and focus groups. Their contributions to this report are invaluable and we are grateful for their participation. We would also like to thank the members of the GNDR Secretariat and Forced Displacement Advisory Group who provided input and guidance throughout this research project. Finally and perhaps most of all, we would like to thank the GNDR project management team for their ongoing support for the research and consideration of its recommendations moving forward.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	1
Table of contents	2
List of tables	4
List of abbreviations and acronyms	5
Executive summary	7
Introduction	10
Overview	10
Project description	10
Context	10
Project objectives and design	10
Organisations involved	12
Intended beneficiaries	13
Mid-term review background	13
Purpose, audience, and intended use of the mid-term review	13
Mid-term review objectives	14
Scope	14
Stakeholder engagement	14
Evaluation team	15
Evaluation methods	16
Approach	16
Evaluation matrix	17
Criteria	17
Data collection methods	17
Data collection procedures	18
Data management	19
Timeline	19
Data analysis	20
Limitations	20
Evaluation results	22
Relevance and validity of design	22
Effectiveness	26
Efficiency	29
Sustainability	32
Impact	35

Coherence	39
Lessons learned	41
Recommendations	43
Recommendations for the Making Displacement Safer project	43
Recommendations for future evaluations	46
References	47
Annexes	48
Annex 1: Evaluation matrix	48
Annex 2: Bond evidence principles	52
Annex 3: Semi-structured interview guides	54
Annex 4: Informed consent information	58
Annex 5: Methods statement on participant wellbeing	60
Annex 6: Advisory group terms of reference	62

List of tables

Table 1: Project partners

Table 2: Work plan

List of abbreviations and acronyms

BHA	Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance
CASM	Comisión de Acción Social Menonita
CDHD	Cercle des Droits de l'Homme et de Développement
COP27	2022 United Nations Climate Change Conference
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DEMI-E	Développement pour un Mieux-Être
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
GNDR	Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction
GPDRR	Global Platform on Disaster Risk Reduction
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IID	Iraqi Institution for Development
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
MDS	Making Displacement Safer project
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
NSET	National Society for Earthquake Technology - Nepal
OECD-DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development-Development Assistance Committee
PDD	Platform on Disaster Displacement
RDI	Resilience Development Initiative
RoG	Root of Generations
SAM	System for Award Management
SLT	Senior Leadership Team
SWOT	Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats analysis tool
ULL	Urban Living Lab

UN	United Nations
UNDRR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VFL Lite	Views from the Frontline Lite
VoSB	Voice of South Bangladesh
VSLA	Village Savings and Loan Association
WIA	Words into Action

Executive summary

It is estimated that 55% of the world's population live in urban areas (UN DESA 2018), of which nearly 25% live in informal settlements on the periphery of urban areas (GSDRC 2016, p. 30). These settlements are often especially vulnerable to disasters resulting from proximity to hazards as well as unplanned infrastructure development. Further, high numbers of displaced persons living in informal urban settlements puts pressure on existing infrastructures and services, especially in developing urban economies. Displaced persons are therefore often left with limited access to water and sanitation infrastructure, education, livelihoods, and other necessities, heightening individual vulnerability when disaster strikes (GSDRC 2016, p. 30). National and local governance systems also often do not incorporate the input and priorities of displaced persons and members of informal settlements in disaster risk reduction (DRR) planning and implementation, only increasing their vulnerability and perpetuating the cycle of displacement and vulnerability.

To address this, the Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction (GNDR) developed the Making Displacement Safer (MDS) project, and has been delivering it with implementing partners in 11 different countries. The project aims to achieve three short to medium-term results:

1. An increased understanding of the unique disaster risk challenges for displaced populations in urban areas
2. An increased number of innovative approaches for reducing the vulnerability of displaced populations in urban areas
3. The approaches and stakeholder roles for reducing vulnerability of displaced populations in urban areas are institutionalised in national and international systems

At the mid-term point of this three-year project, GNDR underwent an evaluation to identify strengths, areas of improvement, and indications for how to maximise results in the remaining 15 months of the project. This report on the mid-term review identified the following key findings:

1. The MDS project is highly relevant to global policy discussions (including the Sendai Framework, Sustainable Development Goals, Global Compact for Migration, Grand Bargain, New Urban Agenda, and Action Agenda on Internal Displacement) and local realities, particularly in terms of: 1) the inclusive and collaborative engagement of local voices in identifying priorities and designing interventions on both local and global levels, 2) providing practical steps for incorporating global guidance such as the Words into Action (WIA) guidelines aligned with the Sendai Framework in influencing local DRR and displacement responses and policies, and 3) developing a practical bridge between development and humanitarian sectors.
2. The timeline of the project was perhaps overly ambitious, particularly in the amount of time allocated to establishing a project of this scope, delivery of activities in each country, and time in which to achieve institutionalisation of findings/new approaches.

3. While the number of beneficiaries reached was smaller than anticipated, beneficiaries reported a high level of satisfaction with interventions, particularly in supporting displaced communities in feeling heard and influential in identifying solutions. (Further discussion of this on p.24)
4. The working relationship with the project management team and implementing members and external partners was very positive. There remains, however, some room for improvement, particularly in the collection and quality control of evidence resulting from project outputs.
5. There is considerable appetite to continue and expand elements of the project on local and global levels, although the priorities differ between these spheres and should be pursued as distinct (although related) pillars of work. Expectation management on the local level of ways to move forward should also be further examined and addressed to maximise momentum and maintain community trust.
6. While the bulk of advocacy work remains to be achieved in the second half of the project, some of the greatest areas of impact thus far have been realised in already raising awareness amongst local and national governments of the needs within displaced communities in relation to DRR, and influencing government understanding for potential future policy change.
7. The project was highly aligned with global policy and GNDR network's strategy, and a good deal of opportunity exists for further placing this work in global arenas.

The authors of this mid-term review report provide the following recommendations, based on the above findings, for the last 15 months of the MDS project:

Advocacy:

1. Identify one or two key advocacy messages for the global level to focus efforts (in both DRR and displacement spaces), and build products to bring to market around those messages.
2. Convene the implementing members in a workshop or series of workshops to reflect on the project, share learnings and best practices around the project, refine global and local advocacy messages and goals, and discuss methodologies for sharing the project and its lessons with non-implementing GNDR members.
3. Collaborate with global partners like Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) and Platform on Disaster Displacement (PDD) to take advantage of upcoming opportunities to feed into global policy discussions, as well as identify other opportunities for future collaboration.
4. Present MDS progress, findings, and key advocacy messages to global partners to assess the best channels for global advocacy work, and distinguish areas in which the MDS specifically can contribute to global discussions versus GNDR network's work overall.
5. Consider opportunities to test MDS approaches in reaching a larger number of beneficiaries to assess scope for reaching entire displaced communities.
6. Consider establishing additional indicators to measure advocacy achievements beyond the number of documents changed to include DRR considerations, given the short timeline of the project relative to the common pace of policy change.

Project management:

7. Put a dedicated M&E officer in place for the remainder of the MDS project to review project data to date, control for quality in past reports, and more fully measure the impact of each intervention.
8. Refine target definitions and areas of work to guide further research and evidence-gathering in the remaining period of the project.

Sustainability:

9. Work with each individual implementing member to develop and monitor bespoke exit strategies in their area.
10. Organise a follow-up event with non-implementing GNDR members to present the MDS project's work and disseminate products such as the MDS Cookbook, which will use MDS case studies to focus on the principles of how to support resilience to disasters amongst displaced populations in urban settings.

Further detail on each of the above recommendations can be found in the Recommendations section (p. 43).

Introduction

Overview

This report details the findings and recommendations developed for the mid-term review of the MDS project implemented by GNDR. It opens with a brief description of the project, followed by context for the mid-term evaluation. Methodology is then detailed before the evaluation results are presented. Results are organised according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development-Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The results are followed by lessons learned for better practice and recommendations for the project, and future evaluation activities. Project information concerning each individual country's project implementation is contained within the annexes.

Project description

Context

By the end of 2021, the total number of people displaced from their homes to become refugees, internally displaced persons (IDPs), and asylum seekers totaled 89.3 million (UNHCR 2022, p. 2). Of these, internally displaced persons account for approximately 60% of all displaced people globally (UNHCR 2022, p. 2). It is further estimated that some 60-80% of displaced persons live in informal urban settlements, rather than in camps. Once forced from their homes, refugees and IDPs are often displaced to areas vulnerable to future climate-related disasters, including informal settlements in urban areas (IDMC 2019).

It is estimated that 55% of the world's population live in urban areas, of which nearly 25% live in informal settlements on the periphery of urban areas (GSDRC 2016, p. 30). These settlements are often especially vulnerable to disasters resulting from proximity to hazards as well as unplanned infrastructure development. Further, high numbers of displaced persons living in informal urban settlements puts pressure on existing infrastructure and services, especially in developing urban economies, leaving displaced persons with limited access to water and sanitation infrastructure, education, livelihoods, and other necessities (GSDRC 2016, p. 30). This in turn heightens vulnerability when disaster strikes. National and local governance systems also often do not incorporate the input and priorities of displaced persons and members of informal settlements in DRR planning and implementation, only increasing their vulnerability and perpetuating the cycle of displacement and vulnerability.

Project objectives and design

The MDS project is a three-year endeavour led by GNDR and funded by United States Agency for International Development's Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (USAID-BHA). It began in

September 2020 and is expected to conclude in October 2023. For the project, GNDR has partnered with 11 implementing member organisations in 11 countries (see Table 1).

The MDS project seeks to contribute to the substantial reduction of disaster risk and losses in lives, livelihoods, and assets for displaced populations in urban areas. It aims to do so by facilitating the discovery and scale-out of innovative locally-led DRR solutions.

The aim is to achieve three short to medium-term results:

1. An increased understanding of the unique disaster risk challenges for displaced populations in urban areas
2. An increased number of innovative approaches for reducing the vulnerability of displaced populations in urban areas
3. The approaches and stakeholder roles for reducing vulnerability of displaced populations in urban areas are institutionalised in national and international systems

To achieve these results, the project works within two subsectors: 1) Building community awareness/mobilisation and 2) Global advocacy and engagement

For the first subsector, **Building community awareness/mobilisation**, there are two components:

Component 1: An increased understanding of the unique disaster risk challenges for displaced populations in urban areas

To address this component, local partners undertake stakeholder mapping, SWOT analysis, and GNDR network's Views from the Frontline Lite (VFL Lite) surveys in order to better understand risk and create an opportunity for the urban displaced to contribute to their own risk reduction.

Component 2: An increased number of innovative solutions for reducing the vulnerability of displaced populations in urban areas

For this component, multiple stakeholders come together in Urban Living Labs (ULL), using data collected through the VFL Lite surveys methodology, to identify and develop innovative solutions to address the specific challenges of each community. The solution is adopted at the ULL, where the local community develops ideas for solutions and determines which to implement in a participatory process.

For the second subsector, **Global advocacy and engagement**, there is a third component to the project:

Component 3: The approaches and stakeholder roles for reducing vulnerability of displaced populations in urban areas are institutionalised in national and international systems

This component involves three core activities:

1. Holding roundtables with national governments to present the results of the community-based work and offering support for their incorporation into national action plans to reduce vulnerability of the target urban communities and beyond.

2. Development of a Cookbook detailing tools, success factors, and examples of principles in action. This Cookbook will be disseminated to GNDR member organisations, local advocacy actors, participants in an international Evidence Festival, and via a social media campaign.
3. Development of an online Innovation Solution Bank for GNDR members to share challenges and lessons learned.

Organisations involved

GNDR is the largest international network of civil society organisations (CSOs) working to strengthen resilience and reduce risk in communities and a network of over 1,400 CSOs in 127 countries. GNDR connects frontline CSOs with national and international policymaking institutions and governments. GNDR influences policies and practice by amplifying the voices of people most at risk. They exchange knowledge and capacities and trial new approaches together. GNDR network's strategic goals are to strengthen collaboration, solidarity and the mobility of CSOs; promote a localisation movement; and work for risk-informed development.

For the MDS project, GNDR has partnered with 11 implementing member organisations in 11 countries (Table 1) from diverse regions across the globe.

Table 1: Project partners

Name of Partner Organisation	Country
Développement pour un Mieux-Être (DEMI-E)	Niger
Manadisaster Organisation	Rwanda
Iraqi Institution for Development (IID)	Iraq
Cercle des Droits de l'Homme et de Développement (CDHD)	Republic of Congo
Voice of South Bangladesh (VoSB)	Bangladesh
National Society for Earthquake Technology (NSET)	Nepal
Resilience Development Initiative (RDI)	Indonesia
Janathakshan	Sri Lanka
Comisión de Acción Social Menonita (CASM)	Honduras
Funsalprodese	El Salvador
Root of Generations (RoG)	South Sudan

Along with these implementing member organisations, GNDR has also collaborated with peer organisations like the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) and Platform on Disaster Displacement (PDD) in advocacy efforts. Nine universities also collaborated with implementing members and GNDR in eight countries to conduct ULLs, which facilitated the identification of key issue areas, their prioritisation, and development of solutions in partnership with local displaced communities.

Intended beneficiaries

The project targets urban displaced communities that are especially vulnerable to disaster risks and who tend to be underserved by policy and programming aimed at DRR.

The proposed number of individuals targeted directly by the project was 48,523. This number includes a total of 46,023 displaced persons. It was further proposed that the project would indirectly reach 416,710 individuals.

Diversity targets indicated that participation should include 50% men, 50% women, 10% youth, 10% elderly, and 10% persons living with disability.

Mid-term review background

Purpose, audience, and intended use of the mid-term review

The purpose of the mid-term review is to verify progress and capture learning on stakeholder roles in addressing challenges of the urban displaced and support critical decisions in next steps and in influencing international policy.

This mid-term evaluation report was developed principally for the use of GNDR and, more specifically, the MDS project team to inform the remaining months of the project, as well as to provide feedback on what has been accomplished to date. Recommendations include suggestions for GNDR to consider moving forward. The report will be shared with the donor, USAID-BHA, for their information regarding this project.

The report will be shared with and benefit implementing member organisations who have participated in the project, who will be able to use the evaluation and its recommendations to inform their activities related to the project in the remaining months.

Finally, the evaluation and its results may be of interest to other stakeholders including peer organisations, interested government entities in implementing countries, and other GNDR member organisations who may wish to implement similar projects.

Mid-term review objectives

1. Verify partner progress in implementing sub-grants to contribute to overall aims of the MDS project
2. Verify global progress in implementing activities to contribute to overall aims of the MDS project
3. Make recommendations for ways forward to:
 - a. Continue to deliver relevant, effective, and efficient contributions to the overall project
 - b. Increase sustainable, impactful, and coherent contributions to challenges faced by displaced communities in urban areas
 - c. Influence international policy regarding DRR for displaced communities in urban areas

Scope

This mid-term review assesses MDS project progress including implementing member activities in 11 countries including: Bangladesh, El Salvador, Honduras, Indonesia, Iraq, Nepal, Niger, Republic of Congo, Rwanda, South Sudan, and Sri Lanka. This evaluation includes assessments of work implemented by the 11 implementing member organisations in those countries (see Table 1), as well as GNDR network's global advocacy efforts over the period of October 2020-July 2022.

Stakeholder engagement

Various stakeholders participated in the development of the mid-term review.

Implementing member organisation staff involved in the MDS project gave generously of their time to share their knowledge and learnings surrounding the programme in their individual country contexts through interviews with the consultants as well as via email. In seven countries, they also organised focus groups with representatives from displaced communities targeted as beneficiaries, government officials, and university partners.

GNDR network's Senior Leadership Team (SLT) held a meeting with the consultants engaged for this evaluation at the beginning of the project on 8 August 2022 where they were briefed on the draft inception report and asked for their feedback, both verbally and in writing via Google Docs following the meeting. Several SLT representatives further participated in interviews with the consultants.

An advisory group was established, consisting of diverse stakeholders including implementing member organisation representatives, GNDR regional staff, other GNDR secretariat

representatives, and the consultants who supported the mapping and ULL processes. Advisory group members were identified and invited by the MDS project team. The terms of reference for the advisory group is available in Annex 6.

The advisory group convened twice for this evaluation, once to discuss the inception report and again to discuss preliminary findings and recommendations. In the initial stages they participated in an inception report presentation and discussion with the consultants managing the evaluation on 3 August 2022. Following this meeting, they were asked to give written feedback via Google Docs or email on the inception report. It should be noted that individuals from the local communities in which the project was implemented were not included in the advisory group due to technology issues and the difficulty of identifying and inviting them in the tight timeline of the evaluation.

The SLT and advisory group were convened again following data collection for a preliminary findings meeting held on 13 September 2022. At this meeting, the consultants shared key findings and recommendations developed based on the data collected and analysed in the course of the evaluation. The SLT and advisory group were asked for their feedback verbally in the meeting and in writing via email to the consultants. The intention was to triangulate and validate findings and generate initial feedback prior to finalising the report for submission to GNDR.

Following the submission of this report on the mid-term review, GNDR intends for the advisory group to continue to meet to work through the report's recommendations, as well as ongoing global activities and commitments in relation to the MDS project and forced migration as a risk driver more generally.

Evaluation team

Mollie Pepper, PhD - Lead Consultant

Mollie holds a doctorate in Sociology with a focus on peace and conflict studies and gender as well as a master's in International Affairs with emphasis on humanitarian studies and human security. She has led research projects in contexts of violent conflict, forced displacement, and gender inequality for more than 15 years. In her career she has worked in humanitarian and development aid with international nongovernmental organisations as well as civil society organisations. She has worked on evaluations, grant proposal development and reporting, and offered capacity-building technical support related to research and project development in addition to conducting extensive independent research and directing research teams.

Mallory Carlson

Mallory has led integration and emergency response projects supporting forced migrants on both the local and global level for nearly 13 years. Having worked for a civil society organisation in the U.S. on labour market integration for resettled refugees, she then joined IOM – UN Migration's Camp Coordination and Camp Management unit in Geneva, supporting global initiatives and capacity building for humanitarian professionals. In IOM's Sudan office, she

worked closely with various UN agencies, government counterparts, and local and international organisations to manage emergency grant dispersals on behalf of USAID to address cycles of displacement. Mallory returned to resettlement and integration in IOM's UK office, where she led capacity building efforts to increase understanding of the backgrounds and experiences of a variety of forced migrant communities arriving in the UK. She holds an MSc. in Refugee and Forced Migration Studies.

Carlson Pepper Collaborative

The Carlson Pepper Collaborative is a collaboration between Carlson Consulting and Mollie Pepper Consulting LLC. Together, Mollie Pepper and Mallory Carlson have 28 years of experience working with vulnerable migrants before, during, and after displacement. Our experience spans UN agencies, humanitarian aid and development organisations, academic institutions, and civil society. Our skills sit at the nexus of scholarship, policy, and practice and we offer our clients practical experience combined with academic skills and policy-relevant work.

Evaluation methods

Approach

Outcome harvesting

Outcome Harvesting is noted as a preferred methodology for the midterm and final evaluations in the MDS monitoring and evaluation plan. Due to time constraints and the fact that this methodology requires a great deal of input from implementing members and beneficiaries, it has been modified for the purposes of this evaluation. Following from the evaluation questions included in the terms of reference and evaluation matrix (Annex 1), semi-structured interview guides were developed that asked interview and focus group participants to reflect on the outcomes of the project so far, the limitations and factors for success that shaped those outcomes, and the overall impact of the project.

Process evaluation

The consultants have further designed data collection tools in line with process evaluation to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of MDS project delivery. Process evaluation determines whether project activities have been implemented as intended and resulted in certain outputs.

These approaches have enabled the mid-term review to assess the extent to which implementing partners and GNDR have done the right things, in the right ways, for the right people.

Evaluation matrix

An evaluation matrix (Annex 1) was prepared building off of the evaluation questions specified by GNDR in the terms of reference for this evaluation. The matrix includes the evaluation questions, indicators, data sources, and methods that guided the evaluation.

Criteria

Indicators have been developed for each of the evaluation questions (see: Annex 1), to be used in conjunction with the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, and coherence to evaluate project progress.

To anticipate and mitigate, to the extent possible, the limitations of this evaluation, the Bond Evidence Principles (Annex 2) have also been used to guide the development of this methodology. The consultants referred to these principles throughout the evaluation to ensure quality standards were upheld to the extent possible.

Data collection methods

Desk review

The consultants have conducted a thorough desk review and analysis of documents provided by GNDR to answer in part or in full some of the evaluation questions as indicated in the evaluation matrix (Annex 1).

Interviews and focus groups

With GNDR network's support for recruitment, the consultants conducted 34 semi-structured interviews with stakeholders, including implementing member organisation representatives, external partners, GNDR secretariat representatives, and other stakeholders and contributors to the project. Each interview lasted between 30 minutes and 1.5 hours and was held over Zoom.

Additionally, seven focus groups were held with approximately 91 individuals including beneficiaries, government officials, and university representatives from Bangladesh, Indonesia, Nepal, Niger, Rwanda, South Sudan, and Sri Lanka. These were recruited and convened by implementing member organisations, who further supplied any necessary interpretation from local languages to English, except in Niger where interpretation was arranged by the MDS project team. These each lasted for 45 minutes to 1.5 hours and were conducted over Zoom.

The semi-structured interview guides were drafted by the consultant team and submitted in the inception report for review by GNDR and the advisory group to ensure that questions were appropriate and addressed all issues of interest to this evaluation. Interview guides directed to implementing member organisation representatives, beneficiaries, external partners, and GNDR secretariat representatives were prepared and are available in Annex 3.

Purposive sampling was used to identify participants, resulting in a non-probability sample that prioritised recruitment based on individuals' knowledge of the project. This was done with the aim of selecting individuals across a broad range of different roles and relationships to the project. GNDR network's MDS project team was responsible for managing recruitment with input from the consultants.

Participants were invited to contribute to the evaluation via email by GNDR project staff. Scheduling of interviews was managed by the consultants, except in the cases where French language skills were needed (in which case MDS project staff coordinated), and were held at the convenience of participants.

All interviews but one were audio recorded for transcription and analysis with the informed consent of all participants. In the case where audio was not recorded, detailed notes were taken for analysis. For focus group discussions, detailed notes were taken due to the complexity of those transcripts and the scheduling of the meetings late in data collection, which did not allow for the management of transcripts, though thorough analysis and coding were still conducted.

Data collection procedures

All interviewees received a written informed consent statement (see Annex 4) prior to meeting and were asked to give verbal consent to participate at the time of the interview. They were informed in writing and verbally that they could withdraw their consent at any time including after the interview up until 22 August 2022 or one week after the scheduled interview, whichever was later. No participant elected to withdraw consent at any time.

Interview participant names, roles, and organisation information were collected with the explicit verbal permission of participants, and will be delivered to GNDR with the raw data at the conclusion of the evaluation, with the exception of those who requested to remain unnamed. However, analysed data will only be available to the two consultants and raw data will only be shared with GNDR MDS project staff for internal use. Further, data security measures were taken that included the storing of data in encrypted, password-protected files.

Focus group participants were briefed verbally on informed consent prior to the consultant asking any questions in the group meeting. It must be noted that it is not clear, depending on the country and the interpretation, how well these terms were communicated. It should also be noted that while the consultants did not record names, implementing members are aware of who participants were because they facilitated the meetings and in most cases provided interpretation. Thus, the informed consent process for focus groups was not ideal and we have taken this into account in our analysis.

A methods statement on participant wellbeing (Annex 5) has been prepared for this evaluation.

Data management

All data collected were stored by the consultants in encrypted and password protected files and the raw, unanalysed data have been organised for electronic delivery to GNDR at the conclusion of the project.

Following finalisation of the final report, findings will be shared by GNDR with implementing members and other evaluation participants and stakeholders as appropriate.

Timeline

The below work plan (Table 2) was developed using the deliverables table agreed upon in the kick-off meeting between the consultant team and GNDR project staff, and was included in the agreement for consultancy services and inception report. This timeline has since been modified to accommodate the extended recruitment and data collection timeline.

Table 2: Work plan

Evaluation phases	Deliverables	Responsible person	Deadline
Contract signed	N/A	Consultants and GNDR Staff	19 July
Desk review	Inception report	Consultants	27 July
Inception report review meeting	Revised inception report and finalised data collection tools	Facilitated by: consultants; Attended by: GNDR staff and advisory group	3 August
Data collection and analysis	Raw data (to be delivered with the final report)	Consultants with interview/focus group recruitment by GNDR staff	14 September
Preliminary findings meeting	Preliminary findings presentation and discussion	Facilitated by: consultants; Attended by: GNDR staff and SLT and advisory group	13 September
Report drafting	Draft report	Consultants	19 September
GNDR feedback	Comments in draft report	GNDR project staff and SLT	22 September
Final report	Final revised report and raw data	Consultants	30 September

Data analysis

As interview and focus group audio data was collected it was transcribed for analysis using Otter.ai, a transcription software programme. Transcripts then were manually checked for accuracy before analysis. Transcripts and other relevant materials were iteratively analysed in Dedoose, a qualitative and mixed-methods data analysis software programme. Analysis involved the systematic thematic coding of collected data, with codes initially derived from the evaluation questions and expanded for greater specificity throughout the coding process. The findings shared in this report were then synthesised from the coded data and data were continually referred to throughout the drafting process.

Limitations

Uneven data by country

Given the spread of the project in 11 countries, and the short timeline of this review, there were limits to the amount of data we were able to collect from each country. Further, some countries were more responsive than others and had varying capacities for organising focus group discussions with beneficiaries. As previously noted, seven focus group discussions were held with stakeholders from Bangladesh, Indonesia, Nepal, Niger, Rwanda, South Sudan, and Sri Lanka. Due to time and resource constraints and other complicating factors in some countries, we were not able to conduct focus group discussions with El Salvador, Honduras, Iraq, and Republic of Congo. As a result, we have an imbalance in country representation in the data collected, and some stakeholders were not included in data collection in every country.

Limited diversity of voices

In terms of obtaining the desired diversity of voices with regard to gender, age, and disability, this posed a challenge and we were highly reliant on implementing members to connect us with stakeholders beyond their organisation representatives for focus group discussions. As a result, the diversity of voices included in this review varies by country. Overall, though, it should be noted that there was good representation of women in the focus group discussions at approximately 57% of participants. Youth and disabled members of the communities were barely included, however, with only 3 youth and 1 disabled person in attendance across all focus groups.

Obtaining candid input

Given that GNDR is a source of funding and support for implementing members, they may have been hesitant to report challenges experienced in the process of implementing this project. One mitigating factor for this limitation was that external consultants led the evaluation, potentially making interview and focus group participants more willing to speak openly about their perspectives and experiences. Further, as part of the recruitment email and informed consent process, participants were made aware that this mid-term review does not seek to assign blame for challenges or shortcomings, but rather is focused on how to manage those moving forward for the rest of the project and how to identify lessons learned. Certainly, the data collected

reflects a willingness to answer questions concerning challenges and limitations on the part of participants, but we are aware that some information may have been withheld.

Varied quality of documentation

As the quality of country narrative reports varies by country, this mid-term review is constrained in its ability to confirm exact progress in project objectives. By thorough and systematic review of project reporting and beneficiary numbers provided by GNDR we have reached the findings and recommendations presented in this report and the included country annexes. However, overall, without a dedicated M&E officer in place the MDS project faces challenges in the quality of its data and evidence, which is an impediment to thorough evaluation and may further constrain subsequent advocacy activities. This could be rectified in the remaining period of the project to ensure best practices and lessons learned are more fully captured, and to inform advocacy and learning products in the latter half of the project.

Evaluation results

Relevance and validity of design

The findings detailed below elaborate on the evaluation questions for the criterion of relevance and validity of design; the extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities; and the degree to which the objectives and design continue to do so should circumstances change. Questions concerning relevance and validity of design established at the beginning of the mid-term review include:

- 1) To what extent is MDS addressing the key issues highlighted in the proposal (highlighted in project objective and design section (p.10) and 11 urban contexts?
- 2) Are the priorities, outcomes, outputs, and activities logical and coherent?
- 3) What parts of the process are the most critical to success?

Before presenting more general findings speaking to these questions, we present findings relevant to each of the desired short to medium-term results detailed in the proposal for the MDS project:

- I. An increased understanding of the unique disaster risk challenges for displaced populations in urban areas;
- II. An increased number of innovative approaches for reducing the vulnerability of displaced populations in urban areas; and
- III. The approaches and stakeholder roles for reducing vulnerability of displaced populations in urban areas are institutionalised in national and international systems

I: At the point of the mid-term review, the project published a global report on findings of the intersection between displacement and disaster risk, and completed a number of research pieces developed by individual implementing partners and university partners. While the findings reinforce current global understanding of the risks facing displaced populations in urban settings, and provide value in sharing localised stories of the effects that rehumanise the issues, they do not necessarily shed new light on the global knowledge of risk factors. Findings listed in the report such as the connections between displacement and prolonged vulnerability, economic insecurity, climate change, lack of localisation, and exclusion of displaced communities in decision making have been well established in displacement literature (for examples, see: Sydney 2018; IRC 206; NRC and IDMC 2015; Zetter 2010; The Brookings Institution and University of Bern 2008). However, on a local and national level, the project has achieved significant gains in increasing the understanding of disaster risk challenges for displaced communities in urban areas, both among policymakers, civil society, and in some cases, within displaced communities themselves. In Nepal, for example, it was reported that the VFL Lite and ULL approaches led to displaced communities further developing their understanding of various disaster risks facing the community. Originally, the main focus had been on road access in the area, but the process eventually led to the community recognising fire and flooding risks, and the need to prepare for how to handle

such situations if they arose. This identified need was addressed in their interventions.

In almost all implementing partner countries, the data provided through stakeholder mapping, VFL Lite survey methodology, and the collaborative approach with national and local decision makers through task forces and the ULLs, brought the risks facing displaced populations in the target area to the attention of government agencies. Successful progress in policy thinking ranges from reinforcing the need for an overall DRR policy in countries where none yet exists such as Iraq, to increased attention on the need for durable solutions for displaced groups in South Sudan, to additional government projects building off of the interventions through the MDS, such as building a school and paved road in an area that is no longer flood-prone as in Rwanda.

II: Implementing members under the MDS have developed a variety of interventions, ranging quite a bit in focus and effectiveness (further information on each intervention can be found in the country project annexes). While specific activities' level of innovation may be limited on a global scale, many elements appear to be new within a specific country, community, or CSO, and can still lead to successful new developments in local approaches. A more generalisable point of interest, however, lies in the approaches taken in this project overall. The assessments of displaced community needs and priorities as seen by the community itself provided through VFL Lite in many cases shed light on previously more "invisible" communities. Feeding this information into the ULL approach and uniting displaced community members, academia, civil society, and local (and even national) government facilitated shared stakeholder buy-in and resource sharing, while still being led by community needs.

This approach has led to three points of interest on a global level that are worth further exploring:

- 1) Participating communities and implementing members, empowered with detailed information on community needs and greater knowledge on international guidance on DRR, can use relationships built with government actors through the ULL to advocate for greater resources and detailed policy to address issues. This provides a promising evolved approach of complementing international efforts like WIA guidance (aligned with the Sendai Framework) to raise awareness and provide additional pressure on a local level in how national policy incorporates best practices on DRR. This could prove immensely helpful as many implementing members noted that awareness of such international guidance had never really trickled down to the local level, or been taken on nationally.
- 2) Many issues and solutions identified by the ULL groups included both short-term life-saving concerns and long-term development goals, such as enhancing infrastructure or increasing economic stability. While displacement issues have long been shown to straddle the humanitarian-development nexus, and the sectors have been urged to increase collaboration and coordination for enhanced outcomes, these two areas of work remain quite siloed. The approach of this project, however, by including a

number of different stakeholders working in collaboration, has provided a promising practical bridge between the humanitarian and development sectors. More learning around the benefits of this approach and how to incorporate it into various areas of work could therefore prove to be a valuable contribution on the global stage. To fully examine this potential, additional attention will need to be focused on the sustainability of various interventions and collecting data in an ongoing way to measure impact over time.

- 3) Finally, the approach of the MDS project also shows gains for the localisation movement. By empowering community members and CSOs in identifying needs and designing solutions, and by providing conduits to present those stories on the global stage such as the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (GPDRR) in Bali, the MDS highlights how such approaches could be incorporated around the world to contextualise interventions to local realities. In addition, opportunities to present globally have, through the MDS project, given individual implementing members more weight within their country of operation, providing an even stronger channel for advocacy with local and national policymakers.

III: The timeline for achieving institutionalisation of approaches under the MDS project was very ambitious, limited to a few months whereas institutional change can typically take years. In addition, a mid-term review is not the optimal time to measure these outcomes, as such work is still ongoing. However, it is worth noting that the level of attention already achieved under the project, both amongst local and national policymakers across most of the 11 participating countries, and among global partners such as NRC and PDD, as well as at global platforms, shows a promising level of engagement through which to advocate for change. In addition, some mid-term review interviewees shared that other members of GNDR have shown interest in the project approaches, and follow-up events for sharing learning may result in the uptake of approaches in additional countries. While outcomes such as actual policy changes may develop beyond the current project timeline, this engagement is highly promising for advocacy work in years to come, and should be further explored and supported.

Turning to findings related to the other evaluation questions for relevance and validity of design, we find that the structure of the overall MDS project is logical in the connections between its three components, outcomes, and activities. Each area has clear channels of influence on subsequent components, starting with assessing contexts and issues, mobilising communities to design solutions, and engaging in advocacy based on learnings and results locally and globally. However, interview data indicate that the overall structure of the project could have benefitted from greater shared understanding at the outset around target definitions such as “displaced” and “urban”. A variety of eligibility questions arose as the project began, such as if the project intended to target only those displaced by disaster versus conflict, or displaced within a certain timeframe, or in peri-urban settings lacking some of the typical urban infrastructure. Had such criteria been clarified earlier, and perhaps pared down to a less extensive list, it is possible that the impact of project findings would have been less diffuse

across a wide variety of displacement contexts, and the selection of target areas ensured as the most appropriate for the intents of the project.

“When we talk about displacement, there are different aspects...disaster displacement...conflict displacement...climate displacement...when we wrote [the proposal], when we started the project and we tried to identify the locations...I think we did miss out on necessarily identifying which kind of these three displaced we are working with specifically, and how we would define them...had we been able to define that this is the community we want to work with...and also in terms of duration of displacement...we could attribute the data a little [more] strongly...it’s a little diffused, it’s not so strong.”

While debate over exact meanings is not unique to the MDS project, some global partners expressed the need for greater alignment with international terminology for clarity of purpose. This includes how the target of MDS is communicated: is it to prevent/minimise/reduce disaster risks facing already displaced communities, or to “address” displacement once it has occurred through securing durable solutions? The global paper seems to reference both, which is quite a wide range, and not all of it specific to DRR concerns. Greater clarity around intent and terminology could therefore enhance the focus, logic, and communication around the project.

At the level of implementing members, data indicates that the overall structure of individual interventions are also logical. This is greatly helped by the collaborative and inclusive nature of problem assessments and intervention design. The nature of the VFL Lite and ULL components presented community priorities from which collective stakeholders could select target priorities and what approaches and activities to implement based on available resources. Through the VFL Lite and ULL methodology of facilitating the community and other stakeholders’ identification and prioritisation of problem areas to address, the solutions implemented in each country were closely tied to the issues identified. In turn, these interventions, though varied, seem to have increased the resilience of beneficiaries, potentially in the context of disaster.

The time allotted to various stages of the project was perhaps overly ambitious in some places, particularly in the establishment of project processes, delivery of local-level interventions, and achievement of policy-change outcomes. The amount of time dedicated at the beginning to setting up administrative processes was very short for such a complex project. Some administrative tasks such as registering through the U.S. System for Award Management (SAM) took more time than anticipated, and had more time been allotted for more detailed assessments of individual implementing member capacities in various components (data mapping, research, etc.), and further explanation given to these members and communities on the reasoning and objective behind each task, it may have been possible to better leverage individual member skill sets to support other implementing members for enhanced results. Indonesia, for example, was noted as being particularly strong in the research aspects of the project and could have shared their knowledge with other implementing members.

In addition, many implementing members reported that only one year out of a three year project dedicated to local-level work was too short, and that more could have been achieved, and

perhaps better data captured, had more time been given to this element. As the most significant aspects of the information feeding into subsequent advocacy stages would have come from this part of the project, it is likely that additional time for local-level interventions would have led to even stronger outcomes.

“This project was implemented in one year [of a three-year global project], but in the field it is one year while we believe that the project duration was not enough to take into account all the different aspects. It is true that we cannot solve all the problems, but it will be interesting for the project. One year was well insufficient...We think it would be interesting for the project to be extended two additional years at country level...so it can be effective.”

“If you’re talking about resilience building, it’s good to have projects at least three years...in two years, you can contribute to resilience building, but in more short and medium-term.”

As also noted previously, the target advocacy outcomes, particularly those focused on the number of documents changed to include DRR considerations, may prove difficult to assess within the MDS project timeframe, particularly on the global level. That being said, this should in no way diminish the very real levels of engagement already achieved on all advocacy levels. Perhaps alternate indicators could be considered to measure this progress, such as greater shared understanding of DRR priorities between government and displaced communities, or increased mention of DRR in policy discussions, or number of visits and consultations between government representatives and communities.

Effectiveness

On the criterion of effectiveness, the following evaluation questions were used:

- 4) What progress has the project made towards achieving its planned objectives?
 - a) What are the reasons/factors behind that progress (or lack thereof)?
 - b) What are the main constraints, problems and areas in need of further information?
- 5) Does the project address diversity in the implementation of the project activity in terms of gender, age, and disabilities?

Though workplan adjustments were required in many countries, due in large part to COVID-19, progress overall has been good with the majority of country projects concluded. According to MDS project data, overall the project has had 13,296 direct project participants across the 11 countries. This is lower than the proposed number of 48,523. In part, this lower number is potentially due to the ways that organisations transitioned from the ULL process of identifying and prioritising needs to actual implementation. Rather than expanding back out to the larger community, for example by including the households and communities that had been included in the VFL Lite survey, the interventions tended to be implemented with the communities with which ULL had been conducted. This created a much smaller pool of beneficiaries. A second potential factor was the ultimate cost of interventions selected may have required a smaller group of beneficiaries to be impacted. Finally, it is not clear that the beneficiary numbers are

correct as data was collected in such a way as to allow for ambiguity, such as potential double-counting between quarterly reports at the country level, in spite of efforts by the project management team to mitigate this. However, it is important to note that the majority of those who have been impacted by the project have made significant gains in terms of quality of life and livelihood. Without additional data, it is not possible to say at the time of this mid-term review how many indirect beneficiaries there are.

The MDS project launched near the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, which did impact the project on various levels. This includes in obvious ways, such as delays in some implementing member intervention delivery due to in-country restrictions on meeting spaces and participant numbers, as well as some of the expert support for the overall project, such as training on mapping and ULL. While these training activities were adapted to online delivery and did still occur, the level of guidance originally planned for these elements included individualised, in-person follow-up and support for implementing members in conducting these activities. For ULL in particular, support was intended to help facilitate joint stakeholder meetings and feed into some of the processes. Due to the complications of global travel, this was no longer possible. It is therefore possible that some of the existing skill sets could have been better targeted or leveraged and results enhanced had the project been able to proceed as initially planned.

Nonetheless, ULL and VFL Lite both featured prominently as key strengths of the project as reported by implementing members, displaced individuals, GNDR staff, and government stakeholders. The VFL Lite results often provided information about the target community where none existed before, and/or helped nuance implementing member and government understanding of needs by highlighting community priorities. While some suggested the tool could in future be further adapted to a displacement context more specifically, it was regardless a noted key factor for success.

The ability of the ULL to involve displaced community members in decision-making was frequently mentioned as the biggest factor of success, with many community members feeling empowered to speak directly to government decision makers about their concerns, planning activities that met their needs, and in some cases inspiring individuals to pursue more advocacy work in the future. It was also an important element of building trust with communities that have long felt exploited or forgotten by typical approaches to assistance. As previously mentioned, the involvement of government officials also raised awareness of the needs amongst decision makers, and created additional communication channels and engagement through which to pursue future advocacy. This was certainly the case in El Salvador and Rwanda.

“One factor throughout the process was that all the officials and CSOs and community, when we were planning implementation, they were all at the same place of understanding for decision making. All were at the same level of thinking for making agreements.”

It is important to note that levels of engagement in the ULL capacity building process varied amongst implementing members, and understanding from the ULL capacity-building process on how the approach typically proceeds was maybe not fully taken on in all cases. For example,

one implementing member seemed to struggle to manage expectations of what was possible in the ULL, with solutions being decided upon that greatly exceeded the allotted budget. This required additional steps be taken to settle on an intervention with which to proceed. Others, such as community members and even government participants in all seven countries in which focus groups took place, have expressed an expectation of continuing funding support to address other needs identified in the VFL Lite and ULL processes. Such limitations on expectation management further pose a challenge for exit strategies in each community, which we will discuss in greater detail in the Sustainability section (p. 32).

Most notably, more national-level representatives were involved in some of the ULL groups than is typical, as the approach is meant to fully focus on local concerns and solutions. Some mentioned that the resulting solutions were maybe therefore not as strong, locally led, or innovative as they could have been in other situations. However, it is important to highlight that involving these national representatives has likely led to the increased official engagement with the topic seen in many of the countries, which is likely to have a positive effect on subsequent advocacy endeavours.

Government engagement was not universal in all 11 countries, and it is important to contextualise levels of engagement by country. However, even in instances where there was no appropriate government liaison to engage on the topic, in such circumstances implementing members still saw success in raising their organisation's profile and influence with United Nations (UN) humanitarian agencies acting in the area, thereby still promoting local voices in responses.

Further to this influence on international actors, the global partnership of the project with NRC and PDD created opportunities for implementing members to present local context and work through the MDS project at global platforms, such as the GPDRR in Bali. Not only did this create an opportunity for members to learn from organisations working elsewhere in the world, but also created a more dynamic and locally-led learning event than is typical in such fora. While facilitating the sharing of these voices is a key strength of GNDR as an organisation in general, having opened up space for this in global spheres through the project, and opening spaces in displacement arenas, is an important opportunity for advocacy to pursue further.

“Some of the formal structures, like the regional platforms...are very much staged...If you looked at Bali, and so the kind of the politics of organising the panels...it's not about local community being visible learning, you have the kind of token representative on a panel, but I think in some ways, some of the presentations and MDS project kind of around the margins of the platform...it would have been much more eye-opening.”

In addition, two implementing members, South Sudan and Bangladesh, reported that their presentations in global spaces brought them to the attention of national policymakers from their own countries also in attendance, giving them more legitimacy in the eyes of such governments and presenting additional opportunities for national and local advocacy. This has some positive

implications for civil society's ability to influence local and national policies around DRR and the urban displaced, but requires more investigation and data to fully understand such outcomes.

In regards to the diversity of participants in the project, over all 11 countries the inclusion of various demographic groups largely met targets. Women were strongly represented across the entirety of the project, even if their inclusion in select country settings was more limited. According to MDS beneficiary data, 52% of project participants were women. Please see country annexes for more information on diversity by country. Both youth and the elderly were moderately represented across the project as well, again with variations by country. Representation of persons with disabilities could have been improved overall, but was highly country-dependent. It is important to note that determining whether their representation was sufficient would rely on strong demographic information available in-country, which was not always possible. Further investigation as to how to ensure inclusion of persons with disabilities in such situations could help strengthen future projects and data, and could include incorporating the Washington Group on Disability Statistics Question sets.

Alongside these successes, the project has endured some constraints as well, the most frequently noted of which are the very different capacity levels of individual implementing members. This includes capacities around mapping, research, administrative practices, and reporting. Opportunities for various implementing members to share their experiences, best practices, and lessons learned with each other as the project progressed were also limited, which left some feeling that there was a lost opportunity for peer learning and associated project enhancement. Depending on existing capacities, an individual implementing member may have gained quite a bit from the mapping or ULL workshops, while others may have felt more overwhelmed. Managing such a disparate level of ability requires quite a bit of additional oversight from the project management team, which was also constrained in the amount of resources it could dedicate to various areas of the project.

The quality of products and reports also significantly varies, which does limit the overall ability to measure impact and advocate for evidence-led change. Under such constraints, the project would have benefitted from more regular time set aside to share learning and collaborate between the implementing members at various stages of the project, which was the original intent under the MDS M&E plan, but due to limited capacity the delivery was more limited than envisioned. The project may have also benefited from assigning some mentorship roles to specific implementing members, particularly in light of limited capacity issues. This could include having an organisation that is very strong in technology or mapping assist those with less experience, or lead those efforts of the project on behalf of other implementing members.

Efficiency

The evaluation questions speaking to the criterion of efficiency are:

- 6) How well has project management worked in delivering project outputs and results (e.g. were alternative solutions to the existing challenges identified proactively)?

- 7) To what extent was the project team organised so as to be responsive to the changes on the ground and be accountable?

Feedback regarding the project management team was highly positive, with implementing members, collaborating GNDR staff, and external partners all feeling the team was very supportive, responsive, and flexible. For example, when one of the disaster threats in Nepal was realised in the target community (flooding), the implementing member asked if it was acceptable to offer support to the community through the project, which was speedily approved. This action proved instrumental in building trust with the target community for the ultimate success of the subsequent MDS intervention. It should also be noted that the positivity of the feedback is particularly impressive given some turnover within and the small size and divided workload of the project management team.

“[Project management] was great, because we had frequent talks, we had monthly meetings, where we could discuss [and] update our progress...there is a system within this project also, what we have to report, when, what, how, all these things as a project implementer’s perspective, the documentation part standards, the requirements, those all things [sic] were in place.”

Within GNDR, the collaboration between the project management team, regional leads, and regional coordinators was also noted to be very effective. Respondents felt this collaboration was very positive, and helped to ensure that more culturally contextualised considerations and approaches were incorporated into the project delivery as a result of GNDR regional staff’s guidance and feedback. It was suggested that this feedback was so valuable, that having regional staff more regularly review implementing member reports to get their insights would be beneficial in future.

The small size and part-time MDS-focused structure of the project management team did present some challenges to delivery at times as well. Most notably, monitoring and evaluation has not been as robust as would have been desired by the project management team due to the lack of a dedicated M&E officer. A project of this size with such a variety of implementing members and capacities, as well as external partners, activities, and stakeholders, requires quite a bit of oversight to ensure the quality of data, timeliness and accuracy of reports, and independent confirmation of reported outputs and outcomes. For example, quarterly narrative reports vary tremendously in terms of quality and detail and some countries could have benefitted from additional coaching on using the template provided by GNDR. Further, beneficiary numbers were collected in such a way as to allow for double-counting between quarterly reports, leaving little clarity on actual beneficiary numbers. Data disaggregated for men and women was for all participants in the project, not just displaced community members so it is impossible from the data to tell what the proportions were for the displaced community participants specifically. Data on youth was captured in a separate question, and was mostly reported as none or left blank and there was nowhere on the template to report elderly or disabled persons participation. The amount of attention required for data collection was not possible to incorporate into the roles of the existing project management team, whose workload

was only partially dedicated to the project, given all the other coordination and support tasks required (external to the MDS project).

In addition, having an M&E officer available could have supported the establishment of additional feedback channels from beneficiaries directly to ensure objectivity of feedback received when not filtered through implementing members, thereby providing more robust measurement of impact. This lack of strong impact data may limit the success of advocacy activities in the latter half of the project if not addressed. Without stronger M&E oversight, the ability of the whole project management team to fully anticipate and proactively address challenges may also have been more limited, despite the positive feedback received by the team.

Furthermore, having M&E personnel supporting the project and at least some of the project management team dedicated full-time to the MDS project would have freed up team members to more fully focus on other coordination efforts that were limited due to overstretched staff. This could include bringing implementing members together more frequently to share learnings, having more time to communicate project reasoning and goals behind specific activities to better facilitate implementing member and beneficiary buy-in, consistent guidance on administrative processes, and stronger expectation management among implementing members and beneficiaries.

One implementing member shared that at the start of their activities, they were unaware of partners in other countries and their activities, so they thought they were alone in talking about the urban displaced and looked purely in their location for examples of relevant work on the ground, and learned only through the research conducted with their local university. Greater staff capacity to establish the collaboration mechanisms they had envisioned (as previously mentioned in the Effectiveness section (p.26) could therefore have made a substantial difference to the understanding and efficient operations of some implementing members.

This stretched capacity, partnered with the compressed timeline for the start-up stage of the project, also meant bringing implementing members on board was not always as smooth as desired. Examples include the high time demand to support implementing members' registration in SAM, and provision of language assistance beyond the official GNDR languages of English, French, and Spanish in meetings to encourage greater implementing member staff engagement in countries with alternate operating languages. Along the lines of enhanced local engagement, one suggestion received for future improvements was to put in place for the MDS project a system used in other GNDR projects in which national coordinating organisations and national advisory committees for each country were also used.

None of this should detract from the excellent work of the existing project management team under extraordinary pressures. Rather, it is to highlight that moving forward, the MDS project would be able to more fully maximise its impact and advocacy with the support of an M&E officer. This would also provide more availability amongst the rest of the team to coordinate

other project pieces, such as liaising with global partners and gathering implementing members in sharing their lessons learned and visions for future work and advocacy.

Sustainability

On the criterion of sustainability, the evaluation questions are:

- 8) To what extent has the project presented or shared intervention information with local, national, regional, and global policymakers for the purposes of contributing to policy improvements?
- 9) How is this intervention informing policy and practice enhancing collaboration with local actors, especially the displaced?
- 10) To what extent can the results of the intervention be carried forward and scaled up?

The MDS project has gained a lot of attention at both global and local levels, and there is clear appetite for further work to be done in both these spheres. The scope and priorities for continuation or scale-up of the project, however, is very different on the global versus the local level. Both should be addressed to fully leverage the benefits of the project and further explore some of its promising developments, but they should perhaps be looked at as two pillars of work.

For the local level, it is clear through the focus groups and implementing member interviews that there is a good deal of momentum and enthusiasm for continuing and scaling up specific interventions. While the level of interest, with what stakeholders, and specific possibilities for scale up vary between countries, in general the message has been that there is a lot of attention from additional individuals or communities who have not yet benefited from such interventions. In many cases, there is also a strong desire from local and/or national governments to continue or scale up specific interventions. In addition, many of the beneficiaries or displaced individuals involved in the ULL groups feel like they have just gotten started. All of the implementing members stated with confidence that there would be a benefit to replicating the process or intervention elsewhere, and that they could do so should additional funding from GNDR be available.

“Continuation is very, very important for sustainability. Other settlements are looking to them as a role model, and that should continue and they can mentor others. This is an investment in the project and this community.”

While GNDR has consistently stated it is not a point of fundraising but rather a leader in sharing knowledge exchange, it is unfortunately clear that in almost all these situations, the expectation is for more funding to come through GNDR, and very little seems to exist in the way of strategies amongst implementing members, communities, or governments to fund activities through alternate means. This poses a significant challenge moving forward. Without plans to secure additional opportunities to continue the work, implementing members may face reputational risks within the communities with which they have worked so hard to build trust. In turn, those communities will be less likely to engage with services or assistance in the future,

thereby potentially increasing their disaster risk vulnerabilities. Furthermore, the gains with advocacy through government engagement, as well as overall momentum in addressing displaced community needs, may be lost. It is therefore important to examine how GNDR, as leader of the MDS project, could support implementing members in the second half of the project in building robust exit strategies, and ensure those strategies are clearly communicated with beneficiary communities to manage expectations and maintain trust. Revived work in data mapping strategies could also support implementing member fundraising efforts moving forward. We provide more detailed recommendations in the Recommendations section (p.43).

“[Implementing member] is actually doing a wonderful job with GNDR and I have to appeal to you to support them so that more resources can be given to them to support more IDPs and to work with others.”

On the global level, there is similarly a great deal of excitement and potential for furthering influence on global policy. However, unlike at the local level, the interest is less focused on specific interventions under the project, and is more focused on the promise of some of the approaches undertaken in the MDS, and in enhanced local representation at global fora through the GNDR network.

As mentioned in previous sections, some implementing members have presented their work and perspectives at GNDR network’s side event at the GPDRR in Bali, which was reportedly seen by many external partners as one of the most engaging events at the platform. Several commented that the focused nature of the information presented in one specific context helped to rehumanise the issues, as data is typically presented in more traditional, distant manners by organisations like the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and International Organization for Migration (IOM), and thus in this respect the data is more powerful in reinforcing current knowledge.

Some external partners felt that the WIA training implementing members received helped to give them a shared language through which to better engage with policymakers at global fora. In addition, GNDR has provided input for PDD’s opinion paper for consideration in future policy at the platform. Both NRC and PDD have mentioned upcoming opportunities to similarly write perspective pieces for potential incorporation into future policy, such as PDD suggesting GNDR provide input for its upcoming 2022 UN Climate Change Conference (COP27) piece, or NRC wanting to work with GNDR to respond to the Sendai Framework mid-term review. In addition, other important global actors have shown an increased interest in collaborating with GNDR due to the MDS project, with the International Council of Voluntary Agencies asking GNDR to speak on a panel that is part of the new UN Action Agenda for Internal Displacement, and the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre asking GNDR to write a section in their annual report. Attention from major UN organisations such as IOM or UN Habitat has also greatly increased, with UNHCR also asking GNDR to speak on a panel at their official COP27 event.

“That recognition from IOM probably was not necessarily expected...That’s great. That’s at the highest level of UN organisations working on displacement...And we were not strategic...it was just sharing a project.”

At this stage, however, there seems to be some conflation amongst global partners on whether there are specific elements of MDS that are of interest, or if it is having access to the GNDR network overall. Feedback from global partners indicated many were unclear on the overall scope and impact of the project beyond their points of contribution, and that they had not received any updated information. Those who attended the learning event in which the global paper was presented felt the findings were valuable in confirming already identified issues persisted, but did not necessarily shed significant new light on the topic.

To maximise the influence of the MDS project specifically, it would therefore be important to identify one or two key messages and products to share on the global stage that will provide more of a unique value-add than just the findings themselves. Based on feedback, it is likely that further investigating the strengths of the MDS approach around engaging local voices in intervention prioritisation and design (particularly at the nexus of displaced community vulnerabilities to disaster risks) would be highly beneficial for the sustainability of advocacy messages. Investigating how the MDS successfully included local voices in project design, how approaches highlighted displacement considerations within DRR policy spheres, how implementing members were able to engage with the WIA initiative and further that learning on a local level, and how to encourage further local representative engagement at global platforms could all be of great interest at the global stage. One global partner noted that the implementing partner from Bangladesh had mentioned that despite the global WIA focus on raising awareness of Sendai guidance with national governments, that learning never trickled down to the local level, or sometimes even within the national government level. Focusing on the approach as a means to empowering local CSOs and community engagement with advocacy and policy change around DRR and displacement, and its ability to complement global efforts in incorporating best practice in national policies from the ground-up, could have broad-reaching and sustained impact at global, regional, and national levels alike.

A focus on the approach as the advocacy message also allows for the complexity of intersecting topics, without having to focus on just one topic. Different interviewees felt that different topics were priorities based on their experiences, contexts, and interests, such as climate change, mobility, development, and DRR. If MDS can identify what aspects of its approach to promote, this could empower different actors on the local level to collect nuanced information on need, pursue specific interventions and advocacy messages that they identify as a priority, and inform and diversify national and global approaches in the process.

Finally, the overall approach of the project itself also promises a unique innovation in creating a practical bridge between humanitarian and development sectors. As discussed previously, by including displaced communities to identify their own priorities and solutions, quite a few interventions showed a mix of immediate humanitarian activities and longer term development

solutions. As such, this approach warrants further investigation to identify best practices and recommendations for how it can further coordinate between these two long-established siloes.

Impact

The following evaluation questions shaped our inquiry into impact:

- 11) To what extent will the project help to improve the lives and livelihoods of the communities most at risk?
- 12) To what extent were project lessons learned made available to non-project members for the purposes of being able to replicate the process?
- 13) What recommendations are given to utilise the final 15 months of the project in the most impactful way?
- 14) What unintended or unexpected changes, positive or negative, have taken place as a result of the project?

At this stage and as noted above, direct beneficiary numbers are significantly lower than originally targeted, which is likely due at least in part to the reduced guidance for implementing partners using ULL approaches, as identified solutions were in many cases focused on delivery to those partaking in the ULL process, rather than a larger scope within the community. However, it is important to highlight that in some cases the very participatory approach of the project focused on building capacities of the community, and identified mentors to take learning and approaches forward beyond the project timeline, ultimately enhancing sustainability. For example, in Nepal, the intervention included establishing a temporary clubhouse shelter through which youth leaders could continue to share learnings around disaster preparedness and cleanup campaigns throughout the whole community, thereby continuing to strengthen resilience and loss reduction. In South Sudan, livelihood activities did not just focus on the economic success of direct participants, but also on establishing a pool of start-up funding replenished by participants once their own business was stable, and adding new participants to take up that funding for their own businesses moving forward. The goal is to continually replenish this pool of funding to reach more and more displaced individuals over time.

Given the sustainable approaches taken in some countries, as well as the focus on long-term development goals such as the poverty reduction approach used in Sri Lanka, longer-term and follow-up measurement approaches will be crucial to truly assessing impact, numbers reached, and value for money, as they are likely to outlast the project period itself.

In the absence of beneficiary feedback mechanisms established through the project, it is difficult to confirm community perspectives on the quality of interventions and change achieved independently of implementing members. Given the methodology of this evaluation due to its tight timeline, the authors still relied on implementing members to connect with beneficiaries to receive their feedback, potentially also weakening the quality of data. However, those beneficiaries contacted through the focus groups were largely happy with the project interventions, despite the variations in breadth and impact of specific interventions. Some described seeing changes to the whole community through road improvements as in Rwanda or

reduced disease vectors in Nepal, and some shared benefits to their own personal circumstances through increased employment opportunities and daily access to food as in South Sudan. What was most commonly shared as an impact, however, is the general happiness to be included and empowered in contributing to and leading project design, as well as being put directly in touch with government leaders. Displaced community members had very positive feedback about the VFL Lite and ULL approaches in general, sharing that it left the community feeling very engaged and listened to, agreeing that it was a key to success.

“Since we joined this group we learned a lot. Since we joined the CBO they surveyed us and asked us what is the problem for us. Since learning the problem from us, they found out the solution for these problems in company with us. The project had an impact on my heart and community.”

As also referenced under previous findings, the degree to which the project has captured previously unknown needs and priorities within displaced communities in urban settings, and its overall success in putting this topic and potential solutions on the local and even national government radar, is likely to have a substantial impact if sustained over the coming years. The degree to which government actors are watching MDS outcomes in their area for potential replication in other areas demonstrates the level of interest that has been garnered as is especially evident in Niger and Rwanda. Similarly, introducing government representatives to the benefits of inclusive processes such as the ULL approach could have broad-reaching positive impacts for future community inclusion and effective DRR programming.

By the date of this mid-term evaluation, two events took place on 1 and 9 December 2021, in which the MDS project was presented to 118 non-implementing GNDR members, for their information. It was reported in interviews that a number of members attending the sessions expressed an interest in similar approaches in their area. Additional sessions will be important to support uptake of approaches identified as beneficial under the MDS project. To maximise impact, the latter half of the project could focus on thoroughly reflecting on lessons learned and best practices for key approaches with implementing members, as well as gathering their suggestions on methodology for how best to share this information.

As noted in the Sustainability section of this report (p.32), there is a difference in focus and recommended next steps between many acting at the local level versus global level.

For many implementing members, displaced individuals, local and national government representatives, and local academia, recommendations for the remaining 15 months of the MDS project focused on the local continuation or scale-up of current interventions. In all focus groups participants stated their enthusiastic hope for additional funding in the remaining 15 months of the project to continue the work that some feel has just gotten started, with an express plea to GNDR directly in every case to provide this funding.

Some academics in the focus groups stated how important continuation of the interventions was for supporting sustainability of gains made, particularly as other areas were looking at what was

happening in target areas, and can be mentored on how to take on similar approaches and solutions. Stakeholders in multiple countries also stated how the interventions get the topic of displacement and connections with DRR on government radar more, and thus how important continuation of the interventions themselves are to not lose potential policy momentum.

Government stakeholders frequently shared this sense of how important continuation of interventions is, with many citing that other areas wanted similar interventions. However, none seemed to indicate they were looking at funding resources from within or other sources. For example, one stated that “This is a pilot project, but when we get more funding we can expand”, indicating some expectations for funding from current sources via GNDR.

Similarly, many individual implementing members (though not all) expressed their recommendations for advocacy work in the next stage to focus on their local intervention continuation needs, such as increased access to schooling for displaced children in the area as in Niger, or establishing a national DRR policy as in Iraq. Very few mentioned broader advocacy goals as a recommendation, although one did mention further advocacy around seeing government policies to plan for and address climate change displacement, as well as gender issues in this area. Another did recommend developing an advocacy message for GNDR to share on their behalf globally. In terms of complementing localised endeavours with a shared advocacy goal for the next 15 months, it may therefore be necessary to pool implementing members together to brainstorm on this point more concretely.

Along these lines, another interviewee suggested organising more shared learning on best VFL Lite and ULL approaches. This could be particularly important as some noted that how these approaches play out on the ground do still differ from place to place, with examples of levels of government engagement and/or how cultural power imbalances may affect the openness and shared communication between participants. So exploring how to adjust approaches to capture more nuanced experiences, shared learning, and tips in different scenarios, like conducting ULL events with different groups separately to start and then combining, could be important to ensure no one is silenced in the process.

On the global partnership level, suggestions for the remaining 15 months focused more on leveraging current momentum in including local voices in global policy considerations. Given how specific findings and local interventions of the project have been of less immediate interest in the global sphere compared to the increased inclusion of local perspectives and approaches overall, it is likely that the methodology of MDS as an opportunity to strengthen locally-driven interventions, support sustainable approaches, and unite the humanitarian and development siloes would have the greatest traction in the remaining 15 months of the project. Furthermore, immediately taking up invitations from current global partners like NRC and PDD to work together in forming opinion papers that feed into the mid-term review of major global frameworks is a time-sensitive and easy win to continue influencing global policy in the next 15 months.

Partners mentioned that applying the WIA tools to get displacement on DRR agendas, and seeing it have an effect, is one demonstration of how to build practical bridges between development and humanitarian siloes, which is unique and holds great promise. One partner even suggested the potential for a WIA Training of Trainers with MDS implementing members taking forward WIA trainings in their respective countries. Partners also suggested MDS may want to focus on helping to get GNDR as equally recognised in humanitarian spaces as it is in DRR spaces while maintaining control of its organisational direction, with organisations like NRC willing to help in supporting enhanced connections with organisations like UNDRR, UNHCR, etc. Suggestions included that working with a displacement-focused organisation could also be helpful with this, and bringing some kind of product to market through MDS could also help put GNDR on UNDRR's radar as an influencer. This could include papers feeding into Sendai and COP27 reviews. Further value was also seen in potentially showing how to build space for local voices in global events without tokenising those voices, and that as UNDRR is keen to work with local civil society, being able to package such an approach or channels could further strengthen advocacy through the MDS project.

Finally, conducting additional research and a much more intensive approach to data collection in order to better measure impact and gather evidence supporting advocacy efforts and strategising will be important. This is particularly the case if the project would like to identify further findings that are perhaps less well established in the current literature. Providing strong data on change achieved, and how it was achieved and why it worked, would be a significant contribution by showing how the identified challenges, which are persistent in literature, have been effectively addressed.

“The more specific you can be, the better...If we can figure out how people could be supported, or how they chose to attack [a] particular problem, that would be great...But I think the challenge to make the Cookbook really be a recipe that you can follow, because I think it's very easy to get into generalities. Because you want to make sure that it applies in lots of places.”

The need to provide detailed examples of addressing problems, yet providing a generalisable “recipe” that others can use, indicates that perhaps the best focus on filling gaps in the literature would be on establishing data on how the MDS approaches of the VFL Lite and ULL worked in a variety of contexts, and strong evidence of how this approach achieved significant change in these various contexts.

Some interviewees had expressed how important it would be to gather some data points that are currently unavailable through the project, such as the degree to which displaced and host community relations have improved, or how integrated displaced community members are in the wider community as a result of this project. Greater evidence on areas of success and why they worked could better inform best practices, and further independent collection of beneficiary feedback will likely provide more nuanced and beneficial perspectives for consideration and final reporting on impact.

To conclude the discussion of this criterion, in terms of unintended or unexpected changes as a result of the MDS project, the most generalisable findings mentioned the high demand received at the local level to replicate and expand interventions to new communities in the area. The level of successful engagement with government as well as overall attention garnered by many interventions was not anticipated. Similarly, on the global level, interviewees mentioned never expecting the level of interest achieved within high-level UN organisations such as IOM, and that the speed at which they already achieved recognition was spectacular. These are both highly positive outcomes, and indicate a level of urgency in strategising and organising how best to realise the potential provided on both levels for maximum impact moving forward.

Coherence

To evaluate coherence, the following evaluation questions were used:

- 15) To what extent do the project interventions interlink with the broad objectives of GNDR strategy?
- 16) To what extent does the project contribute to ongoing deliberations and objectives of key global frameworks, including Sendai, Grand Bargain, SDGs and Global Compact on Migration?

The approach and logic behind the MDS project is very strongly aligned with both GNDR network's strategy and key global frameworks such as the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, Sustainable Development Goals, Global Compact for Migration, and the Grand Bargain.

The three goals of GNDR network's strategy are all clearly represented in the MDS project, with the project very clearly contributing to collaboration and mobilisation of civil society organisations, promoting localisation through locally-driven solutions including affected community input in design, and supporting risk-informed development by identifying and highlighting risks for local communities and government and incorporating those considerations in project interventions. Furthermore, the entirety of the MDS project targets two of the six drivers of risk focused on in the strategy (forced displacement and urbanisation), and specific country-level interventions may also incorporate other drivers such as gender inequality, conflict, and climate change.

At the global level, the localisation elements of the project are also strongly aligned with both the Sustainable Development Goals and the Grand Bargain, both of which seek to strengthen either development or humanitarian outcomes by placing more resources and decision-making opportunities with local communities and actors. The VFL Lite and ULL approaches do exactly that, bringing a variety of local stakeholders together to prioritise problems and create solutions. The ULL approach also adheres to key Global Compact on Migration principles such as people-centred, whole-of-government, and whole-of-society approaches, and also contributes to some objectives depending on the country-specific interventions, such as minimising adverse drivers of migration by seeking to reduce disaster risks that could in turn result in further displacement; reducing vulnerabilities through poverty reduction or raised awareness of disaster risks and

responses; enhancing access to basic services for displaced persons, such as education; and promoting inclusion and social cohesion through increased economic and political engagement.

This approach also applies to the elements of national and local government leadership of the Action Agenda on Internal Displacement. In addition, the vertical exchange between global, national, and local spaces demonstrated through this project feeds into discussions on engagement around solutions at both global and country levels focused on in the Action Agenda on Internal Displacement. Similarly, the MDS project approach directly applies to the Social Sustainability dimension of the New Urban Agenda, in particular empowerment of marginalised groups and planning for migrants.

Furthermore, in regards to the Sendai Framework, the MDS project directly contributes to the understanding of disaster risk at the local level, using the VFL Lite methodology to assess needs and priorities amongst displaced populations in urban settings, and promoting the need to address such concerns with local and national governments. Not only does the project seek to strengthen local disaster risk governance through such awareness raising activities, but also to contribute to global governance through the sharing and re-humanisation of DRR work at the local level, as well as including local voices in global policy spaces. In addition, by engaging with the WIA guidelines aligned with the Sendai Framework through the NRC/PDD WIA training, the MDS project contributed to Sendai by both proving the usefulness of the tool in civil society spaces, and by sharing WIA messages on the ground and with other local civil society, thereby strengthening the reach of the framework as it had quite evidently not trickled down to the local level, even within government, in many countries.

The MDS project is therefore very clearly coherent with GNDR organisational and global policy priorities and learnings, and in addition has demonstrated some potentially exciting, practical approaches to contribute to these spaces and policies in the future.

Lessons learned

Extensive collaboration with communities and facilitating processes that allow them to identify and prioritise their own needs, and connecting these messages with academia and government through collaborative problem-solving, is overwhelmingly positive. Furthermore, there is a great deal of promise for innovative approaches making real impacts on local, regional, and global levels. For further detail on recommendations for how to proceed to achieve maximum impact, please see the Recommendations section (p. 43).

Below are tips and lessons learned through the project thus far for consideration, with the goal of further strengthening and informing approaches for any future projects:

1. Refine scope and proactively communicate shared understanding of key definitions around targets, such as “displaced” and “urban”, at the very start of the recruitment and project. Align with common global DRR and displacement definitions for greater clarity of purpose and advocacy with external partners.
2. Allocate more time for project set-up such as registering implementing members, establishing and communicating administrative processes (including reports), facilitating full implementing member buy-in and understanding of processes and project logic, and assessing individual implementing member capacities in key project areas.
3. Allocate more time for delivery of interventions at the local level to fully support and test approaches, and gather quality data to support subsequent analysis, learning, and advocacy.
4. Allocate more time and/or manage outcome expectations of institutionalised change, as changes to policy typically take years, not months.
5. Look at how to adapt the VFL Lite tool to displacement contexts specifically.
6. Clearly outline exit strategies, including building individual fundraising capacities, at the start of the project, and work more closely with implementing members to proactively manage expectations amongst communities and local stakeholders from the beginning. While GNDR is not a point of funding, incorporating phase-out steps with implementing members, such as building fundraising capacities and connecting them with a variety of funding opportunities, can strengthen the sustainability and reach of future projects.
7. Investigate further how to enhance project inclusion of persons with disabilities, including “invisible” disabilities, in contexts with limited-to-no baseline data on target populations.
8. Enhance opportunities for peer learning between implementing members within a project. Potential ways to facilitate this in future could include assessing individual implementing member capacities, establishing mentors within the implementing member

pool to lead capacity building on key skill sets, and establishing regular workshops to share experiences and collaborate on ongoing pieces of work between implementing members as the project progresses.

9. Establish beneficiary feedback mechanisms independent of implementing members to strengthen quality of data and monitor quality of project delivery and impact.
10. Enhance collaboration within GNDR by having regional leads regularly review implementing member reports, incorporating their contextualised insights into project oversight.
11. Put a dedicated M&E officer in place at the start of projects of this size to build appropriate M&E systems, work with implementing members to ensure quality of data and reporting, and better capture impact and other key data to support subsequent advocacy efforts.
12. Dedicate at least some of the project management team staff full-time to a project of this size to ensure more robust support and coordination with implementing members, particularly at the initial set-up and activity implementation stages.
13. Ensure project kick-off meetings provide interpretation for all relevant languages to facilitate higher staff engagement within implementing members. This could help to ensure interested individuals stay involved, and provide additional points of contact within an implementing member organisation to avoid bottlenecks.
14. Explore the usefulness of including national coordinating organisations and national advisory committees in similar projects in future, along the lines of other GNDR projects.

Recommendations

Recommendations for the Making Displacement Safer project

In light of the findings of this evaluation, the authors of this report put forward the following recommendations for the remaining 15 months of the MDS project:

Advocacy:

1. **Identify one or two key advocacy messages for the global level to focus efforts, and build products to bring to market around those messages.** Areas of potential strong interest globally include assessing the strengths and sharing practical steps of including local voices in project design through VFL Lite and ULL methodology; assessing and sharing how effective these approaches are in advocating for policy change at the national level, promoting the incorporation of global guidance on the national level, and providing practical bridges between humanitarian and development siloes; and assessing and sharing how to better include local voices in global policy spheres. Focusing on innovative approaches rather than advocacy messages around specific policy changes alone could have a greater impact by empowering CSOs to pursue a wide range of advocacy messages both globally and locally in future, as well as possibly providing more support and resources to replicate this approach for similar policy empowerment among other communities around the world.

While the findings of this project can and should reinforce key policy goals such as recognising the intersection of displacement and DRR, the greatest contribution this project can make to knowledge gaps globally is through providing practical guidance on how approaches like that of the MDS can empower local voices to push for change on all levels. While information from the MDS project can also feed into areas of work happening elsewhere in GNDR such as climate change, specific advocacy from MDS would benefit from a more narrow focus. By continuing to focus even through advocacy on facilitating community abilities to identify and address their own needs, rather than setting clear kinds of assistance from beginning, the MDS project can build an even stronger local advocacy network connected to global issues that can advocate for all manner of policy areas based on local, national, and global priorities. The cross-cutting nature of this approach in engaging displaced communities in building resilience as an advocacy message can then be applied to a variety of policy areas, DRR and displacement both. Given the intersectionality of these areas and the application of localisation approaches in both humanitarian and development settings, this could be used to potentially influence the Sendai Framework, Sustainable Development Goals, Action Agenda on Internal Displacement, and New Urban Agenda, mainstreaming displacement considerations in DRR spaces, and engagement around DRR considerations in displacement spaces.

2. **Convene the implementing members in a workshop or series of workshops to reflect on the project.** Share learnings and best practices around the project (overall and specific elements like VFL Lite and ULL methodology), refine global and local advocacy messages and goals, and discuss methodologies for sharing the project and its lessons with non-implementing GNDR members. While many implementing members wished there had been more opportunity for collaboration previously, there is still time to facilitate this collaboration to fully capture the strengths of this project and how to share them, as well as how to support each implementing member in their future work. Working together to design some of these next steps would be an excellent way to gather a more nuanced understanding of what the project has to offer, and empower the continued work of each organisation.
3. **Collaborate with global partners like NRC and PDD to take advantage of upcoming opportunities to feed into global policy discussions, and identify additional opportunities for further collaboration.** Present opportunities include the Sendai Framework mid-term review and upcoming COP27. Potential opportunities for further collaboration could include NRC's suggestion of a WIA Training of Trainers with implementing members; collaborating in various CSO advocacy spaces such as climate change, DRR, development, and mobility; and recommendations for better connecting with and influencing key organisations such as UNDRR and UNHCR. GNDR can consider these opportunities as it assesses what kind of partnerships it would like to build, and toward what focus.
4. **Present MDS progress, findings, and key advocacy messages to global partners.** This opportunity would not only support collaboration and a fuller external understanding of the project, but could also facilitate a discussion assessing what interest lies at the global level in key MDS approaches and findings versus what GNDR as a whole has to offer. Clarifying such interests will likely help identify best ways to proceed in advocacy and building access in decision-making spaces for both MDS and GNDR more generally.
5. **Consider opportunities to test MDS approaches in reaching a larger number of beneficiaries to assess scope for reaching entire displaced communities.** As the current project affected change with a relatively limited number of beneficiaries, testing the effectiveness of the MDS approaches in a larger pool of beneficiaries will provide additional evidence and information on how these approaches can best contribute to work and policies addressing DRR concerns amongst displaced communities in urban settings around the world. While GNDR is not a project-focused organisation, even working with other organisations to replicate the approach for a broader pool of beneficiaries and monitoring outcomes could further support advocacy messages around the benefits of MDS approaches.
6. **Consider establishing additional indicators to measure advocacy achievements beyond the number of documents changed to include DRR considerations.** While

GNDR follows USAID indicators for the MDS project, given the limited timeline of the project in terms of institutionalised change, additional internal indicators such as a greater shared understanding of local DRR priorities between government and displaced communities, mention of DRR and displacement in policy discussions, and/or number of visits/consultations between government representatives and communities could gather a more nuanced understanding of progress in advocacy activities.

Project management:

7. **Put a dedicated M&E officer in place for the remainder of the MDS project to review project data to date, control for data quality, and more fully measure the impact of each intervention.** This will be vital for both the final reporting of the project, as well as supporting advocacy efforts with robust evidence of change. In addition to measuring general impact, align with advocacy goals to collect relevant data and refer to the original monitoring and evaluation plan, including plans for conducting outcome harvesting. Areas for evaluation include, for example, some interviewees suggested wanting more data on changes in the recognition of displaced communities in host communities and local government, as well as the incorporation of urbanisation in resilience planning. Identifying such goals would help to ensure relevant data is examined. GNDR may also want to consider establishing a beneficiary feedback mechanism to better capture impact from the beneficiaries' point of view. Along these lines, further M&E work for the project could look at specifically gathering beneficiary feedback from the countries for which this evaluation was unable to convene focus groups: El Salvador, Honduras, Iraq, and Republic of Congo. Finally, GNDR may wish to consider impact monitoring possibilities beyond the life of the MDS project for data on long-term outcomes, particularly in situations where longer-term change on DRR risk vulnerabilities was targeted through poverty reduction or enhanced education access.

8. **Refine target definitions and areas of work to guide further research and evidence-gathering in the remaining period of the project.** While refinements of these meanings and targets cannot be retroactively applied to the in-country interventions, further clarifying target contexts and communities to focus research and data collection in the remaining 15 months of the project can help inform and support a more robust advocacy message and strategy. GNDR may wish to incorporate this discussion in the suggested workshop with implementing members to gather input on how best to define key terms and target advocacy efforts.

Sustainability:

9. **Work with each individual implementing member to develop and monitor bespoke exit strategies in their area.** This could include developing messaging with communities to manage expectations, building individual fundraising capacities, providing additional data mapping capacity building from MapAction to support fundraising messages, assisting in identifying fundraising and advocacy opportunities,

and working closely with implementing members to manage expectations within target communities. While GNDR is not a fundraising point, incorporating phase-out steps, such as building implementing member fundraising capacities and connecting them with a variety of funding opportunities, can strengthen the sustainability and reach of future projects. As some local and national governments have limited funding or competing priorities, fundraising plans incorporating international as well as local opportunities would be particularly useful. Feeding back to targeted displaced communities on the project's progress and a realistic overview of next steps would also likely prove useful in maintaining transparency, accountability, and trust in communities by managing local expectations. Identifying implementing members with a strong capacity in developing fundraising strategies to support other implementing members in this task could reduce demands on project management time and enhance peer collaboration.

10. **Organise a follow-up event with non-implementing GNDR members to present the MDS project's work and disseminate products such as the MDS Cookbook**, which will use MDS case studies to focus on the principles of how to support resilience to disasters amongst displaced populations in urban settings. Such an event could incorporate lessons, suggestions, and reflections gathered through the collaboration event with implementing members. Assess level of interest and what support non-implementing members need in replicating approaches.

Recommendations for future evaluations

As previously mentioned, the findings of this evaluation have been somewhat constrained due to the variations in quality of the reporting, and lack of secondary mechanisms to confirm data shared in the reports. The quality of future evaluations, particularly ones with limited timescales and resources for field visits, can therefore be improved by ensuring higher quality data through more enhanced ongoing monitoring systems. One way to do this would be to provide guidance to implementing members on how to use the narrative report templates, either before they fill them out or through a feedback process after they've submitted. Additionally, establishing beneficiary feedback mechanisms can improve the ability to confirm reported data, nuance evidence, continue to include local community input, and support accountability. Both steps could improve reporting data, thereby supporting a more robust evaluation process in future.

Due to the size of this project and the broad scope of this evaluation, it was not possible to dive deeply into the project's impact in each country. An evaluation of a project this size would typically require significantly more time to deliver detailed and nuanced findings. For more detailed evaluations of projects this size in future, we recommend allocating additional time for the evaluation process. In addition, if confirmations of data or findings outside of what is available through reports is required, resources to support site visits may also be necessary.

References

- Bond. 2018. *Evidence Principles*. Available: <https://www.bond.org.uk/resources/evidence-principles>
- Brookings Institution and University of Bern Project on Internal Displacement. 2008. *Moving Beyond Rhetoric: Consultation and Participation with Populations Displaced by Conflict or Natural Disasters*. Available: <https://www.brookings.edu/research/moving-beyond-rhetoric-consultation-and-participation-with-populations-displaced-by-conflict-or-natural-disasters/>
- GSDRC. 2016. "Informal Settlements." *Urban Governance: Topic Guide*, pp. 30-31. Available: https://gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/UrbanGov_GSDRC.pdf
- Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre and Norwegian Refugee Council. 2019. *Global Report on Internal Displacement*. Available: <https://www.internal-displacement.org/global-report/grid2019/>
- International Rescue Committee. 2016. *Forced Displacement in Urban Areas: What needs to be done*. Available: <https://www.rescue.org/report/forced-displacement-urban-areas-what-needs-be-done>
- Norwegian Refugee Council and Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, May 2015. *Global Overview 2015: People Internally Displaced by Conflict and Violence*. Available: <https://www.internal-displacement.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/20150506-global-overview-2015-en.pdf>
- OECD-DAC. 2019. *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*. Available: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>
- Sydney, Chloe. 2018. "Cycles of Displacement." *Forced Migration Review* 59, p. 51. Available: <https://www.fmreview.org/GuidingPrinciples20/bilak-shai>
- UNHCR. 2022. *Global Trends Report 2021*. Available: <https://www.unhcr.org/62a9d1494/global-trends-report-2021>.
- University of Oxford: Refugee Studies Centre. 2010. "Adapting to Urban Displacement." *Forced Migration Review* 34. Available: <https://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/urban-displacement/FMR34.pdf>
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. "68% of the world population projected to live in urban areas by 2050, says UN." Available: <https://www.un.org/development/desa/en/news/population/2018-revision-of-world-urbanization-prospects.html>
- Zetter, Roger. 2010. *Protecting people displaced by climate change: some conceptual challenges*. Hart Publishing.

Annexes

Annex 1: Evaluation matrix

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Data Sources and Collection Methods	
		Data source	Methods
Relevance and Validity of Design			
1. To what extent is MDS addressing the key issues highlighted in the proposal and 11 urban contexts?	<p>1.1 Proposal's stated objectives are represented in the M&E plan and reporting</p> <p>1.2 Individual country projects are consistent with proposal's stated objectives and outcome/output indicators</p> <p>1.3 Key issues identified in each local urban community context are addressed by the interventions</p>	<p>Project Proposal</p> <p>Project Narrative Reports</p> <p>M&E Plan</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Document Review</p> <p>Semi-structured Interviews</p>
2. Are the priorities, outcomes, outputs and activities logical and coherent?	<p>2.1 Priorities, outcomes, outputs and activities are consistent with and support each other</p> <p>2.2 Priorities, outcomes, outputs and activities are reported to contribute to the overarching goals of the project</p>	<p>Project Proposal</p> <p>Project Narrative Reports</p> <p>M&E Plan</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Document Review</p> <p>Semi-structured Interviews</p>
3. What parts of the process are the most critical to success?	3.1 GNDR and partners identify best practices and enabling factors that have contributed to project success or failure overall and in each country	Interviews	Semi-structured Interviews
Effectiveness			
4. What progress has the project made towards achieving its	4.1 Outcomes and outputs have been completed successfully as outlined in the M&E plan and	Project Narrative Reports	Document Review

planned objectives?	proposal 4.2 Challenges and delays are identified and accounted for in plans for the next 18 months of the project 4.3 Measures to mitigate delays and deliver planned outcomes and outputs, and address potential risks for the next 18 months	Project Documentation Interviews	Semi-structured Interviews
4a. What are the reasons/factors behind that progress (or lack thereof)?	4a.1 Factors for success are identified by stakeholders 4a.2 Factors hindering success are identified by stakeholders	Project Narrative Reports Interviews	Document Review Semi-structured Interviews
4b. What are the main constraints, problems and areas in need of further information?	4b.1 Stakeholders identified areas that need further information in order to overcome constraints	Project Narrative Reports Interviews	Document Review Semi-structured Interviews
5. Does the project address the diversity in the implementation of the project activities in terms of gender, age and disabilities?	5.1 Women comprise 50% of project participants and beneficiaries 5.2 Youth (18 and under) comprise 10% of project participants and beneficiaries 5.3 Elderly comprise 10% of project participants and beneficiaries 5.4 Persons living with disability comprise 10% of participants and beneficiaries	Project Narrative Reports Interviews	Document Review Semi-structured Interviews
Efficiency			
6. How well has project management worked in delivering project outputs and results (e.g.	6.1 Problems were identified by project management 6.2 Problems were mitigated	Project Narrative Reports Interviews	Document Review Semi-structured

<p>were alternative solutions to the existing challenges identified proactively)?</p>	<p>effectively in a timeframe that enabled objectives to be met</p>		<p>Interviews</p>
<p>7. To what extent was the project team organised so as to be responsive to the changes on the ground and be accountable?</p>	<p>7.1 Project team reports effective organisation</p> <p>7.2 Project team reports responding effectively to challenges and changes</p> <p>7.3 Implementing partners report responsiveness on the part of the project team</p>	<p>Project narrative Reports</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Document Review</p> <p>Semi-structured Interviews</p>
<p>Sustainability</p>			
<p>8. To what extent has the project presented or shared intervention information with local, national, regional, and global policymakers for the purposes of contributing to policy improvements?</p>	<p>8.1 Information including best practices have been made accessible to the public</p> <p>8.2 Policymakers have been made aware of the intervention and its lessons</p> <p>8.3 Is there any known or direct examples of how project information has been used?</p>	<p>Project Narrative Reports</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Document Review</p> <p>Semi-structured Interviews</p>
<p>9. How is this intervention informing policy and practice enhancing collaboration with local actors, especially the displaced?</p>	<p>9.1 Implementing partners report lessons learned for collaborating with displaced persons in project design and delivery</p> <p>9.2 GNDR members and external actors report knowledge of best practices for collaboration emerging from the project</p>	<p>Interviews</p>	<p>Semi-structured Interviews</p>
<p>10. To what extent can the results of the intervention be carried forward and scaled up?</p>	<p>10.1 Implementing partners report that they are able to scale up their projects</p> <p>10.2 GNDR members and other stakeholders report that they are able to scale up by implementing in other countries</p>	<p>Interviews</p>	<p>Semi-structured Interviews</p>

	10.3 Implementing partners have plans for how the project would be prepared to adjust for any issues that come along with scaling (e.g. accounting for new challenges in new locations, capability to track more data, etc.)		
Impact			
11. To what extent will the project help to improve the lives and livelihoods of the communities most at risk?	11.1 Beneficiaries report improved lives, livelihoods, and being part of an enabling policy environment 11.2 Implementing partners report improvement of lives and livelihoods in target communities	Project Narrative Reports Interviews	Document Review Semi-structured Interviews
12. To what extent were project lessons made available to non-project members for the purposes of being able to replicate the process?	12.1 Lessons learned and best practices have been made available to GNDR members, or plans to share have been made	Project Documentation Interviews	Document Review Semi-structured Interviews
13. What recommendations are given to utilise the final 18 months of the project in the most impactful way?	13.1 Recommendations are made by stakeholders for the next 18 months of the project 13.2 External partners/stakeholders make recommendations for improving impact 13.3 Most impactful actions to date are identified 13.4 Gaps and areas for improvement identified	Interviews	Semi-structured Interviews
14. What unintended or unexpected changes, positive or negative,	14.1 Implementing partners report unintended/unexpected changes resulting from the	Interviews	Semi-structured Interviews

have taken place as a result of the project?	project		
Coherence			
15. To what extent do the project interventions interlink with the broad objectives of GNDR strategy?	<p>15.1 Project staff report consistency with GNDR strategy</p> <p>15.2 Project indicators and stated goals are consistent with GNDR strategy</p>	<p>Project Documentation</p> <p>GNDR Strategic Report</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Document Review</p> <p>Semi-structured Interviews</p>
16. To what extent does the project contribute to ongoing deliberations and objectives of key global frameworks, including Sendai, Grand Bargain, SDGs and Global Compact on Migration?	<p>16.1 project indicators and stated goals are consistent with key global frameworks</p> <p>16.2 It is reported that publicly available information from the project contributes to deliberations surrounding key global frameworks</p> <p>16.3 Number of available resources generated by the project and accessible to global leaders on DRR</p>	<p>Project Documentation</p> <p>Global Frameworks</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Document Review</p> <p>Semi-structured Interviews</p>

Annex 2: Bond evidence principles

Principle	Criteria
<p>1) Voice and Inclusion</p> <p>We present beneficiaries' views on the effects of the intervention, and identify who has been affected and how</p>	<p>1a. Are the perspectives of beneficiaries included in the evidence?</p> <p>1b. Are the perspectives of the most excluded and marginalised groups included in the evidence?</p> <p>1c. Are findings disaggregated according to sex, disability and other relevant social differences?</p> <p>1d. Did beneficiaries play an active role in designing the evidence gathering and analysis process?</p>
<p>2) Appropriateness</p> <p>We use methods that are justifiable given the nature of the intervention and purpose of the assessment</p>	<p>2a. Are the data collection methods relevant to the purpose of the enquiry and do they generate reliable data?</p> <p>2b. Is the size and composition of the sample in proportion to the conclusions sought by the enquiry?</p> <p>2c. Does the team have the skills and characteristics to deliver high quality data collection and analysis?</p> <p>2d. Are the data analysed in a systematic way that leads to convincing conclusions?</p>
<p>3) Triangulation</p> <p>We make conclusions about the intervention's effects by using a mix of methods, data sources, and perspectives</p>	<p>3a. Are different data collection methodologies used and different types of data collected?</p> <p>3b. Are the perspectives of different stakeholders compared and analysed in establishing if and how change has occurred?</p> <p>3c. Are conflicting findings and divergent perspectives presented and explained in the analysis and conclusions?</p> <p>3d. Are the findings and conclusions shared with and validated by a range of key stakeholders (eg. beneficiaries, partners, peers)?</p>
<p>4) Contribution</p> <p>We can show how change happened and explain how we contributed to it</p>	<p>4a. Is a point of comparison used to show that change has happened (eg. a baseline, a counterfactual, comparison with a similar group)?</p> <p>4b. Is the explanation of how the intervention contributes to change explored?</p> <p>4c. Are alternative factors (eg. the contribution of other actors) explored to explain the observed result alongside our intervention's contribution?</p>

	4d. Are unintended and unexpected changes (positive or negative) identified and explained?
5) Transparency We are open about the data sources and methods used, the results achieved, and the strengths and limitations of the evidence	5a. Is the size and composition of the group from which data is being collected explained and justified?
	5b. Are the methods used to collect and analyse data and any limitations of the quality of the data and collection methodology explained and justified?
	5c. Is it clear who has collected and analysed the data, and is any potential bias they may have explained and justified?
	5d. Is there a clear logical link between the conclusions presented and the data collected?

Available: <https://www.bond.org.uk/resources/evidence-principles>

Annex 3: Semi-structured interview guides

For all interviews

Introductions

*Collect identifying information including full name, role, and organisation OR determine that a pseudonym is appropriate depending on the preferences of the interviewee

Informed Consent Process

1. Did you review the informed consent information I sent you?
2. Do you have any questions or concerns?
3. Do you consent to participate in this interview/focus group?
4. Do you consent to being audio recorded?

For implementing members

Relevance and Validity of Design

1. Please tell me about your organisation's MDS intervention
2. What key issues were identified in the assessment phase of the project? How did your intervention address those issues? How was your intervention selected from issues identified?
3. What has been the overall impact of the project?
4. What best practices or enabling factors have you identified that have contributed to project success?

Effectiveness

1. Have you completed all aspects (outputs) of the project at this time?

2. What challenges or delays have you experienced in implementing the project? How did you identify and overcome those challenges?
3. How did COVID-19 impact implementation? Could those issues be caused by something else?
4. What factors have contributed to project success?
5. Did the project address diversity by including women, youth, the elderly, and disabled persons?

Efficiency

1. Did project management at GNDR effectively identify and address challenges? Did they do so in a timeframe that allowed for the project to still be successful?
2. Was the project team at GNDR responsive?

Sustainability

1. What plans or possibilities do you see for continuing or expanding the project approach in the future?
2. To what extent are the innovative solutions implemented likely to be carried forward beyond the project life?
3. Is the project scalable? How will you address issues that come with scaling? (accounting for new challenges in new locations, capability to track more data, etc.)
4. What lessons were learned by your organisation in terms of collaborating with displaced persons and other stakeholders for project design and delivery?

Impact

1. Do beneficiaries report improved lives and livelihoods as a result of the intervention? (if completed)
2. What recommendations do you have for the next 18 months of the project? What have been the most impactful actions so far?
3. What gaps or areas for improvement have you identified?
4. What unintended or unexpected results, positive or negative, have there been as a result of the intervention?

Wrap-up

1. Are there any questions I did not ask that you think I should have?
2. Is there anything else you would like to share with me?
3. Do you have any questions before we finish?

For GNDR secretariat

Relevance and Validity of Design

1. To what extent has the project been able to address key issues and meet its objectives?
2. What best practices contributing to project success have you identified so far?
3. What have been key enabling factors for the project?
4. Is there anything you would change about the project?

Effectiveness

1. Have outcomes and outputs been successfully completed according to the project timeline to date?
2. Have the outcomes and outputs contributed to the success of the project? 3. What

factors for success have you identified to date?

3. What constraints have hindered success? How were they identified? Was this timely so as to allow for adjustments? How were they addressed?
4. Have diversity targets been met by the project's implementing partners? Why?

Efficiency

1. Do you feel that problems were identified quickly by project management?
2. Do you feel the project management was well-organised?
3. What could be improved on the part of project management?

Sustainability

1. Has information about the project including best practices been made available to global policymakers? To non-project GNDR members? How?
2. How have national, regional, and global policymakers been made aware of the interventions and lessons learned?
3. Are there any known examples of how project information has been used by policymakers? GNDR members?
4. Have lessons learned regarding collaborating with displaced persons been reported by implementing members? How have these been shared? With whom?
5. Have any implementing members made plans to scale-up their interventions?
6. Have any other (non-project) members expressed interest or action in implementing in other countries?
7. Do implementing partners have plans for how to manage challenges of scaling?

Impact

1. To what extent have improved lives and livelihoods been reported in targeted communities? What about displaced persons becoming part of an enabling policy environment? What has appeared to be most impactful?
2. What areas for improvement have you identified?
3. What unintended or unexpected changes have resulted from the project?
4. What recommendations would you make for the next 18 months of the project?

Coherence

1. In what ways is the project consistent with the overall GNDR strategy? What about key global frameworks?
2. Has publicly available information contributed to global policy discussions? How so? What materials specifically? Which information has been most impactful? Which information would you like to see have an impact?

Wrap-up

1. Are there any questions I did not ask that you think I should have?
2. Is there anything else you would like to share with me?
3. Do you have any questions before we finish?

For community members/beneficiaries

Relevance and Validity of Design

1. Did the project address the most important issues for your community?
2. What factors have contributed to the success of the project in your community?

Effectiveness

1. Were there any challenges for the project? How were these identified? How were they mitigated?
2. What would you do differently in the future to anticipate or avoid these challenges?
3. Does the project include women, youth, the elderly, and persons living with disability? How did it include these groups? Was their inclusion effective?

Sustainability

1. Do you think that the community was included in project design and delivery? Were they effectively informed and involved in the Urban Living Labs?
2. What do you think the project demonstrated are the best practices for engaging the community in the future?
3. Do you think the project could be expanded in the future? Why or why not?

Impact

1. Do you think the project improved your community's lives and livelihoods?
2. Do you think the project gave your community a chance to participate and give feedback?
3. Do you feel your community is more able to participate in policy decisions now?
4. What was most impactful about the project?
5. What could be improved?
6. What recommendations do you have for the future of this project?
7. Were there any unexpected or unintended changes caused by the project?

Wrap-up

1. Are there any questions I did not ask that you think I should have?
2. Is there anything else you would like to share with me?
3. Do you have any questions before we finish?

Annex 4: Informed consent information

INTRODUCTION

Hello, our names are Mallory Carlson and Mollie Pepper and we are consulting evaluators commissioned by the Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction (GNDR) to conduct this mid-term evaluation of the Making Displacement Safer project. We are trying to learn more about the progress toward the goals of the project, lessons learned, and how to improve the project going forward.

This interview will be used along with other interviews and research to write a report that will be submitted to GNDR to inform the remaining 18 months of the project. The final report will be made available to GNDR staff, members, partners, and peer organisations, as well as other interested parties at the discretion of GNDR.

We invite you to take part in this research project by consenting to participate in an interview or focus group. Choosing to talk with us is your choice alone and you should not be compelled by any other person or organisation to participate. You can decide at any time to stop talking with us today or to stop taking part in the research. If at any time we ask you a question that you do not want to answer, just tell us that you do not want to respond and we can skip that question. If at any time you have questions for us you are invited to ask.

You will not receive any direct benefits from talking to us; likewise, as participation is voluntary there will be no consequences if you decide not to speak with us.

If you decide to take part in this research study, you will be asked to give your verbal consent both to the interview and to audio recording.

PROCEDURES

If you agree to speak with us, there will be one interview lasting 30-60 minutes or focus group lasting 60-90 minutes. It will be conducted via phone or Zoom and scheduled at a time convenient to you. You may be interviewed by both consultants or only one, though in both cases collected data will be seen by both consultants.

We will ask if you agree to be audio recorded. We will audio record this interview for use by the consultants and the audio file and transcript of our interview will be submitted to GNDR at the end of the evaluation. You may choose not to have the interview audio recorded, but notes taken during the interview will also be submitted to GNDR.

We will collect identifying information including your name, role, and organisation for inclusion in the final report. However, we will not quote you directly without your prior written consent.

At the end of the interview we will ask if you agree to possibly be contacted again if we have further questions. If you consent, we will collect your preferred contact information. If you do not consent, we will not contact you again.

If you do not wish to be identified in the final report or are under the age of 18, we will not include your name or details of your participation in the final report. If necessary to include, we will use a pseudonym in the final report to protect your identity.

You may withdraw your consent to have your interview included in this evaluation at any time until 22 August 2022 at 11:59pm PST (Pacific Standard Time) or one week after the interview, whichever is later. You may withdraw consent by emailing Mollie or Mallory, our emails are included at the bottom of this form.

RISKS & CONFIDENTIALITY

There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to you for taking part in this study. We will not attribute what is said to you as an individual unless you give us express permission.

We will carefully protect the information we write and record with you by storing it in a password protected and encrypted database accessible to the consultants and for delivery at the end of the evaluation to GNDR.

At the end of this form we have included our contact information and contact information for the Making Displacement Safer project coordinator at GNDR.

BENEFITS

This study will be used to help us evaluate current progress, lessons learned, and needs for further support in the Making Displacement Safer project. There is no compensation for your time and you and your organisation will not receive any direct benefit from participating in this mid-term review.

PARTICIPANT CONSENT

1. Do you have any questions based on what I have explained to you?
2. Do you feel you have been fully informed concerning the purpose of the study with its risks and benefits, and do you agree to participate in this interview? [If no, thank you for your time.]
3. Noting that the digital audio files will be eventually delivered to GNDR with identifying information, do you agree to be audio recorded during this interview?
4. [End of interview] Do you give permission to be contacted again?

CONTACT INFORMATION

If you have any questions about this study, please contact the consulting researchers:

- Mollie Pepper, PhD mpepperconsulting@gmail.com
- Mallory Carlson mcarlson.consulting@gmail.com

If you have any questions about your rights in this research or concerns about its conduct, please contact: Elise Belcher, Making Displacement Safer project coordinator, GNDR, elise.belcher@gndr.org

Annex 5: Methods statement on participant wellbeing

The protection of human subjects is of the utmost importance in the conduct of research and evaluation. This statement details the anticipated potential risks to participants and the measures that will be taken to ensure no harm is caused by the evaluation process.

Risks to participants in this research are minimal. The project does potentially involve the recruitment or collection of data from vulnerable persons including the forcibly displaced, youth, the elderly, and persons with disabilities. However, the evaluation questions and goals do not require divulging personal or sensitive information.

Anticipated potential risks include the following:

1. Risk of alterations in relationships with others that are to the disadvantage of the participant.
2. Emotional distress resulting from participation in the research.

These risks have been carefully considered in the preparation of the research methodology for this project and we anticipate that several factors in the nature of the evaluation and the research design will mitigate these risks:

1. The research is positioned as seeking to evaluate the ongoing Making Displacement Safer project led by GNDR. Given the nature of the evaluation questions, we anticipate any form of retribution or objection on the part of peers, employers, or other relevant actors to be unlikely.
2. Research participation will be subject to informed consent. Participants will be made explicitly aware in writing and verbally prior to any interview or focus group that identifying information will be collected by the consultants and shared with GNDR. Before directly quoting any participant or attributing any data to them personally, the consultants will confirm accuracy of the data with the participant.
3. Research participation is exclusively voluntary. No individual will be compelled in any way to take part in the study and may withdraw their consent to participate at any time.
4. As the research does not deal in highly sensitive subject areas (such as trauma or negative personal experiences), we anticipate participant distress to be minimal to none.
5. The interviews and focus groups will only collect relevant and necessary data and will not deviate from the general themes covered in the initial interview guide. Any major changes will be submitted for review to GNDR.
6. Participants will be provided with the contact information for the evaluation consultants as well as the team commissioning the evaluation, should they wish to make a complaint regarding the conduct of this research.

Informed consent is fundamental to the protection of the participants in this evaluation. To that end, the consultants will ensure that several best practices are observed:

1. From the first contact for recruitment via email we will clearly communicate the purposes of the research, its confidential nature, and planned data usage and

storage. This will be communicated in writing when scheduling interviews and again verbally at the beginning of each interview and focus group when we will ask for verbal consent.

2. A written document detailing informed consent information will be distributed to all participants prior to the interview.
3. Participants will be informed that their participation is exclusively voluntary and that their consent, once given, can be withdrawn at any time and the interview will end without any repercussions.
4. Participants will be informed that the interview will be audio recorded and will give their verbal permission for this form of data collection. They will be informed that this permission may also be withdrawn at any time until August 22 or one week after their interview, whichever is later.

Data security is a priority. To ensure security, the consultants will:

1. Store all data in encrypted and password protected files. Only the consulting researchers will have access to this database during data collection and analysis.
2. Participants will be explicitly informed that the raw, unanalysed data including audio and transcripts with identifying information will be provided to GNDR at the completion of the evaluation along with a list of participants.

Finally, having assessed potential risks and made plans to mitigate those risks, we have determined that the potential benefit to participants, the Making Displacement Safer project, and the wider community outweighs the potential risks.

Annex 6: Advisory group terms of reference

Purpose

The Advisory Group for GNDR network's Making Displacement Safer Midterm Review is being established to provide feedback and guidance to the evaluation team of Carlson Pepper Collaborative for the duration of the evaluation.

Role and Function

Members of the Advisory Group will:

1. Provide advice, feedback and guidance to the evaluation team on the development of the methodology for the midterm review of the Making Displacement Safer project.
2. Will have the opportunity to provide verbal and written feedback during the evaluation process, specifically on the inception report and preliminary findings presentation.
3. Provide feedback and assist the evaluators as needed in recruitment for data collection.

Membership

The members of the Advisory Group will be identified and invited by GNDR network's Making Displacement Safer project team and will include stakeholders in the evaluation including implementing member representatives, beneficiaries, external partners, and others as appropriate and feasible.

Meeting Protocol

Meetings may be convened by GNDR network's Making Displacement Safer project team and will take place via webconference. Written comments, questions, and feedback may be submitted via email at any time.

Feedback Mechanisms

The Advisory Group will be invited to provide specific verbal and/or written feedback on the inception report and preliminary findings presentation. Verbal feedback may be offered during scheduled Advisory Group meetings. Written feedback may be offered via email or comment in google docs on draft documents.

Frequency of Meeting

For the purposes of the Making Displacement Safer Midterm Evaluation, the Advisory Group will be convened twice:

- On August 3, 2022 to introduce the evaluation team and discuss the inception report. This meeting will last up to two hours.
- On August 23, 2022 (tentative) for the preliminary findings presentation and feedback discussion. This meeting will last up to two hours.

Post-evaluation

Following the conclusion of the evaluation in September 2022, the Advisory Group may be disbanded or invited to continue on in a capacity to be determined by GNDR.