



Jordan

Humanitarian

2013/14

## Evaluation of Syria crisis response

Three years of civil war in Syria has resulted in 2.2 million people fleeing across the border into neighbouring countries. Since the start of the violence in 2011, over 600,000 people from Syria have sought refuge in Jordan with several thousand arriving some days in the peak period of January to April 2013. Over three quarters of the refugees live in poor quality and overcrowded rented accommodation in urban centres such as Balqa, Amman and Mafraq while 150-200,000 reside in refugee camps such as Zaatari that opened in July 2012. Oxfam has worked with two partners providing food and hygiene items to refugees in a border community; providing protection and advocacy work for Syrian refugees; WASH facilities in Zaatari camp; cash for rent vouchers and basic needs and recently Oxfam has also started to form peer support networks and provide technical support to local water authorities in host communities. By the end of 2013, Oxfam had reached over 120,000 beneficiaries across the various components of the programme in Zaatari camp, Amman, Balqa and Zarqa, and continues to adapt its programme to the needs of older and new refugees from Syria. The response continues to date, as the conditions within Syria continue to deteriorate and the flow of refugees into neighbouring countries, including Jordan, is unabated.

## Evaluation Design

The programme was evaluated using the Humanitarian Indicator Tool (HIT), a methodology designed to estimate the degree to which the programme meets recognised quality standards. The tool has 13 quality standards each with defined benchmarks, which allow evaluators to assess and score whether the standard was 'met', 'almost met', 'partially met' or 'not met'. The score is weighted and scored with a rating out of 6 for the first three standards due to their relative importance. The other standards are given a rating out of 3. The HIT is carried out as a desk study by an external evaluator using documented evidence that then generates a score against each standard and a cumulative total. For details on evaluation design, see the 'How are effectiveness reviews carried out?' document, and the full report for how these designs were tailored by individual reviews.

Response date: June 2012 - December 2013

Evaluation: January 2014

Publication: February 2015

# Results

Quality standard evaluated	Level of achievement	Rating					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Timeliness: Rapid appraisal of facts within 24 hours, plans and scale-up or start-up commenced within three days	Almost met				4		
2. Coverage uses 10% of affected population as a planned figure	Met						6
3. Technical aspects of programme measured against Sphere standards	Almost met				4		
			1	2	3		
4. MEAL strategy and plan in place and being implemented using appropriate indicators	Half met			1.5			
5. Feedback/complaints system in place and functioning and documented evidence of consultation and participation leading to a programme relevant to context and needs	Fully met						3
6. Partner relationships defined, capacity assessed and partners fully engaged in all stages of programme cycle	Half met			1.5			
7. Programme is considered a safe programme	Almost met				2		
8. Programme (including advocacy) addresses gender equity and specific concerns and needs of women, girls, men and boys	Partially met		1				
9. Programme (including advocacy) addresses specific concerns and needs of vulnerable groups	Half met			1.5			
10. Evidence that preparedness measures were in place and effectively actioned	Partially met		1				
11. Programme has an advocacy/campaigns strategy based on evidence from the field	Half met			1.5			
12. Evidence of appropriate staff capacity to ensure quality programming	Half met			1.5			
13. Programme has an integrated approach	Not assessed						
<b>Final Rating</b>		<b>28.5 / 45</b>					
<b>Percentage Equivalent</b>		<b>63%</b>					

The first three standards are weighted and scored out of 6 due to their relative importance. The other standards are scored out of 3.

## Going forward

The effectiveness review highlighted areas that were essentially strong in the programme but also pinpointed some areas for improvement. The team are now addressing the fact that standards were not being used to measure technical quality: in Jordan the clusters together with NGOs are finalising Humanitarian Consortium standards that will incorporate Sphere and will be used across all programmes. The team have all started training on Sphere as well as ensuring that the standards are included in all future proposals. As partnerships were identified as a weakness, the team is trying to broaden the partnership base and has begun a mapping of potential partners especially for the longer term work in water and governance. Protection and advocacy has been strengthened by hiring qualified staff and doing training on protection; an advocacy strategy is being developed and will give a better steer to the advocacy work for the country programme in the coming year. Other areas being addressed is ensuring inclusion of vulnerable groups by revising the vulnerability criteria used; the finalisation of the Refugees perception study and a community consultation carried out around future programme design. Gender and safe guarding training was also carried out for all staff. All data will now be disaggregated by age and gender as this was an area identified as a gap. A contingency plan is being drawn up to cope with the continuing influx of refugees from Syria into Jordan.

Photo credit: Jane Beesley/Oxfam