

Evaluation Report



Improved Emergency Preparedness and Coordinated Response in South Caucasus (EMPREP)

AX 23445

November 2018

Peter Rothe Schultz



Table of contents

Executive Summary	4
1. Evaluation Background	7
1.1 Project Objective and Content	7
1.2 Evaluation Objective	8
2. Methodology	8
3. Limitations	9
4. Findings.....	9
4.1 Relevance.....	9
4.2 Effectiveness	10
4.3 Sustainability	14
4.4 Impact	15
4.5 Coordination and Partnership	16
5. Conclusions & Recommendations	17
5.1 Recommendations	18
Annex 1: Terms of Reference (ToR)	20
Annex 2: Methodology: Guiding Questions for semi-structured interviews	27
Annex 3: Persons met	29
Annex 4: List of Key Documents reviewed	30

List of acronyms

ARCS	Armenia Red Cross Society
AutRC	Austrian Red Cross
AzRC	Azerbaijan Red Crescent
CBRN	Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear
CEA	Community, Engagement and Accountability
CP	Contingency Plan
CTP	Cash Transfer Programming
DIPECHO	Disaster Preparedness ECHO programme
DM	Disaster Management
DRC	Danish Red Cross
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DRT	Disaster Response Team
ECHO	European civil protection and humanitarian aid operations
EMPREP	Improved Emergency Preparedness and Coordination Response in South Caucasus
EMS	Emergency Management Service
EOC	Emergency Operation Centre
FA	First Aid
GRCS	Georgia Red Cross Society
IceRC	Icelandic Red Cross
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent
MES	Ministry of Emergency Situations
in	National Society
PA	Partnership Agreement
PFA	Psychological First Aid
PSS	Psychosocial Support
RFL	Restoring Family Link
RRC	Romania Red Cross
SAG	Stakeholder Advisory Group
SC	Steering Committee
SOP	Standard Operational Procedures
SwRC	Swiss Red Cross
ToR	Terms of Reference
WPNS	Well Prepared National Society

Acknowledgment

The evaluator would like to extend its sincere gratitude for the assistance and generous hospitality offered by Georgia Red Cross Society (GRCS) and Armenia Red Cross Society (ARCS) staff and volunteers during the mission in Georgia and Armenia. In addition, thanks go to all the partners and stakeholders who generously offered their time, knowledge and information. Finally, huge thanks are extend to the Danish Red Cross (DRC) Country Coordinator for Georgia and Armenia for all the coordination, support and valuable insights provided during the evaluation.

Executive Summary

The purpose of the evaluation was to analyse the overall impact of the project and provide an indication as to what extent the activities, produced materials, networking and exercises fulfilled their goal of enhancing the preparedness capacity of ARCS and GRCS. The evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and impact was given particularly focus in the scope of the evaluation as well as coordination and partnership were a key focus of the evaluation.

The specific objectives of the evaluation were to:

- Examine to which extent the EMPREP project had contributed to the overall level of preparedness and response capacity of Armenia and Georgia Red Cross Societies
- Assess the extent to which the project had achieved overall indicators and deliverables
- Provide recommendations for the implementation of the upcoming project 'Ready 2 Respond'.

The evaluation followed and adhered to the criteria and standards in the DRC criteria for evaluations as set out in the DRC Standard Operational Procedures as well as the IFRC Framework for Evaluations. The methodology included: Review of key project documents and deliverables; Interviews with key project staff and stakeholders; and Field mission to Armenia and Georgia for on-site interviews and assessment.

A few limitations on the methodology were present during the evaluation. The evaluation was conducted while the project was still implementing the final activities. The findings are consequently not based on fully completed activities and documentation. The evaluation build findings on gathering mostly qualitative data. Finally, the interviews during the mission to Georgia and Armenia were conducted only in Tbilisi and Yerevan, reducing the perspective from the involved branches and the Disaster Response Teams (DRT).

The evaluation produced the following overall findings:

- The EMPREP project is highly relevant and filled a void in disaster preparedness in both countries
- Delay in the beginning of the project and non-completion of some deliverables provided a challenge
- The project has improved the emergency preparedness capacity of ARCS and GRCS
- Overall sustainability of project components is high
- Inconclusive evidence on project impact

The evaluation verified that the project delivered and made solid progress on its planned key outputs:

- The interoperability and coordination within the Consortium partners and in-country stakeholders was facilitated and strengthened
- Preparedness Framework consisting of Contingency Plans (CP), Standard Operational Procedures (SOP), and scenarios were available in both Armenia and Georgia and was known to the staff and to some extent Disaster Response Teams (DRT) volunteers
- The Disaster Response Teams (DRT) in both countries, showed through the exercises that the training package, purchase of equipment, and development of emergency operations catalogue that they were able to apply the skills
- Psychosocial Support (PSS) in emergencies capacity was strengthened through the development and implementation of a PSS plan of action
- Emergency exercises were planned and implemented with strong support of Consortium partners.

For the specific project components / tasks the evaluation concluded:

Interoperability, Experience Sharing and Coordination (task b)

- Collaboration with Government structures appeared strong
- Specific roles and responsibilities of ARCS and GRCS not clearly defined in the national emergency response plans and framework proved a challenge
- Interconnectivity with authorities provided solid foundation for scaling up and diversifying emergency preparedness
- Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) valuable and effective for coordination and collaboration
- In Georgia the project strengthened GRCS' obligation as coordinator of non-state actors involved in emergency response. A high number of meetings and fora with participation of the same actors, was not feasible taking the small DM community in Georgia into consideration
- In Armenia MoU with regional authorities only partially implemented

Preparedness framework (task c)

- Contingency Plans and SOPs key aspect for a strengthened preparedness capacity
- SOPs well developed and providing relevant guidance within respective areas. The process of developing and preparing the SOPs appeared to be valuable and gave ARCS and GRCS a framework to work strategically within different response modalities
- WPNS framework provided a strong frame for prioritization of preparedness activities

Disaster Response Teams (DRT) (task d)

- DRTs significant contribution to the strengthened preparedness capacity
- Few DRT volunteers had previous disaster/emergency management experience
- Low number of DRTs increase manageability and sustainability
- Need for stronger focus on volunteer recruitment, management, and retention
- Comprehensive training of the DRTs – questions raised around depth and length of the training related to trainings been too short for the different topics and covering a high number of topics within a short timeframe.
- Basic equipment provided relevant, important and needed. Specialized equipment less in line with expected role of the DRTs
- EOC role and functioning need to be further developed

Psychosocial Support (task e)

- Delayed start – initiated in later part of project
- Lack of defined PSS role of ARCS and GRCS in national response plans a challenge
- Training of volunteer's complex to ensure adequate skills to provide PFA and PSS

Emergency Exercises (task f)

- Emergency exercises highly relevant and valuable
- Provided key lessons learned and recommendations for preparedness capacity and particular Contingency Plans and SOPs
- Lack of testing of key guidance documents during of exercises due to non-completion of Contingency Plans and SOPs
- Exercises valuable for validating Contingency Plans and SOPs

Cross cutting

- Broad based consortium ambitious - but well-functioning
- Regional approach less pronounced
- Synergy between ARCS and GRCS narrow

The evaluation produced the following recommendations:

- ✓ Strong need for clarify and formally establish the role of ARCS and GRCS within the national response framework and plans
- ✓ Strengthen ARCS and GRCS preparedness capacity through stronger volunteer engagement and management
- ✓ Consolidate the capacity of the DRTs through a continues systematic, in-depth, and targeted training and capacity building
- ✓ Continuation of simulation exercises to consolidate the trainings and capacity building of the DRTs through regular practical exercises
- ✓ Continuously revise and validate ARCS and GRCS preparedness framework, through updating and consolidating the Contingency Plans and SOPs, as prioritized the WPNS
- ✓ ARCS and GRCS to strengthen and invest in key response capacities. Within the national response framework First Aid and Psychosocial Support (PSS) appears to be an area where ARCS and GRCS can establish a niche and fill a cap
- ✓ Strong senior management commitment needed to strengthen institutional response preparedness as a key component of ARCS and GRCS portfolio
- ✓ Consolidate rather than expand activities and components. With the late completion of several of the components in the project consolidating achievements should be priorities, rather than expanding and focusing on new technical areas. A clear link to the mandate and role of ARCS and GRCS need to be present.

1. Evaluation Background

Armenia and Georgia are disaster prone and the population have a high likelihood of being impacted by natural disasters and crisis, due to high levels of vulnerability. Regardless both countries have limited capacity to manage risks posed by earthquakes as well as weather-related hazards like flood, landslides and drought. The capacities of the authorities and civil society actors to assist affected people are limited and was at the time of the project development assessed to require strengthening.

Armenia Red Cross Society (ARCS) and Georgia Red Cross Society (GRCS) enjoys good and respected relationships with their public authorities at the national, municipal and local levels and are for GRCS case formally mandated by the Government to assist in civil protection and emergency response. Moreover, both National Societies are mandated to work in coordination with cross-sector governmental institutions both at the central, regional and local levels within disaster management. Disaster preparedness and response is furthermore a key strategic priority for both ARCS and GRCS as articulated in their strategic plans. The above formed the background for the EMPREP project.

1.1 Project Objective and Content

The objective of the EMPREP project was to increase the interoperability and capacity of the Armenian and Georgian emergency management sectors to adequately and effectively prepare for and respond to emergency events, both within national boundaries and across the South Caucasus region. The specific objective of EMPREP was to increase the capacities of key emergency management actors, ARCS and GRCS, for more effective coordination with disaster management authorities. Focus has been on strengthening the organizational preparedness, so that ARCS and GRCS actively contributed to the nations' ability to prepare for and respond to disasters in a coordinated, timely and effective manner, reducing the impact of these events on vulnerable people.

The EMPREP Project had the following expected results each with a number of deliverables:

1. Enhanced structures, systems and procedures for efficient and effective emergency preparedness and response; structures and plans are more interlinked to and part of regional and international disaster response mechanisms.
2. Clearly defined roles in emergency preparedness and response that are recognized by the Civil Protection Authorities in the Civil Security National Plan; ARCS and GRCS will be represented and active in the national and local coordinating bodies for emergencies.
3. Effective disaster management capacities at national levels in line with the EU's Civil Protection Mechanism: well-trained and equipped response teams and leaders able to meet the needs of those affected, rapidly and efficiently.
4. Increased delivery of psychosocial support in emergencies to affected people and first responders by well-trained and equipped Red Cross staff and volunteers operating within a methodological framework.
5. Coordinated preparedness and response agencies optimizing relief operations through better sharing of resources, information and expertise; as refined in practice through exercising.
6. Regularly monitored, reviewed and evaluated emergency preparedness and response work to assess performance, quality and impact.

The planned project period was 24 months, commencing 1 January 2017 with a total budget of EURO 569.071 (with EC contribution of EURO 425.000). However, due to natural disasters during the summer of 2018 in both Georgia and Armenia with disaster response operations by GRCS and ARCS, activities were put on hold for a period. Moreover, in Armenia the project implementation was affected by the

nationwide protests (Velvet Revolution) in the spring of 2018. As a result, the project was extended with two months until 28 February 2019.

1.2 Evaluation Objective

The evaluation was originally planned conducted by an external facilitator. After consultation and agreement with ECHO it was decided that the evaluation should be done by a Danish Red Cross (DRC) advisor to focus more on consolidating the learning from the project and ensure that the findings relates to learning from other similar projects implemented by consortium partners.

The purpose of the evaluation was to analyse the overall impact of the project and provide an indication as to what extent the activities, produced materials, networking and exercises fulfilled their goal of enhancing the preparedness capacity of ARCS and GRCS.

The objectives of the evaluation were (see Annex 1 – Terms of Reference):

- The evaluation will examine to which extent the EMPREP has contributed to the overall level of preparedness and response capacity of Armenia and Georgia Red Cross Societies. In this the evaluation must assess specific capacity building contributions within the various tasks (task A–F)
- To assess the extent to which the project has achieved overall indicators and deliverables as described in the project document
- Based on the above, provide recommendations for the implementation of the upcoming project 'Ready 2 Respond'.

The evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and impact was given particularly focus in the scope of the evaluation. Additional coordination and partnership was a key focus of the evaluation (see Annex 1 – Terms of Reference). Aspects that provided added value were integrated in the evaluation as appropriate. The evaluation did, in line with the ToR, not consider aspects of accounting or other financial aspects as this was to be reported in a separate finance audit.

2. Methodology

The evaluation follows the DRC criteria for evaluations as set out in the DRC Standard Operational Procedures as well as the IFRC Framework for Evaluations (2011) – both documents draw on the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and principles. The evaluation strived to adhere to the criteria and standards set out in these guiding documents.

The methodology included:

- a) Review of project documents and deliverables such as; T-form, WPNS (base-line & end-line), Mid Term Review, progress and activity reports, SOPs, Contingency Plans, etc. See Annex 4 for a complete list.
- b) Interviews with:
 - Consortium partners (Austrian RC, Icelandic RC, Swiss RC, Azerbaijan RC, ICRC and IFRC)
 - Georgia and Armenia Red Cross Society staff and volunteers
 - External partners in both countries.
- c) Field mission (19-23 November 2018) to Armenia and Georgia for on-site interviews with key project staff and stakeholders.

Key persons met/interviewed are listed in Annex 3, and Guiding questions/issues for the semi-formal interviews are listed in Annex 2.

3. Limitations

The evaluation was conducted while the project was still implementing the final activities (as a no-cost extension was granted to the end of February 2019). The findings are consequently not based on fully completed activities and documentation. Final deliverables of the project will be provided in the final narrative report by end-of-project (February 2019).

The evaluation build findings on gathering mostly qualitative data, taking some statistics from progress reports. This limits the depth of evidence of the findings and conclusions. However, according to the Terms of References (ToR) the task was to identify tendencies and lessons learnt rather than collect quantitative data.

Moreover, the interviews during the mission to Georgia and Armenia were conducted only in Tbilisi and Yerevan, reducing the perspective from the involved branches and the Disaster Response Teams (DRT) outside Yerevan in Armenia.

The findings and recommendations in this report represents the evaluator's best analytical judgements based on first-hand impression in both countries from a limited portion of the total activities in the project and during consultations with project partners and stakeholders. The conclusions and recommendations are the full responsibility of the evaluator; any misunderstanding or mistake in the report is the responsibility of the evaluator alone.

4. Findings

The findings below are organized in relation to the objectives and scope in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation.

4.1 Relevance

Disaster and emergency preparedness and response is a key strategic priority for both ARCS and GRCS as articulated in their strategic plans. Both National Societies has signed MoU with relevant Ministries and Emergency Response Agencies. The EMPREP project is highly relevant as it filled a real void in the disaster and emergency preparedness and response of both organizations. Moreover, the interconnectivity with government and civil protection authorities and other emergency management agencies provided a solid foundation for scaling up and diversifying emergency preparedness. The interviewed staff and management in both ARCS and GRCS unanimously emphasized that the project had significantly improved the preparedness and basic response capacity. *"With the trained human resources – the disaster response teams – we are more confident we have the capacity to respond"* (Head of DM, ARCS).

Both ARCS and GRCS enjoys good and respected relationships with the government authorities at national, municipal and local levels, and are mandated by the respective governments to assist in civil protection and emergency response through their auxiliary role. Moreover, ARCS and GRCS are to work in tight coordination with cross-sector governmental institutions both at the central, regional and local levels in terms of disaster and emergency response. However, the specific roles and responsibilities of ARCS and GRCS are in general not clearly defined and the role of both organizations are expected to have in supporting the emergency management agencies in emergency rescue and recovery activities is not clearly defined. Nonetheless, GRCS is mandated to coordinate disaster and emergency NGOs activities in Georgia under the Emergency Management Services (EMS) coordination. It is evident that the EMPREP project has helped meet the "coordination of non-state actors in disaster response" especially in Georgia.

In both countries the Government has set up special coordination and operational bodies on national and local levels, which is activated in case of emergency situations. ARCS and GRCS is to be involved upon needs and Government request.

The EMPREP project is found to be relevant, as it filled a gap in the disaster preparedness and response capacity and structures in both countries. The government authorities and external stakeholders interviewed unanimously emphasized that the project has significantly improved the basic disaster management capacity.

The regional approach in EMPREP is assessed to be less strong. Besides the cross-border exercise little evidence points towards any in-depth regional collaboration. The Consortium Steering Committee provided a forum for stronger regional collaboration and knowledge sharing. However, from the minutes of the meetings and from interviews, it appears as the Consortium Steering Committee mainly focused on progress of activities and less on regional experience and knowledge sharing.

4.2 Effectiveness

The project aimed to improve the response capacity of ARCS and GRCS through setting up in-country mechanisms for early mobilization of teams and assets in case of disasters. The evaluation verified through interviews and inspections of documents produced that the project delivered its planned key outputs:

- The interoperability and coordination within the Consortium partners and in-country stakeholders had been facilitated and strengthened
- Preparedness Framework consisting of Contingency Plans (CP), Standard Operational Procedures (SOP), and scenarios were available in both Armenia and Georgia and was known to the staff and to some extent Disaster Response Teams (DRT) volunteers
- The Disaster Response Teams (DRT) in both countries, showed through the exercises that the training package, purchase of equipment, and development of emergency operations catalogue that they were able to apply the skills
- Psychosocial Support (PSS) in emergencies capacity was strengthened through the development and implementation of a PSS plan of action
- Emergency exercises were planned and implemented with strong support of Consortium partners.

Due to delay in the beginning of the project, some of the deliverables were delayed and were only completed in the last part of the project. The project implementation was further hampered because of both Georgia and Armenia were affected by natural disasters during the summer of 2018 in both instances requiring the response of Georgia and Armenia Red Cross Society respectively. As the EMPREP project staff were occupying key positions within the respective Disaster Management Departments the EMPREP staff were fully involved in preparing and implementing relief operations to the affected population. Once these thresholds were passed, the project started moving and, in the end, achieving most of its deliverables. The project was extended for two months to ensure completion of all deliverables.

With the regular planning and monitoring of activities by the project team and Steering Committee, the complications and hindrances faces during the project implementation did not cause significant changes in the plan of activities. In case of significant adjustments, as it happened with the delay of project start and natural disasters in the second year of implementation, the issues were discussed in the project team and Steering Committee demonstrating relevant flexibility in the implementation and planning without complications to the project.

Besides the formal progress reporting the Steering Committee meeting provided an excellent forum for discussion and monitoring progress and fulfilment of objectives. The regular and consistent discussion of progress ensured quality assurance and a joint dialogue on the different components of the project.

The project demonstrated flexible and good capacity to implement the project despite several obstacles during the implementation period. The everyday management of the project proved consistent and reliable with a strong commitment by both ARCS and GRCS DM departments. Monitoring and reporting was done in accordance to DRC and ECHO requirements.

Interoperability, Experience Sharing and Coordination (task b)

Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) in both Armenia and Georgia provided input and external perspective into the outcomes of the project, as well as providing knowledge and coordination related to the project activities. The SAG proved to be a valuable and effective way of coordinating and collaborating with external stakeholders during the project. All stakeholders interviewed emphasized that the EMPREP had facilitated better coordination and had contributed to a strengthened disaster preparedness at national level.

In Georgia the project strengthened GRCS' obligation as coordinator of non-state actors involved in emergency response in Georgia, which is assessed to be highly relevant. It was highlighted during the evaluation that the EMPREP had facilitated better coordination in Georgia. On the other hand, it was also voiced that the project had several meetings and fora with participation of the same actors, which seems to be unfeasible taking the small DM community in Georgia into consideration. The initial excessive and not well-planned coordination activities proved a challenge.

The collaboration with Government structures in both countries appeared to be strong. The Government representatives interviewed praised the initiatives to interlink Red Cross contingency plans and disaster response with the national civic protection authorities' emergency plans. Despite meetings with Government Representatives, evidence on stronger interoperability with Government emergency structures was not so strong. The changing institutional set up and structures of emergency services in both countries hampered the collaboration and connectivity with the Government Structures. In Armenia this proved particular challenging as the Ministry of Emergency Services (MES) underwent several organizational changes with change in institutional reference during the project implementation.

The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with nine regional authorities in Armenia were at the time of the evaluation only partially implemented. The intention of the MoU was to present capacities established within EMPREP. The MoUs is not binding in any form but present the current capacities of what ARCS can do in case of an emergency/disaster laying down areas of cooperation between ARCS and local authorities. The local presence of DRTs is a significant contribution to community engagement and local operational disaster response capacity and is an excellent foundation for collaboration with local authorities. The framework for the cooperation and mutual support with local authorities in case of emergencies is present but need to be fully institutionalised and implemented.

Preparedness framework (task c)

A significant contribution of the EMPREP on the preparedness capacity of GRCS and ARCS is the preparedness framework. Updating and revising the ARCS and GRCS Contingency Plans (CP) together with the development of Standard Operational Procedures (SOPs) is assessed to be a key aspect for strengthen ARCS and GRCS preparedness capacity.

In both countries 8 SOPs were developed. GRCS developed SOPs within Coordination, Needs Assessment, Volunteer Management, Emergency Operational Centre (EOC), First Aid (FA), Psychosocial Support (PSS), Reception Centres, and Logistics. While ARCS developed SOPs within Needs Assessment, Registration, Volunteer Management, Restoring Family Links (RFL), First Aid, PSS, Reception Centres and Logistics. The planned SOP on Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) in Armenia was not developed. In general, the SOPs were found to be well developed and providing a relevant guidance

within the respective areas. Additionally, the process of developing and preparing the SOPs appeared to be valuable and had given ARCS and GRCS a framework to work strategically on different response modalities. The process might have been more important than the actual SOP product.

The use of the IFRC Well-Prepared National Society (WPNS) framework provided a strong baseline and assessment of the organizational, structural, human and physical capacities of ARCS and GRCS. The WPNS identified actions needed to ensure that ARCS and GRCS had the capacity to enact the Contingency Plans in times of an emergency. The WPNS action plans provided a prioritized guidance to the EMPREP project providing a strong management tool for the project. However, a number of the prioritized actions were outside the scope of the EMPREP project (see further section 4.4).

The SOPs and range of templates for contingency planning as well as the preparedness action plan (based on and developed from the WPNS) developed during the EMPREP provided a support platform that made it relatively easy for the DRTs to engage and know their role. The number of SOPs developed is assessed to be relevant and adjusted to the specific context and role of ARCS and GRCS.

Disaster Response Teams (task d)

Within the EMPREP, the Disaster Response Teams (DRT) was established providing the capacity for ARCS and GRCS to operationalize the emergency preparedness frameworks. The DRTs were trained, equipped, and resourced to respond to emergencies in a timely and professional manner. The EMPREP established a small core of well-trained volunteers with capacity covering all relevant aspect of emergency management in line with the role of ARCS and GRCS in emergency response in Armenia and Georgia respectively. Previously, both ARCS and GRCS had community volunteer groups (DIPECHO supported) and other volunteer groups from which experience could be drawn. However, to develop specific disaster response teams was a new aspect for both ARCS and GRCS.

A significant contribution to the preparedness capacity of ARCS and GRCS is assessed to the DRTs. The DRT volunteers in both countries showed themselves to be very enthusiastic, engaged and committed. In Georgia a total of 20 DRT volunteers organized at national level in Tbilisi were recruited and trained. In Armenia a total of 60 DRT volunteers organized in 4 provincial teams were recruited and trained, including the ICRC funded DRT in Tavush. This provides a small response capacity - especially in Georgia. On the other hand, the limited number of DRT volunteers increases the manageability and sustainability of the DRTs. ARCS have nonetheless already experienced that some of the DRT volunteers had resigned and stopped as volunteers.

No evidence was present that the DRTs were linked to the previous community volunteer groups. The members of the DRT were both drawn from existing volunteers in ARCS and GRCS but were also recruited externally specifically for the establishment of the DRTs. Most of the DRT volunteers drawn from existing volunteers in ARCS and GRCS had been volunteers in other programs or in other regions/branches. However, only a few DRT volunteers had previous disaster/emergency management experience. The recruitment of the DRT volunteers could have been strengthened if more clear selection criteria and recruitment process had been in place.

All, the DRT volunteers received the same training to get a basic knowledge within all the different topics, with some being appointed to specific roles, such as PSS and team leader. It was not possible during the evaluation to assess in detail the curriculum and quality of the training provided to the DRTs. However, most of the DRT volunteers interviewed were satisfied with the training, which gave them a good basic knowledge. It should be noted that the issue of quality and depth of the trainings was raised by several people during the evaluation. Particularly the aspect around quality of the trainers and the length of the trainings were highlighted as a challenge. Particular related to trainings been too short for the different topics and covering a high number of topics within a short timeframe.

Equipment was provided to the DRTs in both countries. The basic personal equipment such as clothing, boots, helmets, and First Aid kits is assessed as relevant, important and needed equipment. However, no plan was present on how the First Aid kits is to be replenished. The more specialized equipment such as

cutters, carabiner, and robes were assessed to be less in line with the expected role the DRTs will have in emergency situations. During the interviews it was also raised that the equipment provided was not supported and linked to the training provided.

The equipment to the Emergency Operational Centres (EOC) had been procured. The role and functioning of the EOCs was on the other hand more unclear and not fully established - despite GRCS developing a SOP on the EOC. The EOC component was hampered by GRCS being in the process of moving office and the location of the EOC not being established, and ARCS Headquarter being under renovation and the specific room to be used as the EOC was not completed, making it difficult to assess functioning of the EOCs.

No evidence was present on the emergency assistance (e.g. hygiene kits, blankets) being procured and distributed to the most high-risk branches in Armenia. Likewise, no evidence that the CBRN basic equipment was available for ARCS response was present during the evaluation.

Psychosocial Support in Emergencies (task e)

This task focused on increasing the emergency preparedness and response capacity of both ARCS and GRCS on psychosocial support (PSS). A key component was to assess the needs and gaps of ARCS and GRCS within PSS and based on this develop the PSS capacities. The task was off to a slow start and was only initiated in the second year of the project. Based on the internal assessment, a PSS plan of action were drafted, and SOP has been developed on psychosocial support and caring for volunteers in both countries. Finally, the DRTs has been trained in providing psychological first aid (PFA). The component has received a strong support from one of the consortium partners Icelandic Red Cross.

The PSS assessment revealed that there were gaps within PSS, which were not realistic to respond to within the timeframe of the project. A further challenge related to the PSS component was a lack of defined PSS role and responsibility of ARCS and GRCS within the national response plans and framework. A defined national response role within PSS would have provided a clear framework providing clear direction and stronger management of the PSS work within ARCS and GRCS.

With PSS being a critical topic to work with ensuring that people have the adequate skills to provide psychological first aid and psychosocial support, the training of volunteers is a complex issue. The quality of the training is critical to ensure that volunteers is not doing harm to people in need of psychosocial support. The length of the training does not indicate that this has been the case. The DRTs interviewed also raised the issue of PSS being a difficult topic and that they would like to have more training within PSS. On the other hand, they felt confident to use the skills - especially active listening during an emergency.

Emergency Exercise (task f)

The emergency exercises (Simex) were to test the levels of interoperability and increased emergency preparedness and response capacities of involved stakeholders in Armenia and Georgia, based on prior project achievements (such as contingency plans, standard operating procedures, training of the DRTs).

Based on the report from the exercises and interviews with key resource persons and observers during the exercises, it is found that the exercises have been a very valuable activity supporting the emergency preparedness capacity building of ARCS and GRCS. The exercises showed several challenges, but provided some key lessons learned and recommendations for ARCS and GRCS to increase the interoperability and strengthen their emergency preparedness and response capacities. The engagement of a broad range of external stakeholders, particular Government authorities, was vital for the interoperability and corporation with the emergency services. Moreover, the exercises provided an important opportunity for practical training of the DRTs and their role in different emergency and conflict situations.

With delay on some projects deliverables (Contingency Plans, SOPs), the exercises could not test against some of these guidance documents. Thus, findings and recommendation from the exercises have been used both to validate existing contingency plans and SOPs, and feed into ongoing design of additional guidance documents.

Conclusion

The objective and results of the project is assessed to be balanced and with a well inter-related logic. The project has made solid progress against the set deliverables. The use of the WPNS framework provided a strong baseline and assessment of the organizational, structural, human and physical capacities of ARCS and GRCS, which provided both organizations with prioritization of actions needed to ensure that ARCS and GRCS strengthened their emergency preparedness and response capacity.

A significant contribution of the EMPREP to the preparedness capacity of ARCS and GRCS was the DRTs. Together with the institutional aspect of developing the preparedness framework through updating and revising the ARCS and GRCS Contingency Plans and the development of SOPs, the DRTs provided a key aspect of the preparedness capacity.

The opportunities and threats to clarify and consolidate the mandates of ARCS and GRCS in the national emergency response framework, requires continued engagement by both organizations in key processes of institutional preparedness and response as well as continued advocacy towards key Government authorities.

The delays in the beginning of the project and the non-completion of several deliverables at the time of the evaluation was a challenge. Especially, the lack of completion of the Contingency Plans and SOPs at the time of the exercises was a challenge for the full achievement of the objective with the exercises.

4.3 Sustainability

The consortium model with the involvement of a high number of stakeholders (see further section 4.5) require strong and elaborate coordination. At the same time, it provides the opportunity for drawing on and involving a broad range of knowledge, expertise and experiences, which has been strong utilized under the EMPREP with different partners providing expertise and support within specific tasks.

The project has made a strong effort in involving external stakeholders through the Stakeholder Advisory Groups (SAG) and particular in Georgia through GRCS' role as the designated organisation responsible for coordination and organization of other NGOs emergency and preparedness activities, under the Emergency Management Services (EMS) coordination. Interviews with SAG members in both countries and the emergency management agencies show that the SAG's are worthwhile and contributed to a strong sustainability. The SAG is found to be central for the sustainability of the project and is central to keep functioning in future projects.

As mentioned above the need to fully clarify and consolidate the mandates of ARCS and GRCS in the national emergency response framework, requires continued engagement and advocacy by both organizations and is a central aspect of the sustainability of the EMPREP and future projects.

Institutional sustainability

One of the key components of the project is the volunteers in the DRTs, their training and management, as well as their active role in disaster response at local and national level. Linking lessons, experiences, models and capacities from this project to the existing programs of GRCS and ARCS ensures institutional sustainability as volunteers often will remain and be integrated in the organization's other activities. The resources accumulated by volunteers in EMPREP invest greatly to the possibility of prolongation of volunteer activities. Moreover, a higher degree of coherence in volunteer activities has been created by securing volunteer activities are integrated in a larger framework of GRCS and ARCS activities and closely connected to the overall strategies of both National Societies within the broad categories of First Aid, PSS

and Response. The small number of DRT volunteers increases the manageability and sustainability of the DRTs. A stronger focus and clear strategy on volunteer recruitment, management, and retention could have strengthened the DRT component and could have ensured an even higher level of sustainability. To sustain the DRT's after the project comes to an end, emphasis must be put on how to retain the volunteers and how to refurbish their equipment.

The significant work on promoting volunteers and the DRTs as well as the exercises, has contributed to an increased focus on volunteerism within emergency response agencies in both Georgia and Armenia. The promotion by GRCS and ARCS of volunteerism has contributed to the institutionalization of volunteerism in both countries, as highlighted by the Armenian MES planning to establish a national volunteer network of volunteers' emergency responders.

Involvement and ownership of senior level management is critical for ensuring institutional sustainability. Internally, the evidence of senior management commitment might be underlined by the Secretary General participating in the simulation exercises, thereby highlighting the importance of institutional preparedness as a key component of the National Society's portfolio, and on operational level support the testing and optimization of plans and procedures. On the other hand, the data collected during the evaluation indicates a gap in the involvement of the senior management in the project activities, hereunder the collaboration and dialogue with Government stakeholders, which is critical for pushing particular issues and promoting a strong advocacy in favour of the ARCS and GRCS. The issues of advocacy were raised by several of the Partners interviewed, as important in relation to clarify and strengthen ARCS and GRCS role within emergency management.

Conclusion

The volunteer network and volunteer management are one of the key strength and achievement of the EMPREP project. The motivation and enthusiasm of the DRT volunteers and the comprehensive training provided to the DRTs are significant for the sustainability.

The involvement and coordination with external stakeholders, through among others, the SAGs, moreover increases the sustainability of the project. Strengthening networks and coalitions between stakeholders, both nationally and regionally, further promoted institutional sustainability.

4.4 Impact

The data collected during the evaluation gives inconclusive evidence to make assumptions concerning effects and impact of the project. Moreover, the project did not conduct a systematic assessment of effects and impact during the project implementation. However, ARCS and GRCS met the project design and reporting requirements by DRC and the ECHO and delivered on the expected deliverables.

Evidence of the contribution of the project to the overall objective: *"to increase the interoperability and capacity of the Armenian and Georgian emergency management sectors to adequately and effectively prepare for and respond to emergency events, both within national boundaries and across the South Caucasus region"* appears strong. The effort by both ARCS and GRCS to strengthen their emergency preparedness and response capacity has been highlighted above. The Preparedness Frameworks, Contingency Plans, and SOPs has given both organisations new tools and guidance. With the establishment of the DRTs, ARCS and GRCS have gained a group of trained volunteers with knowledge and skills to be deployed in time of disasters, emergencies and conflict situations. This has increased the capacity to respond significantly in both organisations.

In Georgia the DRTs were involved in the floods response operation in the mountain region (Chuberi community) during July 2018. The DRTs participated in the packing of relief items to be sent to the affected region. Additionally, one of the trained DRT member was deployed to the affected area to support the local branch and its volunteers during the distribution of relief items, using the skills received during the training. Some of the PSS skills were also used, particular related a tense situation during the distribution where people acted very aggressive and were difficult to deal with. Focus were also on

volunteer well-being – using ventilation skills. During breaks and at the end of the day they talked about the experience and ensured that everybody was ok.

It is not within the scope of this evaluation to measure the full progress against the WPNS documents. The WPNS is very comprehensive outlining a high number of prioritized components with a very optimistic time frame. 40 benchmarks (out of 370) were prioritized and were to be addressed through different actions. The time frame for reaching the prioritized benchmarks were between 6 and 12 months. Some of the prioritized actions were outside the scope of the EMPREP project and falls within other departments of ARCS and GRCS. Among these were Cash Transfer Programming (CTP), resource mobilization, and CEA plan which is not within the scope of the EMPREP project. Other prioritized areas such as Emergency Operational Centre (EOC) were not fully completed and implemented by the time of the evaluation.

With several of the deliverables in the EMPREP project not fully completed by the time of the evaluation, the full impact from the project is still to be assessed.

4.5 Coordination and Partnership

The project was organized with an operational consortium with 6 Consortium partners. Besides ARCS and GRCS, the following Red Cross Movement partners were part of the Consortium: Danish Red Cross (DRC), Icelandic RC (IceRC), Austrian Red Cross (AutRC), and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). Additionally, Swiss Red Cross (SwRC), Azerbaijan Red Crescent (AzRC), Romanian Red Cross (RRC), and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) were observers to the Consortium. In Armenia, the ICRC had a more active role by initiating the establishment of an additional DRT in the Tavush region and contribution with knowledge and input related to response in conflict situations. The background for this comprehensive set up was to ensure that specific experiences and expertise was included and drawn upon in the project. Specific partnership agreement was signed between the Consortium partners outlining roles and responsibilities.

The organizational set up with a broad-based Consortium was ambitious and provided the potential for conflict between the high number of partners. The clearly defined responsibilities in the project document and the partnership agreements with different Consortium partners providing lead and technical expertise and support within specific tasks (e.g. AutRC task F – Exercise, and IceRC task E - PSS) provided a well-developed and communicated set up. All partners interviewed valued the broad Consortium and complimented the strong technical expertise this brought into the project.

A Steering Committee was established with all Partners as the executing body of the project. The Steering Committee meet three times during the project. Several of the partners interviewed agreed that the Steering Committee had a strong value as a communication forum between Consortium partners. However, it was highlighted that the Steering Committee meetings were mainly used for presenting project progress and less on sharing experiences and lessons learned.

The data collected by the evaluation gives little evidence to make a clear conclusion on the cooperation between ARCS and GRCS. The regional component facilitated a strong focus on cooperation between ARCS and GRCS, but the evaluation found that the cooperation was limited and mainly took place in the later part of the project, particular related to PSS.

Conclusion

The communication between the Consortium partners was strong through the DRC Project Coordinator and IFRC Technical support. An effective sharing of expertise between Consortium partners and ARCS/GRCS was present. The synergy between ARCS and GRCS was less pronounced and appeared to mainly take place related to the exercises and lately within PSS.

5. Conclusions & Recommendations

The EMPREP project helped enhance the emergency preparedness and response capacity of ARCS and GRCS. This is a much-needed support to the national emergency framework in both countries as well as to ARCS and GRCS operational approach to disaster and emergency management.

The objective and outcome of the project is assessed to be balanced and with a well inter-related logic. The EMPREP project has made solid progress against the set deliverables. The delays in the beginning of the project and the non-completion of several deliverables at the time of the evaluation provided a challenge. Especially, the lack of completion of the Contingency Plans and SOPs at the time of the exercise was a challenge for the full achievement of the objective with the exercises.

The use of the WPNS framework provided a strong baseline and assessment of the organizational, structural, and human capacities of ARCS and GRCS, which provided a valuable prioritization of actions needed to ensure a strengthened emergency preparedness and response capacity of ARCS and GRCS.

The EMPREP project showed how focus on building the emergency preparedness capacity can contribute to building the necessary preparedness framework within a short timeframe. Together with the institutional aspect of developing the preparedness framework through the updating of the Contingency Plans and the development of SOPs, a significant contribution of the EMPREP to the preparedness capacity of ARCS and GRCS was the DRTs. The network of trained volunteers on stand-by to assist in situations of disasters and emergencies provides ARCS and GRCS with a strong response capacity. The volunteer network and volunteer management are one of the key strength and achievement of the project. The motivation and enthusiasm of the volunteers and the comprehensive training provided to the DRTs are significant for the project sustainability. However, a stronger focus and clear strategy on volunteer recruitment, management, and retention could have strengthened the DRT component.

The exercises were a valuable activity supporting the emergency preparedness capacity building of ARCS and GRCS. The exercises showed several challenges, but provided some key lessons learned and recommendations for ARCS and GRCS to increase the interoperability and strengthen their emergency preparedness and response capacities. Moreover, the exercises provided an important opportunity for practical training of the DRTs and their role in different emergency situations. With delay on some projects deliverables (Contingency Plans, SOPs), the exercises could not test against some of these guidance documents. Thus, findings and recommendations from the exercises have been used both to validate the Contingency Plans and SOPs, and feed into ongoing design of additional guidance documents.

The collaboration with Government structures in both countries appeared to be strong. The initiatives to link the ARCS and GRCS Contingency Plans and disaster response with the national emergency and civic protection authorities' emergency plans is valuable. However, the current situation, with changing political contexts and frameworks at national level in both countries, requires continued engagement and advocacy to clarify and specify the role of ARCS and GRCS in the national response framework.

The SAG in both countries proved to be a valuable and effective way of coordinating and collaborating with external stakeholders during the project, providing input and external perspective into the outcomes of the project, as well as providing knowledge and coordination related to project activities. The involvement and coordination with external stakeholders, through the SAGs, moreover increases the sustainability of the project. Strengthening networks and coalitions between stakeholders, both nationally and regionally, further promotes institutional sustainability.

Finally, the organizational set up with a broad-based Consortium was ambitious. But the clearly defined roles and responsibilities in the project document and partnership agreement with different Consortium partners providing lead and technical expertise and support within specific tasks provided a well-developed set up brought strong technical expertise into the project. An effective sharing of expertise between Consortium Partners and ARCS/GRCS was present. The synergy between ARCS and GRCS was less pronounced and appeared to mainly take place related to the exercise.

5.1 Recommendations

- **Clarify role within the national response framework**

With the unclear and not formally defined role of ARCS and GRCS in the national response framework, there is a need to continuously engage and advocate towards Government authorities and to continue the cooperation with the emergency agencies. The good relationship with the Emergency Management Agencies need to be nurtured and developed. The current situation, with changing political contexts and frameworks on national level in both countries give rise to opportunities to potentially change the mandates of ARCS and GRCS. This requires organizational and management (senior level) commitment and engagement in key institutional emergency preparedness and response processes.

- **Find systematic ways of strengthening capacities through volunteer engagement**

The operational capacities of ARCS and GRCS is present, yet a challenge exist on systematic utilization of these capacities in the broader national disaster management context (prevention, preparedness and response). By exploring ways to contribute to governmental initiatives intended to strengthen and utilize volunteer capacities (e.g. volunteerism laws), ARCS and GRCS can systematically complement the governmental capacities, sustain the capacities build in the DRTs, and promote a formal volunteerism frameworks and legal status.

- **Consolidate the capacity of the DRTs**

To ensure that ARCS and GRCS has strong first responders, with adequate skills, modern equipment and methodologies to respond in emergencies and disasters, the training of the DRTs need to be systematic, more in-depth and targeted. Involvement of external experts and resources, such as consortium partners, will be key in this regard.

- **Continue with simulation exercises**

To consolidate the trainings and capacity building of the DRTs, emergency exercises should continue and take place on a regular basis. The emergency exercises should aim to empower branches and volunteers to manage their own small-scale simulations exercise together with local emergency entities. The objective should continue to be to test the expertise and skills of the DRTs through practical training as well as validate contingency plans and SOPs, and feed into design of additional guidance documents.

- **Continuously revise and update Contingency Plans and Standard Operational Procedures**

The simulations provided an excellent opportunity to validate the CPs and SOPs and to contribute to the design of additional guidance as prioritized in the WPNS. The findings and recommendations of the simulations need to be considered and fully implemented in the CP and SOPs. Same applies to future simulations, allowing for continuous learning and improvement of both guidance and operations.

- **Invest in key response capacities**

To continue enhancing their profile of the key capacities requires a comprehensive approach addressing both the policy, legislative, operational and capacity building level. Within the national response framework First Aid and Psychosocial Support appears to be where both ARCS and GRCS can establish a niche and fill a gap in the national response framework and capacities. This should be linked to and reflect the mandate and role of ARCS and GRCS. Capacity should continue to be built within these areas. Emphasis should also be on strengthen the focus on Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA) and Protection, Gender and Inclusion (PGI).

- **Ensure continued senior management commitment to strengthening institutional preparedness**

To strengthen the institutional preparedness and response capacity commitment and engagement of senior management is central. Making emergency preparedness and response a key component of ARCS

and GRCS's portfolio, all management level need to be engaged and participate in the preparedness activities and advocacy work.

- **Consolidate rather than expand**

With the late completion of several of the components in the EMPREP consolidating achievements should be prioritized, rather than expanding and focusing on new technical areas. A clear link to the mandate and role of ARCS and GRCS need to be present.

Annex 1: Terms of Reference (ToR)

**Terms of Reference (ToR)
Final Evaluation (Internal)**



**Improved Emergency Preparedness and
Coordinated Response in South Caucasus
(EMPREP)**

AX23445

September 2018

1. Background

A group of three PNSs (Austrian Red Cross, Danish Red Cross, Icelandic Red Cross), together with the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), have signed a Consortium Agreement to support the implementation of the Action: *Improved Emergency Preparedness & Coordinated Response in South Caucasus (EMPREP)*. On this basis, the Partners have signed a commitment to work together with the Armenia Red Cross Society (ARCS) and Georgia Red Cross Society (GRCS) on the implementation of the Action in coordination with other programmes and interventions in the region, supported by the Partners.

Funded by the European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO), the EMPREP programme endeavors to strengthen the capacities and coordination of GRCS and ARCS, with the aim of increasing the interoperability and capacity of Georgia and Armenia emergency management sectors to adequately and effectively prepare for and respond to emergency events, both within its national boundaries and across the South Caucasus region.

The EMPREP Project has the following expected objectives, time frame and budget

- Increase interoperability and capacity of emergency management sectors in Armenia and Georgia
- Increase capacities of key emergency management actors (ARCS and GRCS) for more effective coordination with disaster management authorities

Duration: January 2017 – December 2018

Budget: Total eligible costs: € 569.071 (EC contribution: € 425.000)

The EMPREP Project has the following expected results each with a number of deliverables

1. Enhanced structures, systems and procedures for **efficient and effective emergency preparedness and response**; structures and plans are more interlinked to and part of regional and international disaster response mechanisms.
2. Clearly **defined roles in emergency preparedness and response** that are recognized by the Civil Protection Authorities in the Civil Security National Plan; ARCS and GRCS will be represented and active in the national and local coordinating bodies for emergencies.
3. Effective **disaster management capacities** at national levels in line with the EU's Civil Protection Mechanism: well-trained and equipped response teams and leaders able to meet the needs of those affected, rapidly and efficiently.
4. Increased delivery of **psychosocial support in emergencies** to affected people and first responders by well-trained and equipped Red Cross staff and volunteers operating within a methodological framework.
5. **Coordinated preparedness and response** agencies optimising relief operations through better sharing of resources, information and expertise; as refined in practice through exercising.
6. Regularly monitored, reviewed and **evaluated emergency preparedness and response work** to assess performance, quality and impact.

Implementing partners

- Armenia Red Cross
- Georgia Red Cross

- Austria Red Cross
- Icelandic Red Cross
- IFRC

Contract holder

- Danish Red Cross

Observing partners

- Azerbaijan Red Crescent
- Romania Red Cross

PNS Consortium partners

- Swiss Red Cross
- ICRC

To support the evaluator the WPNS previous studies and documents within the project will be made available (annexed)

From 1 January 2019 a similar consortium will start the project 'R2R' likewise funded by the European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO) which will build and rely on capacities gained within the EMPREP project.

2. Purpose, Objectives and Scope

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation will be to analyse the overall impact of the project and an indication as to what extent the produced materials, discussions, networking and exercises are fulfilling their goal of enhancing the preparedness capacity of ARCS and GRCS.

The evaluation was originally planned conducted by external facilitator. After consultation and agreement with ECHO it was decided that evaluation will be done by DRC advisor to focus more on consolidating the learning from the project and ensure that the learnings can be connected with learnings from other similar projects implemented by consortium partners.

The evaluation report will be shared with consortium partners with an emphasis on implementing partners for all partners to use findings in future DRR projects in South Caucasus. The evaluation report will be shared with European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO)

The evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and impact shall be particularly analysed, whereas other evaluation criteria are not in the primary scope of the evaluation. Aspects of added value should be integrated in the evaluation as appropriate. The evaluation shall not consider aspects of accounting or other financial technicalities (being reported in a separate finance audit).

2.2 Objectives

The objectives of the Final Evaluation are:

- The evaluation will examine to which extent the EMPREP has contributed to the overall level of preparedness and response capacity of Armenia and Georgia Red Cross. In this the evaluation must assess specific capacity building contributions within the various tasks (TASK A – F)
- To assess the extent to which the project has achieved overall indicators and deliverables as described in the project document
- Based on the above, provide recommendations for the implementation of the upcoming project 'Ready 2 Respond'

2.3 Scope

The evaluation shall comprise but not necessarily be limited to the following evaluation criteria:

Relevance

- Assess whether the objectives and results (Tasks) are in line with needs and priorities of Armenia and Georgia RC as well consortium partners' priorities for South Caucasus.
- In Armenia assess the relevance of results at HQ as well branch level
- Assess feasibility and relevance of the Red Cross DRTs / NDRTs to the national policies and priorities of Civil Protection Authorities

- Assess relevance of the regional approach within EMPREP
- Provide recommendations for improved relevance of RCRC preparedness and response capacity to be considered in Ready2Respond

Effectiveness

- Assess the progress and quality of project deliverables and Armenia and Georgia RC preparedness frameworks
- Assess the technical quality of programme activities and the effectiveness and appropriateness of methodologies and approaches applied.
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outcome/expected results/outputs? (Also consider any which were possibly beyond the control of the project)
- Did the project/programme contribute to capacity development as planned?
- Recommendations...

Sustainability

- Assess the sustainability of the program including the cooperation with relevant external partners. Has sufficient efforts been put into effective collaboration with relevant authorities
- Assess the degree to which the Armenia and Georgia RC at all relevant organisational level have obtained ownership of the programme.
- Assess the sustainability of DRTs
- Recommend how sustainability can be improved, for consideration of Ready2Respond

Impact

- Provide good examples/cases of how the project has contributed towards improved preparedness capacity of Armenia and Georgia RC. Include any aspects of regional preparedness
- Measure if the project and project partners have adequately incorporated gender-sensitivity, community-engagement and prevention of sexual harassment (policies)
- Measure progress against WPNS document on prioritised components

Coordination and Partnership

- Assess the extent of regional component of the project. To what extent was the regional approach with regards to cooperation and knowledge transfer an added-value to the programme? What were the relevant success factors associated with this?
- Assess the extent of effective cooperation between Armenia / Georgia RC with local stakeholders
- Identify examples for improved regional South Caucasus preparedness
- Assess if attempts have been made to promote harmonization with other partners and other projects; thereby reducing administrative costs of the programme implementation (e.g. through establishment of alliances with other PNSs and IFRC).
- Assess the effectiveness of communication, knowledge- and experience-exchange between consortium partners and identify realised synergies

3. Methodology

The evaluation will base its findings based on interviews or group discussions with consortium members and external stakeholders. In addition, the following methods should be applied;

- a) Desk-study reading of existing documents such as; T-form, WPNS (base-line & end-line), Mid Term Review, narrative reports
- b) Review of project selected deliverables (e.g. SOPs, Contingency Plans). Specific documents to be decided at a later stage
- c) Interviews / dialogue (remote) with consortium partners. A full list will be provided by the DRC country coordinator. Schedule to be decided by evaluator

- d) Field mission (5 days) to Armenia and Georgia for on-site interviews with key project staff from ARCS/GRCS/DRC, DRT members and local stakeholders such as civil protection authorities and DRR partners.

Reports and documents from major disaster responses (e.g. DREF operations) during EMPREP implementation period can be used by the evaluator if existing and deemed useful as illustrative examples of preparedness capacities

4. Roles & Responsibilities

The evaluator will be responsible for consolidating data and overall coordination of the evaluation assisted by the DRC country coordinator. Armenia RC and Georgia RC EMPREP project teams will assist in organising mission to South Caucasus. Consortium Partners will contribute and provide information to the evaluator within their specific role in the project and generally. The evaluator will be briefed and introduced the project by DRC country coordinator and DRC (IFCR) project manager.

1. Evaluator (DRC advisor) – team leader
2. DRC project manager (IFRC) –
3. DRC country coordinator –
4. ARCS + GRCS Head of DM departments –
5. ARCS + GRCS EMPREP project teams –
6. Consortium Partner Representatives (Icelandic, Austrian RC, IFRC) –
7. Observing Partner Representatives (Azerbaijan RC, Swiss RC, Romania RC, ICRC delegations) –

5. Deliverables & Schedule

The following outputs are expected;

- a) Final evaluation report (15.12.2018)
- b) De-briefing session(s) with consortium partners OR Armenia and Georgia RC (December 2018)

The evaluation will take place in November / December 2018 and report finalised 15 December 2018 as indicated in below table

	Tasks	Timeline	Budgeted time	Deadline
1	Preparation of evaluation, desk study collecting and reading of main documents including selected project deliverables	November 2018	2 day(s)	
2	Prepare and conduct interview/discussions with implementing partners – key staff	November 2018	1 day(s)	
3	Mission to Armenia / Georgia Writing on the report	19 -23 November	5 day(s)	
4	Compilation of interim report to be shared with all consortium partners	December 2018	1 day(s)	30.11.2018
5	Comments from consortium partners and management responses	December 2018	0 day(s)	12.12.2018
6	Revision of draft report & upon need follow-up interviews with implementing partners – key staff (upon need) De-briefing / presentation to consortium partners (skype)	December 2018	1 day(s)	
7	Delivery of final report + briefing of consortium partners		10 day(s) in total	15.12.2018

The evaluation report must be provided in English using the DRC standard format for evaluations.

Briefing session with consortium partners

6. Skills & Qualifications

The following skills and qualifications are required:

- In-depth Knowledge of RC/RC Movement
- Experience in RC/RC DM a/o DRR projects and operations
- Proven experience in evaluations and analyses
- Knowledge and experience from DRC engagement in South Caucasus
- Knowledge on UCPM and its priorities

7. Budget

The evaluation will be conducted using the below budget line and workload estimated accordingly

DRC DM advisor	10 working days	EUR 3394,00
----------------	-----------------	-------------

8. Available Data & Documentation

I: EmPrep Project Document (T-Forms)

II: EmPrep Project budgets

III: Interim Report no. 1 and Interim Report no. 2 plus financial reports

IV: Well Prepared National Society (WPNS) work sheets for Armenia and Georgia. (Base Line)

V: Mid-Term Review (MTR)

VI: EmPrep Project Deliverables (TBC / xx numbers)

VII: R2R Project Proposal

Annex 2: Methodology: Guiding Questions for semi-structured interviews

EMPREP	Guiding questions
	Note: the questions are not necessarily to be phrased as they are written here – but they serve as a checklist
1	Please describe your role in EMPREP
2	In your opinion, what is the best about the EMPREP program overall?
3	Name 3-4 key successes / good practices of the program
4	Name 3-4 key over all challenges of the program
5	What was the biggest challenge in your position to implement / engage in the EMPREP?
6	Compared to before the EMPREP, please describe how the project has changed the response preparedness?
7	As a result of the EMPREP how much better in disaster preparedness / response is ARCS/GRCS?
8	If ARCS/ GRCS should implement DRT in other Regions, what do you recommend should be done differently?
9	How would rank the quality of the trainings material and trainings delivered in EMPREP – scale 0-5 (5 =best)
10	How has the contingency plan revision process been experienced?
11	How has the SOP development process been experienced? How many SOP have they developed within what topics?
12	Please describe how the new disaster preparedness set-up in ARCS/GRCS will assist if a disaster strikes
13	How has it been to work with Psychosocial support? What do you recommend should be done differently?
14	Emergency operations centre (EOC) – how does the EOC function? - permanent or established for a specific disaster?
15	How did they experience the simulation exercise? What did you learn?
16	Are you satisfied with the coordination and cooperation between project stakeholders? Why/not?
17	Please describe the role ARCS/GRCS play in the coordination with external stakeholders during an emergency / disaster. Has this role changes over the last two years?
18	What has been the most valuable outcome from the Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) meetings? Have they provided better coordination / linkage between the stakeholders? Do they see it as a valuable forum?
19	Are they satisfied with the regional aspect of the project – coordination between

	the ARCS and GRCS? To what extent has it provided added value?	
20	What has been the most valuable outcome from the consortium meetings? Have they provided better coordination / linkage between the stakeholders? Do they see it as a valuable forum?	
21	Any final suggestions/recommendations for the evaluation – not mentioned previously	
22	Any questions to me as the evaluator?	

Annex 3: Persons met

Partners

IFRC/DRC - EMPREP Project Manager / Disaster Preparedness Delegate

Danish Red Cross – Country Coordinator Armenia & Georgia

Austrian Red Cross - Head of Delegation South Caucasus + technical resource person for Task F (responsible for Task F, Simex)

Icelandic Red Cross – Project Manager Humanitarian Operations (responsible for Task E, PSS)

Swiss Red Cross – Country Coordinator & DRR Advisor Kyrgyzstan (expert observer Simex)

Georgia

Georgia Red Cross Society:

- Secretary General
- Deputy Secretary General
- Head of Disaster Management Department / Deputy Secretary General
- EMPREP Project Coordinator
- Disaster Management Coordinator
- Psychologist
- RFL responsible & youth project Officer
- Disaster Response Team – 8 members

Emergency Management Service – representatives of the Crises Management National Centre

Bridge Innovation – Head of Governance

ICRC – Cooperation officer

Armenia

Armenia Red Cross Society:

- Head of Disaster Management Department
- EMPREP Project Coordinator, Disaster Management Department
- Volunteer Coordinator, Disaster Management Department
- Psychologist, Disaster Management Department
- Disaster Response Team – 6 members

Ministry of Emergency Services – Deputy Head of Emergency Services

DRR Platform – Head of Platform and Former Head of Platform/Rep German Red Cross

ICRC – Movement Cooperation Program Officer and Field Office

Annex 4: List of Key Documents reviewed

- ARCS and GRCS Disaster Management strategy documents
- EMPREP t-Form
- EMPREP Consortium agreement + addendum
- WPNS for Armenia and Georgia Red Cross Societies
- Contingency Plans ARCS and GRCS
- SOPs from ARCS and GRCS
- Progress reports
- Mid-term review report
- EMPREP Deliverables table & status
- Minutes SAG meetings minutes
- Consortium Steering Committee meeting minutes
- EMPREP Exercises Evaluation Report
- PSS assessment ARCS and GRCS
- PSS Plan of Action ARCS and GRCS
- PSS and Caring for volunteer SOPs
- Description of Action: Ready 2 Respond