

# Beneficiary Communications and Accountability Review

Prepared for the PRCS and IFRC Delegation, Pakistan



*Written by: Louise Taylor*  
*Preparedness and Resilience Unit – SARD, IFRC*  
*[louise.taylor@ifrc.org](mailto:louise.taylor@ifrc.org)*

	2
<b><u>ACRONYMS</u></b>	<b>3</b>
<b><u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u></b>	<b>4</b>
<b><u>NARRATIVE SUMMARY</u></b>	<b>7</b>
BACKGROUND	7
METHODOLOGY	8
CONSTRAINTS AND LIMITATIONS	9
<b><u>FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u></b>	<b>9</b>
BCA INTERNAL PROCESSES	9
RELEVANCE AND APPROPRIATENESS OF BCA TOOLS AND PRACTICES TO THE COMMUNITY	13
RELEVANCE AND APPROPRIATENESS TO THE IRP PROGRAM	16
<b><u>ANNEXES</u></b>	<b>19</b>
ANNEX 1: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	19
ANNEX 2: IRP BCA PROGRESS ON TARGETS AS OF MAY 2013	22
ANNEX 3: ACCOUNTABILITY ASSESSMENT GRID	24
ANNEX 4: WHAT INFORMATION TO SHARE WITH THE BENEFICIARIES	29
ANNEX 5: TERMS OF REFERENCE	30
ANNEX 6: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	35
ANNEX 7: RESPONDENT LIST	37

## Acronyms

BCA – Beneficiary Communications and Accountability

CoC – Code of Conduct

CNB – Community Notice Board

CHC – Comment Handling Cell

FGD – Focus Group Discussion

IRP – Integrated Recovery Program

VC – Village Committee

## Executive Summary

The beneficiary communications and accountability (BCA) program began following the 2010 floods in Pakistan as part of the Integrated Recovery Program (IRP). After three years, the BCA program has gone under several evolutions. In 2013, although the IRP program has drawn to a close, the PRCS has included BCA in its country strategy for 2015. As such, the IFRC and PRCS has requested a review of the program to date and recommendations that can inform the PRCS and IFRC Pakistan Delegation of how to move forward.

Specifically the objectives of the review are to:

- Evaluate the of the BCA Programme's internal processes in terms of:
  - a. human resources, capacity-building and management
  - b. relevance & appropriateness
  - c. coordination & integration
  - d. impact
- Assess the relevance and appropriateness of the BCA program design, including the communication tools and content delivered to the different targeted and assisted communities.
- Assess the effectiveness and coordination of the BCA intervention to the overall goal of the IRP program.

In general, the reviewer found that many good practices have been developed by the BCA team including:

### General

- A dedicated BCA team with shared values and a willingness to overcome challenges in order to deliver on the mandate.
- Strong support of the concept of BCA among the beneficiary communication, program and management staff.
- Informal coordination with program teams and willingness to support each other, especially at the field level.
- Use of accountability practices such as a complaints mechanism.
- Good BCA practices in place such as introductory meetings to explain the PRCS mandate, programs and activities, feedback tracking sheets and trend analysis.
- Good, professional IEC materials that seem to be very appreciated by communities.
- In communities in which notice boards were installed, the understanding of IEC material was almost twice as high as in communities without notice boards.
- High level of appreciation among community members for the communication efforts and feedback process, for the majority of which was the first experience of its kind.

### Province Specific

- Strong coordination with program teams and use of beneficiary feedback: feedback tracked, discussed and acted upon in coordination meetings (Sindh).
- The establishment of BCA as a “neutral party” that manages the dialogue and resolves issues between the PRCS and the community (Sindh).
- Increased community coordination and communication skills: households coordinated together to collectively their needs to the PRCS collectively. (Sindh).
- Community involvement in generating beneficiary selection lists (KPK, Sindh).
- BCA team was key in reducing problems and increasing efficiency of the cash grant delivery. This subsequently increased the level of trust between the PRCS and communities (Punjab).

The findings on gaps for the BCA program are presented under the narrative summary the report. Some of the key findings are as follows:

### Policy Direction, Management, Human Resources and Technical Support

- Lack of clear policy direction on beneficiary communications and accountability.
- Lack of policy documents and procedures to support complaints handling system.
- Lack of consistent technical support from IFRC throughout the IRP program.
- Need to link feedback analysis to a management/decision-making forum beyond the project level.
- Unclear organizational structure and reporting lines at the NHQ level.
- Lack of resources (human and logistics) to deliver on the mandate in some areas of intervention (particularly Punjab).
- Need to employ volunteers capable of delivering on that mandate, especially females at the field level.
- Need for clear understanding of BCA at a management level so that they can adequately support BCA staff.
- Need to capacitate field staff on best practices for complaints handling and conducting investigations.

### Integration and Coordination of BCA with other Program Sectors

- Need for standard benchmarks to be incorporated in the program proposals with a complementary operational plan at the field level in order to harmonize program delivery.
- Need to link up beneficiary accountability indicators to the PMER framework.
- Need to induct BCA staff in all program activities and include them in program planning and implementation from the get-go.

### Appropriateness and Relevance of Tools for IRP Communities of Intervention

- Disproportionate emphasis on the development of high tech communication tools without a complementary community mobilization/accountability component and use of other low-cost communication tools such as radio.
- Need to simplify and focus the complaints handling system to ensure that feedback is given to the beneficiary.
- Need to link the BCA Officers with village committee structure.
- Need to integrate a gendered approach to communications mechanisms.
- BCA has taken on a monitoring function. Need to link up beneficiary satisfaction with program indicators.

## Key Recommendations

- Ø *Develop an Beneficiary Accountability Framework that outlines (a) common benchmarks in quality programming for all sectors; (b) a cross-cutting community engagement strategy including plan for human resources; (c) tools and training modules to support implementation; (d) linkages with the PMER framework and (e) appointment of IFRC focal point with knowledge of beneficiary communications and accountability to give technical support for implementation, capacity-building and knowledge sharing.*
- Ø *Revitalize use of low-cost, easy to produce communications tools such as local radio for information provision. Continue to pursue TERA and to explore the use of other technologies such as mobile phone, IVR lines or sound trucks. Incorporate a gender analysis to information sharing to ensure that female community members have access to information.*
- Ø *Develop supporting complaints handling and investigations policy, (b) streamlined procedures for complaints handling and investigations at the field level separate from feedback mechanisms, (c) mandatory sensitization in the community of the RC/RC Code of Conduct and, where necessary, (d) develop a perception and risk matrix to guide communications.*

## Narrative Summary

### Background

In response to the worst floods to hit Pakistan in recent history, affecting 20 million persons of Pakistan's 170 million population, spreading to all seven provinces of the country - Baluchistan, Punjab, Kyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), the Federal Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJ&K), Gilgit Baltistan (GB) and Sindh. The floods damaged/ destroyed homes, roads and bridges, crops and public infrastructure, with 1,985 deaths, 2,946 injured and 1.744,471 houses damaged (NDMA Nov 2010).

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), on behalf of the Pakistan Red Crescent Society (PRCS) launched the Monsoon Floods Appeal for CHF 130 million for 24 months in August 2010; to assist 130,000 families (910,000 persons) with relief and early recovery in 3 of the most affected provinces, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), Punjab and Sindh. An Integrated Recovery Programme (IRP) was approved in March 2011 to respond to the continued multi-sector needs, with the appeal and budget revised in August 2012 to CHF 92.6 million with an extended timeframe till the end of July 2013.

PRCS/IFRC integrated recovery program (IRP) was launched to provide continued recovery assistance to communities in six districts with a package of support comprised of shelter, health, water, sanitation and hygiene (Watsan), livelihoods, disaster preparedness and risk reduction, with a Beneficiary Communication and Accountability Programme (BCA). An integrated programming approach was adopted with the aim of promoting efficiency and enabling sharing of resources, volunteers and capacity, and adding value to the overall recovery response. The IRP aimed to support 130,000 (900,000 persons) flood affected families to recover from the continued adverse impacts from the 2010 flooding, responding to the needs of communities and seeking to support the strengthening of community resilience to face any future disasters.

The IRP Beneficiary Communications and Accountability program outcome as articulated in the IRP 2012 logframe is "improved lives of those affected by the floods through the provision of timely, relevant and accurate information". The program originally called for three outputs:

- Developed mechanism and system that allow the IFRC/PRCS to effectively communicate with disaster-affected community members in Pakistan.
- An environment for transparency and accountability between flood-affected communities and the PRCS/IFRC is in place
- Necessary infrastructure and guidelines to sustain the delivery of BCA interventions within the PRCS/IFRC structure is in place.

The BCA program as articulated in the Revised IRP Logframe 2012 sets out to meet these commitments through a variety of telecommunication, Radio, TV and print activities.<sup>1</sup> Over the course of the IRP program, however, the development of several of the tools was discontinued (radio, television) or did not get off the ground (SMS). The PCRS opted to discontinue radio. TV was stopped because it was found to be too expensive to produce. TERA negotiations with Telenor, although still underway, have stalled at the legal agreements.

By the end of the IRP program, the main tools in use were: face-to-face communication, IEC materials, community notice boards and a comment handling cell (CHC) consisting of suggestion boxes attached to the notice boards, postcards, and a telephone/SMS line. The review did not find a revised logframe, or program proposal that described the program in its current state.<sup>2</sup> For the purposes of the review, however, the relevance and appropriateness of the tools and processes that will be evaluated are those currently in use. Interviews were conducted in both the field and NHQ. The evaluation however, primarily focuses on processes at the field level.

## Methodology

The IFRC Beneficiary Communications Advisor based in the SARD office in New Delhi, India carried out the review. The Beneficiary Communications Focal Point and the Beneficiary Communications Officer for the PCRS/IFRC based in Islamabad, Pakistan supported her in the process. The review was carried out from June 3<sup>rd</sup> to the 14<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

The reviewer used a variety of methodologies during the short review period. These were secondary data review (provided by both IFRC and the PCRS); key informant interviews and six focus groups. Work was carried out in Islamabad, and KPK, Sindh, and Punjab provinces. In summary, the reviewer conducted:

- Secondary data review: BCA documentation such as IRP Logframes, baseline and endline studies, monthly reports, and feedback tracking sheets.
- Key informant interviews, including personnel from:
  - Program staff, IFRC, Islamabad
  - PCRS Management and program staff, PHQ and field
  - BCA staff in NHQ, PHQ, and field
- Focus groups: male and female in Punjab and Sindh.

A full listing of interviews undertaken and documents consulted can be found in the annexes.

<sup>1</sup> IRP Logframe, April 2012. See Annex for status on which activities were realized throughout the course of the IRP program.

<sup>2</sup> The document "New BCA Document" does describe the different phases of the BCA program but it does not appear to have been adopted in an official capacity.

## Constraints and Limitations

All evaluations and reviews are subject to some constraints or limitations. In general, the BCA review was well supported by leadership of both IFRC and PRCS, and the BCA NHQ officers did a good job facilitating the visit. Stakeholders made themselves available and were otherwise cooperative. However, there were several constraints that had an impact on the quality and scope of the data that are worth mentioning:

- The schedule did not allow for the review to conduct the workshops as per the inception note and the methodology had to be adapted on the fly.
- The majority of BCA-specific documents were received mid-review or after. They could not be used then to inform the review methodology and consequently the majority of the review was dedicated to a mapping of BCA practices, rather than an analysis of the systems in place. A second reviewer or three weeks in the field would have been necessary to adequately review the systems and practices in place.
- Could not evaluate the capacity of the CHC to address corruption in Punjab.
- Very little time to conduct interviews in Punjab. Inadequate time with all interviewees resulted in spotty data collection.
- Quality of information collected in FGD in Punjab was impacted by the large presences of security escorts and large number of IFRC and PRCS staff beyond those required for translation.
- The reviewer did not review any community mobilization elements (such as village committees) as this was not under the purview of the BCA program.
- Impact not able to be measured because the evaluation took place too soon after the closure of the program

## Findings and Recommendations

### BCA Internal Processes

*Finding One: Directing beneficiary feedback to NHQ was an inefficient use of resources. The lack of policy documents on how to manage beneficiary feedback created a lot of confusion among staff on what to do with the information received; while feedback was directed to NHQ, it was not consistently captured and raised in a management forum.*

The BCA program relied on three major tools to provide information to beneficiaries: face-to-face and community sessions, community notice boards and IEC material. The beneficiary communications officers gave introductory sessions on BCA alongside the technical teams to

explain program modalities. They continued with face-to-face communications throughout the program, going door-to-door or conducting in focus groups. They attended meetings with the village committee (VC), although they were not directly linked to its formation or management. The BCA program also published information on community notice boards including IEC material, phone numbers for staff and beneficiary selection criteria (livelihoods only) and beneficiary selection lists (all programs). IEC material for shelter, WATSAN and livelihoods was also distributed in the communities.

The core of the BCA program revolved around the various ways to give feedback to the PRCS. In all three provinces (Sindh, KPK and Punjab) beneficiaries were invited to give feedback via face-to-face, suggestion boxes, telephone, and postcards (KPK and Sindh only). The feedback was treated at the field, PHQ and NHQ, but the feedback policy was not coherent between the provinces. Suggestions and calls that were logged at the PHQ or field hub level were discussed with program managers to find a solution or response, which was then communicated to the beneficiary. In Sindh and KPK, suggestions from the suggestion box were bundled and sent directly to PHQ in case there was a complaint against a staff member in the field. Also in Sindh, the major trends in feedback were discussed at monthly coordination meetings. Each site recorded the process in feedback tracking sheets with complementary information such as date, type of complaint and who was responsible. Feedback that went to NHQ via phone, SMS or postcards followed the same process but was logged on tracking sheets at the NHQ level.

Province	Entry Point	Process	Feedback Received?
KPK <sup>3</sup>	Face-to-Face	Logged in tracking sheet and coordinated with program officer	No focus group held. Feedback tracking sheet found, but no category that logs the institutional response.
	Suggestion Box	Collected by volunteer, triage by BCA officer at PHQ	No focus group held. Feedback tracking sheet found, but no category that logs the institutional response.
	Postcards	Sent to NHQ	No focus group held. Feedback tracking sheet found, but no category that logs the institutional response.
Punjab	Face-to-face	Logged in tracking sheet and coordinated	No evidence of tracking sheet found.

<sup>3</sup> The BCA officer for Sindh was seated in PHQ.

		with program officer at field level	
	Awareness Session	Logged in tracking sheet and coordinated with program officer	No evidence of tracking sheet found.
	Cell	Call made to BCA officer and logged in tracking sheet and response coordinated with program officer	No evidence of tracking sheet found.
Sindh <sup>4</sup>	Face-to-face	PHQ – logged into data entry sheets	FG cited receiving a response. Evidence of feedback tracking sheets including organizational response found.
	Phone/SMS	NHQ or number of sectorial manager	Beneficiaries in KSK reported not using the phone for privacy issues. Evidence of feedback tracking sheets including organizational response found at the field levels.
	Suggestion Box	Opened every 10 days and sent to PHQ SG	FG cited receiving a response. Evidence of feedback tracking sheets including organizational response found.
	Postcards	NHQ	FG did not receive a response. Evidence of feedback tracking sheets including organizational response found.

<sup>4</sup> The BCA officer was seated at the field hub.

The reviewer found that efficiency and timeliness of the response to feedback increased the closer the feedback loop was to the field. In general, the focus groups said that they received responses from the suggestion boxes and face-to-face communication, which were channeled through PHQ, but did not receive responses from the postcards, which were channeled to NHQ. Phone calls were difficult to evaluate as both NHQ numbers and the number of the technical officer were given and, additionally, some focus groups said they did not use the phone but preferred suggestion boxes because it was important to have a private, individualized relationship with the PRCS.

While PRCS respondents cited that comment handling was done PHQ or NHQ to ensure accountability in case there were complaints against field staff, it was difficult to manage feedback that did *not* require special handling. Rather, the efficiency of the system would be improved if 1) a privileged channel for sensitive complaints was established that was directed to PHQ or NHQ, 2) non-sensitive feedback was channeled at the field level and 3) trends and recommendations were discussed in decision-making forum (field, PHQ and NHQ as necessary), actual triage and response process itself remained at the field.

*Recommendation: Develop supporting complaints handling and investigations policy, (b) streamlined procedures for complaints handling and investigations at the field level separate from feedback mechanisms, (c) mandatory sensitization in the community of the RC/RC Code of Conduct and, where necessary, (d) develop a perception and risk matrix to guide communications.*

It is significant that the PRCS has a feedback and complaints handling mechanism, as many National Societies have yet to prioritize beneficiary feedback as a key component to their programming. Moreover, it can be cited as a best practice that the PRCS moved from calling the complaints mechanism to a comment handling cell so as not give the image that the feedback loop was in place to address only negative concerns. However, communities need to retain the understanding that they have a right to “complain” on a limited number of grievous offences such as corruption and sexual abuse, especially in high-risk programs such as shelter, where the likelihood of fraud and abuse of power greatly increases. Equally, a grievance mechanism is key for protecting the reputation of the organization from accusations of fraud and bribery.

While the reviewer could not evaluate the current CHC to manage accusations of fraud and bribery, in general, the efficiency of the CHC would be improved if:

- Ø The triage of feedback should take place at the field and PHQ (as close to the implementing body as possible), not at NHQ. A mechanism at NHQ, however, should be developed for Senior Management at NHQ to review trends and link feedback to strategy and other decision-making processes at a policy level.
- Ø A specific channel for grievous complaints is established separate from feedback channels.

- Ø Sensitization of the community on the RC code of conduct (CoC), training on the CoC for all staff and volunteers, the development separate process for addressing grievous complaints, and training for staff on how to handle difficult complaints and investigations.
- Ø Development of a comprehensive SoP for the CHC that harmonizes the best practices form all three implementation sites and includes:
  - A statement on why the PRCS wishes to develop a CHC
  - A mapping the type of complaints, complainants, aspects of relevance etc
  - The list of stakeholders who will have access to complain.
  - A participatory assessment to establish what constitutes safe and easily accessible complaints mechanisms for different types of complaints and the different entry points in communities, including a gender analysis.
  - A CHC map that that illustrates the processing cycle including different entry points, appeals structure, and roles and responsibilities.
  - A standardized complaints form.
  - An information campaign informing stakeholders in their right to complain and how it will be processed.
  - An investigation policy and training for staff and volunteers on how to conduct investigations.
  - A beneficiary complaints registry with date; complainants name and details; who is responsible for following up; what action was taken; what date resolved/communicated that is reviewed by the Senior Management Team on a regular basis.
  - Regular reviews of the complaints mechanism to assess effectiveness and capture lessons learned.

KPK PHQ Branch developed a concept paper on the Complaints Handling Cell that addressed many of these concerns including the purpose, definition of a complaint, how they should be addressed and timeframe, but was not actually implemented. The reviewer strongly suggests that this concept paper be developed further and, along with the NHQ BCA Officer in charge of CHC, they take lead in the development of the CHC procedure and training package for the PRCS.

## Relevance and Appropriateness of BCA Tools and Practices to the Community

*Finding Two: Communities were generally appreciative of the BCA program. Disproportionate emphasis on the development of high tech communication tools (which did not get off the ground), however, led the BCA team to focus solely on monitoring and beneficiary satisfaction leaving the use easy, low-cost tools such as radio unexploited.*

In general, the communities greatly appreciated the BCA program, many citing that this was the first time that an organization had ever included a communications component.

*BCA program – First class!!!*  
- Male community member,  
Sultan, Sindh

The IEC material was generally appreciated, many beneficiaries citing that they saved the pamphlets for future use and was considered a high-valued item in the household. All said that even though the majority of them were illiterate, there was always someone in the village who could read and translate for them and the written explanation brought additional clarity to the drawings and should remain, always in the local language however. The BCA officer in Sindh also reiterated the importance of localizing all the illustrations to reflect the communities in which they are working.

All focus groups consulted had access to a community notice board. The Punjab officer noted that while all communities access to at least one notice board, the number should be increased according to the size of the community and budget information should be published. In this vein, particular attention should also be given to the location to notice boards and accessibility for women, as some women cited not consulting the notice board because it was located in the “field” (in reality, 10 metres from the household compound) and therefore applied only to men. (Gender consideration will be addressed to fuller extent in a separate recommendation). The BCA endline survey also noted that in communities in which notice boards were installed, the understanding of IEC material was almost twice as high as in communities without notice boards.

*I learned from BCA that I should know and what I don't know I should find out.*  
- Female Beneficiary, Sindh

All focus groups cited a high appreciation for the feedback process. In provinces in which the BCA program was the most developed (particularly Sindh), each community seemed to have undergone a growing process during the in which they learned how to organize and channel their communication to the organization. For instance, the male focus group in KP Alluh Bux, Sindh organized among themselves to develop common suggestions that were communicated to the PRCS on behalf of several households. Additionally, when asked to rate which information was the most valuable to them, all focus groups (including women) stated health and hygiene as most important, with coordination and organization with the PRCS as second for many. They also suggested a future best practice of appointing a communications focal point from the community itself to interface with the PRCS, as the Village Committee did not meet often enough to pass on information between the two. Although the reviewer did not have time to elaborate on the statements made by the focus group, this does suggest that 1) each community must go through a process in which they learn how to channel their communications to and from the implementing agency, and 2) there is a high level of appreciation for activities that increase communication and coordination.

While the focus groups did not have much critical to say about the BCA program, most being just generally grateful for the efforts, they did demonstrate a huge thirst for information, especially for

thematic areas such as health and hygiene. The reviewer found that there is room to exploit the use easy, low cost tools such as radio to better support programming and respond to beneficiary's information needs.

*Recommendation: Revitalize use of low-cost, easy to produce communications tools such as local radio for information provision. Continue to explore the use of other technologies such as SMS, mobile phone, IVR lines or sound trucks.*

The suspension of tools such as radio and TV<sup>5</sup>, and issues surrounding the realization of TERA has left the BCA program very focused on beneficiary feedback and complaints, but less focused on actual information provision (other than through community awareness sessions). While the BCA team should continue to pursue the development of TERA and other high-tech communication tools, the revitalization of community radio should be prioritized.

Community radio, as opposed to national, is an effective, flexible and low-cost medium to provide information to communities. All focus groups cited wishing to receive more information on health, hygiene and DRR and community radio is an incredibly creative and flexible way to improve communities understanding of any programming for any phase of the disaster cycle. It is highly recommended that radio be reinstated as a priority in future BCA activities.

*Finding Three: A gap in gender strategy led to low participation among females in BCA activities.*

Gender and communication was a key issue. All women interviewed said that they did not use the CHC mechanism (phone, suggestions or postcards) either because they did not have access to a telephone, even if they borrowed one, it was inappropriate to call a man on the phone; they were illiterate; or giving feedback on the organization was "men's business". Interestingly enough, the location of the suggestion box might play a role as one women's focus group cited not giving feedback because it was located outside of the compound walls. Equally, women said that if they had a designated phone (with a woman respondent) or radio, they would be more likely to receive information or give feedback. If they did pass on a suggestion or complaint, it was done through a male member of the family. This is supported by the endline survey, which showed that of the almost 40% of all respondents who provided feedback on PRCS services, the results are highly disproportionate between males (75.3%) and females (24.7%).<sup>6</sup>

The only way that women were able to access information independent of men was through the female volunteers. Although some women were on the VC, this did not come out as a key channel of information (although woman cited a special appreciation for the VC because it allowed them to receive news from the other communities, from which they were normally isolated). All BCA field officers cited the need for more female volunteers and a gender strategy as primordial.

<sup>5</sup> TV was suspended due to cost. The reviewer did not ascertain why radio was suspended.

<sup>6</sup> BCA IRP Endline Survey.

*Recommendation: Incorporate a gender analysis to information sharing to ensure that female community members have access to information in future BCA activities.*

In general, it would be advised that in future BCA activities special attention is given to asking women how need to communicate with the PRCS. For example, in the case of the suggestion boxes, women did cite that a specifically designated suggestion box within the compound might increase the likelihood of giving feedback. This, however, might not be true for every village. This remains especially true for the establishment of a CHC, in which females are more likely to be targets of sexual abuse and would be more likely to not raise a claim or would undergo negative repercussions for doing so unless a safe and appropriate mechanism is determined.

As such, gender should be highlighted in all assessment questions and focus groups when setting up the BCA program. Based on the respondent's particular needs, a gender strategy should be incorporated to future BCA activities including the hiring and retention of female volunteers and special attention made to ensuring that women receive information, can give feedback or make a complaint in a safe and accessible channel.

## Relevance and Appropriateness to the IRP Program

*Finding Four: Lack of policy documentation and common benchmarks for program implementation gave inadequate direction on how BCA is implemented in the field in coordination with other programs.*

The reviewer found that while informal coordination existed between BCA programs and programs especially at the field level, there is a general confusion in both NHQ and the field around role of beneficiary communications in program delivery.

At the NHQ level, most program officers<sup>7</sup> had an intuitive idea of what beneficiary communications and accountability intends to do. All program officers were able to discuss the need for standards for good programing and beneficiary involvement in the design and implementation.<sup>8</sup> In addition to a familiarity with BCA, many program officers were even able to describe operational plans of how it could be institutionalized and implemented in a program. Yet,

<sup>7</sup> Only IFRC delegates were interviewed.

<sup>8</sup> Interestingly enough, many delegates demonstrated confusion when the line of questioning was around beneficiary communications (as defined as "two-way communications), but when the reviewer changed the terminology to "participation" and "community involvement", everyone responded with clarity. This suggests that the confusion might be more semantic more than practical.

despite this familiarity, no technical officer was able to concretely describe how it was implemented in the program in question, many citing that this information was at the field level.

Program officers at PHQ and field hub level did have knowledge of how BCA was implemented, but the planning seemed to be a result of default rather than design. No field team demonstrated a communications or community mobilization plan that was designed for their program, although some elements of both did exist in the shelter and livelihood strategies such as the formation of village committees and use of MOUs to outline the roles and responsibilities for the livelihood and shelter programs. All field officers (both BCA and programs) cited having gone through a rather stressful and confusing phase at the beginning of the program in which no one was sure of what BCA was suppose to do and how before developing their own coordination techniques, which resulted mostly in the monitoring of beneficiary satisfaction with the programs and responding to beneficiary queries. Although this is a good practice, the logframe for BCA, however, measures the existence and impact of various communications tools As such, there is an inconsistency between the criteria that BCA is measured by and what BCA is actually measuring. The BCA program, in its final stages, thus became a bit “lopsided”, with a heavy emphasis on feedback, complaints and response, but with less emphasis on actual information provision and participation in the program cycle.

Despite growing pains, program officers interviewed stated:

- BCA should be part of the planning and design because they have an intimate knowledge of the communities that will better inform the viability of a program. To do this however, the BCA officers must also have an in-depth knowledge of the different programs, which was not always the case.
- BCA mechanisms increased trust and access to the community, and reduced the possibility of community problems from growing out of control.
- Although responding to feedback was a considerable effort, it was part of their jobs to deliver quality programming.

*Assessments are not 100% - we miss problems and by speaking to beneficiaries and incorporating feedback throughout the project we get a better sense of the community. BCA prevents small problems from becoming big.*

- Mohamad Adil, BCA Officer, KPK

The development of BCA programming knowledge at the field level, but lack of understanding at the NHQ suggests 1) a need to better integrate BCA into program design from the get-to and 2) there is a disconnect of information traveling between PHQ and NHQ. The feedback that was given by beneficiaries rested completely at the project level, and was necessarily not fed back into upper management to influence any decision-making at a policy or strategic level at key moments in the program process. Mapping the decision-making process could greatly improve the capacity of using beneficiary feedback to make programming decisions.

Recommendation: Develop an Beneficiary Accountability Framework or similar policy document that outlines (a) common benchmarks in quality programming for all sectors; (b) a cross-cutting community engagement strategy including plan for human resources; (c) tools and training modules to support implementation; (d) linkages with the PMER framework and (e) appointment of IFRC focal point to give technical support for implementation, capacity-building and knowledge sharing.

The reviewer found that there was an enormous gap in terms of an integrated approach to operationalizing the IRP programs. While there were instances of integration such as the establishment of village committees, at the time of the review, integration of the IPR program could have been stronger by incorporating a harmonized community mobilization strategy consisting of information provision, beneficiary participation and feedback and complaints for all programs. This strategy would consequently provide the backbone to the beneficiary communications plan, as it would define 1) what beneficiaries should be informed about through the course of an operation<sup>9</sup> and 2) how to integrate beneficiary feedback into the program cycle.

In future operations, the reviewer recommends that the PRCS adopt a policy document (commonly articulated as a Beneficiary Accountability Framework) that identifies the minimum standards for quality programming. These benchmarks should then be addressed in every project proposal and reflected in the program budget.<sup>10</sup> Secondly, the policy document is operationalized in a cross-cutting beneficiary engagement strategy which outlines each programs activities in information sharing, participation and feedback/complaints and response throughout the course of an operation with appropriate human resources. These activities should then be linked up to the PMER framework. It is strongly recommended that someone with a strong background in beneficiary communications and accountability led this process.

---

<sup>9</sup> See annex 3

<sup>10</sup> Full-fledged accountability programs generally include six benchmarks: institutional commitments, human resources, information sharing, beneficiary participation, complaints and response and continual learning. However, as this is a heavy directional shift, focusing on consistent information sharing, participation and complaints and response would be a good start. See Annex 3 for details on information sharing, participation and complaints and response.

## Annexes

### Annex 1: Summary of Findings

#### Policy Direction, Management, Human Resources and Technical Support

Findings	Short-term or for immediate action	Medium-term within 2013	2014 and beyond
<p><b>Policy Direction</b> <i>Lack of clear policy direction on beneficiary communications and accountability framework.</i></p>	<p>Review BCA - PRCS Strategy in light of review findings</p>	<p>Adopt BCA strategy/policy paper that outlines PRCS commitment to information sharing, participation, and feedback and response mechanism throughout its programs.</p>	<p>Develop Accountability Framework which also includes benchmarks for institutional commitments, human resources</p>
<p><i>Lack of policy documents and procedures to support coherent comment handling cell</i></p>		<p>As part of the BCA strategy/policy paper, develop institutional policy, procedures and training package based on CHC concept paper developed by KPK PHQ, KPK Ben Coms Officer and PHQ Ben Coms Officer to take lead in process.</p>	<p>Capacitate staff in investigation procedures</p>
<p><b>Management</b> <i>Need to link feedback analysis to a management/decision-making forum beyond the project level.</i></p>		<p>Beneficiary feedback trends should be discussed at PHQ operational meetings, and reviewed by NHQ Senior Management.</p>	<p>Develop mechanism for continual learning in which lessons learned are consistently gathered, reviewed by senior management and acted upon.</p>
<p><i>Unclear organizational structure and reporting lines at the NHQ level for BCA officers.</i></p>		<p>Consider embedding one BCA officer in IFRC and one BCA officer in PRCS with clearly defined roles and responsibilities.</p>	
<p><i>Need for clear understanding of BCA at a management level so</i></p>		<p>Deliver workshop on BCA to PHQ and NHQ Management</p>	

<i>that they can adequately support BCA staff.</i>			
Human Resources <i>Lack of resources (human and logistics) to deliver on the mandate in some areas of intervention (particularly Punjab).</i>	N/A as program is closed	Ensure that field level HR and logistics planning is adequately supports BCA to achieve objectives in new Implementation sites	
<i>Need to employ staff and volunteers capable of delivering on that mandate especially females at the field level.</i>	Keep competent BCA officers and volunteers in current field positions or employ them where possible so as not to lose institutional knowledge of BCA		Improve volunteer retention strategy and recruitment of female volunteers
Technical Support <i>Lack of consistent technical support throughout the IRP program</i>	Contract BCA Advisor from SARD office to provide technical support	Ensure that new IFRC Program Coordinator has excellent knowledge of beneficiary communications and accountability	

### Integration and Coordination of BCA with other Program Sectors

Findings	Short-term or for immediate action	Medium-term within 2013	2014 and beyond
<i>Need for standard benchmarks in the program cycle to be written into program proposals and complementary operational plan at the field level harmonized approach to program delivery</i>	Develop community engagement operational plan for ICBDRR (depending on current phase of operations)	As part of the BCA strategy, embed a community engagement plan in each program document based on information sharing, participation and feedback and response.	Embed BCA into Disaster Management policies, procedures and activities.
<i>Need to link up beneficiary accountability indicators to the PMER</i>		Development of indicators that measure information sharing, participation and	

framework.	complaints and response	
<i>Need to induct BCA staff in all program activities and include them in program planning and implementation from the get-go.</i>	BCA officers to receive briefings for all programs and jointly work on BCA operational plan for field site.	

### Appropriateness and Relevance of Tools for IRP Communities of Intervention

<i>Disproportionate emphasis on the development of high tech communication tools without a complementary community mobilization/accountability component or use of easy, low-cost tools such as radio.</i>	Develop communications plan based on "need to know" checklist as part of community mobilization plan for new programs. Revitalize radio programming.	Continue to pursue the development of TERA and other high-tech communication tools where needed.
<i>Need to simplify and focus the complaints handling system to ensure that feedback is given to the beneficiary. Need to link the BCA Officers with village committee structure.</i>	As part of the CHC revisions, ensure that feedback is managed as closely to the field as possible. Consider increasing the prevue of BCA officers to community managers that can lead in community mobilization activities for all programs	
<i>Need to integrate a gendered approach to communications mechanisms.</i>	Conduct gender analysis on new BCA activities to ensure that females have access to and use BCA tools.	

## Annex 2: IRP BCA Progress on Targets as of May 2013

### Beneficiary Communications and Accountability

<b>Programme Component Outcome</b>  <b>Improved lives of those affected by the floods through the provision of timely, relevant and accurate information.</b>	<b>Status in June 2013</b>
<b>Output 7.1</b>  <b>Developed mechanism and system that allow the IFRC/PRCS to effectively communicate with disaster-affected community members in Pakistan.</b>	
<b>Activities</b> 7.1.1a) Negotiate and process contract agreements with local telecommunication, Radio, TV and print providers in Pakistan. 7.1.2a) BCA field officers manage information received through SMS by assisting directly with facilitation, resolution and advocacy for both individual and community issues. 7.1.3a) Develop IFRC/PRCS print materials to allow more efficient layout, distribution and expansion of readers for specific sector needs. 7.1.4a) Develop radio shows to communicate to flood affected beneficiaries.	7.1.1) Partnerships established with mobile/media providers and agreements completed and signed by relevant parties. <b>SMS system is still being vetted by the legal departments of Telenor and the IFRC</b> 7.1.2) Beneficiary information management SMS system in place. <b>SMS system is still being vetted by the legal departments of Telenor and the IFRC</b> 7.1.3) Number of print material distributed to the community. <b>Print material developed for livelihoods, shelter, Watsan</b> 7.1.4) Number of radio shows broadcasted. <b>Radio shows discontinued.</b>
<b>Output 7.2</b>  <b>An environment for transparency and accountability between flood-affected communities and the PRCS/IFRC is in place</b>	<b>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</b> 7.2.1) Number of calls received and responded to through radio broadcast. <b>Radio shows discontinued.</b> 7.2.2) Number of print material distributed to affected community. <b>NA</b> 7.2.3) Monitoring field visits carried out on a monthly basis. <b>Monitoring visits conducted regularly but results not linked to the PMER framework.</b>
<b>Activities</b> 7.2.1a) Establish and provide two-way communication services to allow feedback through radio broadcast. 7.2.2a) Establish and provide two-way communication services to allow feedback through print material. 7.2.3a) Carry out monitoring field visits to the affected communities.	
<b>Output 7.3</b>  <b>Necessary infrastructure and guidelines to sustain the delivery of BCA interventions within the PRCS/IFRC structure is in place.</b>	<b>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</b> 7.2.1) SOPs and generic job descriptions in place. <b>Job descriptions in place. SOPs for the CMR existing, but not in effect.</b> 7.2.2) BCA dissemination tools in place. <b>NA</b> 7.3.3) Trainings sessions held for volunteers and staff members of all provinces. <b>Some training sessions held, but feedback indicates more are required.</b> 7.3.4) Number of volunteers in the mentorship programme. <b>NA</b> 7.3.5) Attendance of weekly meetings at relevant forums. <b>BCA staff attended relevant meetings for both the IFRC and PCRS.</b>
<b>Activities</b> 7.3.1a) Develop standardised job descriptions and SOPs. 7.3.2a) Disseminate BCA tools and objectives to PRCS and other internal stakeholders via video documentary. 7.3.3a) PRCS staff members and volunteers are trained on all	

aspects of BCA at provincial level.

7.3.4a) Conduct a BCA mentorship programme for volunteer to improve their capacity.

7.3.5a) BCA representatives attend meetings and build partnership with local, regional and international communication groups including the Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities (CDAC) working group, EIS, USAHIDI and local media outlets.

#### **Output 7.4**

**To increase the accountability of the PRCS at the National and Provincial level in handling complaints on their humanitarian interventions.**

#### **Activities**

7.4.1a) Facilitate the provision of guidelines to PRCS on dealing with complaints concerning quality, quantity and accountability of their work.

7.4.2a) Provide technical support in the development of PRCS TOR for the complaints mechanism and defining the role of the complaints committee.

7.4.3a) Support PRCS in developing IEC materials and complaints forms for use by communities so they understand the purpose of the CHC and how to use it.

7.4.4a) Carry out community orientation/awareness sessions on how the CHC mechanism works.

7.4.5a) Provide technical support in the production of radio programs that include segments that increase understanding of accountability with in the RC/RC Movement and the community.

7.4.6a) Develop and roll-out a database to PRCS NHQ that assists in the management of data on complaints.

#### **Objectively Verifiable Indicators**

7.4.1) Guidelines are in place **Guidelines written but not in effect**

7.4.2) The PRCS has terms of reference (TOR) for the complaints mechanism and well-defined role of the complaints committee. **No ToR or complaints committee formed**

7.4.3) IEC material is developed and is easily understood by the communities. **Focus groups all report having access to IEC material and that it was useful and clear.**

7.4.4) IEC material is available to the communities and they understand how the complaints mechanism operates. **Focus groups report that they were giving introductory sessions on how to give feedback but no IEC material produced.**

7.4.5) Radio programs are broadcast with programs on accountability. **Radio shows discontinued.**

7.4.6) Efficient collection and analysis of information at collected through PRCS complaint mechanism. **Feedback is collected and tracked at the field level, but results are not transferred up to NHQ.**

### Annex 3: Accountability Assessment Grid

Benchmark	Basic (1)	Intermediate (2)	Advanced (3)	Mature (4)
<b>Information Sharing</b>	<p>Content: NGO staff provides project participants with basic information about the NGO and its goals and work. Most information is about project-specific aims and activities.</p> <p>Channel: Most information is provided verbally and/or informally in reaction to field needs.</p> <p>Frequency: It is generally provided at the beginning of projects, and may not be updated often.</p> <p>Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation: No formalized communications strategy document. Information sharing is not included as an indicator in monitoring and evaluation framework.</p>	<p>Content: Information about the NGO and its work is made publicly available to stakeholders including contact details for NGO staff, programme aims and activities, timescales, selection criteria, and some budget information (where appropriate).</p> <p>Channel: There is one or more methods of sharing information chosen by the NGO (for example, meetings, information sheets, noticeboards, radio, posters, newspapers). Channels are identified for beneficiaries to give feedback to the organization (see feedback, complaints and response) and the organization integrates this feedback into its decision-making processes.</p> <p>Frequency: Information is provided at the beginning,</p>	<p>Content: Full information about the programme is made publicly available to local people and partners. It includes a budget, showing all direct costs. Thematic information is provided to complement specific programs (health, DRR, violence prevention etc.).</p> <p>Channel: A variety of methods are used based on community consultation. Languages used are easy for local people to access. Specific efforts are made to provide information to women and the most marginalised people (including people who are illiterate). Channels are identified for beneficiaries to give feedback to the organization (see feedback, complaints and response) and is integrated into decision-making processes</p>	<p>Content: Full programme and financial information is published. Thematic information is provided to the program complement specific programs (health, DRR, violence prevention etc.).</p> <p>Channel: Communication channels are agreed upon with communities in order to ensure accessibility and entertainment value for all members (including men, women, girls and boys). Channels are designated by the community to give feedback to the organization. Feedback is incorporated into decision-making process at both field and strategic levels (see feedback, complaints and response). Organization explores use of new technology to improve reach and scale of information sharing where appropriate.</p>

		and then sporadically throughout the program cycle. Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation: Documentation of communications activities or procedures exists at the field level and perhaps at HQ.	Frequency: Information is regularly updated – for example, with reports of activities carried out, expenditure made, and changes to activities or budgets. Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation: Communications plan exists, as well as procedural documents. Indicators for monitoring and evaluation may or may not be included in the M&E framework.	Frequency: Information is published systematically including an exit strategy. Budget and expenditure information for direct and indirect costs. Updates and progress reports are published regularly. Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation: An integrated beneficiary engagement strategy exists. All program proposals have a section on communications. Regular monitoring (by NGO staff or beneficiaries) is carried out to ensure that the information is relevant and understood, particularly by excluded groups. Indicators for information sharing are included in the M&E framework.
<b>Participation</b>	<i>Information: Community mobilization is limited to information sharing (see above) in which participants are informed about the NGO's plans, throughout the project cycle. NGO must continue to lead in program implementation for program</i>	<i>Consultation: Participants provide information that NGO staff use to make key decisions about their work, at all stages of the project cycle. Programs more effectively target beneficiary needs; no structure is developed to take on their implementation after</i>	<i>Partnership: Decisions are made jointly by NGO staff and project participants. Joint ownership over program process, program objectives are not community driven</i>  Community Profiling/Needs Assessment: The assessment	<i>Delegation: Community and partners take a lead in making decisions, drawing on the NGO's expertise, as relevant. Community takes on full responsibility for the continued implementation of program/program goals are reached.</i>

	<p><i>to maintain sustainability.</i></p> <p>Community Profiling/Needs Assessment: Participatory needs assessment for the purpose of getting information about the community. NGO staff assume that key informants represent poor and marginalised people. There is limited analysis of who holds authority in the local community and how.</p> <p>Design and Planning: Proposals and plans are mostly written by senior/technical NGO staff. The goal of the project will be determined by the NGO based on a participatory assessment. The community is informed about the outcome of the NGO's design and planning process.</p> <p>Beneficiary selection: The selection criteria is determined by the NGO and affected population is informed about the selection criteria and process.</p> <p>Implementation: The</p>	<p><i>organization pulls out.</i></p> <p>Community Profiling/Needs Assessment: Participatory assessment includes asking the community about their priorities. NGO staff consults women and men separately. They identify the main social groupings in the community, including the most marginalised, and consider their priorities. They identify the local institutions responsible for delivering services, and also discuss plans with them.</p> <p>Design and Planning: The community is asked to advise on the outcome of our design and planning process e.g. through committees.</p> <p>Beneficiary Selection: The community is asked to give advise on the selection of beneficiaries e.g. through committees.</p> <p>Implementation: The community is asked to give advise on the implementation of our programs e.g. through</p>	<p>is carried out jointly between the community and the NGO.</p> <p>Design and Planning: Community members contribute equally to making key decisions about the programme, throughout the project cycle, including program objectives and budget. They reflect on their current situations and make sure they feel free to contribute to discussions and decisions.</p> <p>Beneficiary Selection: The selection criteria and process is developed jointly between the affected population and the NGO. NGO staff makes sure they work with individuals and organisations that truly represent the interests of different social groups, including the most marginalised people, and women as well as men.</p> <p>Implementation: The program implementation is a joint effort between the community and the NGO.</p> <p>M&amp;E: The monitoring and evaluation is a joint effort</p>	<p>Community Profiling/Needs Assessment: The assessment is carried out by the affected population itself for their programs. NGO staff check that the work truly reflects the priorities of the poorest and most marginalised people (including women as well as men). Conflicts between different interest groups in the local community are recognised and tackled using mechanisms that local people respect. The work strengthens connections between groups.</p> <p>Design and Planning: The design and planning process is carried out by the community for their programs</p> <p>Beneficiary Selection: The community develop their own selection criteria and process for their programs</p> <p>Implementation: The community implements their programs</p> <p>M&amp;E: The community monitors and evaluates their</p>
--	---	---	--	--

	<p>affected population is informed about the implementation of our programs. The NGO is responsible for the majority of project implementation.</p> <p>M&amp;E: The affected population is solicited for information about our programs for M&amp;E purposes.</p>	<p>committees.</p> <p>M&amp;E: The community is asked to give feedback in our monitoring and evaluation of our programs.</p>	<p>between the community and the NGO.</p>	<p>programs</p>
<p><i>Feedback and Complaints Handling</i></p>	<p>No differentiation is made between feedback and complaints.</p> <p>Channel: Community feedback is provided verbally and/or informally. Informal opportunities are made during staff's day-to-day activities. There are no formal systems for encouraging feedback, or for recording and monitoring complaints.</p> <p>Response: Response to beneficiary feedback may or may not be addressed depending on the priorities of the personnel in place; it is not an institutional priority.</p>	<p>A differentiation is made between feedback and complaints.</p> <p>Channel: Staff make opportunities to hear feedback and complaints from project participants through formal systems for feedback and complaints – for example, complaints boxes, phone lines, feedback forms, meetings with managers, and written reports.</p> <p>Response: Complaints and feedback receive a formal response, but are not necessarily incorporated into the decision-making processes. Staff and managers spend time in local communities, and ask for</p>	<p>A differentiation is made between feedback and complaints.</p> <p>Channel: The NGO actively encourages people to give feedback and make complaints. Formal systems for both feedback and complaints are designed in collaboration with the community and are safe, easy and accessible for project participants to use (including women and men). They are in local language(s), and are promoted to local people. The community is educated on the organization staff Code of Conduct.</p> <p>Response: Feedback receives a formal response and is integrated into the joint</p>	<p>A differentiation is made between feedback and complaints.</p> <p>Channel: Feedback is actively solicited through channels designated by the community. The CMR is designed by the community, building on respected local ways of giving feedback. They encourage the most marginalized people to respond, and cover sensitive areas like sexual abuse and corruption. NGO staff is trained on how to manage sensitive complaints and there is an investigation policy and procedure in place.</p> <p>Response: All feedback, complaints and responses</p>

		<p>informal feedback from local people and partners (including women and men).</p>	<p>decision-making process. Complaints are recorded by the agency and there is evidence that action is taken in response. The NGO regularly monitors how satisfied people are with the work (for example, using feedback forms, focus groups or surveys). Staff carefully creates informal opportunities to hear from different people.</p>	<p>are recorded, and there is evidence that they are systematically acted on and acknowledged with those that submitted them. Feedback and complaints are incorporated into decision-making procedures, captured into lessons learned and validated by senior management to be incorporated into future project design. Staff and managers set targets for the time they spend in communities and monitor their performance. They may employ staff to liaise with different social groups. The NGO regularly monitors satisfaction levels.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

## Annex 4: What Information to Share with the Beneficiaries

- ü Information about the Red Cross; our Fundamental Principles; our commitment to beneficiary accountability; our staff code of conduct; the mode of implementation, especially when implementation involves other partners;
- ü Aim and purpose of the program, including main activities, duration and geographical coverage, budget and whether or not funding for the program has been secured;
- ü The development of an agreement/MOU with communities;
- ü Assessment and design process for the project and how the local communities will be involved in this process;
- ü Beneficiary selection processes and eligibility criteria, when appropriate, and how local communities will be involved in the validation of such selection processes;
- ü Monitoring and evaluation activities, and how local communities will be involved in these, especially those leading to programme changes;
- ü When appropriate key beneficiary choices to increase 'informed decisions';
- ü Discussion about appropriate complaints and response mechanism(s) with the community;
- ü Explanation of the complaints and response mechanism(s) once established;
- ü Names and roles of those working directly with the beneficiaries;
- ü Significant changes to the program(s);
- ü When appropriate, the exit strategy, especially if we are expecting local communities or local National Society to take over the program (including the expected programme duration, activities likely to be sustained beyond programme and any changing lines of responsibility);

## Annex 5: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference (ToR)  
Review of Beneficiary Communication and Accountability Programme (BCA) in Integrated  
Recovery Programme (IRP),  
MDRPK006 2010 Floods Operation

### 1. SUMMARY

**Purpose** – The review is being undertaken to measure the effectiveness and appropriateness of the BCA model implemented in identified IRP areas as a cross-cutting support for the implementation of different sectoral IRP activities under the 2010 Floods Operation by the Pakistan Red Crescent Society (PRCS)/ International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). The review is commissioned as an accountability tool towards the targeted flood affected communities assisted as well as to inform and guide future BCA approaches for PRCS and RCRC support in Pakistan.

**Scope** – The review will assess to what extent the BCA component support has achieved the expected objectives and the Implementation Framework for PRCS/ IFRC Flood Recovery Activities April 2011. All the geographic areas where recovery activities took place are included in the scope of this review. The review encompasses the design, implementation and exit phases of the BCA programme within the scope of the PRCS – IFRC Flood Recovery Activities.

**Audience** – PRCS, IFRC and PNS

**Commissioners** – International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)

**Reports** – PRCS/IFRC Focal Person and line-managers

**Duration** – 20 days

**Timeframe** – June 2013

**Location:** Sindh (Kamber Shahdad Kot, Shikarpur), KPK (Shangla, Kohistan), Punjab (Muzafarghar) Pakistan

### 2. BACKGROUND

In response to the worst floods to hit Pakistan in recent history, affecting 20 million persons of Pakistan's 170 million population, spreading to all seven provinces of the country - Baluchistan, Punjab, Kyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), the Federal Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJ&K), Gilgit Baltistan (GB) and Sindh. The floods damaged/ destroyed homes, roads and

bridges, crops and public infrastructure, with 1,985 deaths, 2,946 injured and 1.744,471 houses damaged (NDMA Nov 2010).

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), on behalf of the Pakistan Red Crescent Society (PRCS) launched the Monsoon Floods Appeal for CHF 130 million for 24 months in August 2010; to assist 130,000 families (910,000 persons) with relief and early recovery in 3 of the most affected provinces, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), Punjab and Sindh. An Integrated Recovery Programme (IRP) was approved in March 2011 to respond to the continued multi-sector needs, with the appeal and budget revised in August 2012 to CHF 92.6 million with an extended timeframe till the end of July 2013.

PRCS/IFRC integrated recovery program (IRP) was launched to provide continued recovery assistance to communities in six districts with a package of support comprised of shelter, health, water, sanitation and hygiene (Watsan), livelihoods, disaster preparedness and risk reduction, with a Beneficiary Communication and Accountability Programme (BCA). An integrated programming approach was adopted with the aim of promoting efficiency and enabling sharing of resources, volunteers and capacity, and adding value to the overall recovery response. The IRP aimed to support 130,000 (900,000 persons) flood affected families to recover from the continued adverse impacts from the 2010 flooding, responding to the needs of communities and seeking to support the strengthening of community resilience to face any future disasters.

Key components of the BCA model implemented under the IRP include: community awareness sessions; field visits; face to face interactions through local volunteers; live radio and pre-recorded Radio Programmes through National Broadcast channels; community notice boards; suggestion boxes, Information, Education and Communication (IEC) materials; post-cards; banners; and Comment Handling Cell (CHC) and feedback mechanism. These aim to provide a vehicle for effective two-way dialogue with the flood affected IRP Communities assisted through different communication tools, contributing to an environment of transparency and accountability of the flood recovery activities implemented.

### 3. OBJECTIVES AND CRITERIA

#### 3.1. Objectives

The review seeks to evaluate the BCA modalities implemented during the IRP, focusing on the following objectives:

- Evaluate the of the BCA Programme's internal processes in terms of:
  - e. human resources, capacity-building and management
  - f. relevance & appropriateness
  - g. coordination & integration
  - h. impact

- Assess the relevance and appropriateness of the BCA program design, including the communication tools and content delivered to the different targeted and assisted communities.
- Assess the effect of the BCA intervention to the overall goal of the IRP program.

#### Outputs

- Recommend approaches/models and an effective organizational structure for future PRCS BCA programming, and RCRC partner support.

#### 3.2. Criteria

Following the IFRC evaluation guide, the BCA program will be evaluated in terms of the following (where appropriate)

- Relevance & Appropriateness*
- Effectiveness & Impact*
- Efficiency*
- Sustainability & Connectedness*

#### 4. REVIEW METHODOLOGY

The review will use a mix of the following approaches:

- Review existing reports and documents (monthly reports, IRP Mid-Term Review, IRP endline assessment, etc)
- Data collection and analysis from BCA/PMER team based on logframe indicators (section 7 of Revised IRP logframe)
- Field visits and focus group discussion with Village Committee members, other Stakeholders and community members to analyze the performance and functioning of BCA under the IRP.
- Interviews with key PRCS and IFRC staff (national, provincial and district)

#### 5. DELIVERABLES

- Inception Note*: covering the plan of work for the evaluation with the proposed methodologies, data collection, interview guides, reporting plan, travel and logistic arrangements for the review, etc, based on the TOR.
- Preliminary Findings De-briefing*: to share the broad findings of the review with the PRCS and IFRC staff. The session will provide the opportunity to note feedback on the preliminary findings and recommendations to enrich the substance of the review and note their comments, capture clarifications and suggestions as appropriate.

*iii. Draft Report:* The results of the review will be presented in a draft report for the comments by PRCs and IFRC. The report should focus on delivering clear lessons and recommendations from the programme, supported by information and observations.

*iv. Final Report:* Should be no longer than 20 pages (excluding annexes), including an executive summary of no more than 3 pages. Additional materials are to be provided as annexure to the report. The report and analysis should be structured along the review categories above, presenting its findings, followed by lessons and recommendations for the future. A timeline of the programme should be drawn up to support the report.

## 6. SCHEDULE

The review is envisaged to take 20 working days:

- Ø 5 days of preparatory time including Inception Note and desk review of documents
- Ø 10 days data collection in Pakistan, and debrief of initial findings
- Ø 5 days to compile draft report, and to incorporate any valid comments before finalizing the report

## 7. REVIEW QUALITY AND ETHICAL STANDARDS

The reviewers should take all necessary steps to ensure that the evaluation is designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of people and the communities of which they are members, and to ensure that the review is technically accurate, reliable, and legitimate, conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organizational learning and accountability. Therefore, the review team should adhere to the evaluation standards and specific, applicable practices outlines in the IFRC Framework for Evaluation:

<http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Publications/monitoring/IFRC-Framework-for-Evaluation.pdf>

## 8. EVALUATION TEAM

The team will comprise of:

- 1) An experienced independent BCA technical specialist (team leader)
- 2) A designated member of the PRCs
- 3) An IFRC PMER designated member

The team members should have the following skills and experience:

- A good understanding of Beneficiary Communications and Accountability mechanisms.
- Familiar with carrying out reviews
- Experience with working at community level, gathering key informant information and beneficiary feedback through a variety of techniques, including gender and other special need and vulnerable groups expertise.

- Sensitivities to the complexities and constraints associated with IFRC / RCRC National Society mandates
- Good analytical and communication skills
- Experience in the use of qualitative and quantitative assessment methodologies
- Ability to prepare professional, unbiased and accurate reports
- Knowledge and experience of working in Pakistan, preferable

## Annex 6: Documents Reviewed<sup>11</sup>

### General Documents

- Logframe for Beneficiary Communications and Accountability
- Revised IPR Logframe, April 2012
- MDRPK006 Baseline Survey Report – Integrated Recovery Program, Pakistan Floods 2010
- Briefing Note – Beneficiary Communications and Accountability
- Final PRCS IFRC Recovery Implementation Plan 2011 - 2012
- Pakistan Recovery Framework 2010
- Midterm Review Pakistan March/April 2012
- Management Response to Midterm Review Pakistan March/April 2012
- Radio Show Documentation
- BCA Exist Strategy

### KPK

- BCA Plan of Action 3<sup>rd</sup> & 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter, 2012, 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter, 2013
- PRCS KPK Recovery Budget 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter
- Sectorial Programme/Unit History/Review Report, Floods 2010 – MDRPK006, IRP Program - KPK
- BCA Success Stories
- KPK IRP Monthly Reports
- BCA Monthly Feedback Tracking Sheets and Reports
- Concept Paper – KPK

### Punjab

- BCA Budget, Punjab
- Community Awareness Sessions Tracking Sheets
- Community Notice Boards and Suggestion Boxes Installation Plan
- Feedback Tracking Sheet
- IEC Material Distribution Plan
- Money Order Disbursement Mechanism
- Monthly Reports
- Trend Analysis
- IRP Lessons Learned, Punjab

### Sindh

- BCA Awareness-Raising Sessions Records

<sup>11</sup> Note that documents which were not operational in the IRP program such as the KPK CHC Complaints Handling Cell Concept Paper and the BCA – PRCS strategy were *not* reviewed as they were out of the purview of the mandate.

- Sectorial Programme/Unit History/Review Report, Floods 2010 – MDRPK006, IRP Program - Sindh
- BCA Feedback Mechanism and Steps, Field-Level, Sindh
- Feedback Tracking Sheet, Sindh
- Field Visit Plans and Monthly Workplans
- IRP POA and Budget, Sindh
- Post Card Distribution Plan
- Sectorial Integration Plan

## Annex 7: Respondent List

### Islamabad

Basharat Ullah Khan – Shelter Coordinator, IFRC  
 Sadia Jamil – Livelihoods, IFRC  
 Henk Schipper – Watsan Delegate, IFRC  
 Qaswar Abbas – DM Coordinator, IFRC  
 Muhammad Jamal – Health Coordinator, IFRC  
 Hina Sardar – Beneficiary Communications Officer, PRCS/IFRC  
 Nadia Butt – Beneficiary Communications Focal Point, PRCS/IFRC

### KPK

Ali Hassan – Provincial Secretary, PRCS  
 Muhammad Adil – Beneficiary Communications Officer, PRCS  
 Dr. Babar Jadoon – Provincial Health Officer, PRCS  
 Favad Wahed – PSP Program Manager, PRCS  
 Fahad Ali – CBHFA Program Manager, PRCS  
 Philip Hayes – Head of Field Office, IFRC

### Punjab

Asif Anwar – Beneficiary Communications Officer, PRCS  
 Abaid Ullah – Operational Manager, PRCS  
 Kamran Kashif – Field Office Manager, IFRC

### Sindh

Meijan ur-Rehman – Field Operations Delegate, IFRC,  
 Syed Shafqat Ali – Recovery Programs Manager, PRCS  
 Naimatullah – Livelihoods Officer, PRCS  
 Shafqat Ali – Beneficiary Communications Officer, PRCS  
 Kanwar Waseem – Provincial Secretary Sindh, PRCS