AVANT-PROPOS

En tant qu'auxiliaire des pouvoirs publics dans le domaine humanitaire, la Croix-Rouge de Belgique développe des activités de diffusion du DIH auprès de différents groupes cibles en Belgique et soutient la mise en œuvre du DIH par les autorités belges. Dans le cadre de leur Plan d'action DIH 2017-2021 actuel, les deux communautés de la Croix-Rouge de Belgique – la Croix-Rouge de Belgique - Communauté francophone (CRB-Cf) et la Rode Kruis-Vlaanderen (RKV) - consacrent une partie importante de leurs activités aux activités de plaidoyer auprès des décideur·euses politiques belges en faveur d'un meilleur respect du DIH : formations, sessions d'information, dialogue bilatéral et confidentiel, participation au Comité national belge de DIH (Commission interministérielle du droit humanitaire) et aux Conférences internationales de la Croix-Rouge et du Croissant-Rouge. Ces activités s'appuient sur les recommandations et les politiques élaborées par les réseaux et les plateformes créés au sein du Mouvement international de la Croix-Rouge et du Croissant-Rouge.

L'évaluation à mi-parcours du Plan d'action 2017-2021, financé par la Coopération belge au développement, se concentre sur ces activités de plaidoyer en faveur du DIH auprès des décideur·euses politiques belges, mises en oeuvre de janvier 2017 à juillet 2019. L'évaluation, menée par Organisation Development Support (ODS) entre septembre 2019 et mars 2020, s'est concentrée sur les critères d'impact (contribution à) et d'efficacité.

L'analyse montre que, par ses activités, la Croix-Rouge de Belgique maintient le DIH présent dans l'agenda des décideur·euses politiques belges, conformément à son rôle d'auxiliaire des pouvoirs publics en matière de DIH, et que les objectifs seront probablement atteints à la fin de la période de mise en œuvre. L'évaluation a permis d'identifier certains enseignements et de formuler une série de recommandations visant à consolider la méthodologie de la Société nationale en relation avec son travail de sensibilisation.

Pour des raisons de confidentialité, les annexes I, II et III ont été retirées du rapport.

La réponse managériale de la Croix-Rouge de Belgique est disponible à la fin du présent document.

ODS GREATER IMPACT

Mid-term Contribution to impact and Effectiveness Evaluation of the CRB-Cf and RKV Advocacy Action Plan 2017-2021

Final evaluation report

Prepared by ODS
Brussels, 16 March 2020

39, Rue Ducale | 1000 Brussels, Belgium
www.odsupport.eu | info@odsupport.eu |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction and approach

The present document constitutes the mid-term evaluation of the Action Plan 2017-2021 on IHL activities of The Belgian Red Cross-French speaking community (CRB-Cf) and Flemish-speaking community (RKV) towards policy makers, funded by the Belgian Government.[1]

The evaluation was conducted by Veronika Horvath, Kaat Boon and Emma Harte from Organisation Development Support (ODS). The review covered activities from January 2017 to July 2019. Where particularly relevant for the contribution to impact or effectiveness, outcomes and activities that took place between July 2019 and the time of writing of the review, were also mentioned.

The objectives of the evaluation were:

1. to assess the effectiveness and impact of the implementation of the advocacy activities with policymakers under the Action Plan with regards to its original objectives;
2. to identify lessons learnt and recommendations that can inform the forward planning and strategy development for both CRB-Cf and RKV.

[1] Throughout the document 'BRC' is used to indicate activities that cover both branches, and CRB-Cf or RKV to indicate the individual branches.

The evaluation was conducted through a combination of desk research, key informant interviews and roundtables (12 external interviewees including policymakers, National Red Cross societies and one Belgian NGO; 6 internal interviewees); two case studies on advocacy journeys and a validation workshop.

Context

The structure of the Red Cross in Belgium reflects the federal structure of the state. As such, there is one National Society with separate branches for each of the communities representing two of the language communities: French-speaking community - Croix-Rouge de Belgique Communauté francophone (CRB-Cf), Flemish-speaking community - Rode Kruis-Vlaanderen (RKV) and German-speaking community - Belgisches Rotes Kreuz - Deutschsprachige Gemeinschaft. CRB-Cf and RKV are part of the programme under review.

The two branches cooperate closely on most strategic issues. They cooperate on advocacy under a framework contract funded by the Belgian federal government's Directorate-General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid (DGD). In line with BRC strategy, advocacy is focused on 5 key themes [Nuclear weapons; Healthcare in danger; Gender-baased violence; Terrorism and IHL; Explosive weapons in populated areas].

Contribution to impact

All BRC advocacy activity is rooted in the principles of IHL and aims at promoting the knowledge and respect of these norms. As Belgium is subject to IHL (Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols), advocacy highlighting the respect of IHL is clearly in line with the obligations of Belgian policy makers.

The activities of BRC towards its policymaker audiences are in line with the mandate of the BRC and aligned with the profile of policymakers who are targeted by the advocacy activities. This is done through follow-up on international pledges and through advocacy that reflects on IHL priorities from the ICRC and the BRC.

The main impact that the evaluation found was keeping IHL present in the agenda of Belgian policymakers, and as part of this, supporting the processes related to follow-up of pledges made by the Belgian federal government at international conferences of the Red Cross. This contribution is reflected in IHL and BRC priority issues being mentioned in official communications and at international Red Cross conferences, as tracked in the BRC monitoring system; and was reinforced through the interviews conducted for the evaluation. It is also reflected in the participation and follow-up of Belgium to pledges. The primary venue for this work is through chairing and coordinating the working group of the International Conferences of the CIDH/ICHR.

Impact is enabled by the high level of expertise of the teams responsible for implementation. The advocacy is also strengthened by the special auxiliary status of the Red Cross vis-á-vis the government; and as a consequence of this status, the collaborative and confidential approach that the BRC takes to interactions with the governments (as opposed to a more oppositional "traditional" advocacy approach)..

Barriers to impact are represented by a challenging external context for IHL in general. In addition, the engagement of the BRC focuses on a limited number of decision makers (mainly through the National IHL Committee CIDH/ICHR), as well as challenges related to tracing impact in advocacy.

Effectiveness

Progress against the indicators in the log-frame is promising. The BRC has shared positions with decision makers according to the planning, with a slight over-delivery.[2] The evaluation found it highly likely that the BRC will meet all its commitments and targets by the end of the implementation period. Table 2 below illustrates the significant progress that BRC has made towards its advocacy objectives.

The review found the frequency of engagement and the mix of tools used by the BRC to be overall well adapted to meet the objectives of the programme. The advocacy team feels that the CIDH/ICHR is a well-chosen primary interlocutor as it unites representatives from ministerial departments, who are also entry points for potential contacts in the Ministries' cabinets. At the same time, the team also felt that sometimes the CIDH/ICHR also acts as a gatekeeper, meaning that there is little

[2] For the counting of positions shared, each message can be counted as one instance of sharing, even if it is the same document. Numbers provided in this section cover activities until the end of Y3 (2019). Given the data collection practices of the BRC, no data was available on the partial progress by July 2019 [the evaluation period].

support for the BRC building own contacts without going through the CIDH/ICHR first.

The advocacy programme has made steps towards incorporating gender and environment in the strategy, and a more complete reflection of these elements can be expected by the end of the implementation period.

Table i. Progress towards indicator targets

Indicator	Value at end of 2019 [July 2019 where available] [Target value by 2019/ by end of project]	% of target
RKV Indicator 2.1 Professionals and Belgian policy makers report that their knowledge of IHL has increased due to RKV training	96% [85%/85%]	113%
RKV Indicator 2.2 The Belgian government implements and makes commitments during the 32nd International Conference of the Red Cross and the Red Crescent (IC) prepares the 33rd IC.	85% [75%/100%]	113%
Shared Indicator 2.2.2 - Number of times RKV actively shared a position on IHL with Belgian policy makers.	39 [32/58]	122%
Shared Indicator 2.3 Number of times the Belgian government positions itself on IHL with regard to humanitarian issues	19 [20/50][3]	95%
CRB-Cf Indicator 3.1 The number of times that the BRC has actively shared a position on international humanitarian law that takes into account gender and/or the environment among Belgian decision-makers	36 [30/50]	120%
CRB-Cf Indicator 3.2 Number of Belgian policy makers supported who claim to have durably strengthened their knowledge of international humanitarian law and the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement through support and the expertise of the BRC.	72 [34/56]	211%

[3] value to the end of 2018

Enablers of effectiveness included the close collaboration among the two communities, as well as the coherent Theory of Change of the programme. Barriers to effectiveness were due to a high number of competing priorities, challenges in securing follow-up from policymaker audiences, engaging a broad range of actors in addition to the CIDH/ICHR, and strategically involving CEO-level leadership in advocacy. The evaluation found that the BRC's alignment with the Belgian policy agenda could be strengthened.

Sustainability

In terms of sustainability of BRC's message, IHL is likely to stay relevant in the coming years. The validity of IHL advocacy is not questioned within the National Society. The same is true for institutional stakeholders, who will likely continue to be subjects to IHL and therefore have an obligation to

engage with the topic. Appetite for this engagement may change with political changes however, which might necessitate the development of scenario-based strategies for the IHL advocacy. The programme does not at present include exit planning for advocacy topics or stakeholders. In terms of financial sustainability, the programme is currently dependent on DGD funding and does not have alternative funding sources beyond the own institutional funds of the BRC.

Table ii Recommendations

Contribution to impact
1. In formulating advocacy positions, build on the experience with pledges and other specific messaging. This would allow BRC to map out where the BRC position is aligned with the Belgian government's position, whether there are any key allies and how much can be achieved in a certain direction. 2. Cover main expected results and a timeline for following up on the pledges. 3. Capture "impact stories" of BRC's advocacy work. 4. Exchange experiences with advocacy with other National Societies. 5. Internal reflection on contribution to impact scheduled into standing meetings (beyond progress on indicators). These should draw on an agreed-upon definition of impact. 6. CRB-Cf should consider making IHL advocacy a priority in its next multi annual strategy.
Effectiveness
1. Developing an advocacy strategy that could be shared internally; including an advocacy calendar and stakeholder mapping/strategy. 2. Create space for reflection on BRC practice, successes/challenges and decision making based on insights on outcomes. 3. Update meetings on individual dossiers 4. Operationalise the gender strategy for the specific advocacy goals and types of intervention led by BRC. A good starting point for this process would be the development of short gender-related advocacy points for each of the 5 priorities. 5. Update the terms of the collaboration in a way that one of the two branches can be delegated to represent the joint advocacy work of the two towards policymakers. 6. At the level of each branch, strengthening internal knowledge and capacity around IHL and advocacy could offer additional resources and support for the work. 7. Covering federal and regional parliaments as well as identifying and building a network of champions in the ministries and key other services (e.g. military)
Monitoring and evaluation
8. An update to the impact measurement system would ideally include some of the following elements: a. a reflection on intermediate outcomes that can lead to policy impact; b. analysis of the content of the items that are captured;

c. BRC's teams should capture their understanding of the BRC contribution close to the time of the outcome;
d. Finally, attention to actual policy change and change in the way current rules are implemented.

9. Review the current impact tracking process. Consider including tipping point, intermediary and framing type- activities and workflows into the practice. The collection of data should be accompanied by opportunities for reflecting on the insights that the data offer, in a structured debrief around key outcomes.
10. In future programming, we strongly encourage CRB-Cf and RKV to align the structure of outcomes, Theories of Change and indicators.
11. The BRC should develop a Theory of Change for its work with the CIDH/ICHR.
12. Indicators should be useful, used and relevant to the decisions taken by the teams. We suggest that for each indicator, the BRC lays out where these indicators would be used for steering the advocacy project.
13. We suggest that the BRC teams reflect on the reality of their work, priorities, successes and engagement. Insights from this reflection should inform the definition of impact and overarching objectives which are aligned with this reality.

Sustainability

14. The teams would benefit from a structured approach to the longer-term view of the advocacy programme, as it is likely to remain an important component of the BRC's work.

15. Sustainability planning would take place at all levels of the program:

a. Planning: Implement a yearly evaluation meeting.
b. Scenario-based forward planning could be useful in framing advocacy priorities, even as insecurity persists, e.g. around elections.
c. We recommend BRC to develop an exit plan for advocacy.
d. Organisational: Increase the strategic relevance of the work for the whole organisation.
e. Gradually widen the circle of team-members involved.
f. The collaboration between the two communities is a key aspect of the advocacy programme which should be safeguarded through formal and informal approaches. e.g. through high-level meetings, or a common advocacy advisory Board/shared figurehead.

1. INTRODUCTION

The present document constitutes the mid-term evaluation of the Action Plan 2017-2021 on IHL activities of The Belgian Red Cross-French speaking community (CRB-Cf) and Flemish-speaking community (RKV) towards policy makers, funded by the Belgian Government.[4] The evaluation was conducted by Veronika Horvath, Kaat Boon and Emma Harte from Organisation Development Support (ODS). The review covered activities from January 2017 to July 2019. Where particularly relevant for the contribution to impact or effectiveness, outcomes and activities that took place between July 2019 and the time of writing of the review, were also mentioned. During this evaluation, we experienced an openness and constructive cooperation of BRC staff and external partners, which helped to collect the necessary information. The data collection and analysis took place between October 2019 and February 2020. Below we summarise the evaluation questions and our approach as well as the limitations of this evaluation.

Approach

The evaluation relied upon the following tools:

- Desk research which allowed the team to situate the advocacy work within the framework of the Action Plan, as well as gather evidence on the advocacy planning and outcomes in the review period.
- 1 internal workshop with the implementing teams, allowed reflection on the outcomes of the desk review and collection of information from the implementing teams.
- 8 in depth interviews with external key informants (1 policymaker; 1 Belgian NGO; 6 ICRC or national Red Cross societies). The list and profile of interviewees was agreed with BRC at the inception meeting, with BRC coordinating the first contact for participation.
- Consultation and interviews with 6 BRC staff (5 implementing team and 1 RKV leadership), giving in-depth insights on the ways of working of the programme, as well as outcomes and effectiveness. as well as our own experience and expertise in working with NGOs in human rights and advocacy.
- A roundtable conversation with 4 members of the CIDH/ICHR, where the evaluators could gather insight into the BRC's advocacy work through the Committee; The number and topics for the case studies were decided together with the BRC at the inception meeting.

[4] Throughout the document 'BRC' is used to indicate activities that cover both branches, and CRB-Cf or RKV to indicate the individual branches.

- Information from these sources was triangulated and analysed following the research questions formulated in the TOR (horizontal analysis).
- The evaluation also includes two case studies mapping out activities and outcomes of the BRC's advocacy on two specific dossiers: Nuclear weapons and Healthcare in danger. These serve the purpose of illustrating in more specificicity the range of activities, enablers and challenges of BRC advocacy.
- Finally, the draft evaluation report was discussed in a validation meeting, where findings and conclusions were covered, and additional data provided. Comments and insights from the BRC and from the validation meeting were addressed in the final report of the evaluation.

About the project

The table below provides an introduction to the activities of the project under evaluation.

Background	The structure of the Red Cross in Belgium reflects the federal structure of the state. As such, there is one National Society with separate branches for each of the communities representing two of the language communities: French-speaking community - Croix-Rouge de Belgique Communauté francophone (CRB-Cf), Flemish-speaking community - Rode Kruis-Vlaanderen (RKV) and German-speaking community - Belgisches Rotes Kreuz - Deutschsprachige Gemeinschaft. CRB-Cf and RKV are part of the programme under review. Both the CRB-Cf and RKV comprise several divisions based on thematic areas (which include international services), as well as support services and provincial branches. The CRB-Cf's international department acquired its NGO status in 1997, while the RKV's international cooperation division received the same status in 2005. The CRB-Cf sub-division on International Humanitarian Law (IHL) is responsible for advocacy around IHL in the French-speaking community, with the correspondent RKV unit doing the same for the Flemish-speaking community. Responsibility for the bilingual Brussels area is shared between CRB-Cf and RKV. The two branches cooperate closely on most strategic issues. They cooperate on advocacy under a framework contract funded by the Belgian federal government's Directorate-General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid (DGD). The framework contract is covered by a total funding of EUR 1,159,556 (CRB-Cf) and EUR 1,072,625 (RKV) for the period 2017-2021. The framework contract is organised around 2 overarching objectives: (CRB-Cf) 1) Strengthening the capabilities of teachers around global citizenship and 2) Strengthening the IHL capabilities of employees and volunteers in the long term,

	intermediate actors and political decision makers. The framework of the RKV breaks down the equivalent of objective 2 into two separate objectives: 1) The volunteers of RKV-International Cooperation are fully committed to make those that are vulnerable more resilient. 2) Professionals and Belgian policy makers are reinforced in their knowledge of international humanitarian law and convey the respect for IHL towards the public. The evaluation focuses on the advocacy carried out under this Action Plan. The budget of the full IHL activity is respectively EUR 832.854 (CRB-CF) and EUR 715.168 (RKV), with the advocacy component making up a relatively small proportion of this budget - only a few thousand € of running costs, with the salaries of the staff covered by the DG of the Red Cross.
Evaluation objectives	The evaluation focuses on the advocacy carried out under this Action Plan. The objectives of the evaluation are: 1. to assess the effectiveness and impact of the implementation of the advocacy activities with policymakers under the Action Plan with regards to its original objectives; 2. to identify lessons learnt and recommendations that can inform the forward planning and strategy development for both CRB-Cf and RKV.
Target Group(s) of Grant	Decision makers in Belgium: Politicians and political parties; ministers; members of Parliaments and their staff in Belgium, at different levels of government. (Flanders, Wallonia); Government and other public-facing institutions.[5]
Intended Outcomes (relevant for the evaluation)	**General (from project planning)** 1. Professionals and Belgian decision makers are strengthened in their knowledge of IHL and apply this. (RKV) 2. The target actors are able to act in the interest of victims of armed conflicts thanks to a better application (knowledge, respect, promotion and implementation) of IHL also reflecting the gender dimension. (CRB-Cf) The list of indicators for these outcomes are listed in the evaluation framework, annexed to the present report, and in Table 2 in the Effectiveness section.

[5] Surce: RKV framework, ToC p. 11., CRB-Cf framework p.40.

Research questions

Below, we list the evaluation questions which guided the review. The full evaluation framework can be found in the annex to the report.

Contribution to impact

1. Do our activities have an impact on policymakers' decision-making?
2. How can we measure the impact of our activities on policymakers' decision-making?
3. Do our activities towards policymakers promote the adoption of legislation and/or policies consistent with their obligations?

Effectiveness

4. Is our expertise effectively shared with policymakers?
5. Do we communicate enough about our specificity as the Red Cross compared to other organizations of the civil society (principles, mandate)?
6. Are our expectations, objectives and added value clear enough for policymakers?
7. Are policy makers strengthened in their knowledge of IHL following our interventions?
8. Do we use the right tools to support and influence policy makers? Are the tools and messages transmitted useful and exploitable by the authorities?
9. Does the frequency of dialogue allow structural monitoring of the dossiers? If not, how to ensure a more structural follow-up?
10. Should we take more and/or better account of the Belgian political calendar and the RCRC Movement? If yes, how ?
11. How does the planning and implementation of advocacy respond to the emergent changes in the political context?
12. Are we working with interlocutors at the right levels (administration, parliament, cabinet) and contacts within the institution ? With which additional levels should we work?
13. Are our monitoring tools adequate?
14. How does the BRC's work reflect the gender dimensions?
15. How does the BRC's work reflect the environmental dimensions?
16. How does the BRC work with other actors?

Sustainability / long-term

17. How is the long-term sustainability as a result of the advocacy planned and managed?
18. Are there already some activities which have not had the desired results? What can be learned from this?

Limitations

Our team sought to have a balanced and diverse set of information sources for this review. However, some limiting factors remained. Most importantly, the only members of the target audience that could be reached for the evaluation were those from the Belgian National IHL Committee (CIDH/ICHR). This meant that no policymakers beyond the CIDH/ICHR who would be the prospective audience of the BRC's advocacy were reached for comment, despite repeated invitations from both the BRC and the evaluation team. This resulted in a total of 18 interviewees reached as opposed to the 30 planned at the inception phase (see breakdown below) This number still allowed some insights into the work of the BRC. However, the difficulties in securing availability from policymakers will have to be taken into account for the end-term evaluation of the advocacy under the Action Plan. Secondly, limited quantitative and qualitative data was available for the review. The evaluators received the logical framework from the BRC with indicators updated to July 2019. However, only a limited amount of information is captured in writing by the teams in terms of reflections on strategic planning and learning. In the absence of reflection documents, the evaluation relied on in-depth interviews with the implementation team to reconstruct the strategic thinking behind the programme. As interviewees were selected together with BRC staff, and as participation to interviews was optional for interviewees, we have to be aware of a significant risk of confirmation bias (i.e. that interviewees who have better overall relationships with the BRC are more likely to participate in the review).

Finally, the timeframe of advocacy actions is often much longer than the two and a half years covered by this evaluation. As such, the mid-term evaluation has yielded insights on intermediate results. This is especially the case in policymaker advocacy in a challenging political environment (at the time of writing of the evaluation report, more than 400 days have passed without a federal government in the country, which has a bearing on the scope of political advocacy. As strengthening the IHL advocacy focus is a relatively new initiative for the BRC, we can expect that more insight into the outcomes and longer term impact of this work will emerge by the end-term evaluation.

REVIEW OF THE INTERVENTION

This section of the report reviews the Action according to the criteria outlined in the Review Matrix.

1 Contribution to impact

Do our activities have an impact on policymakers' decision-making?

The main impact that the evaluation found was keeping IHL present in the agenda of Belgian policymakers, and as part of this, supporting the processes related to follow-up of pledges made by the Belgian federal government at international conferences of the Red Cross. This contribution is reflected in IHL and BRC priority issues being mentioned in official communications and at international Red Cross conferences, as tracked in the BRC monitoring system; and was reinforced through the interviews conducted for the evaluation. It is also reflected in the participation and follow-up of Belgium to pledges. The primary venue for this work is through chairing and coordinating the working group of the International Conferences of the CIDH/ICHR.

Working with the CIDH/ICHR is a very important part of the advocacy of the BRC, and one of the few instances where BRC and policymakers have face-to-face conversations. It is a venue where staff and policy maker interviews confirm that long-term relationships are built up and a key engagement space for BRC.

CIDH/ICHR members highlighted the high quality of contributions and the high level of involvement of the BRC. In terms of enabling the functioning of the CIDH/ICHR, the BRC is a key contributor.

Red Cross societies in other countries who occupy a similar role with their national IHL committees have recognised the crucial role in convening and facilitating the work of the Committee and described the BRC's approach to close involvement as a good practice for the movement.

The importance of the BRC's engagement with the CIDH/ICHR is based on the assumption that discussions and decisions taken within the CIDH/ICHR have the possibility to influence policy decisions. At the same time, it is unclear to what extent and through which specific channels the BRC's coordination and information provision work contributes to decisions taken in the institutions that have representatives in the CIDH/ICHR through this channel. CIDH/ICHR members are often already aware of IHL and human rights law, given the focus of the Committee. In this context, the contribution of the BRC's work can be assumed in moving discussions on the follow-up of international conferences forward and bringing relevant actors to the table to support the government's adherence to pledges made at the international conferences. In the case of following up on

pledges related to nuclear weapons and healthcare in danger (see Case studies), the CIDH/ICHR engagement was a key element of the engagement both times, and contributed to keeping the issue on the agenda.

Table 1 Priority themes of BRC advocacy

Nr	Theme
1	Nuclear weapons
2	Healthcare in danger
3	Gender-based violence
4	Terrorism and IHL
5	Explosive weapons in populated areas

Engagement with the CIDH/ICHR is such a key part of BRC's advocacy, and is regarded as a success by both BRC and the CIDH/ICHR members who contributed to the evaluation. However, the impact of this engagement has not yet been traced.

Given that the evaluation covers a relatively short timeframe and the Belgian political context, it is expected that most policy-level impact will become visible by the end of the review period, and once a fully functioning federal government is operational.

Finally, the definition of impact as part of this action plan needs further clarity. There seems to be a mismatch between the outcomes sought (defined in terms of decision making), the ways in which these are monitored (through public statements) and the main venue for engagement (CIDH/ICHR, with desk-staff, who are rarely in high-level decision making positions).

Do our activities towards policymakers promote the adoption of legislation and/or policies consistent with their obligations?

All BRC advocacy activity is rooted in the principles of IHL and aims at promoting the knowledge and respect of these norms. As Belgium is subject to IHL (Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols), advocacy highlighting the respect of IHL is clearly in line with the obligations of Belgian policy makers.

The activities of BRC towards its policymaker audiences are in line with the mandate of the BRC and aligned with the profile of policymakers who are targeted by the advocacy activities. This is done through follow-up on international pledges and through advocacy that reflects on IHL priorities from the ICRC and the BRC.

One interviewee highlighted the key role of the BRC in reviewing the Humanitarian Strategy of Belgium and ensuring that it meets IHL principles. This is ensured through twice-yearly meetings between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Development and BRC.

International conferences of the Red Cross and Red Crescent are an important moment that catalyses BRC's advocacy planning and interaction with the government every 4 years. These are also occasions where the government adopts pledges to conduct actions that promote the respect of IHL. These pledges, drafted in dialogue with the BRC, reflect priorities of the BRC as well as the extent to which Belgian government commitments

can be steered towards a closer focus on IHL. The European Union also publishes pledges, which involve Belgium as a Member State.

At both the 32nd (2015) and 33rd (2019) conference,several pledges were taken up by the Belgian government. At the 32nd conference 26 commitments were made through pledges submitted or co-submitted by Belgium.[6] These pledges were taken before the current review period, but their implementation partly took place during the period 2017-2019. At the 33rd conference, 8 EU pledges and 5 specific pledges were submitted by Belgium at the time of writing of the present evaluation.[7] Two of these pledges from the 32nd edition (nuclear weapons and healthcare in danger), are covered in the case studies annexed to the present evaluation report.

As part of the follow up on pledges, all of have published a report on the activities of the Belgian Red Cross towards the realisation of the pledge. All pledges have seen at least some relevant actions and follow-up by the BRC and the government.

The format of the reports however does not facilitate the assessment of these actions and the role of the BRC in the policy results. The reports list actions by the BRC and policy initiatives by the government. At the same time, they lack reflection and stocktaking of the result of the work in terms of envisioned versus obtained policy outcomes, an analysis of successful initiatives or best practices, or indication of the way forward. From the 33rd Conference onwards, the pledge format allows for planning in terms of milestones and measurement, which will, if implemented correctly, increase the insights that can be gained from the reporting on pledges.

The Red Cross mandate is a special added value where advocacy/advisory roles and implementation roles flow together. This is visible in the case of the Humanitarian Strategy of Belgium, where the BRC consults twice-yearly on the adjustment of the strategy and is also the main implementation partner. In this case IHL expertise and the capacity to conduct principled

[6] 26 pledges submitted or co-submitted at the 32nd conference according to the database of the ICRC. Submitted on the 9/12/2015 by the EU and its Member States: Health Care in Danger: Respecting and Protecting Health Care;Promotion and dissemination of international humanitarian law; Strengthening international humanitarian law protecting persons deprived of their liberty; International Criminal Court; Fundamental Principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement; Strengthening compliance with international humanitarian law;Sexual and gender-based violence during times of armed conflict or in the aftermath of disasters and other emergencies; . 19 pledges submitted by Belgium or the BRC : Sauver des vies par le renforcement des formations aux premiers secours; Strengthening compliance with International Humanitarian Law; Rôle de la Société nationale en tant qu'auxiliaire des pouvoirs publics; Ratification du troisième amendement au Statut de Rome; Espace humanitaire;Mise en œuvre de la Convention de La Haye de 1954 relative à la protection des biens culturels en cas de conflit armé et de ses Protocoles; Partenariat entre la Coopération au développement et le CICR; Préparation aux catastrophes à l'étranger;Dialogue on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons; Aide humanitaire internationale;Tracing/RFL; Formation des magistrats en droit international humanitaire;Renforcement des cadres juridiques applicables aux interventions en cas de catastrophes, à la réduction des risques et aux premiers secours;Aide humanitaire internationale – Evidence Based Practice;Soins de santé en danger – Renforcer le cadre normatif national;Soins de santé en danger – Formation des personnels de santé;Training of officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Development Cooperation; Sensibilisation des acteurs humanitaires au droit international humanitaire. source: Pledges and reports search engine https://rcrcconference.org/about/pledges/search/.

[7] Pledges submitted or co-submitted by Belgium at the 33rd conference according to the database of the ICRC . Pledges submitted by Belgium on the 10/12/2019: Formation des magistrats en DIH; Ratification des quatrième, cinquième et sixième amendements au Statut de Rome; Renforcement du respect du droit international humanitaire – Mise en œuvre de la Convention de La Haye de 1954 relative à la protection des biens culturels en cas de conflit armé et de ses Protocoles; Development of a revised operational law manual for the Belgian armed forces; Co-submitted by Belgium and other countries on 19/11/2019: Support for the International Humanitarian Fact Finding Commission (IHFFC). Source: ICRC 33rd edition conference website at http://ir.icrc.org/en/2019/12/33rd-international-conference-of-the-red-cross-and-red-crescent/

humanitarian action strengthens each other. This is a particular type of impact which illustrates the auxiliary role of the BRC.

Enablers of impact

Interviews with the team highlighted that IHL advocacy has been more successful in cases where the Belgian government does not have diplomatic and policy priorities that go firmly against the BRC's advocacy position.

BRC's advocacy draws strength from the special mandate, international visibility and long-term relationship between the ICRC, BRC and governments. The special status of the BRC and the RCRC in general as the guardian of IHL is rarely disputed.

BRC, similarly to other National Red Cross Red Crescent societies around the world, works with governments following principles of collaboration, and behind-the-scenes work. Different from traditional advocacy, which is often defined in more oppositional terms, this approach has been useful in maintaining long-term dialogue with advocacy targets, based on trust and confidence. At the same time, the role of BRC and all Red Cross societies is different from that of NGOs. According to its mandate provided by the Statutes of the Movement and its own Statutes, the BRC is acting as auxiliary to the Belgian authorities in the humanitarian field, based on which it disseminates and assists their authorities in disseminating IHL and takes initiatives in this respect, and cooperate with the authorities to ensure respect for IHL and to protect the distinctive emblems recognized by the Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols. This auxiliary role entails a specific relationship with the authorities. The bilateral and confidential dialogue is the privileged approach of the BRC regarding this specific relationship and according to the Principle of Neutrality. As the holder of a special mandate, the organisation's strategy does not include criticising government action or talking to the media about specific developments in Belgium.

BRC's IHL teams have a highly skilled, if small, workforce and little turnover in recent years. This has allowed BRC to construct a long-term relationship of trust with some stakeholders (especially the CIDH/ICHR).

The expertise and professionalism of the team members was highlighted in several of the interviews conducted for this study. This enables them to manage several stakeholder relations at the same time, as well as being an equal conversation partner for the CIDH/ICHR.

The BRC has a broad network within the CIDH/ICHR and many policymakers have a personal connection to the organisation. These relationships can be an important vehicle for goodwill, although difficult to quantify and trace.

Several civil society organisations (CSOs) advocate on issues that are pertinent to the BRC's priorities. The interest of policymakers in making specific decisions and the extent to which IHL-related issues are pertinent on the political agenda, is also influenced by the advocacy of these other CSOs. Therefore, BRC advocacy benefits from the campaigning of other CSOs where the goals are complementary. This is a benefit, even as, due to the special mandate of the BRC, the collaboration usually takes the shape

of an exchange of expertise and not that of structured concertation [see Effectiveness section].

Advocacy is an institutional priority for the BRC). IHL advocacy is also stated as an area of focus in the multi-annual Strategy of the RKV. This means that the teams working on advocacy have internal support and visibility for their work.

Barriers to impact

Where advocacy takes place through written outputs (e.g. official letters to decision makers), the team reported that there is often little scope for securing an official response and for making requests or information provision into a deeper conversation.

BRC's advocacy also builds on training to young diplomats. This type of engagement has a very long-term theory of change between the action and the purported effect- i.e. that these individuals will work on the ground in crisis areas where they will be able to recall and apply IHL in crisis situations. This theory of change has however not been explicitly spelled out as part of the strategy, and there are no long-term follow-up structures that would allow the BRC to probe the validity of this expectation. The long timeline makes tracking and attribution close to impossible. The strategy behind the training seems valuable in mapping the chain of actors that are in decision making positions in situations where the respect of IHL has to be ensured. If this is the case, there could be a separate strategic approach to interacting with other actors and over a longer timeframe to build this thread of intervention into a whole approach (e.g. engagement with the trained diplomats over time, follow-up with embassies).

Given the limited resources of the team, most of the engagement takes place within the relationship with the CIDH/ICHR. This means that advocacy is only as influential as CIDH/ICHR members are in bringing IHL back to their respective departments. The BRC currently does not work with Parliaments extensively (as it was reported about the Dutch society) nor does it have a strategy to identify and build a relationship with key stakeholders in decision making positions (as the french society does, for instance).

The BRC's engagement strategy with the media, and how this could support advocacy, has not yet been articulated. CRB-Cf does not have a media strategy, and RKV sees media strategy as a tool for general visibility, not specifically as an advocacy tool. More reflection on what questions were raised by the media could be useful in understanding what works in the BRC's approach and where it could be strengthened.

BRC's advocacy work is taking place in a challenging international and national context. Interviewees have identified a worrying global trend towards states questioning the validity of IHL principles, together with a broader trend towards restriction of civil space and human rights. This restricts the space for IHL advocacy.

Recommendations - contribution to impact

7. In formulating advocacy positions, build on the experience with pledges and other specific messaging. This would

allow BRC to map out where the BRC position is aligned with the Belgian government's position, whether there are any key allies and how much can be achieved in a certain direction.

8. Work around pledges is a keystone feature of BRC's advocacy, which makes BRC's impact on decision making visible. However, the pledges do not currently use milestones or means of verification. This was the case for the pledges made at the 32nd International COnference and their reports. It is still missing in the pledge documents of the 33rd International Conference despite the possibility offered by the standard pledge format, which now expressly includes headings for milestones and monitoring. We recommend that BRC includes main results and a means and timeline for following up on the pledges; possibly with a range of outcomes (e.g. also specifying what would be the minimum response the BRC would hope to see in the 4 years; what would be a satisfactory follow-up and what would be an outstanding outcome). For EU pledges, the BRC could play a leading role in following up on the implementation of those that are most relevant for the BRC's 5 priorities, while for the Belgian pledges, a systematic way of capturing the evolution of results could be applied to all pledges. This work could build on the already existing structures of the CIDH/ICHR, and add a reflective element to the discussions. These frameworks would then help the BRC tell the story of its influencing work to internal and external audiences.
9. We recommend capturing examples of "impact stories" where the message was taken up, and capturing the work that contributed to these outcomes. This would be usefully done as close to the outcome as possible. These could take the shape of a few bullet points and drafted at or around the twice-yearly reflection meetings. The two IHL teams could share this with each other and the senior leadership of their respective organisations, as well as other National Societies. These could also help in illustrating advocacy outcomes for the final evaluation.
10. In cases where EU/international conferences (such as the Legal Support Group's events) are organised these could offer a useful venue for discussions around the impact of Red Cross societies in influencing, and the means to understand and capture progress towards the realisation of pledges.
11. Impact is currently rarely discussed in the cooperation meetings between the BRC teams. We recommend that at each scheduled meeting, or informal catch-up on a monthly or quarterly basis, successes and missed chances for contribution to impact, are reflected upon, and these insights inform the planning of upcoming action. These should draw on an agreed-upon definition of impact.
12. CRB-Cf should consider making IHL advocacy a priority in its next multi annual strategy, to highlight its importance.

2 Effectiveness

This section reviews the ways in which the BRC's advocacy activities are delivered.

Is our expertise effectively shared with policymakers?

Progress against the indicators in the log-frame is promising. The BRC has shared positions with decision makers according to the planning, with a slight over-delivery.[8] The evaluation found it highly likely that the BRC will meet all its commitments and targets by the end of the implementation period. Table 2 below illustrates the significant progress that BRC has made towards its advocacy objectives.

Positions are shared with policymakers through collaboration in the CIDH/ICHR, and through meetings, as well as official letters and mailings. The BRC has however limited insight into how/whether these positions are received at the appropriate level of decision making.

The planning foresees 10 instances of shared positioning per year, with no increase or decrease for any of the programme years. The number is the same as the baseline in 2015. This constant target could reflect that the planning does not foresee years of peak activity (e.g. elections or years where International conferences of Red Cross societies are held), and that there are no ambitions to increase the targeted messaging in the peak times. While the logic framework does not offer a reason for keeping the ambitions of position-sharing constant, the implementing team has indicated that this decision is motivated by a focus on ensuring a high quality of positions instead of pushing for higher numbers.

Work around the pledges in the four-yearly Red Cross conferences is an effective way of sharing specific expertise with policymakers. However, this sharing stays at the level of the CIDH/ICHR in most cases, where pledges are drafted through working groups. Implementation of the pledges then is supposed to include a wider variety of stakeholders. Given limited resources, focusing on the CIDH/ICHR is an effective way of reaching relevant stakeholders. However, issues of high priority, or where the engagement level of the CIDH/ICHR participants is lower, may necessitate a more intense mapping and engagement with interlocutors beyond the Committee.

[8] For the counting of positions shared, each message can be counted as one instance of sharing, even if it is the same document. Numbers provided in this section cover activities until the end of Y3 (2019). Given the data collection practices of the BRC, no data was available on the partial progress by July 2019 [the evaluation period].

Table 2. Progress towards indicator targets

Indicator	Value at end of 2019 [July 2019 where available] [Target value by 2019/ by end of project]	% of target
RKV Indicator 2.1 Professionals and Belgian policy makers report that their knowledge of IHL has increased due to RKV training	96% [85%/85%]	113%
RKV Indicator 2.2 The Belgian government implements and makes commitments during the 32nd International Conference of the Red Cross and the Red Crescent (IC) prepares the 33rd IC.	85% [75%/100%]	113%
Shared Indicator 2.2.2 - Number of times RKV actively shared a position on IHL with Belgian policy makers.	39 [32/58]	122%
Shared Indicator 2.3 Number of times the Belgian government positions itself on IHL with regard to humanitarian issues	19 [20/50][9]	95%
CRB-Cf Indicator 3.1 The number of times that the BRC has actively shared a position on international humanitarian law that takes into account gender and/or the environment among Belgian decision-makers	36 [30/50]	120%
CRB-Cf Indicator 3.2 Number of Belgian policy makers supported who claim to have durably strengthened their knowledge of international humanitarian law and the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement through support and the expertise of the BRC.	72 [34/56]	211%

[9] value to the end of 2018

Do we communicate enough about our specificity as the Red Cross compared to other organizations of the civil society (principles, mandate)?

CIDH/ICHR members interviewed for this review were keenly aware of the specificities of the BRC and its role in Belgium. However, no policymakers from other bodies were reached by the study, which does not make it possible to answer this question for those policymakers who are not engaging with IHL and the BRC on a daily basis in their own work.

Communicating about the specificity of the Red Cross is central to the thinking of the team. An in-depth review of the outputs of the BRC was beyond the scope of this evaluation, but based on interviews, the team has a high level of awareness of the specificities of the BRC mandate and refers to the mandate and specificities extensively when planning the form or

content of advocacy actions. Therefore, the team communicates sufficiently about the BRC's specificity.

Are our expectations, objectives and added value clear enough for policymakers?

Based on our interviews with policymakers and reflection with the team,policymakers in the priority audience of the BRC are sufficiently aware of the objectives and added value of the BRC.

The team reported different levels of awareness and openness to the objectives and special status of the Red Cross in the policymaking audiences that the BRC engages with less frequently (e.g. members of federal Parliament). As a result, if the range of policymakers will grow in the future, the first period of engagement will likely need to include communication about the Red Cross as such, alongside IHL content.

Are policy makers strengthened in their knowledge of IHL following our interventions?

Two types of interaction can contribute to strengthening the IHL awareness of policymakers: awareness and knowledge gained through receiving targeted messaging of the BRC and awareness or knowledge strengthened through attending events such as conferences or the training of young diplomats. Some of these counterparts, especially the ones with whom BRC works in the CIDH/ICHR might already have high levels of awareness and knowledge of IHL.

Based on the indicators listed in the logframe made available to the evaluators, the proportion of training participants who express that their knowledge of IHL was strengthened through the training is very high (above 75%). Therefore, we can conclude that training participants' awareness of IHL has been strengthened, at least in the short term, through the intervention. The same is likely to be true for conference or seminar attendees. We base this assumption on the reasoning that the content of these presentations is highly specific and targeted to the profile of attendees. Therefore, those that attend are likely to be interested, and receive information that has been adapted to the professional interests of the participants. These assumptions however remain to be proved further, perhaps in the final evaluation of the programme.

An assessment of the impact of BRC engagement on knowledge/awareness would need to rely on an assessment of the starting knowledge of counterparts. In some cases this is available, at least informally (e.g. the presenter from BRC can gauge it from interaction with conference participants).

The evaluation found little to no evidence of long-term engagement of training participants. Follow-up on engagement could help deepen the effects of knowledge transfer on individual occasions.

Do we use the right tools to support and influence policy makers? Are the tools and messages transmitted useful and exploitable by the authorities?

Not identifying as a traditional "advocacy" organisation is key to the Red Cross identity. This was reflected in all interviews conducted for the evaluation. Most Red Cross and ICRC stakeholders feel that direct confidential dialogue is the most important tool for the Red Cross

organisations, and this should stay the cornerstone of the BRC's approach. Our analysis and recommendations take this specificity into account. As such, there is no expectation of the BRC to conduct wide-ranging and highly visible public campaigns or media-based interventions around its priorities.

The BRC uses a mix of tools that face policymakers within the framework of confidential dialogue: pledges; coordination and information provision within the CIDH/ICHR; written requests for response or action; meetings; conferences and training. As discussed above in the effectiveness sections, the staff, policymakers and other National Societies all felt that working with the Committee is a highly effective tool for strengthening IHL. Staff felt that the follow up on written communications and official letters is often less. Where possible, repeated coordination and in-person meetings have proven an effective way to keep communications open and strengthen the relationship with key policymakers. This was visible in the case of BRC's advocacy around Nuclear weapons (see case study).

The BRC also works with standard letters prepared by the ICRC with the support of National Societies on specific IHL issues. The IHL team considers these letters an effective tool in prompting reaction or positions from the Blgian government. As these letters are shared with a high number of States by their respective National Societies, the first objective of this kind of documents is to prompt action through explicitly addressing multiple countries, a strategy that has been effective in Belgium. The BRC often adapts the content of these letters to the Belgian context, and attempts follow up with recipients (e.g. the Ministry of Foreign Affairs). The effectiveness in terms of longer term follow up has not always been successful, depending on the agenda of the targeted policymakers.

For the 5 priority areas, the BRC also uses tools that are beyond advocacy. While not the focus of this evaluation, the priority areas are also addressed in the dissemination and communications programmes of the BRC. This is relevant as the advocacy work does not take place in a vacuum: it leverages the status and expertise of the BRC to give weight to its arguments. In the case of the Healthcare in danger portfolio for instance, this meant coordination with policy makers, but also training and dialogue with implementers.

From interviews with the IHL team, we know that the BRC tailors information provision to its recipient. Interviews with CIDH/ICHR members and the DGD have felt that the information was useful and applicable to concrete situations. We know less about the usefulness and applicability of BRC's information or recommendations to target groups which have less intense engagement with the BRC.

Does the frequency of dialogue allow structural monitoring of the dossiers? If not, how to ensure a more structural follow-up?

Monitoring of dossiers depends on the provision of information from policymakers, but also on internal structures for the team to transform information into insights and decisions about advocacy. BRC's frequency of engagement with policy makers varies according to the structures and relationships. In the CIDH/ICHR, standing structures mean sufficient space for follow up, provided all relevant actors are willing and able to participate. Where several policymakers are involved in follow-up to pledges (such as in

the case of the Healthcare in danger dossier), the coordination for follow-up has been more challenging than in cases where the dialogue needs to be ensured with a more limited range of actors (e.g. on Nuclear weapons).

The work is currently organised in a fluid way, with the small teams following all dossiers and pressure to address the 5 BRC priorities as well as ICRC priorities as they emerge. This has led to considerable workload and pressure on the teams working on advocacy, and a challenge in ensuring structural follow up.

The evaluation found a lack of sufficient and structured reflection time to take stock of progress, pitfalls and successes on each area of activity. The opportunity to reflect would enable the team to capture insights and learn about their own practice, as well as in structuring follow-up on the basis of insights.

An update of the meeting practice and the monitoring and evaluation framework of the advocacy workstream could address several of these challenges (see recommendations).

Should we take more and/or better account of the Belgian political calendar and the CRCR Movement? If yes, how ?

The BRC follows the CRCR Movement agenda closely. The IHL team makes all efforts possible to follow up on requests from the ICRC and coordinate with other National Societies around specific interventions (e.g. letters, or addressing intergovernmental bodies such as the NATO in the case of nuclear weapons advocacy).

The Belgian political agenda is currently not one of the planning priorities of the BRC's advocacy programme. The BRC team highlighted a potential conflict between addressing political changes too much and being a neutral guardian of IHL. Being perceived as having a stake in political changes, is felt to present a risk that could undermine the perception of impartiality that is key to the special mandate and identity of the Red Cross.

At the same time, currently important opportunities are missed to transmit the messages that the BRC most cares about. Formation of governments and changes in ministries and parliaments that are responsible for formulating policies leave space for specialist input. If the BRC manages to keep track of the policy and decision making cycle, it can multiply the reach and impact of its messages about IHL priorities. This is true for both electoral cycles and for decision making processes around individual pieces of legislation.

These are possibly high-level strategic decisions where the leadership of the BRC would also need to play a role in connecting the BRC's advocacy planning with the Belgian political agenda. The evaluation recommends the definition of a structured advocacy strategy and calendar that can guide this strategic planning.

How does the planning and implementation of advocacy respond to the emergent changes in the political context?

Pledges made at the International Conferences, and the 5 priorities defined in the Action Plan form the thematic backbone of the advocacy planning.

Priorities are decided in a consultation between the two implementing BRC teams every 6 months, and refined during more informal exchanges. This

allows for shorter-term requests and priorities to be added (e.g. as ICRC priorities and requests to National Societies are formulated throughout the year). Most priorities are addressed on a rolling work planning basis (i.e. there is a yearly cycle of planning outreach or CIDH/ICHR meetings), which enables the team to know what is coming up on their agenda.

A challenge of the high level of involvement in the CIDH/ICHR is that in the working groups led by the BRC, the organisation has increasingly occupied key responsibilities in chairing and managing the work. Interviewees shared a feeling of being responsible for keeping momentum and urging action within the working groups. As the BRC is not a policymaker, this role is somewhat beyond its mandate, and is a source of pressure on the team. At the time of the review (starting January 2020) the team was reviewing their engagement in the CIDH/ICHR and supporting the development of a strategy for the Committee. This is an important role and one that will also enable more structural planning for the BRC.

BRC's advocacy is not informed by a multi-annual or yearly advocacy plan and calendar, which could be the keystone tool for organising advocacy. There is close consultation between the two IHL teams, which has enabled the programme to run smoothly so far. The lack of such a planning structure however can make it challenging to integrate other actors or new team members into the work stream; or to take decisions on redistributing resources between priorities.

It is not possible to gain a systematic overview of activities and outcomes that took place in addition to the planned results, or those cases where the outcomes fell short of the planning, as the progress of the activities is not captured in an institutional framework. The lack of an advocacy framework and structured reflection ultimately constitutes a limit to the ability of the two teams to synthesise insights and understand the "big picture" over time, as well as to respond to emerging changes in a strategic way.

Are we working with interlocutors at the right levels (administration, parliament, cabinet) and contacts within them? With which additional levels should we work?

The BRC currently does not use a strategic stakeholder mapping for reaching more or different stakeholders. There is a stakeholder mapping in the project application and a SWOT analysis of the individual stakeholders, therefore we can assume that this has been part of the discussions. However, the mapping has not been translated into shared guidelines for how to adapt the advocacy to each of the stakeholders on the basis of these insights. It is unclear with what frequency the mapping would be updated.

The advocacy team feels that the CIDH/ICHR is a well-chosen primary interlocutor as it unites representatives from ministerial departments, who are also entry points for potential contacts in the Ministries' cabinets. At the same time, the team also felt that sometimes the CIDH/ICHR also acts as a gatekeeper, meaning that there is little support for the BRC building own contacts without going through the CIDH/ICHR first.

The focus on the CIDH/ICHR however also means that the BRC has very limited own networks with some types of institutional stakeholders (most importantly, members and staff of the regional or federal Parliaments; regional governments; youth movements; and ministerial cabinets beyond

CIDH/ICHR members). According to our interviews with the team, some of these stakeholders have a relationship or awareness of the ICRC's work but less so of the BRC's priorities and vision.

For example, the team has realised some activities with members of the federal Parliament (hearings, seminar, meetings). They have found limited availability and interest from MPs for substantial follow-up. This practice therefore needs further reflection and planning from the BRC to strengthen the alignment between the interest of MPs and their staff, and the BRC's approach.

How can we measure the impact of our activities on policymakers' decision-making? Are our monitoring tools adequate?

The current system for monitoring outcomes of advocacy relies on a database of official statements, manually collected and maintained by two members of the BRC team for agreeing on the value related to the common indicator on positions taken by the government..

As such, the monitoring of this indicator relies on the follow-up on pledges through the CIDH/ICHR and scanning of official government press releases or official reports of events for a mention of IHL issues that are covered by BRC advocacy. This risks not capturing all influence of BRC's contributions. The team has closer knowledge of policy processes, especially in the files where BRC, either individually or together with the ICRC, directly engages with decision makers (not only with the committee). In these cases, there are more insights. These stories of contribution are however not captured systematically beyond some notes in the monitoring framework. An additional practice of describing the contribution of BRC to outcomes as they happen could strengthen this insight.

The BRC currently has several indicators that would depend on self-assessment of the awareness level of the advocacy targets. While it is possible to gain some understanding of the impact through the ratings provided by training participants, but not into what this awareness has led to.

The current system has to answer two partially overlapping sets of indicators and outcomes (a set from CRB-Cf and one from RKV), corresponding to two similar but not identical Theories of Change in the two frameworks. The indicators are also framed in slightly different ways (see table above). The team has a shared understanding of several of the indicators and how they apply to advocacy, but not all. e.g. gender, environment.

The teams organise regular monitoring meetings, via telephone or in-person. Based on the review of the minutes of these meetings, the conversations are rather free-flowing, with no structured attention to the objectives of the action plan or clear decision points. This makes it challenging for an outsider to identify the way in which objectives and progress towards them is reflected upon them.

In conclusion, the current systems for monitoring impact should be strengthened to enable tracking the contribution of BRC to policy and decision outcomes.

- There is no structure for following up or reflecting on outcomes.
- Indicator values are exclusively used for reporting, and not taken into account (nor considered useful) for planning advocacy (training feedback is used for adjusting training). This is caused by lack of time and a lack of space saved for reflection and decision making in the regular meeting structure.
- The process does not allow for an in-depth insight into what elements of BRC outreach and advocacy were the most successful.

How does the BRC's work reflect the gender dimensions?

CRB-Cf has a recent gender action plan, which is linked to the ICRC's 1999 Gender Policy, and a new policy adopted in December 2019 on gender equality and diversity.[10] It has so far mainly addressed the communication and educational sections of the Action Plan (where the BRC has implemented several relevant activities), including the development of outcomes and indicators for implementation within CRB-Cf. Thhis approach to integrating gender is of high quality, and the evaluators found it a good practice, even as the organisations might need more time to implement the changes that are envisioned by the plan. All CRB-Cf staff members have attended a short training on gender policy. However, implementation has focused relatively less on the direct relevance of a gender transformative approach to advocacy. The team has emphasised that increased attention on gender is a relatively recent focus of the ICRC and as a result, in National Societies.

Gender - based violence is one of the priority advocacy topics of the BRC. At the 32nd conference (2015) a specific pledge was adopted on sexual and gender-based violence during times of armed conflict or in the aftermath of disasters and other emergencies by the EU and its Member States.[11] Therefore, it is likely that the implementation and longer-term follow up on this pledge will require that national societies increase the capacity of their staff to understand the gender relevance of IHL, as well as strengthen their ability to articulate advocacy positions that include gender analysis.

The 2015 resolution has identified a number of actions that National Societies committed to adopting in line with their mandate. The BRC has made progress towards this. For instance, training programmes of the BRC has been updated to include discussion on gender-based violence - this includes the training of diplomats, which is part of the advocacy programme. According to the gender focal point, gender-based violence is also occasionally covered in the dialogue with the CIDH/ICHR meetings that relate to following up on pledges. The wider contribution of the BRC to the outcomes reported by Belgium on the pledge related to gender-based

[10] IFRC Gender, inclusion and diversity resources available at https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/what-we-do/inclusion/protection-gender-inclusion/; New policy not yet publicly available at the time of writing of the evaluation.

[11] Pledge of 2 december 2015, Sexual and gender-based violence during times of armed conflict or in the aftermath of disasters and other emergencies and End report Belgium and Belgian Red Cross – Sexual and gender-based violence during times of armed conflict or in the aftermath of disasters and other emergencies, OP320037 available at : https://rcrcconference.org/pledge-report/end-report-belgium-and-belgian-red-cross-sexual-and-gender-based-violence-during-times-of-armed-conflict-or-in-the-aftermath-of-disasters-and-other-emergencies/

violence remains to be specified.

The advocacy programme has applied the gender lens to topics that are not directly linked to gender-based violence a limited extent. No gender-specific messaging has been developed yet. This is different from other programmes of the BRC, where gender aspects are increasingly reflected, e.g. in training materials on a wide range of IHL topics.

Given the new gender, diversity and inclusion policy of the ICRC, and the progressively growing attention to gender in the BRC (at least in the CRB-Cf), the evaluators expect that the second half of the implementation period will see increased gender- specific advocacy approaches.

How does the BRC's work reflect the environmental dimensions?

There is currently no environmental strategy connected to the BRC's IHL advocacy. However, the environment is addressed in IHL training to some extent, and discussed in advocacy and dialogue around Nuclear weapons. The CRB-Cf logical framework does mention plans for drafting an environmental strategy, foreseen for 2020.

Environment is also an increasingly important area of concern for the ICRC's strategy.[12] As such, the impact of warfare on natural environments is discussed at the highest levels of the Movement, and reflected in Movement-wide strategies where relevant. Currently, one of the focus areas of implementation of environmental protection is the update of military guidance. Therefore, this is likely to be relevant to the BRC's work with military policymakers as well in the coming years.

How does the BRC work with other actors?

Following policy guidelines from the ICRC, as well as the humanitarian mandate and the Fundamental Principles of the Movement (especially Neutrality), the BRC does not collaborate with civil society actors or NGOs in formal alliances. This strategy is aimed at avoiding that Red Cross societies become part of alliances with their own messaging which could go against or beyond the Fundamental Principles and Statutes of the International RC RC Movement. As such, the BRC maintains relations with several NGOs working on areas adjacent to IHL topics. These partners are invited to events or take part in informal exchanges of information, and often request specific IHL expertise from the BRC. No official strategy or guidelines exist to govern the relationships with these actors and the BRC around advocacy in Belgium or internationally.

The BRC coordinates closely with other National Societies, e.g. concerning the timing of influencing actions or messages. This is visible in the case studies on Nuclear weapons and Healthcare in danger, where the National Societies worked together, issuing shared calls to action to policymakers, and exchanging expertise and insights in conferences. BRC's network with other National Societies is another important aspect of partnership. In the period under review, the BRC's IHL advocacy team has emerged as a respected peer in the community of National Societies. Interviewees for this review highlighted the professionalism and drive of the two team leads. Their work in internal collaboration structures, (such as the Legal Support

[12] For an overview, see ICRC (2019) Natural environment, a neglected victim of armed conflict, 5 June 2019, ICRC website https://www.icrc.org/en/document/natural-environment-neglected-victim-armed-conflict

Group of the movement) as well as the way in which BRC's interaction with the CIDH/ICHR is structured around working groups and is planning a strategy, were drawn out as potential examples for other National Societies to follow.

BRC exchanges on tools and strategies with other National Societies - mainly in France, the Netherlands and Germany. This is a good practice which can offer further insight in the future.

Enablers of effectiveness

The Theory of Change of the programme is coherent. The advocacy work is seen as a component of a wider programme which also includes education and awareness raising.

The expertise and dynamism of the team is the most important asset in raising the profile of the BRC with policymakers, other Red Cross societies, the ICRC and civil society in Belgium.

Dynamic exchanges with other National Societies allow the BRC to get inspiration for tools and approaches that might be successfully adapted to the Belgian context and BRC's own priorities. Working closely with the CIDH/ICHR, with an increasingly strategic structure enables the BRC to reach relevant policy staff.

Collaboration between the two communities has been characterised by strong involvement and willingness to contribute to common priorities. This has enabled the BRC to present a unified front towards policymakers.

Barriers to effectiveness

The BRC does not currently have a shared and validated advocacy strategy that would link outcomes to the long-term impact sought (as opposed to the Action Plan, which is more focused on outputs). . This results in challenges in dealing with competing priorities (e.g. internal/between the language communities or international goals).

Collaboration between the two communities in the programme still presents some efficiency challenges, Where meetings with partners or decision makers need to include a representative from each society, the organisation of meetings and events often takes a long time. This impacts on effectiveness

Most of the advocacy planning and delivery is led by the IHL teams in the two branches. CEOs or board members rarely engage with the advocacy targets. The lack of a high-level figurehead or at least more engagement from the CEOs could help in extending the reach of the BRC's advocacy messages to higher-level decision makers.

The BRC does not work with all relevant decision makers in Belgium. BRC has good access to CIDH/ICHR members, but very limited access to very high-level decision makers.

There is no clear strategy for the informal relationships between civil society organisations and the BRC.

Recommendations - effectiveness

8. Developing an advocacy strategy that can be shared internally. A structured organization-wide advocacy strategy (beyond the work planning of the teams) would allow the BRC to clarify priorities

internally and externally, as well as assess the timeframe for action and the resources needed to strengthen the approach. A clear advocacy strategy would help the team differentiate between target groups of the actions, and specify a strategy for reaching each of them.

a. A multi-level advocacy calendar could help the BRC teams plan their outreach around electoral cycles, around specific Belgian, regional and European legislation processes and international (e.g. ICRC) events. A clear multi-annual calendar would help the team in planning for internal as well as external engagement around positions, messaging and delivery.
b. The toolbox of the BRC would benefit from broadening and a revision of how each of these tools is used. The team could draw on external and internal expertise to map out different methods of approaching decision makers and a first understanding of how each of those methods could support specific moments or fields. Examples could include, e.g. specific program points at the time of formation of governments. The BRC could also reflect on practices so far and strengthen those that have already been piloted, such as in-person meetings with members of parliament(s) at federal and regional levels; briefing breakfasts; debates with a clear message around IHL; inviting policymakers to BRC events or training as contributor; de-briefs on the pledges by the government; offering IHL training to policymakers at senior levels; etc. This toolbox would allow the teams to adapt each tool to the audience that they are targeting and to the specific question/context.
c. As part of the toolbox, concrete actions would strengthen the team's ability to work with pledges. These concrete actions would need to be aligned with the rest of the advocacy strategy and the advocacy calendar to enable forward planning.
d. The team would benefit from identifying champions outside of the CIDH/ICHR for each institution/thematic area an cultivating longer-term relationships with high-level staff in priority institutions.
e. A strategy for managing the informal relationships with civil society organisations in a way that helps further BRC's advocacy goals: identify the goals, map possible partners, identify concrete actions for follow-up that go beyond exchange of information.
f. Communications about the specificities of the Red Cross should be adjusted to the audience and the purpose of highlighting the special mandate of the organisation, in line with the advocacy objectives.

9. Create space for reflection on BRC practice, successes/challenges and decision making based on insights on outcomes. This could be included in the meeting practice. We recommend that update meetings between the two teams strengthen the current practice of using a pre-agreed agenda, and that the minutes are redacted with a view towards capturing decisions and owners of follow-up action points, and deadlines. This will enable handover or inclusion of new

colleagues, but also make sure that discussions end with actionable decisions.

10. Update meetings on individual dossiers would allow the teams to increase their strategic learning and follow-up to the advocacy streams. These meetings should take place on a quarterly basis and follow a pre-set agenda. They could focus on each target group/thematic areas and on capturing learning, unexpected resource needs, insight into expected or unexpected achievements or shortcomings, and lessons. Following the reflection, the team could move on to planning follow-up action on the basis of evidence discussed in the first session.
11. We recommend that the team operationalises the gender strategy for the specific advocacy goals and types of intervention led by BRC. For this, the advocacy team should rely on the internal expertise (e.g. CRB-Cf Gender Focal Point), but also, if needed, external expertise. A good starting point for this process would be the development of short gender-related advocacy points for each of the 5 priorities.
12. Update the terms of the collaboration in a way that one of the two branches can be delegated to represent the joint advocacy work of the two towards policymakers. The current high level of trust and professionalism on the two teams makes this a good moment for streamlining some of the methods of external outreach. Of course, the risks and internal responsibilities would need to be discussed if these changes were to be made.
13. At the level of each branch, strengthening internal knowledge and capacity around IHL and advocacy could offer additional resources and support for the work.
14. Covering federal and regional parliaments as well as identifying and building a network of champions in the ministries and key other services (e.g. military) would help the BRC in pursuing its own advocacy agenda and further differentiate the organisation from the ICRC. THis is a practice that is used by some other National Societies. At the time of writing of the evaluation, the BRC had also recognised the need and was planning some outreach actions to Members of Parliaments in the federal Parliament through written brochures. We recommend building further on the examples of meetings and seminars that have already taken place in addition (or instead of) written outputs.

Recommendations - Monitoring and evaluation

16. An update to the impact measurement system would ideally include some of the following elements:
    a. a reflection on intermediate outcomes that can lead to policy impact (champions and key relationships built with policy targets; key networks);
    b. analysis of the content of the items that are captured through the monitoring to allow the BRC to identify impact in a more granular way: changes in oral and written rhetoric; new items appear in political discussions; items are framed in new ways within policy arguments;resources re-distributed to issues.
    c. BRC's teams should capture their understanding of the BRC contribution, based on formal and informal information, close to the time of the outcome.

d. Finally, attention to actual policy change and change in the way current rules are implemented.

17. Review the current impact tracking process. Consider including tipping point, intermediary and framing type- activities and workflows into the practice. The collection of data should be accompanied by opportunities for reflecting on the insights that the data offer, in a structured debrief around key outcomes. This would also include a focus on curating key relationships within the target audiences and following up informally to gain an understanding of the contribution of the BRC to new developments. [13] Where this planning requires additional time or resource investment for the team, these should be accounted for in the management of the programme.
18. In future programming, we strongly encourage CRB-Cf and RKV to align the structure of outcomes, Theories of Change and indicators. The Theories of Change would benefit from being broken down to the level of the main engagement topics or actors. Outcomes would be more useful if they specified the type of change sought (legislation, implementation policy etc.).
19. The BRC should develop a Theory of Change for its work with the CIDH/ICHR. This would allow BRC to understand the expectations around interaction with CIDH/ICHR members leading to changes at the policy level.
20. Indicators should be useful, used and relevant to the decisions taken by the teams. We suggest that for each indicator, the BRC lays out where these indicators would be used for steering the advocacy project.
21. We suggest that the BRC teams reflect on the reality of their work, priorities, successes and engagement. Insights from this reflection should inform the definition of impact and overarching objectives which are aligned with this reality. For instance, indicators could capture changes in the level and intensity of the dialogue with key interlocutors.

[13] see for example Save the Children (2012) Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy, available at: https://www.open.edu/openlearncreate/pluginfile.php/128097/mod_resource/content/1/Monitoring%20and%20evaluating%20advocacy.pdf

CARE NL (2018) Advocacy Toolkit, Guidance Document, Available at : https://www.carenederland.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/MEL-for-Advocacy-Guidance-2018.pdf

3 Sustainability

This section looks at the long-term prospects of the advocacy programme in terms of funding and content.

How is the long-term sustainability as a result of the advocacy planned and managed?

The Red Cross societies' four-yearly cycle of international conferences offers a useful mid-term framework for planning advocacy. Along with the political cycle, and the multi-year strategies of the BRC partners and the ICRC, these ensure that the advocacy vision is planned on at least a 4-5 year horizon.

In terms of sustainability of BRC's message, IHL is likely to stay relevant in the coming years. The validity of IHL advocacy is not questioned within the National Society. The same is true for institutional stakeholders, who will likely continue to be subjects to IHL and therefore have an obligation to engage with the topic. Appetite for this engagement may change with political changes however, which might necessitate the development of scenario-based strategies for the IHL advocacy.

As described above in relation to the BRC's work with other actors, no change to the way in which the BRC works with others is expected. The sustainability of the advocacy therefore relies on keeping the level of expertise and leadership on IHL of the BRC. This can be further strengthened through continuing collaboration with other National Societies.

The structural role of the BRC within the CIDH/ICHR and as partner of the Belgian government is provided by the Royal Decree establishing the CIDH/ICHR, and therefore planned on a long-term horizon as well, with no end of the engagement in mind. Long-term engagement of all policymakers is also expected by the team. The IHL team have extensive knowledge of the characteristics of their target audiences and the history of their engagement with the BRC. There is currently no written monitoring of the long-term approach and changes in it of each policymaker, which may make handovers or onboarding of new colleagues challenging.

Advocacy is currently only financed through the DGD funding, which is focused on development. Ensuring additional funding sources (e.g. from regional governments, EU or other international actors) would increase the financial sustainability of the programme. According to meeting minutes, this has been discussed within the teams but no concrete proposals (yet) were developed for additional institutional fundraising.

Are there already some activities which have not had the desired results? What can be learned from this?

The case study on nuclear weapons highlights BRC's journey in a case where the engagement did not lead to the wished outcome. This process saw a significant investment of efforts from the BRC which then did not result in a correspondent position in the form of a pledge from the Belgian

government. Even in this case, the follow-up helped prepare the ground for a new pledge which offers a framework for continuing the dialogue [see case study].

In several cases, impact is challenging to track in a way that would support decision making in the team. This results from the set-up of the monitoring framework and the nature of some of the activities. The Effectiveness section offers specific recommendations on both of these aspects.

Recommendations - What practices can the coalition reinforce?

22. The teams would benefit from a structured approach to the longer-term view of the advocacy programme, as it is likely to remain an important component of the BRC's work.

23. Sustainability planning would take place at all levels of the program:

    a. Planning: Define a structure for a yearly evaluation meeting where insights from the year are captured, data interpreted and actions taken for the coming year. This should be aligned with the strategies of the partners and the ICRC and weighed against changes in context and resources.

    b. In the case of important political changes, scenario-based forward planning could be useful in framing advocacy priorities, even as insecurity persists, e.g. around elections.

    c. We recommend BRC to develop an exit plan for advocacy with the main actors, including possibilities for rebalancing the roles occupied by the BRC's with the CIDH/ICHR. Exit planning would also enable the sustainability of BRC's work in areas which become special focus for the period of time between two Red Cross conferences. Planning for the after-life of pledges would help balance resources and priorities.

    d. Organisational: widen the circle of colleagues who are part of the advocacy work around IHL and the strategic relevance of the work for the whole organisation. Main outcomes and decisions from the strategic review meeting should be shared with the CEO-level leadership in the partner organisations.

    e. Organisational: currently, much of the work is owned by the senior leads in the two partner communities. Gradually on-boarding at least one or two additional team members by including them in meetings, phone calls and delivery of advocacy work would not only help with the considerable workload, but also increase the BRC's resilience to turnover or absence.

    f. The collaboration between the two communities is a key aspect of the advocacy programme which should be safeguarded through formal and informal approaches. e.g. through high-level meetings, or a common advocacy advisory Board/shared figurehead.

    g. Funding: We recommend that the teams put in place a fundraising plan to secure alternative/additional funding streams for advocacy.

Conclusions and learning

The evaluation found it highly likely that the BRC will meet all its commitments and targets by the end of the implementation period.

The collaboration of the two branches on IHL advocacy has been found to add value through a broad engagement to keep IHL on the agenda of policymakers in Belgium.

The collaboration itself is strengthening the national and international standing of the BRC. The two communities increasingly present a united front, have made headway into aligning their planning and have succeeded in putting down the roots of a united IHL team. This team collaborates closely, and can rely on the IHL expertise of the two advocacy leads. BRC has been repeatedly highlighted in our interviews as a dynamic leader of IHL advocacy discussions within the ICRC Movement, at the international conferences and in the periods between the quadrennial convenings.

BRC plays a key role in enabling, supporting and organising the work of the CIDH/ICHR. IHL team members from BRC have been instrumental in making conversations move forward, as well as bringing relevant information to the working groups they chair- often going above and beyond the role of an external partner to the CIDH/ICHR. The initiative of revitalising working groups and developing a strategy has been indicated as an example that other Red Cross National Societies find inspiring.

Although in the years under review the IHL committee was the primary direct interlocutor of the BRC, the team has also employed written tools and in-person meetings and conferences/training, Through these tools, the BRC engaged with a broad range of priorities and several stakeholders. In Belgium this has meant that the BRC has acted in line with its mission as guardian of IHL in keeping relevant issues on the agenda.

The first two and a half years have shown that there is considerable potential for IHL work. They have also demonstrated that a challenging political context makes IHL more relevant than ever; the BRC team can rely on some very highly skilled professionals; and that several channels exist where the BRC could leverage its special mandate to get access to all levels of decision making. All three areas of contribution could be further strengthened by revisiting the way in which the strategic planning of advocacy is conducted. Revising the advocacy strategy, sustainable management and the monitoring framework for the programme would be a pragmatic starting point for this process. Finally, a clear outline of the capacity that the team needs to deliver on the objectives of the advocacy programme will enable the BRC to build a resilient internal structure to guide its IHL advocacy in the coming years.

Acronyms

BRC	Belgian Red Cross
CIDH/ICHR	Belgian National IHL Committee
CRB-Cf	Croix Rouge de Belgique Communauté Francophone (Belgian Red Cross, French-speaking community)
CSO	Civil society organisation
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IHL	International Humanitarian Law
RKV	Rode Kruis Vlaanderen

Annex I: Case study I

[Internal]

Annex II: Case study II

[Internal]

Annex III: List of Interviewees

[Confidential]

Annex IV Documents consulted

2015 INF 32IC Pledge nucleaire wapens Belgische overheid en Belgische Rode Kruis v1.00
2016 GSK België DEF
20161020 PRE brief 3417 D Reynders - Nucleaire wapens DEF v2.00
20170603 INF _AP17-21 België DGD versie na herziening FINAL.docx
20180425 PRE NS Workshop on NW Geneva 25-26 04 18 - BEL RC.Def
20180803_MB_arrête Gouver Cté Franc du 27 juin 2018_approbation des statuts de la CRB
20181008 INF Draft programma vorming stagiairs diplomaten v1 01
2019 06 suiviPlanactiongenre ECMDIH
2019 CoD - Res 4 2017 CoD _ Res 7 2013 CoD on Weapons - BEL RC report
2019 CoD - Res 4 2017 CoD & Res 7 2013 CoD on Weapons - BEL RC report
2019 NPT PrepCom_Key msg recommendations BEL RC Final
20190517 RAP Berekening Indicator Posities door België inzake IHR 2017-2018 v1.00(1)
20190517 RAP Berekening Indicator Posities door België inzake IHR 2017-2018 v2.00

201909 Mid-term evaluation Overview actions Belgian RC on nuclear weapons v2.01
201912 Mid-term evaluation Overview actions Belgian RC Health Care in Danger v2.00
32 CI - Rapport BEL mi parcours pledges.Final 29.06.17
32 CI - Rapport BEL mi parcours résolutions.Final 29.06.17
32e Conf CRCR Rapport intérimaire CRB 2017 - resolutions DEF.pdf
32e Conf CRCR Rapport intérimaire CRB 2017 DEF
70418 RAP Report BRC on implementation Resolutions 1 and 7 of 2013 Council of Delegates
Armes nucléaires - 11.07.18
cadre logique 17-21 rapport A3
CICR_Stratégie_2015-2018
CICR_Strategie_2019-2022
CIDH - AR 06.12.00
CIDH - Arrêté Royal
CIDH - rapport d_activités 2016 - FR
cidh_-_rapport_dactivites_2015_fr_vfinale
CIDH_article sur CIDH - revue int CR
cidh_ichr_liste_des_membres_ledenlijst_v2
Convention de collaboration CRB-RKV 17-21
CRB_Statuts
CRB-Cf - Cadre logique 17-21
CRB-Cf - Légende Toc
CRB-Cf - TOC FINALE
CRB-Cf_IOV3OS2 Suivi prises de position des autorités
CRB-Cf_PGM DGD 2017-2021 DEFINITIF_Belgique
CRB-Cf_PMER résultats 2018

CRB-Cf_Récap cadre rendement PMER 2018
CRB-Cf_Strategie 2020
CRB-Cf_Stratégie 2020 Activités internationales
CSC Belgique
ELSG Mandate, as amended, March 2017
Evaluation ED_SES_rapport_final_FR
Evaluation Formation stagiaires diplo 8 oct 2018 - Evaluation NLFR v1.00
EWIPA - 11.07.18
Formation SPF AE 31 10 17 - Prog. final
HCiD MRG Terms of Reference 2016 - 2019 Final version
ICRC HCiD strategy 2020-2022
Internationaal humanitair recht Rode Kruis-Vlaanderen
Introductory Seminar in IHL 2019 - Draft Programme
Introductory Seminar on IHL 2017 Programme INVITATION
Leaflet Formation NOHA CICR CRB 2017 - final 1
Leaflet Formation NOHA CICR CRB 2019
Lettre CRB - OTAN. 11-12-juillet 2018.Armes nucléaires.27.06.18
Lettre MAE - Armes nucléaires 10.02.14
Lettre MAE armes nucléaires mars 2013
Nuclear Weapons RCRC NS NATO letter (1)
NW_Movement_Support_Group_ConNote
Organigramme Département fr 2019 05
Plan action GENRE ECM-DIH 2016-2021
Pledges of BRC and Belgian government at 32nd and 33rd conferences
PMER résultats mi-année 2019ok
Principes-fondamentaux_ MICRCR

réunion de suivi RKV-CRB 6052019-PV
réunion RKV CRB 01022018-PV
réunion RKV CRB 02022017-PV
Réunion RKV CRB 06072017-PV
RKV strategie-2020
Soins de santé en danger - 11.07.18

Statuts Mouvement CRCR amendés 2006
Terrorisme et DIH - 11.07.18
Violences sexuelles - 11.07.18

Annex V Terms of Reference of the evaluation

TERMES DE REFERENCE

26/04/2019

Rode Kruis Vlaanderen

CROIX-ROUGE de Belgique

EVALUATION INTERMEDIAIRE

DES PROGRAMMES DIH/IHR DGD BELGIQUE DE LA CRB-CF ET DE RKV
2017-01-BE-DGD
COMITE D'EVALUATION: DELPHINE DE BLEEKER (CRB-CF), AVRIL DE PIERPONT (CRB-CF), VEERLE DE CRAENE (CRB-CF), LAURA DE GREVE (RKV), MARIJKE PEYS (RKV)

1. Résumé

+ **But :** Evaluer l'efficacité et l'impact des activités de plaidoyer vers les décideur·euse·s politiques mises en œuvre conjointement par la CRB-Cf et RKV dans le cadre des Plans d'Action 2017-2021 financés par la Direction Générale de Coopération au développement et Aide humanitaire (DGD) et formuler des recommandations permettant d'ajuster l'intervention, d'appuyer les réflexions et orientations pour la formulation de la prochaine programmation ainsi que de contribuer à la réflexion stratégique autour de la prochaine stratégie CRB-Cf comme RKV
+ **Mandataires:** Croix-Rouge de Belgique-Communauté francophone, Département international, service Education à la citoyenneté mondiale et Droit international humanitaire et Rode Kruis Vlaanderen, Departement Humanitaire diensten, dienst International Samenwerking, unit internationaal humanitair recht
+ **Destinataires :** SPF Affaires étrangères, commerce extérieur et Coopération au Développement - Direction Générale de Coopération au développement et Aide humanitaire (DGD), et Croix-Rouge de Belgique (Croix-Rouge de Belgique-Cf et Rode Kruis Vlaanderen)
+ **Focal point:** Avril de Pierpont, Coordinatrice de projets PMER, Croix-Rouge de Belgique - Communauté francophone
+ **Calendrier :** De juillet 2019 à février 2020. Le temps nécessaire pour la réalisation de l'évaluation est estimé à 25 jours au total.
+ **Lieux:** Belgique, essentiellement Bruxelles-Capitale et Malines.
+ **Budget indicatif maximum :** 15.000 € TTC

2. Historique et contexte

Présentation de la Croix-Rouge de Belgique :

Mission et mandat

La Croix-Rouge de Belgique a pour objet de prévenir et d'atténuer les souffrances en conformité avec les principes fondamentaux du Mouvement international de la Croix-Rouge et du Croissant-Rouge (humanité, impartialité, neutralité, indépendance, volontariat, unité et universalité).

En tant qu'auxiliaire des pouvoirs publics, sa mission consiste notamment à :

- Agir en cas de conflits armés, s'y préparer dès le temps de paix, dans tous les domaines prévus par les Conventions de Genève et leurs Protocoles additionnels en faveur de toutes les victimes de la guerre, tant civiles que militaires ;
- Propager les principes fondamentaux du Mouvement et le droit international humanitaire afin de développer au sein de la population les idéaux de paix, de respect et de compréhension mutuelle entre tous les hommes et tous les peuples. La diffusion du DIH participe à sa mise en œuvre.
- Collaborer avec les autorités pour faire respecter le droit international humanitaire (mise en œuvre du DIH).

Le mandat de diffuser le droit international humanitaire et de veiller à son respect en collaboration avec les autorités belges est une attribution statutaire qui revient à toute société nationale (SN) dans son pays. La CRB l'exerce sur base de son rôle d'auxiliaire des pouvoirs publics dans le domaine humanitaire, reconnu à toute SN en vertu des Statuts du Mouvement CRCR dont la CRB fait partie.

Structure

La Croix-Rouge de Belgique est constituée sur base des Conventions de Genève du 12 août 1949 auxquelles la Belgique est partie, les Statuts du Mouvement de 1986 et la Loi du 30 mars 1891 qui accordent la personnification civile à l'Association de la Croix-Rouge de Belgique (M.B. du 02.04.1981).

En tant que société nationale, la CRB est membre du Mouvement CRCR qui se compose de la Fédération internationale des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge et du Croissant-Rouge.

La Belgique étant un Etat fédéral, l'organisation de la CRB épouse les structures communautaires : Communauté francophone, Communauté flamande et Communauté germanophone.

La Croix-Rouge de Belgique – Communauté francophone et Rode Kruis Vlaanderen sont chacune composées de départements/services thématiques, de départements supports et de comités provinciaux.

Leurs départements/services thématiques respectifs comptent parmi eux un département international : Activités internationales (CRB-Cf) et Coopération internationale (RKV).

La département international de la CRB-Cf est en partie constitué en ASBL et bénéficie de l'agrément ONG depuis 1997. Il est composé de trois services opérationnels dont le service Education à la citoyenneté mondiale et Droit international humanitaire (service ECM-DIH). Le service ECM-DIH met en place des activités de diffusion du DIH sur le territoire de la région de langue française et de la Région bilingue de Bruxelles-Capitale auprès du milieu scolaire (enseignant·e·s, autorités centrales et locales du milieu scolaire), des acteurs de deuxième ligne (acteur·trice·s relais, volontaires et permanent·e·s) et des décideur·euse·s politiques par de l'information, de la sensibilisation/conscientisation, de l'éducation, de la mobilisation et du plaidoyer (autorités centrales et locales du milieu scolaire, décideur·euse·s politiques).

Le service Coopération internationale de RKV a été constitué en ASBL le 11 février 2005 et bénéfice de l'agrément ONG. Il est constitué de différentes unités dont l'unité droit international humanitaire qui met en place des activités de diffusion du DIH sur le territoire de la Région flamande et la Région bilingue de Bruxelles-Capitale.

Ces actions sont menées grâce au soutien financier de la Direction générale Coopération belge au développement et Aide humanitaire (DGD) dans le cadre d'un programme quinquennal 2017-2021.

Objectifs vers les décideur·euse·s politiques

La CRB-Cf et RKV visent des objectifs communs : le renforcement de la connaissance du droit international humanitaire et du Mouvement international de la Croix-Rouge et du Croissant-Rouge auprès des professionnel·le·s (journalistes, avocat·e·s, militaires, …) en Belgique et la coopération avec les décideur·euse·s politiques belges afin de promouvoir le respect du DIH.

Dans le cadre de leur plan d'action DGD 2017-2021 respectif, la CRB-Cf et RKV réalisent conjointement diverses activités et résultats vers les décideur·euse·s politiques belges, dont, notamment :

- Des démarches auprès des décideur·euse·s politiques belges (parlementaires, assistant·e·s parlementaires fédéraux, cabinets et fonctionnaires des administrations) dans le cadre d'un travail de plaidoyer en faveur d'un meilleur respect du DIH : formations, sessions d'informations, dialogue bilatéral et confidentiel, Commission interministérielle de droit humanitaire, Conférences internationales CRCR ;
- Une contribution active et conjointe aux réseaux et plateformes créés au sein du Mouvement CRCR avec des finalités différentes : rassembler des expert·e·s pour mener des processus de réflexion sur les défis actuels du DIH, émettre des recommandations et proposer des plans d'action en ce sens, identifier des engagements à prendre pour les Etats et les composantes du Mouvement CRCR.

Les dossiers concernés par le plaidoyer portent entre autre sur les thématiques suivantes : armes nucléaires, violences sexuelles, soins de santé en danger, terrorisme et DIH et guerre urbaine. Un dialogue structurel est également mené avec le SPF Affaires étrangères concernant le désarmement et la non-prolifération (armes autonomes, armes à sous-munitions, mines antipersonnel, armes chimiques, armes biologiques, etc.).

Objectifs spécifiques 2 et résultats attendus des cadres logiques respectifs

Pour RKV :

Objectif spécifique 2 : Professionals en de Belgische beleidsmakers zijn versterkt in hun kennis over IHR en dragen bij tot de naleving van het IHR.

Indicateur 2.1 - Minstens 85% van de professionals en de Belgische beleidsmakers geven aan dat hun kennis over IHR is toegenomen door RKV vormingen

Indicateur 2.2 - De Belgische overheid voert haar engagementen aangegaan tijdens de 32ste Internationale Conferentie van het Rode Kruis en de Rode Halve Maan (IC) uit en bereidt de 33ste IC voor.

Indicateur 2.3 - Aantal keer dat de Belgische overheid zich positioneert over IHR inzake humanitaire kwesties.

Résultat 2.1 - RKV voorziet kwaliteitsvolle vormingen over IHR voor professionals en Belgische beleidsmaker, met aandacht voor gender en milieu gerelateerde thema's.

Indicateur 2.1.1 - Aantal Belgische beleidsmakers die gevormd zijn over IHR door RKV. (270 beleidsmakers op 5 jaar)

Résultat 2.2 : RKV communiceert over en positioneert zich inzake IHR, met aandacht voor gender en milieu gerelateerde thema's

Indicateur 2.2.2 - Aantal keer dat RKV actief een positie over IHR heeft gedeeld met Belgische Beleidsmakers. (58 keer op 5 jaar)

Pour la CRB-Cf :

Objectif spécifique 2 : Les acteur·trice·s relais, les volontaires et permanent·e·s de la CRB et les décideur·euse·s politiques belges sont capables d'agir en faveur de la protection des victimes de conflits armés grâce à une meilleur application (connaissance, respect, promotion et utilisation) du DIH en tenant compte de la dimension genre.

Indicateur 2.3 - Dans les 5 ans, les autorités belges prennent position sur le DIH concernant les questions humanitaires en tenant compte de la dimension genre. (50 prises de position en 5 ans)

Résultat 3 : Les décideur·euse·s politiques belges ont renforcé leurs connaissances du droit international humanitaire (en tenant compte du genre) et du Mouvement international de la Croix-Rouge et du Croissant-Rouge avec l'appui et l'expertise de la Croix-Rouge de Belgique.

Indicateur 3.1 - Dans les 5 ans, nombre de fois où la CRB a partagé activement un positionnement relatif au droit international humanitaire tenant compte du genre et/ou de l'environnement auprès des décideur·euse·s politiques belges. (50 partages de position en 5 ans)

Indicateur 3.2 - Dans les 5 ans, 75% des 75 (56) décideur·euse·s politiques belges appuyés, affirment avoir renforcé durablement leurs connaissances du droit international humanitaire et du Mouvement international de la Croix-Rouge et du Croissant-Rouge grâce à l'appui et l'expertise de la CRB.

Contribution au Cadre stratégique commun Belgique :

Ces objectifs spécifique et leurs résultats contribuent directement à trois cibles stratégiques (D1, D2, D3) du domaine « Actions de Plaidoyer » du CSC Belgique auxquelles la CRB-Cf comme RKV ont souscrites : renforcer la reconnaissance de notre expertise par nos groupes cibles (D1), conclure, renforcer et/ou influencer des alliances sur des thèmes pertinents pour le développement (D2), influencer et appuyer les décideur·euse·s politiques nationaux, européens et internationaux et les acteurs privés en faveur du développement durable et des droits humaines (D3).

3. Objectifs et portée de l'évaluation

L'évaluation est une évaluation à mi-parcours des Plans d'Action 2017-2021 financés par la DGD qui porte sur la démarche de plaidoyer vers les décideur·euse·s politiques belges mise en œuvre conjointement par la CRB-Cf et RKV durant la période allant de janvier 2017 à juin 2019, en Belgique.

Après deux années et demie de mise en œuvre des Plans d'Action, cette évaluation a pour objectif d'apprécier l'**impact** et l'**efficacité** (cf. critère CAD) de cette démarche. Plus précisément, les commanditaires souhaitent obtenir une vision claire de l'impact et de l'efficacité de leurs activités (réunions bilatérales, sensibilisation/formation) à destination des décideur·euse·s politiques belges en faveur d'un meilleur respect du DIH et se voir proposer des pistes éventuelles d'amélioration de cette efficacité pour le programme actuel et les programmes futurs.

Les résultats de l'évaluation seront utilisés par les équipes du programme DIH de la CRB-Cf et de RKV ainsi que par le management de ces organisations. Les résultats de l'évaluation seront également partagés avec la DGD et publiés sur les sites web de la CRB-Cf et de RKV.

Il est attendu de cette évaluation que ses conclusions et recommandations permettent aux commanditaires d'ajuster l'intervention, d'appuyer les réflexions et orientations en vue de la formulation de la prochaine programmation et de contribuer à alimenter la réflexion autour de la prochaine stratégie tant CRB-Cf que RKV.

4. Critères et méthodologie de l'évaluation

Critères et questions évaluatives

L'évaluateur·trice définira lui/elle-même les critères de l'évaluation afin de répondre à ces objectifs :

1. Mesurer l'impact de nos actions
2. Apprécier l'efficacité des activités à destination des décideur·euse·s politiques

Il veillera cependant à couvrir les questions évaluatives énoncées ci-dessous, sans pour autant s'y limiter ni y répondre dans un ordre préétabli étant donné leur indépendance :

Au niveau de l'**impact** (contribution à) :

- Nos activités ont-elles un impact sur les prises de décision des décideur·euse·s politiques et comment le mesurer ?
- Nos activités vers les décideur·euse·s politiques favorisent-elles l'adoption de législations et/ou de politiques conformes à leurs obligations ?

Au niveau de l'**efficacité** : Nos activités sont-elles efficaces ?

- Partage-t-on efficacement notre expertise vers les décideur·euse·s politiques ? Communiquons-nous suffisamment sur notre spécificité en tant que Croix-Rouge par rapport à d'autres organisations de la société civile (principes, mandat) ? Nos attentes, nos objectifs et notre plus-value sont-ils assez clairs pour les décideur·euse·s politiques?
- Les décideur·euse·s politiques sont-ils renforcés dans leur connaissance du DIH suite à nos interventions?
- Utilisons-nous les bons outils pour appuyer et influencer les décideur·euse·s politiques ? Les outils et messages transmis sont-ils utiles et exploitables par les autorités ?
- La fréquence de dialogue permet-elle un suivi structurel des dossiers ? Si non, comment assurer un suivi plus structurel ?
- Faut-il prendre plus et/ou mieux en compte le calendrier politique belge et du Mouvement CRCR ? Si oui, comment ?
- Comment mieux prendre en compte la situation et le positionnement institutionnel de la Belgique ?
- Travaillons-nous avec l'ensemble des bons niveaux d'interlocuteurs (administration, parlement, cabinet) et de contacts en leur sein ? Avec quels niveaux supplémentaires devrions-nous travailler ?
- Nos outils de suivi sont-ils adéquats ?

Dans son analyse, l'évaluateur·trice veillera à prendre en compte la dimension genre et le travail en synergie avec d'autres acteurs.

Sources disponibles

- Principes fondamentaux du Mouvement international de la Croix-Rouge et du Croissant-Rouge
- Mandat et statuts de la Croix-Rouge de Belgique

- Stratégie CICR
- Stratégies 2020 CRB-Cf et RKV
- CSC Belgique, domaine « Actions de Plaidoyer »
- Evaluation de l'ECMS du Service de l'évaluation spéciale de la DGD (2018) pour la partie portant sur le plaidoyer
- Programmes 2017-2021 CRB-Cf et RKV, cadres logiques et théories du changement
- Convention de collaboration CRB-Cf – RKV 2017-2021
- PV des réunions semestrielles CRB-Cf - RKV
- Dispositifs de suivi des indicateurs
- Rapports d'activité
- Fiches/rapports d'évaluation de formations
- Liste de contacts de décideur·euse·s politiques
- Documents et autres supports de formation
- Rapports de sessions de rencontre (sauf confidentialité)
- Documents de synthèse sur le positionnement de la CRB
- Liste des réseaux auxquels participent la CRB-Cf et RKV
- Document fondateur de la plateforme soins de santé en danger (présentation des objectifs)
- *Movement support group* sur les armes nucléaires (présentation des objectifs)
- Mandat du *European legal support group* (mission et priorités en termes de plaidoyer)
- Arrêté royal sur la CIDH, article sur la CIDH, rapports d'activité et site web
- Rapport à mi-parcours de la Conférence internationale de la Croix-Rouge

Méthodologie

La méthodologie et les outils déployés pour répondre aux questions d'évaluation devront être définis par l'évaluateur·trice dans son offre. Cependant, celui/celle-ci veillera à couvrir les connaissances, perceptions et réalisations des parties consultées dans le cadre de l'évaluation. Voici quelques suggestions pouvant être intégrées à sa démarche :

- Lecture et analyse des documents listés précédemment
- Questionnaire (par écrit ou par téléphone)
- Focus groups
- Entretiens individuels avec le public cible, les équipes du programme et le management du département international de la CRB-Cf comme de RKV, ainsi qu'avec les parties prenantes (CIDH, CICR)
- Si possible, consultation auprès d'autres SN (ex : Croix-Rouge française, Croix-Rouge néerlandaise) et de diverses ONG actives dans le plaidoyer (ex : CNCD, 11.11.11)

L'évaluateur·trice tiendra compte du fait qu'il s'agit d'un public fort sollicité afin d'assurer un bon « taux de réponse » à l'évaluation de la part des décideur·euse·s politiques.

5. Rapports d'évaluation et autres produits

L'évaluateur·trice devra produire :

- Un rapport de démarrage après analyse de la documentation et réunion de cadrage avec les équipes de la CRB-Cf et de RKV. Ce rapport devra contenir les éléments suivants :

  - Les données clés de l'évaluation (titre de l'évaluation, données, commanditaires de l'évaluation, contractants,…)
  - Une méthodologie détaillée basée sur les termes de référence et la réunion de cadrage (dont une stratégie et des méthodes pour impliquer activement les décideur·euse·s politiques dans l'évaluation)
  - Une planification détaillée de chaque tâche du processus d'évaluation et des personnes responsables
  - La liste des parties prenantes à consulter
  - Commentaires sur la faisabilité de l'évaluation proposée et suggestions d'amendements des termes de référence si besoin

- Un rapport provisoire dont la structure est identique au rapport final.

- Un rapport final qui comportera au minimum :
  - Un résumé exécutif de quatre pages maximum reprenant les « éléments principaux » de l'évaluation relatifs au contexte et à la méthodologie, les conclusions par rapport aux critères/questions d'évaluation ainsi que les recommandations et les leçons tirées de l'évaluation
  - Le rapport principal comprenant :
    - Une explication du contexte, du but, de la portée, des objectifs et des questions évaluatives de l'évaluation
    - Une présentation des méthodes et des outils employés pour collecter les données, leur justification et leurs limites, une explication de la constitution de l'échantillon et de la triangulation des données
    - Des constats, des conclusions par question évaluative (analyse) et des recommandations communes aux commanditaires de l'évaluation
    - Les annexes pertinentes: données qualitatives et quantitatives (en version électronique de manière complète et claire), termes de référence, outils de collecte de données, liste des sources utilisées (primaires et secondaires) et autres documents de référence.

Le rapport final devra également :

- Etre rédigé en anglais
- Etre rédigé dans un langage accessible et clair
- Assurer une analyse sur base de données pertinentes et fiables et en préciser les sources
- Comprendre des recommandations spécifiques, réalistes et détaillées quant à comment les mettre en œuvre et par qui
- Ne pas dépasser 30 pages (annexes non comprises)

- Un PowerPoint de présentation servant de support pour la restitution et reprenant (résumé):
  - Présentation du plan d'implémentation de l'évaluation
  - Explication de la méthodologie utilisée et de ses limites ainsi que de la constitution de l'échantillon
  - Présentation des résultats clés et des recommandations

L'évaluation devra aboutir en un rapport final écrit, rédigé en anglais et délivré à la CRB-Cf et RKV au plus tard le 14 février 2020 en version électronique et papier.

L'exercice d'évaluation sera clôturé une fois les parties s'étant mises d'accord sur les documents finaux produits par l'évaluateur·trice.

6. Budget et calendrier

Le budget indicatif maximum de cette évaluation est de 15.000 € TTC.

L'évaluation sera réalisée entre juin 2019 et février 2020. Elle s'effectuera en plusieurs phases : une phase de cadrage permettant à l'évaluateur·trice de s'informer sur l'approche mise en œuvre et de cadrer son évaluation, une phase d'évaluation proprement dite et une phase de restitution comprenant des échanges sur les rapports provisoire et final ainsi qu'une présentation des conclusions et des recommandations aux commanditaires.

Le temps à consacrer à la réalisation du processus d'évaluation est estimé à un total de 25 jours, dont :

+ 3 jours de lecture de documents
+ 2 jours de phase de cadrage
+ 8 jours de récolte de données
+ 2 jours d'analyse de données
+ 5 jours de rédaction du rapport provisoire
+ 2 jours de restitution du rapport provisoire et d'intégration des commentaires du comité d'évaluation
+ 2 jours de rédaction du rapport final
+ 1 jour de réunion de restitution

Le calendrier indicatif proposé de l'évaluation est le suivant :

Mois-année	Etape	Responsabilité
Mai 2019	Lancement de l'évaluation Sélection de l'évaluateur·trice	Comité d'évaluation
Juin 2019- août 2019	Etude documentaire	Comité d'évaluation
	Briefing de l'évaluateur·trice	
	Présentation de la méthodologie	
Septembre – novembre 2019	Phase de récolte de données	Evaluateur·trice
Janvier 2020	Rédaction du rapport provisoire, à remettre au plus tard le 6 janvier 2020	Evaluateur·trice
Début février	Réunion de restitution du rapport provisoire auprès du comité d'évaluation	Evaluateur·trice
17 février 2020	Rédaction du rapport final, à remettre au plus tard le 14 février 2020	Evaluateur·trice
Février-mars 2020	Réunions de restitution auprès d'un comité élargi	Evaluateur·trice
	Validation du rapport final et rédaction de la management response	Comité d'évaluation

L'évaluateur·trice est libre de soumettre un calendrier revu en fonction de ses propres estimations.

Dans sa planification, l'évaluateur·trice devra cependant tenir compte de l'agenda international et de l'agenda des décideur·euse·s politiques belges, moins disponibles durant la période allant de novembre à décembre.

7. Comité d'évaluation

L'ensemble du processus d'évaluation est géré de façon conjointe par un comité de pilotage mixte CRB-Cf/RKV qui a pour responsabilité de :

- Rédiger le cahier des charges de l'évaluation
- Diffuser l'appel d'offre et sélectionner l'évaluateur·trice externe
- Briefer et mettre à disposition de l'évaluateur·trice l'ensemble des documents et informations nécessaires à la bonne réalisation de l'évaluation
- Contrôler la qualité des produits de l'évaluation : veiller à leur conformité avec les termes de référence, à leur validité, fiabilité et utilité, formuler des commentaires au rapport provisoire fourni par l'évaluateur·trice
- Valider le rapport final
- Examiner les recommandations
- Rédiger une réponse de l'organisation quant aux recommandations reçues
- Assister à/aux réunion(s) de restitution faite(s) par l'évaluateur·trice

Ce comité est composé de :

- CRB-Cf : Responsable du Service Education à la citoyenneté mondiale et Droit international humanitaire, Coordinatrice de projets PMER, Responsable Partenariats et Programmes
- RKV : Responsable du service droit international humanitaire, Responsable du service Restoring Family Links

Chaine de communication

L'évaluateur·trice devra adresser ses correspondances d'ordre général et relatives à la CRB-Cf au point focal comité : Avril de Pierpont (dih@croix-rouge.be).

Pour des questions spécifiques à RKV, il/elle pourra contacter Laura De Grève (Laura.De-Greve@rodekruis.be). Dans ce cas, le point focal comité sera mis en copie.

Les livrables de chaque phase seront transmis par l'évaluateur·trice au point focal comité par email.

Lors des communications du comité d'évaluation vers l'évaluateur·trice, le point focal comité sera chargé de compiler les remarques et décisions et de les transmettre à l'évaluateur·trice. Les décisions devront être validées par les membres avant d'être transmises.

8. Normes éthiques et de qualité

Tel que stipulé dans la politique d'évaluation interne externalisée, les évaluateur·trice·s devraient prendre toutes les mesures raisonnables pour garantir que l'évaluation soit conçue et menée de manière à respecter et à préserver les droits et le bien-être des personnes et des communautés auxquelles elles appartiennent ; qu'elle soit techniquement exacte, fiable et légitime ; qu'elle soit réalisée de façon transparente et impartiale ; et qu'elle contribue à promouvoir l'apprentissage institutionnel et la responsabilisation. Par conséquent, l'équipe

d'évaluation devrait respecter les normes énoncées ci-dessous (https://www.ifrc.org/Global/Publications/monitoring/IFRC-Framework-for-Evaluation.pdf) :

1. Utilité : les évaluations doivent être utiles et utilisées.

2. Faisabilité : les évaluations doivent être réalistes, diplomatiques et gérées de façon rentable et sensée.

3. Éthique et licéité : les évaluations doivent être réalisées dans le respect de l'éthique et des lois, en veillant tout particulièrement au bien-être des personnes qui y participent ou qui en subissent les effets.

4. Impartialité et indépendance : les évaluations devraient être impartiales et donner une appréciation détaillée et objective qui tient compte du point de vue de toutes les parties prenantes.

5. Transparence : les évaluations devraient être menées de façon ouverte et transparente.

6. Précision : les évaluations devraient être techniquement exactes et fournir suffisamment d'informations sur les méthodes de collecte, d'analyse et d'interprétation des données pour en démontrer la validité ou le bien-fondé.

7. Participation : les parties prenantes devraient être consultées et véritablement associées au processus d'évaluation si cela est possible et justifié. Une attention particulière doit être portée sur la participation des enfants.

8. Collaboration : la collaboration entre les principaux partenaires opérationnels dans le processus d'évaluation contribue à renforcer la légitimité et l'utilité de l'évaluation.

Il est également attendu que l'évaluation soit menée dans le respect des sept Principes fondamentaux de la Croix-Rouge et du Croissant-Rouge, à savoir : 1) l'humanité, 2) l'impartialité, 3) la neutralité, 4) l'indépendance, 5) le volontariat, 6) l'unité, et 7) l'universalité. De plus amples informations sur ces Principes sont disponibles à l'adresse : www.ifrc.org/what/values/principles/index.asp

9. Equipe d'évaluation & qualification

L'équipe d'évaluation devra présenter les compétences suivantes :

- Diplôme de master pertinent
- Faire preuve d'une maîtrise active du français, du néerlandais et de l'anglais, tant à l'oral qu'à l'écrit
- Faire preuve d'une connaissance méthodologique et pratique des méthodes d'évaluation qualitative
- Très bonnes compétences interpersonnelles et de communication
- Faire preuve d'une capacité d'analyse de données qualitatives
- Faire preuve d'une expérience prouvée réussie d'évaluation portant sur le plaidoyer

- Atouts supplémentaires : une expérience ou connaissance d'organisation fonctionnant en réseau ; une connaissance du Mouvement international de la Croix-Rouge et du Croissant-Rouge

10. Procédure de candidature

L'évaluateur·trice sera sélectionné sur base d'une offre technique et financière à soumettre par email à l'adresse suivante : dih@croix-rouge.be avant le 24 mai 2019. Le document doit être joint au courriel en format Word avec pour objet du message : « Evaluation externe plaidoyer 2019 – offre technique et financière ».

La candidature devra comprendre :

- Une offre technique (max. 8 pages) décrivant les objectifs de l'évaluation, les questions d'évaluation, une matrice de conception d'évaluation (cf. annexe 1), l'approche méthodologique, les données et les sources sur lesquelles l'évaluation se base
- Une offre financière détaillée (nombre de jours nécessaires et honoraires journaliers, enveloppe forfaitaire pour d'autres frais tels que de déplacement, administratifs, etc.).
- Un calendrier de l'évaluation (plan de travail, étapes et échéances)
- Le CV de l'évaluateur·trice (ou les CV si réalisée par plusieurs personnes)
- Une lettre résumant l'expérience de l'évaluateur·trice en cohérence avec l'évaluation, sa disponibilité et les contacts de trois personnes pour prise de référence
- Un exemple récent de rapport d'évaluation déjà réalisé par l'évaluateur·trice

La CRB-Cf et RKV utiliseront les informations fournies par les soumissionnaires uniquement pour évaluer les candidatures. Les candidatures incomplètes ou soumises après la date de clôture ne seront pas prises en compte.

Les candidatures seront évaluées selon les critères suivants :

- Expérience et compétences pertinentes
- Description claire de l'approche méthodologique proposée
- Respect du calendrier proposé
- Offre financière

L'évaluateur·trice sélectionné sera averti au plus tard le 29 mai 2019.
La CRB-Cf et RKV se réservent le droit de relancer une nouvelle procédure de sélection si aucune proposition reçue n'est jugée de qualité suffisante.

11. Annexes

+ Annexe 1: Matrice de conception d'évaluation

+ Annexe 2 : Acronymes et glossaire

Annexe 1: Template evaluation design matrix/modèle de matrice de conception d'évaluation

Question	Sub-question	Type of sub-question[1]	Indicator	Target value[2]	Baseline value	Data source	Sample or census[3]	Data collection instrument[4]	Data analysis method[5]	Comments

[1] Fill indicate 'normative', 'descriptive', or 'cause-and-effect'.
Normative question = Question that seeks to determine what is. They compare the current situation with a specified target, goal, or benchmark. Normative questions can be used to answer questions about *inputs, activities,* and *outputs*.
Descriptive question = Question that compares what is with what should be. They may describe aspects of a process, a condition, a set of views, or a set of organizational relationships or networks.
Cause-and-effect question = Question that determines what difference an intervention makes. Often referred to as *outcome, impact,* or attributional questions, they attempt to measure what has changed because of the intervention. These questions seek to determine the effects of a project, program or policy. They ask whether the desired results have been achieved as a result of the program.
[2] Only applicable in case of a normative question.
[3] Sample = a proportion of the population. Census = entire population.
[4] Examples: transect walk/ survey/ record retrieval document/ key informant interview (KII)/ literature review/ focus group discussion (FGD)/ etc.
[5] Examples: frequency distribution/ content analysis/ frequency count/ comparison to standard/ etc.

Annexe 2: Acronymes et glossaire

CRB-Cf: Croix-Rouge de Belgique – Communauté francophone

RKV : Rode Kruis Vlaanderen

Mouvement CRCR : Mouvement international de la Croix-Rouge et du Croissant-Rouge

DIH : droit international humanitaire (ensemble de règles qui, pour des raisons humanitaires, limitent les effets des conflits armés. Le DIH protège les personnes qui ne participent pas ou plus aux combats et restreint les moyens et méthodes de guerre)

DGD : SPF Affaires étrangères, commerce extérieur et Coopération au Développement - Direction Générale de Coopération au développement et Aide humanitaire (bailleur de fond principal)

CSC : Cadre stratégique commun

CIDH : Commission interministérielle de droit humanitaire

FICR : Fédération internationale des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge et du Croissant-Rouge

CICR : Comité international de la Croix-Rouge

SN : sociétés nationales

TdC/ToC : théorie du changement/theory of change

Annex VI Interview protocol

For policymakers	
1	Please describe the ways in which you have interacted with the BRC in the past 3 years.
2	How does the information provided by the BRC add value to your work?
3	Could you give an example where the information provided by BRC contributed to your work?
4	Is there any way in which it could be more useful (prompts: topics covered, timing, format)
5	What other actors do you interact with?
6	How does the BRC compare to these?
7	What has been your experience interacting with the BRC? Could you give an example of one thing that works well and one thing that you would like to change/improve?
8	How do you expect your work to evolve in the next 1-2 years? (prompts: priorities, Beglian political context, international political context)
9	How do you see your interaction in the next 1-2 years?
For Other RC stakeholders	
1	Please describe the ways in which you have interacted with the BRC in the past 3 years.
2	Can you tell us about your strategy and experience with advocacy with policymakers? How did your approach change in the past 5 years?
3	Which stakeholders are the most important for your advocacy on IHL, and on more specific issues? How do you identify and engage with them (process)? (prompts: timeline, messaging, type of interaction, tools)
4	What has worked well and less well for you?
For CIDH/ICHR	
1	How does the role provided by BRC add value to your work?
2	Could you give an example where the role provided by BRC contributed to your work? One specific change or way of working where the BRC has been an important catalyst?
3	Is there any way in which it could be more useful (prompts: topics covered, timing, format)
4	What other actors do you interact with?

5	How does the BRC compare to these?
6	What has been your experience interacting with the BRC? Could you give an example of one thing that works well and one thing that you would like to change/improve?
7	How do you expect your work to evolve in the next 1-2 years? (e.g.priorities, Belgian political context, international political context)

Annex VII Evaluation framework

Research questions

Based on the TOR and the inception meeting which took place on the 10 July 2019, the following questions will be answered through the evaluation:

Question	Judgement criteria/ indicator *(RKV and CRB-Cf indicators, included for reference)*	Information source	Analysis method	Limitations	Anticipated conclusions the information will allow to draw
Contribution to impact					
Do our activities have an impact on policymakers' decision-making?	Reported number of times / how IHL was introduced in decision-making through engagement with BRC <u>RKV:</u> Indicator 2.1 - Professionals and Belgian policy makers report that their knowledge of IHL has increased due to RKV training Indicator 2.3 - Number of times the Belgian government positions itself on IHL with regard to humanitarian issues <u>CRB-Cf:</u> Indicator 2.3 - Number of times the Belgian government positions itself with regard to IHL humanitarian issues	• Desk review: *INTERNAL* baseline BRC 2016 data collected by RKV and CRB-fr against these indicators activity logs and reports reporting against advocacy plan theory of change and logframes advocacy tools used position papers *EXTERNAL* mentions in media, as available position papers • Interviews: all types of interviewees • Case studies • Validation workshop	• Horizontal analysis • In-depth analysis	• With advocacy, it is important to understand the distinction between contribution and attribution • Limited availability of interviewees/selection bias • Lack of awareness of interviewees on IHL • Potentially too soon to draw conclusions on the impact or results to date • The quality and quantity of monitoring data available within BRC	If, and the extent to which, the BRC's activities play a role in decision making The level of competition with competing NGOs/lobby groups/alternative points of view

How can we measure the impact of our activities on policymakers' decision-making?	BRC team understands monitoring system Results stated against expected outcomes in monitoring reports submitted Decision-makers report influence of BRC's activities on decision-making, policy outcomes or government positioning on IHL on humanitarian issues (also incl. positioning on gender and environment dimensions) BRC team demonstrates knowledge and use of the channels and tools available to understand which decisions have been made.	● Desk review: baseline BRC 2016 M&E data collected against the advocacy plan ● Interviews: staff CRB-fr and RKV staff other SN MCRCR other organisations active in the same advocacy space ● Validation workshop		● Limited availability of interviewees/selection bias ● Lack of awareness of interviewees on IHL ● Potentially too soon to draw conclusions on the impact or results to date	Mechanisms for monitoring progress and capturing (potential) impact How staff are using the M&E systems
Do our activities towards policymakers promote the adoption of legislation and/or policies consistent with IHL obligations?	Decision-makers report influence of BRC's activities on decision-making, policy outcomes or government positioning on IHL on humanitarian issues (also incl. positioning on gender and environment dimensions) <u>RKV:</u> Indicator 2.2 - The Belgian government implements and makes commitments during the 32nd International Conference of the Red Cross and the Red Crescent (IC) prepares the 33rd IC.	● Desk review: *INTERNAL* Strategy 2020 reporting against strategy, especially M&E data Activity reports Interview reports (confidentiality) advocacy tools used: training materials etc. position papers on IHL networking information *EXTERNAL* Strategy and other documentation CICR CIDH mentions in media, as available position papers on IHL Evaluation advocacy conducted		● Limited availability of interviewees/selection bias ● Potentially too soon to draw conclusions on the impact or results to date	If, and the extent to which, the BRC's activities play a role in decision making

	Indicator 2.3 - Number of times the Belgian government positions itself on IHL on humanitarian issues. <u>CRB-Cf:</u> Indicator 3.1 - The number of times that the BRC has actively shared a position on international humanitarian law that takes into account gender and/or the environment among Belgian decision-makers Indicator 2.3 - The number of times the Belgian authorities take a position on IHL on humanitarian issues taking into account the gender dimension.	by DGD CSC Advocacy ● Interviews: cabinets Parliament other government CIDH ● Case studies			
Effectiveness					
Is our expertise effectively shared with policymakers?	Policy-makers report receiving evidence/opinion/expertise from the BRC Policy-makers report comprehension of the evidence/opinion/expertise received <u>RKV:</u> Indicator 2.2.2 - Number of times RKV actively shared a position on IHL with Belgian policy makers. <u>CRB-Cf:</u> Indicator 3.1 - The number of times that the BRC has actively	● Desk review: *INTERNAL* advocacy tools used: training materials etc. position papers on IHL networking information *EXTERNAL* position papers on IHL ● Interviews: staff CRB-fr and RKV cabinets Parliament other government staff The National IHL Committee (CIDH/ICHR) ● Case studies	● Horizontal analysis ● In-depth analysis	● Limited availability of interviewees/selection bias	How expertise is shared Enablers and barriers to communicating expertise

	shared a position on international humanitarian law that takes into account gender and/or the environment among Belgian decision-makers				
Do we communicate enough about our specificity as Red Cross compared to other organizations of the civil society (principles, mandate)?	Policymakers can articulate the specificity of the Red Cross Policymakers can distinguish between the position of the Red Cross compared to other civil society organisations	• Interviews: all types of interviewees • Case studies			How distinct the BRC and its work is from other organisations What BRC adds to knowledge and debates that other organisations do not
Are our expectations, objectives and added value clear enough for policymakers?	Policymakers can articulate the expectations of the BRC Policymakers can articulate the objectives of the BRC Policymakers can articulate the added value of the BRC	• Interviews cabinets Parliament other government • CIDHCase studies			
Are policy makers strengthened in their knowledge of IHL following our interventions?	Policymakers report better knowledge of IHL as a direct result of the BRC's intervention Policy-makers' perception on quality of interventions <u>RKV:</u> Indicator 2.1 - Number of professionals and Belgian policy makers give that their knowledge of IHL has increased due to RKV training <u>CRB-Cf</u> Indicator 3.2 - Number of Belgian	• Interviews cabinets Parliament other government • CIDHCase studies		• Limited availability of interviewees/selection bias • Policymakers have not yet had the opportunity to apply their knowledge	Are the BRC's interventions and activities in line with policy-makers' needs? What policy-makers learned as a result of the interventions

	policy makers supported who claim to have durably strengthened their knowledge of international humanitarian law and the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement through support and the expertise of the BRC.				
Do we use the right tools to support and influence policy makers? Are the tools and messages transmitted useful and exploitable by the authorities?	Authorities are aware of the BRC's communications Authorities report on BRC influence in decision making Authorities report on use of BRC messages <u>RKV:</u> Indicator 2.3 - Number of times the Belgian government positions itself on IHL on humanitarian issues. <u>CRB-Cf:</u> Indicator 3.1 - The number of times that the BRC has actively shared a position on international humanitarian law that takes into account gender and/or the environment among Belgian decision-makers	● Interviews: CIDH CICR staff CRB-fr and RKV staff other SN MCRCR donor(s) cabinets Parliament other government CIDH other organisations active in the same advocacy space ● Case studies			How BRC (seeks to) achieve its objectives If, and the extent to which, the BRC's activities contribute to the objectives Are the BRC's interventions and activities in line with policy-makers' needs?
Does the frequency of dialogue allow structural monitoring of the dossiers? If not, how to ensure a more structural follow-up?	Frequency of dialogue with interlocutors Types of interlocutors with whom dialogue is taking place Perceptions on the quality and consistency of the evidence collected in the monitoring process	● Interviews: CIDH CICR staff CRB-fr and RKV staff other SN MCRCR donor(s) cabinets Parliament other government other organisations active in the		● Limited availability of interviewees per dossier/selection bias ● Some dossiers or approaches weigh more heavily on the horizontal analysis than others	How and when staff are communicating

		same advocacy space ● Case studies			
Should we take more and/or better account of the Belgian political calendar and the CRCR Movement? If yes, how ?	Frequency and timing of communications	● Desk review: *INTERNAL* Strategy 2020 reporting against strategy, especially M&E data Activity reports Internal meeting reports advocacy tools used: training materials etc. position papers on IHL networking information *EXTERNAL* mentions in media, as available position papers on IHL ● Interviews: CIDH CICR staff CRB-fr and RKV staff other SN MCRCR donor(s)- FPS Foreign Affairs cabinets Parliament other government other organisations active in the same advocacy space	● Horizontal analysis ● Learning and looking forward	● Unpredictability of the political landscape, e.g. composition and formulation of government post-election ● Federal state is complex ● The level of initial stated commitment to fulfilling pledges may differ from the resources dedicated to fulfilling pledges. ● Limited availability of interviewees/selection bias	If and how BRC identifies and adapts to opportunities
Are we working with interlocutors at the right levels (administration, parliament, cabinet) and contacts within them? With which additional levels should we work?	Types of interlocutors with whom dialogue is taking place (level of responsibility, proximity to decision makers, etc.)	● Interviews: CIDH CICR staff CRB-fr and RKV staff other SN MCRCR donor(s) cabinets Parliament other government other organisations active in the	● Horizontal analysis ● Learning and looking forward	● Limited availability of interviewees/selection bias	How and why BRC identifies interlocutors

		same advocacy space			
Are our monitoring tools adequate?	Perceptions of the quality and consistency of the evidence collected in the monitoring process Are the data being captured capable of indicating desired results?	• Desk review: *INTERNAL* Strategy 2020 reporting against strategy, especially M&E data Activity reports Internal meeting reports • Interviews: staff CRB-fr and RKV staff other SN MCRCR donor(s) • Case studies • Validation workshop	• Horizontal analysis • In-depth analysis • Learning and looking forward	• Limited availability of interviewees/selection bias	How staff are using M&E systems The information BRC M&E systems feedback
How does the BRC's work reflect the gender dimensions?	BRC team's reported understanding of the gender dimension in relation to interventions Reported quality of the recommendations the BRC makes on gender dimensions Number of times gender is incorporated into IHL decisions by policymakers	• Interviews (internal and external): CIDH CICR staff CRB-fr and RKV staff other SN MCRCR donor(s) cabinets Parliament other government other organisations active in the same advocacy space • Case studies • Validation workshop	• Horizontal analysis • In-depth analysis	• Limited availability of interviewees/selection bias	How and why gender is integrated into activities/interventions
How does the BRC's work reflect the environmental dimensions?	BRC team's reported understanding of the environmental dimension in relation to interventions Reported quality of the recommendations the BRC makes on environmental	• Interviews: CIDH CICR staff CRB-fr and RKV staff other SN MCRCR donor(s) cabinets Parliament other government	• Horizontal analysis • In-depth analysis	• Limited availability of interviewees/selection bias	How and why environmental dimension is integrated into activities/interventions

	dimensions Number of times the environment is incorporated into IHL decisions by policymakers	other organisations active in the same advocacy space ● Case studies ● Validation workshop			
How does the BRC work with other actors (e.g. CNCD,11..11.11)?	Reported quality of interactions between BRC and other actors	● Interviews: CIDH CICR staff CRB-fr and RKV staff other SN MCRCR other organisations active in the same advocacy space ● Case studies ● Validation workshop	● Horizontal analysis ● In-depth analysis	● Limited availability of interviewees/selection bias ● Early stage of working with other actors means there are few outcomes to report	If and why alliances/partnerships/coalitions are made How alliances/partnerships/coalitions are made Potential outcomes from working with other actors
Sustainability					
How is the long-term sustainability as a result of the advocacy planned and managed?	The BRC has built partnerships with allies to deliver key advocacy messages Status of policies and policy proposals are continuously monitored Position of decision makers on IHL policy is tracked over time	● Desk review: *INTERNAL* Strategy 2020 logical frameworks and theories of change reporting against strategy, especially M&E data Activity reports Internal meeting reports Interview reports (confidentiality) management information: finances, HR, timelines advocacy tools used: training materials etc. position papers on IHL networking information *EXTERNAL* Strategy and other documentation ● Interviews: staff CRB-fr and RKV	● Learning and looking forward	● Limited availability of interviewees/selection bias	If and how systems and resources are planned and implemented The information that systems provide If and how BRC plans to adapt to opportunities If and how BRC plans to exit interventions
What practices can the Society reinforce? Are there already some activities which have not had the desired results?	Stakeholders' perception on effectiveness/outcomes of practices Reported value and outcomes of practices		● Learning and looking forward	● Limited availability of interviewees/selection bias	What practices work well? What practices have not worked well?

What can be learned from this?		staff other SN MCRCR donor(s) ● Validation workshop			
How does the planning and implementation of advocacy respond to the emergent changes in the political context?	Frequency and timing of communications BRC responses/communications to emergent political, policy, and social changes	● Desk review: *INTERNAL* Strategy 2020 reporting against strategy, especially M&E data Activity reports Internal meeting reports advocacy tools used: training materials etc. position papers on IHL networking information *EXTERNAL* mentions in media, as available position papers on IHL ● Interviews: CIDH CICR staff CRB-fr and RKV staff other SN MCRCR donor(s)- FPS Foreign Affairs cabinets Parliament other government other organisations active in the same advocacy space	● Horizontal analysis ● Learning and looking forward ● Horizontal analysis ● Learning and looking forward	● Unpredictability of the political landscape, e.g. composition and formulation of government post-election ● Federal state is complex ● The level of initial stated commitment to fulfilling pledges may differ from the resources dedicated to fulfilling pledges. ● Limited availability of interviewees/selection bias	If and how BRC identifies and adapts to opportunities

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

15/05/2020

Rode Kruis Vlaanderen

CROIX-ROUGE de Belgique

MID-TERM EVALUATION: CONTRIBUTION TO IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION OF THE CRB-CF AND RKV ADVOCACY PLAN 2017-2021

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

As auxiliary to the public authorities in the humanitarian field, Belgian Red Cross (BRC) develops activities for the dissemination of IHL towards different target groups in Belgium as well as supports the implementation of IHL by the public authorities.

In the framework of the current Action Plan 2017-2021, the two communities of Belgian Red Cross, Croix-Rouge de Belgique – Communauté francophone (CRB-Cf) and Rode Kruis Vlaanderen (RKV), undertook jointly the following actions towards Belgian policy makers:

- Approaches to Belgian political decision-makers (parliamentarians, federal parliamentary assistants, cabinets and civil servants of the administrations) within the framework of an advocacy work in favor of a better respect of IHL: training, information sessions, bilateral and confidential dialogue, participation in the Belgian National IHL Committee (Interministerial Commission for Humanitarian Law), international conferences of the Red Cross and Red Crescent (RCRC international conferences);
- An active and joint contribution to the networks and platforms created within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (RCRC Movement) with different aims: to bring together experts to carry out reflection processes on the current challenges of IHL, make recommendations and propose plans of action in this direction, identify commitments to be made for the States and the components of the RCRC Movement.

The mid-term evaluation of the Action Plan 2017-2021, funded by DGD, is focused on these IHL advocacy activities towards Belgian policymakers, developed from January 2017 to July 2019. The evaluation, conducted by Organisation Development Support (ODS) between September 2019 and March 2020, focused on the criteria of impact (contribution to) and effectiveness.

2. SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

The conclusions of the report by ODS show a good level of progress of the activities; it is highly likely that the targets will be achieved by the end of the implementation period. The frequency of engagement and the tools used enable the teams engaged with a broad range of priorities and several stakeholders. The analysis of the impact criteria shows that, through its activities, the BRC is keeping IHL present in the agenda of Belgian policymakers according to its auxiliary role which consists in assisting them in IHL dissemination and cooperating with them to ensure respect for IHL. This ongoing work is made particularly through supporting the processes related to follow-up the pledges made by Belgian federal government at International Conferences of the Red Cross and Red Crescent and through several other advocacy activities reflecting BRC priorities that are also corresponding to the ones identified by the International Red Cross Red Crescent Movement at the international level. The key role of BRC in enabling, supporting and organizing the work of the National IHL Committee (CIDH/ICHR) that unites representatives from ministerial departments who are entry points for potential contacts in the cabinets, is also outlined.

The evaluators conclude that there is a considerable potential for IHL work and stress that the areas of contribution could be further strengthened by revisiting the way in which the strategic planning of advocacy is conducted.

The evaluators identified some lessons learned and made a set of recommendations to BRC teams, including with a view to strengthen the planning, tracking and capturing of the results of its efforts. Details of these recommendations and of our position on these can be found below. Out of the 21 recommendations formulated by ODS, we fully accept 12 recommendations, partially accept 8 recommendations and reject 1 recommendation. The accepted and partially accepted recommendations will be implemented as part of the current action plan and/or in the future five-year programmes. As an answer to these recommendations, we have listed a series of action points. Some of them are referred several times as some recommendations seem to be redundant or to overlap each other.

3. MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TABLE

Recommendation	Responsible	Involved	Key action(s)	Timing
1. CONTRIBUTION TO IMPACT				
1.1. In formulating advocacy positions, build on the experience with pledges and other specific messaging. This would allow BRC to map out where the BRC position is aligned with the Belgian government's position, whether there are any key allies and how much can be achieved in a certain direction.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV)	IHL teams	Importance : 6 and feasibility : 8 **Management response : partially accepted** This recommendation is partially accepted as BRC already formulates advocacy positions on the basis of previous experience. However, BRC plans to do so in a more structured way : • In a document per priority topic, analysis of eventual gaps between BRC position and government's one; • Explore broader range of key allies (stakeholder mapping); • Map possible intermediate steps with timeline towards specific goal.	Future programme
1.2. Cover main expected results and a timeline for following up on the pledges.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV)	IHL teams	Importance : 8 and feasibility : 6 **Management response : accepted** This recommendation will contribute to measure the impact of BRC advocacy work and to reorient its actions if needed in due time. It will also help to rebalance the respective roles of BRC and the authorities within CIDH/ICHR. However, the realization and the coordinated follow-up of the pledges, although doable at BRC level, does not depend solely on BRC. BRC will : • Continue to contribute to the establishment of follow-up tools for pledges including by identifying concrete means for verification (outputs); • Continue to contribute to the creation of a Four-Year Action Plan within CIDH/ICHR that will include the implementation of resolutions and pledges of the 33rd International Conference (2019); • Make its own assessment and timeline for specific actions in the framework of the pledges outside of the CIDH/ICHR.	Current and future programme
1.3. Capture "impact stories" of BRC's advocacy work.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV) PMER	IHL teams	Importance : 8 and feasibility : 8 **Management response : accepted** BRC recognizes the importance to regularly identify in a more structured manner the positive outcomes of its advocacy work for future reflections and for a better external and internal visibility. BRC will: • Establish a format for the twice-yearly reflection meetings so this can be tracked in the same way over the several years; • Create a shared tool for capturing these successes/decisions taken in relation to the priority topics; • See also action point in relation to recommendation 1.1	Future programme

1.4. Exchange experiences with other National Societies	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV)	IHL teams	Importance : 2 and feasibility : 10 **Management response : partially accepted** This recommendation is partially accepted as this approach is already implemented: BRC systematically shares its experience on the implementation of the joint EU pledges and IHL resolutions adopted at RCRC international conferences and on other issues of advocacy of common concern with other NS. BRC will continue to do so by participating in different Movement's fora as platforms for this exchange.	Current and future programme
1.5. Internal reflection on contribution to impact scheduled into standing meetings (beyond progress on indicators). These should draw on an agreed-upon definition to impact.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV) PMER	IHL teams	Importance : 7 and feasibility : 7 **Management response : accepted** See action points related to recommendation 1.1 and 1.3.	Future programme
1.6. CRB-Cf should consider making IHL advocacy a priority in its next multi annual strategy.	Head of International Department (CRB-Cf) IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf)	CRB-Cf IHL team	Importance : 9 and feasibility : 7 **Management response : accepted** The implementation of this recommendation would help to increase the internal visibility of IHL advocacy activities and the support from leadership and colleagues from other departments of CRB-Cf. Reflection has started on how to include advocacy as a cross-cutting topic into the next strategy. CRB-Cf will : • Continue to share internally its experience on IHL advocacy; • Act in favour of the incorporation of advocacy as well as IHL advocacy as a priority in its next multi annual strategy.	Future CRB-Cf multi annual strategy
2. EFFECTIVENESS				
2.1 Developing an advocacy strategy that could be shared internally; including an advocacy calendar and stakeholder mapping/strategy.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV) Communication officer	IHL teams	Importance : 8 and feasibility : 6 **Management response : partially accepted** This recommendation is partially accepted as we already have an advocacy strategy as reflected in the ToC of the current programme. However, BRC will : • Integrate a calendar and a stakeholder mapping in the document per priority topic (see action point related to recommendation 1.1.) • Create a readable document facilitating the communication of its IHL advocacy strategy to an internal audience	Future programme
2.2. Create space for reflection on BRC practice, successes/challenges and decision making based on insights on outcomes.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV) PMER	IHL teams	Importance : 8 and feasibility : 8 **Management response : accepted** See action points related to recommendations 1.1, 1.3. and 1.5.	Future programme
2.3. Update meetings on individual dossiers.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV)	IHL teams	Importance : 5 and feasibility : 8 **Management response : accepted** This recommendation will have a limited impact on the relationship between IHL teams as there are already regular meetings on specific files and bi-annual general meetings. But BRC can always improve these updates through more structural meetings: see action points related to recommendations 1.1, 1.3. and 1.5.	Future programme

2.4. Operationalize the gender strategy for the specific advocacy goals and types of intervention led by BRC. A good starting point for this process would be the development of short gender-related advocacy points for each of the 5 priorities.	Gender focal point IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV)	IHL teams	Importance : 6 and feasibility : 6 **Management response : partially accepted** This recommendation will aim to consider more gender as a cross-cutting issue. The development of a short gender-related advocacy document for all of the five advocacy priorities is not feasible but BRC will continue to : • Reflect on key messages around the implementation of IHL under gender perspective; • Follow the work of the RCRC Movement on the theme of Protection, Gender and Inclusion.	Current and future programme
2.5. Update the terms of collaboration in a way that one of the two branches can be delegated to represent the joint advocacy work of the two towards policymakers.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV)	IHL teams	Importance : 6 and feasibility : 6 **Management response : partially accepted** The two branches already coordinate very intensely and BRC doesn't agree that it is necessary to update the terms of collaboration As the contact with federal authorities remains within the competence of the whole National Society, the representation at national level should be ensured by both communities in principle, especially if BRC leadership may be more involved (Statutes of the BRC, art.34). When not possible, a community could exceptionally represent the whole National Society with explicit consent from the other.	Current programme
2.6. At the level of each branch, strengthening internal knowledge and capacity around IHL and advocacy could offer additional resources and support for the work.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV) Head of IHL (CRB-Cf)	IHL teams	Importance : 6 and feasibility : 4 **Management response : partially accepted** This recommendation is only partially accepted because while BRC believes it could be beneficial to strengthen the internal knowledge and capacity around IHL in general for support of our activities, this will not have a direct impact on the advocacy efforts as the files require a technical and continuous follow-up. BRC will strive to continue in its efforts towards strengthening internal capacity : • Continue to ensure optimal use of human resources in the future; • Reflect on the possibilities of a greater engagement of leadership (e.g. CEOs, members of the boards) on IHL advocacy files.	Future programme
2.7. Covering federal and regional parliaments as well as identifying and building a network of champions in the ministries and key other services.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV) PMER	IHL teams	Importance : 7 and feasibility : 6 **Management response : accepted** BRC has already approached parliamentarians but without reaching the expected outcomes. Contacting parliamentarians is challenging and time-consuming (problem of agenda and of keeping level of interest and turnover after elections) and human resources of IHL teams are limited. But broadening the range of policy makers beyond CIDH/ICHR would contribute to increase the BRC influence on Belgian policies. BRC will : • Analyze, case by case, the added value of working with parliamentarians and explore the best way to contact them and involve them in specific initiatives; • See action points related to recommendation 1.1 (stakeholder mapping). • BRC will also continue to explore potential key persons who may be considered as champions in the ministries and key other services.	Current and future programme

3. MONITORING AND EVALUATION				
3.1. An update to the impact measurement system would ideally include some of the following elements : **a. A reflection on intermediate outcomes that can lead to policy impact** **b. Analysis of the content of the items that are captured** **c. BRC's teams should capture their understanding of the BRC contribution close to the time of the outcome** **d. Finally, attention to actual policy change and change in the way current rules are implemented.**	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV) PMER	IHL teams	Importance : 7 and feasibility : 6 **Management response : partially accepted** An update to the impact measurement system would help have a better identification of BRC potential influence on the adoption of policies and decisions. Points b and d are already implemented, although not in a structural format : • See action points related to recommendations 1.1., 1.3 and 1.5.	Future programme
3.2. Review the current impact tracking process. Consider including tipping point, intermediary and framing type activities and workflows into the practice. The collection of data should be accompanied by opportunities for reflecting on the insights that the data offer, in a structured debrief around key outcomes.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV) PMER	IHL teams	Importance : 7 and feasibility : 6 **Management response : partially accepted** Recommendation is too vague as it is phrased, but, considering its available human resources and time, BRC will undertake the following actions to the extent possible: • Explore the existing and relevant tools for measuring advocacy impact; • Exchange with other organisations working on advocacy; • See also action points related to recommendations 1.3 and 1.5.	Future programme
3.3. In future programming, we strongly encourage CRB-Cf and RKV to align the structure of outcomes, theories of change and indicators.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV) Head of IHL (CRB-Cf) PMER	IHL teams	Importance : 8 and feasibility : 8 **Management response : accepted** As regards advocacy, the programme frameworks are already quite similar. But BRC IHL teams can always improve the alignment of their outcomes, ToC and indicators for this part of the Action Plan.	Future programme
3.4. The BRC should develop a theory of change for its work with the CIDH/ICHR.	/	/	Importance : 5 and feasibility : 4 **Management response : rejected** The participation of BRC in the work of the CIDH/ICHR cannot be questioned according to the BRC statutory mandate and auxiliary role in IHL, its role as it is provided in the 2000 Royal Decree related to the organization of the committee and resolutions of the International Conference of the RC/RC. The involvement of BRC in the committee is one of the main advocacy approaches where the NS can effectively influence the policy makers. It is an integral part of our general theory of change. Moreover, a four-year action plan of CIDH/ICHR is being developed and will contribute to rebalance the respective roles of the National Society and the departments which are represented.	/

3.5. Indicators should be useful, used and relevant to the decisions taken by the teams. We suggest that for each indicator, the BRC lays out where these indicators would be used for steering the advocacy project.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV) PMER	IHL teams	Importance : 8 and feasibility : 5 **Management response : partially accepted** Recommendation as it is phrased here is too vague but there will be another reflection on the indicators as part of the formulation of the future programme. See also action points related to recommendations 1.3 and 1.5 and 3.2.	Future programme
3.6. We suggest that the BRC teams reflect on the reality of their work, priorities, successes and engagement. Insights from the reflection should inform the definition of impact and overarching objectives which are aligned with this reality.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV) PMER	IHL teams	Importance : 8 and feasibility : 7 **Management response : partially accepted** Recommendation is very vague but meet some of the above-mentioned recommendations. See action points in relation with recommendations 1.1, 1.2., 1.3, 1.5, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1., 3.2.	Future programme
4. SUSTAINABILITY				
4.1. The teams would benefit from a structured approach to the longer-term view of the advocacy programme, as it is likely to remain an important component of the BRC's work.	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV)	IHL teams	Importance : 6 and feasibility : 8 **Management response : accepted** BRC will : • Try, for each priority topics, to identify multi annual goals and goals per year; • See also action points in relation with recommendations 1.1 and 3.1.	Current and future programme
4.2. Sustainability planning would take place at all levels of the program: **a. Planning: Define a structure for a yearly evaluation meeting where insights from the year are captured, data interpreted and actions taken for the coming year. This should be aligned with the strategies of the partners and the ICRC and weighed against changes in context and resources.** **b. In the case of important political changes, scenario-based forward planning could be useful in framing advocacy priorities, even as insecurity persists, e.g. around elections.** **c. We recommend BRC to develop an exit plan for advocacy with the main actors, including possibilities for rebalancing the roles occupied by the BRC's with the CIDH/ICHR. Exit planning would also enable the sustainability of BRC's work in areas which become special focus for the period of time between two Red Cross conferences. Planning for the after-life of pledges would help balance resources and priorities.** **d. Organisational: widen the circle of colleagues**	IHL legal adviser (CRB-Cf) Head of IHL (RKV) Head of IHL (CRB-Cf) PMER	IHL teams	Importance : 7 and feasibility : 6 **Management response : partially accepted** Points e, f and g reflect existing practices. No exit strategy is foreseen (c) : it is important to keep an ongoing support of the BRC to the authorities and of a constant dialogue with them according to its statutory mandate and auxiliary role in IHL. Pledges are important humanitarian advocacy tools and not an end in itself. That is why additional pledges will continue to be considered for other Belgium's commitments for the next RCRC international conferences and considering new IHL challenges in contemporary armed conflicts. See also general comments in relation with recommendation 3.4. a. This point meets some of the above-mentioned recommendations: see action points in relation with recommendations 1.1, 1.2., 1.3, 1.5, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1., 3.2. b. BRC's key messages and approaches are already adapted in case of important political changes but BRC will consider alternative ways for each priority topic. d. See action points in relation with recommendation 2.6.	Current and future programme

who are part of the advocacy work around IHL and the strategic relevance of the work for the whole organisation. Main outcomes and decisions from the strategic review meeting should be shared with the CEO-level leadership in the partner organisations. **e. Organisational: currently, much of the work is owned by the senior leads in the two partner communities. Gradually on-boarding at least one or two additional team members by including them in meetings, phone calls and delivery of advocacy work would not only help with the considerable workload, but also increase the BRC's resilience to turnover or absence.** **f. The collaboration between the two communities is a key aspect of the advocacy programme which should be safeguarded through formal and informal approaches. e.g. through high-level meetings, or a common advocacy advisory Board/shared figurehead.** **g. Funding: We recommend that the teams put in place a fundraising plan to secure alternative/additional funding streams for advocacy.**				

Tiene Lievens
Manager International Cooperation
Rode Kruis-Vlaanderen

Stéphanie Rémion
Directrice du Département international
Croix-Rouge de Belgique – Communauté francophone