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What is the Tech RRT?

Technical rapid response mechanism to support collective work for nutrition in emergencies

Consortium

Funding

In close collaboration with

August 2015 – March 2018 …
What has the Tech RRT done?

37* deployments to 13 countries…

Soon to be 40

* Includes four with other funding sources

Number of Deployments

- Haiti
- Serbia/Greece
- Turkey/Syria
- Iraq
- Yemen
- Somalia
- Egypt
- South Sudan
- Ethiopia
- Mozambique
- DRC
- East Africa
- Niger
- Nigeria

Assessments

- SBC
- CMAM
- IYCF-E
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback - GNC Oct 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal webinars trainings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respond to all population types and countries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respond to refugee situations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparedness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for nutrition sensitive program requests</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent deployment time for advisers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-deployment time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff on a retainer basis (NOT full-time)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A roster system for additional human resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A cost recovery or cost sharing model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversification of funding</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Phase 2

Through 28 Feb 2019

Program Goal:
To improve and strengthen the technical quality of programs and assessments for improved nutrition outcomes of affected populations in emergencies and protracted crisis situations
Phase 2 – major changes

Focus on practical, hands-on support to improve the quality and reach of assessments and programs at implementation level (decreased involvement in strategy and guideline development)

Support to individual agencies or groups of agencies - strongly encouraging individual or several organizations together to make requests directly

Seeking ways to support and interact more with local & national actors

Better follow up of deployment initiatives – continuity of work started

Increased capacity strengthening initiatives

Changes to the team composition –
- SBC – no dedicated adviser,
- Assessments & Surveys – new focus; SMART to the SMART project, only for backup

Pilot deployments focusing on integration of nutrition-sensitive activities

Exploration and testing of new financing modalities and expanding the funding base
CS/CR - the new norm to investigate for each deployment

Every deployment will use this approach

DEPENDS ON RESOURCES AVAILABLE

Four tiers of contribution possibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Financial contribution of country/organization(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 0</td>
<td>No contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1a</td>
<td>Only deployment costs (flights, per diem, accommodation, visas, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1b</td>
<td>Only adviser salary/fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>Tier 1a + 1b (deployment costs and adviser salary/fees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>Tier 2 plus program support costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TECH RRT PHASE 1
EXTERNAL EVALUATION
Objectives and Scope

Objectives:
• Identify accomplishments
• Evaluate performance (internal and external)
• Identify constraints in implementation of the program and in attainment of the project’s specific objective: to improve overall emergency nutrition response.

• Scope: 31 deployments during 2016 and 2017
Sources and Sample

- **Sources**: document review and 41 interviews with both global and country level informants (SC, Tech RRT advisors, HST advisors, INGO staff, GNC, UNICEF)

- 10 day field visit to South Sudan during 2 deployments (IYCF and CMAM) – observation of deployments and face-to-face interviews

- **Sample**: Focus on Yemen, Nigeria, Syria/Turkey and South Sudan (45% of 31 deployments)
13 priority evaluation questions covering the following areas:

- Relevance and timeliness of deployments and non-deployment work
- Effectiveness of deployments and non-deployment work
- Awareness of the Tech RRT
- Effectiveness of M&E system
- Coordination (country and global level)
- Difference made by deployments
- Efficiency of operational model
- Evaluation of deployment process including engagement with key partners
- Financial sustainability
- Cost-recovery
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main findings: the good &amp; the bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided highly qualified technical expertise in a rapid and efficient manner to clearly identified gaps in capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is well placed to enable cross-fertilization of learning from one context to another on the use of cutting edge best practice in emergency settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have successfully provided support to the collective in all deployments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But rarely deploys within 72 hours due to factors external to the Tech RRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployments – largely effective in meeting the needs of the country programme as defined in the assignment ToR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has functioned well with good governance systems and strong relationships between consortium members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But non-deployment time - poorly structured and monitored with varied usefulness and efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E plan is effective in measuring the success of the project at the output level…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But alternative hosting arrangements have been problematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But no means to measure success at outcome or impact level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standby Partnership Agreements between UNICEF and partner agencies have facilitated smooth deployments….
Main findings: the good & the bad

Deployments - largely regarded as relevant and appropriate to the needs
- CMAM and IYCF-E were regarded as appropriate
- Assessment function - too focused on SMART; should respond to different assessment needs
- SBC - least demanded function, due to a lack of awareness of its use in emergency settings
- Strong support for including nutrition sensitive programming, intersectoral work and nutrition response preparedness

Deployment durations:
6-weeks - too restrictive and sometimes inappropriate...

Coordinates very well at country level, and largely well at global level

The type of support provided was relevant to the needs...

But not always deemed an appropriate role for the Tech RRT (grey area)

Without on-going core funding, a cost recovery model seems to be the only available option for sustaining the Tech RRT in the long term...

But recent examples show that this is viable

On the whole, the deployment mechanism works well in enabling rapid deployments following requests, whilst ensuring appropriate engagement (at field level) and coordination (at global level).
Main findings – going forward

• To improve quality and scale with more “hands-on” support, rather than policy environment; UNICEF is better placed to support this
• Expanding support to individual NGOs is a welcome development – more communication needed to NGOs (smaller and less established in nutrition)
• Not well placed to do research - but has unique position to identify opportunities for new research, document learning and operationalize new evidence-based approaches
• General agreement that collaboration between Tech RRT and GNC should be closer – for coordination and information sharing on individual deployments and strategic discussions around the development and future
• Strong role for the Tech RRT under the organisation and guidance of the NiE TAB. Appetite for a common approach and a desire to hold on to the successes of the Tech RRT.
How can the Tech RRT most effectively change to increase the speed, quality and effectiveness of technical support to nutrition emergencies?
Preliminary recommendations
FOR DISCUSSION

- Type of support
- Deployment process
- Non-deployment work
- Development of Tech RRT & coordination
- Communications
- Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning
- Program Management and Sustainability
Thank you!

For more information:

technical@InternationalMedicalCorps.org

Follow us on Twitter: @TechRRT