

Annex One: Terms of Reference for the Human Security in Conflict & Emergencies Thematic Review

June-December 2007

1. Background

ActionAid's experience in emergencies and conflict has grown considerably over the last 10 years. In 2004 Human Security in Conflict & Emergencies was selected as one of the six priority themes for ActionAid International's new strategy – *Rights to End Poverty 2005-2010*¹. It was a recognition within the organisation of the need to make a more concerted response to violent conflict and emergencies. The strategy also highlighted ActionAid's distinctive approach and experience in emergencies.

The strategic approach to Human Security work was fleshed out in the *Human Security in Conflict & Emergencies Strategic Plan 2005-2010*. It provides a strategic framework which describes how ActionAid works to mitigate the causes and effects of emergencies and conflict for poor and excluded people. The strategic plan takes a rights-based approach to emergencies and conflict work. This approach puts poor women, men, girls and boys at the centre of perceptions and analysis and focuses on the issues they cite as important. It also directs attention to the responsibilities of the state and powerful institutions to protect and empower poor and excluded people and to work together with partners and alliances to hold states, governments and institutions accountable for human security. Therefore issues of power and gender are central to ActionAid's understanding and approach to human security.

ActionAid is now in its second year of implementing the HS strategic plan. Highlights of the work in the past two years include:

- ♦ Responding to the tsunami and the earthquake in Pakistan. A great deal of this work has already been evaluated. It is important that the lessons from this work are sufficiently brought out and models of good practice drawn to help inform future work.
- ♦ Responses to other disasters including the Sahel Crisis in 2005/6, East Africa Food Crisis and Floods in 2006, Vietnam typhoon in 2006, Floods in SE Asia in 2006 (namely Bangladesh, Nepal and India).
- ♦ Disaster Risk Reduction: initiating the 'Disaster Reduction through Schools' project, partnership with UNISDR, lobbying them and countries to implement the Hyogo Framework for Action, implementing DIPECHO projects.
- ♦ Developing an understanding of how ActionAid can address the impact of climate change.
- ♦ Work in developing participatory methodologies (namely Participatory Vulnerability Analysis).

¹ Other core themes include: Women's rights, the right to education, the right to food, the right to a life of dignity in the face of HIV&AIDS, the right to just and democratic governance

- ♦ Putting in place the appropriate structures and systems for managing the thematic human security work.
- ♦ Improving our understanding and positioning around conflict.
- ♦ A focus on improving humanitarian responses by influencing the UN Reform Process and the UN Security Council Resolutions.

ActionAid International is now calling for a mid term evaluation of the Human Security strategy. It should be a “forward looking” evaluation: an opportunity to critically review our work so far to draw out lessons, learning and recommendations on the way forward.

2. Human Security work within ActionAid

2.1. ActionAid’s distinctive approach

The human security work needs to be seen in context within ActionAid. Some distinctive characteristics of ActionAid of relevance for the review are highlighted here.

- ♦ **Rights-based Approach.** As highlighted in its *Rights to End Poverty* international strategy, ActionAid is an organisation which takes a rights-based approach. We concentrate on “deepening our focus on poverty eradication by addressing unequal power relations and strengthening our rights-based approach and methods”.
- ♦ **Accountability and learning framework, putting poor and excluded actors at the centre.** ActionAid strives to improve the quality of its planning and analysis of change through ALPS (Accountability, Learning and Planning System). ALPS requires that each planning / review process look closely at principles such as Accountability, Learning, Transparency, Power and Women Rights. ALPS is also based on a set of shared attitudes and behaviours; and it demands the inclusion and participation of all relevant stakeholders (first and foremost the poor and excluded) in all planning processes.
- ♦ **An internationalising organization.** The structure and governance of AAI reflect our international nature – sharing power across the north and south, acting together with one voice from local to international. Following a regionalisation process, ActionAid moved its headquarters to Johannesburg and is shifting its decision- making to its affiliates (in the north as well as in the south).
- ♦ **A structure geared to interconnection (“matrix work”).** ActionAid recognizes that the effectiveness and impact of our work depends on the ability to work in diverse, flexible and empowered teams. The organization provides space and incentives for staff to work within and between geographical divisions, functions and themes.

2.2 Human Security within ActionAid

The Human Security in Conflict & Emergencies Strategic Plan 2005-2010 provides a strategic framework for the Human Security theme. The overall goal of the strategic plan is for: ‘People to exercise their rights and maintain a sense of security during conflict and emergencies’². This is to be achieved through working towards **5 strategic objectives**:

- To reduce the hazards that threaten poor people
- To alleviate and address the causes of conflict
- To build people’s resilience to conflict and emergencies
- To generate pressure on governments, armed opposition groups and institutions to uphold their responsibility to protect people in conflict and emergencies
- To assure poor people access to appropriate assistance and basic services in conflict and emergencies

As the work on Human Security evolves, the strategic objectives have tended to organise around **3 strands of work**: disaster risk reduction, emergency response and violent conflict. This comprises: national and global policy work to address the root causes of natural and human-made disasters (including conflict); pre-disaster preparedness work to enhance the resilience of vulnerable communities; and post-emergency relief, rehabilitation and recovery programmes.

The distinctive approach of ActionAid in emergencies and conflict is an evolving one and can be characterized by:

- ♦ **Rights-based approach.** Protection, respect and promotion of people’s rights are equally valid in emergencies as at other times. The fight for women’s rights is central because their rights are denied so extensively and systematically.
- ♦ **Emergency relief in development work.** Emergency relief– in seeking to respond to people in need – should not abandon development principles. That is, the notion of “saving people’s lives” must not result in ignoring or overlooking local capacity and people’s rights to information and decision-making etc, or in treating rights holders as passive beneficiaries. Mobilisation of affected communities to claim their rights is an ongoing, longer-term process.
- ♦ **Linking relief, rehabilitation and development.** Disasters/emergencies are integral to development processes and should not stop at the relief phase. As such, the emergency response should be implemented with a view of the spectrum of relief, rehabilitation and development and to incorporating long-term development considerations from the early stages.
- ♦ **Taking sides with poor and excluded people. Poor and excluded people are the worse affected by disasters.** In keeping with RTEP, emergency work must take sides with poor and excluded people, ensuring equity and justice. This is consistent with humanitarian principles as the vulnerabilities caused by poverty and exclusion significantly affect their

² ActionAid International Human Security in Conflict and Emergencies - Strategic Plan 2005-2010

needs and their ability to recover. Operationalising a rights-based approach will result in changes in the status/power relationships in favour of poor and excluded people within the timeframe of the emergency response projects.

- ♦ **Working collaboratively and in genuine partnerships** We actively work collaboratively and cooperatively with other stakeholders to ensure that work is not being duplicated, and that each part contributes to the overall response. Ways of working with partners embody the core principles of “partnerships”, particularly holding shared values and perspectives, and each partner adds value to the process.
- ♦ **Integrating with work on conflict.** We link conflict & emergencies work under one strategy. We believe that implementation of humanitarian work takes place within an evolving context which demands a political awareness, conflict sensitivity and incorporation of work on conflict.
- ♦ **Emphasis on effective participation.** Rigorous and effective participatory methodologies for conflict analysis and vulnerability analysis ensuring that all our responses are appropriate, community-led and transparent.
- ♦ **Emphasis on transparency, accountability, learning.** Innovative mechanisms for accountability and transparency through ActionAid’s Accountability, Learning and Planning System - a framework for involving communities and partner organizations closely in the planning, budgeting, monitoring and reviewing of programmes.
- ♦ **Linking practice and policy, from local to global:** International expertise and policy analysis on humanitarian issues drawing experience from the communities we work with to influence policy and practice locally, nationally and internationally. Priority areas include disaster risk reduction and adaptation to climate change, conflict and peace building, food aid and UN humanitarian reform.

2.3. Who works on Human Security in Actionaid?

At the heart of the Human Security theme lies the *International Emergencies and Conflict team* (IECT). The team is a central resource providing a service to country programmes to improve the scale and quality of ActionAid’s emergencies and conflict work, implementing an international policy programme and contributing to ActionAid’s profile and brand. The team works closely with country programmes that have prioritised human security work, supporting alignment to the human security strategic plan & identifying the implications of their work beyond their own boundaries to deliver the international component of the plan.

IECT consists of a core team coordinating policy, communications and fundraising, and focussed on improving systems, a team of six **advisors** who are deployed in the event of a disaster. They all have a global remit for emergency response, but are based in different regions to give consistent support to their sub-regional country programmes for the wider implications of the strategic plan. The team of advisors is line managed and deployed by a Programme Manager who deals directly with country programmes in emergencies to make sure that they have the support they need to respond adequately. A Global Conflict Advisor drives concept, coherence and quality

in this emerging field. A donor funded post manages the multi-country disaster reduction project. A new post appointed in July 2007 is an International Security Advisor focussing on institutionalising issues of security across ActionAid.

The distinctive structure of ActionAid means that the International Emergencies and Conflict Team has, in most cases, no direct role in the management of emergency programmes. Within countries, Human security work is planned within national frameworks and delivered by local staff and/or partners.

To enhance its capacities further, the IECT has recently initiated the *Emergency First Action Support Team (E-Fast)*, a pool of experienced and skilled AA staff from various country programmes who can be quickly deployed for response, supplementing the work of IECT staff.

Ultimately, ActionAid believes that also in the context of Human Security work, the main actors should be the poor and excluded that are affected by the emergency. ActionAid recognizes at all stages the importance of recognizing and developing their power and to working in true partnership with them.

3. Purpose and scope of the review

The review is primarily about **looking forwards**. It offers an opportunity:

- ♦ ***To check if our thinking and the assumptions underpinning the strategy (and the way it is implemented) are valid and relevant.*** For example, this was the first time that conflict & emergencies came under one strategy, what has been learnt what might need to change based on lessons and new areas of work emerging.
- ♦ ***To take stock of our work to date.*** To draw out the key issues and lessons from our work and from the wider sector that will help to improve our understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of our approaches, systems and structures and provide recommendations for future work and on how to improve performance. To provide a stronger rationale as to how we spend our money and whether the model is the right one. This is also about understanding how ActionAid apply a rights approach in its emergency and conflict work and to what extent our practice matches our rhetoric.
- ♦ ***To assess, how our strategy ‘sits’ within the wider emergencies and conflict sector and within ActionAid.*** To look at how the strategy is perceived both by external actors (including poor and excluded, donors, partners, peers, governments and AA supporters) and internally, within ActionAid (including country programmes, themes, international directors, trustees and IEC team members).
- ♦ ***To provide an overall analysis of the current processes and approaches for monitoring progress and learning*** about our human security work, and generate ideas on how we might do this more systematically in the future.

- ♦ ***To check on and deepen our accountability.*** ActionAid's Accountability Learning and Planning system's (ALPS) commitment to learning, and involvement of stakeholders especially poor and excluded groups in all aspects of its work (including monitoring progress) has presented a number of challenges on how to effectively engage stakeholders in a meaningful process to ensure that we are sufficiently challenged from outside the organisation to critically examine and be accountable for our work. There are also external pressures that require ActionAid to critically look at its accountability processes to poor and excluded people partners and allies, including the recent HAP initiative. Whilst ActionAid has often been cited as ahead of the game with regards to accountability, we need to examine more closely what we have been doing, and what lessons can be learnt for the future and for the sector.

The lessons from the review should help to us to see whether our strategy is still relevant and help inform our future work.

The review should look at ActionAid's Human Security thematic work as a whole at local, national and international level and how the sum of the parts add up, and how work at national level links into international. The emphasis of the review should be at the country level (community, partners and national level). It is important that review looks at accountability processes to poor and excluded people and partners and allies. This includes an understanding of different roles and behaviours, culture, power relations and conflict. Issues of gender and women's rights should be a key component of this review.

4. The components of the review

The review will build on the components outlined in the table.

- ♦ Each stream of work will be allocated to a different team. Separate TORs are issued to further define evaluation and review questions.
- ♦ The streams of work are phased so that they can build on each other. The evaluation of the tsunami response and the evaluation of the South Asia Earthquake response will need to feed into the review of "how does Human Security fit in the broader humanitarian context"
- ♦ The findings from external consultants will be validated and discussed within ActionAid through peer reviewing processes. These include 1) a workshop of the International Emergency and Conflict Team; 2) consultation with other peers in ActionAid (staff working in Emergencies, Country Directors of countries working on Human Security, other theme heads).

<i>1. Evaluation of tsunami response</i>		
<i>Timeframe:</i> Approx 30 days (from August to November)	<i>Undertaken by:</i> External consultant (to be	<i>Key questions</i> 1. Whether the assumptions underlying our programming are valid and whether the approaches are appropriate within ActionAid's overall strategy, Rights to End

<p>* An interim report should be completed by 1st October 2007.</p> <p>*A presentation for peer review should be completed by November 2007 TBC)</p>	<p>appointed)</p>	<p>Poverty.</p> <p>2. Whether our implementation of these approaches made the difference we intended at all levels (local, national, international).</p> <p>3. The effectiveness of our systems for programming, management, accountability and learning.</p> <p>Specific questions for the review are in Appendix 1.</p>
2. South Asia Earthquake response		
<p><i>Timeframe:</i> Approx 30 days (from August to November)</p> <p>* An interim report of findings should be completed by 1st October 2007.</p> <p>*A presentation for peer review should be completed by November 2007)</p>	<p><i>Undertaken by:</i> External consultant (to be appointed)</p>	<p><i>Key questions</i></p> <p>1. Whether the assumptions underlying our programming are valid and whether the approaches are appropriate within ActionAid's overall strategy, Rights to End Poverty.</p> <p>2. Whether our implementation of these approaches made the difference we intended at all levels (local, national, international).</p> <p>3. The effectiveness of our systems for programming, management, accountability and learning.</p> <p>Specific questions for the review are in Appendix 2.</p>
3. How does Human security work fit in the broader emergencies/conflict context?		
<p><i>Timeframe:</i> Approx 30 days (from end July to end October)</p> <p>*A presentation</p>	<p><i>Undertaken by:</i> External consultant (to be appointed)</p>	<p>We need to take stock of the external environment in which we are operating in and understand how our strategy 'sits' within current thinking and developments within the wider sector and assess whether the assumptions and thinking underpinning the strategy are correct or still relevant.</p> <p>We also need to look at recent themes and</p>

<p>for peer review should be completed by November 2007)</p>		<p>areas of work that have developed over the strategy period. This includes our work on violence against women, Disaster Preparedness ECHO (DIPECHO) (disaster preparedness and ECHO or Disaster Preparedness ECHO projects? Not clear) and conflict work. We want to explore how this work and the approaches taken are perceived by others and link to other themes within countries and in to international work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External environment scan. What are key trends, developments and innovation that ActionAid should be considering? • Where does our strategy sit with external environment, what is the added value? What are the areas that would require challenging our approaches / assumptions? • How does the capacity of ActionAid compare to that of other humanitarian organization? What are our strengths, weaknesses? What are opportunities and threats? • What are the key strategic areas where ActionAid can achieve maximum impact in positively influencing the broader humanitarian sector, in coherence with its own missions and values? • To what extent the commitments sets by ALPS to accountability, learning, transparency, power, women's rights are effectively realized? To what extent our approaches to the above (in particular vis-à-vis accountability) can positively influence the broader humanitarian sector? • What is the positioning of AAI and the relevance within the broader sector re: priority areas of work? (Disaster Risk Reduction / Violence against women / Climate Change) • What are the value and relevance of the methodologies that ActionAid is developing? (for example: PVA – Participatory Vulnerability Analysis) • Work with partners- What is the role of partners and AA? How do we build capacity of and collaborate with partners? How do we involve them in project design? • One specific area of work for ActionAid as a whole is to influence donor policies and attitudes. To what extent does ActionAid
--	--	---

		<p>succeed in doing this in the emergency context? What are the opportunities and threats?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is our niche? Where should we focus in the future? <p>The review should include in country engagement with people affected by disasters and ActionAid staff and partners. A list of countries willing to engage in the review will be provided following consultation with countries.</p> <p>The review should build on the findings from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The independent review of Tsunami and South Asia Earthquake (interim report to be shared by 1st October). The peer review on the Disaster Risk Reduction through School programme (conducted internally by ActionAid) DIPECHO funded projects Participatory Vulnerability Analysis review (conducted by IDS)
4. How does Human security fit within ActionAid? (organizational aspects)		
<p><i>Timeframe:</i> Approx 20 days (from end July to end October) *A presentation for peer review should be completed by November 2007)</p>	<p><i>Undertaken by:</i> External consultant (to be appointed)</p>	<p>The review offers an opportunity to draw out lessons for the broader organisation on matrix working and learning across themes, functions and countries and how work at national level links into the international. It will be important to identify areas of synergy and explore what is working well and what is not going well and why. This is also an opportunity to understand whether time spent on cross-cutting themes makes any difference to our development practice and approaches and its impact at different levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> External environment scan. What are key trends, developments and innovation in organization management that ActionAid should be considering? What is the influence of the IECT team in helping to develop a stronger awareness of the right to Human Security, and of effective strategies and methods to tackle it? What is the capacity of the IECT team and of ActionAid as a whole to learn and innovate from our engagement in the areas of emergencies and conflict? How can IECT maximise its added value in

		<p>the future?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is matrix working supporting Human Security work? To what extent Human Security is linked across geographic areas, at different levels (from the Development Area level to the international level), with other ActionAid themes (education, women rights, HIV/AIDS, governance, food security) and with functions (e.g. policy, fundraising, international partnership development, finance, HR)? • What are opportunities and challenges offered by an internationalizing organization and our models of management and governance vis-à-vis human security work? • Is Human Security work effectively engaging local partners? What are the challenges and opportunities in working with local partners in an emergency / preparedness context?
--	--	---

Peer reviewing (These components are not yet open to bids)

Peer reviewing will help to critical reflect, consolidate and learn from the findings of the external reviews. They will involve key stakeholders within ActionAid. The peer reviewing will take place through facilitated meetings / exchanges, but the exact design is still to be finalized. We are asking to external reviewers to provide their findings also as a concise presentation that will be used in the course of the peer reviewing process. We will also evaluate the possibility of inviting external reviewers to the ActionAid workshops.

<i>Review and Reflection at the IECT meeting</i>		
<i>Timeframe:</i> November 2007	<i>Undertaken by:</i> IECT team together with review consultants and other key stakeholders.	The annual review of the International Conflict and Emergencies team will be an opportunity to reflect on the findings of the various components of the thematic review and to consolidate and feed back comments and recommendations based on them.
<i>Consultation of Peers in ActionAid</i>		
<i>Timeframe:</i> November 2007	<i>Undertaken by:</i> Facilitated consultation of key stakeholders in ActionAid	Key staff from ActionAid will also be consulted to engage in critical questioning and probing of the findings of the different component of the review. The focus is on validation, discussion, consolidation, lesson learning. We will look at the possibility of bringing together key stakeholders in a facilitated

		meeting (or by use of remote conferencing), or to held discussions in the course of other existing meetings
--	--	---

Methodology

ActionAid does not demand consultants to followed a pre-set methodology, but calls consultants and team to propose their own approach. The chosen consultants will be asked to work closely with an internal reference group for the review when preparing a detailed guidance document, including areas of investigations, key questions to be addressed and an outline of the processes and proposed methodologies.

ActionAid will offer logistical support in organizing field visits to AAI offices and programmes.

We will favour approaches which:

- are light and where possible build on existing ActionAid processes, reviews, learnings (e.g. available strategies, plans, reviews, reports) as well as other existing external sources.
- seek to consult with key stakeholders, both external and internal to ActionAid, remembering that ActionAid places first and foremost accountability and participation from poor and excluded, in particular women and girls.
- will ensure a variety of perspectives (e.g. from different geographic areas, from local to global)
- will ensure that the different review strands are sufficiently linked

We are favouring a non-sector component/perspective for any bid (i.e. people from outside the development, emergency response and conflict communities).

Outputs

Each component of the review will need to result in a report no longer than 25 pages with a 3-5 page summary.

In addition to this, consultants and teams responsible for each component of the review should set up a presentation of the process and findings of maximum 20 minutes, possibly accompanied by audio / visual (e.g. powerpoint, videos). Such presentation will be the main tool used to inform participants to the peer reviewing process.

The report will be a lasting document which will include insights and reflections in addition to key lessons and recommendations. The report should also include the reflections and voices of stakeholders involved in the review process, both positive and negative in direct quotes.³

³ Whilst ensuring confidentiality

We will give preference to consultants and teams who will propose, in addition to the report, innovative and effective ways to capture the process and the results of the review, and to create outputs which can be more effectively shared and presented to our audiences.

Management of the review

The International Director for the Human Security theme is responsible for commissioning the review.

The review will be project managed by the European Impact Assessment advisor, who is responsible for supporting the Human Security theme. They will be responsible for:

- ♦ finding and managing the consultants, including briefing and providing initial contacts to country programmes, IECT team members, conflict network members etc.
- ♦ liaising with the internal reference group
- ♦ assisting the consultant in accessing relevant information/documentation and contacts.
- ♦ overseeing the budget for the review

An internal reference group will be established which will include the IECT Management team, ActionAid's Head of Impact Assessment and an adviser.

1. Useful documents

Rights to End Poverty ActionAid International Strategy
Available at: <http://www.actionaid.org/main.aspx?PageID=6>

Human Security Strategic Plan 2005-2010
Available from: [**emergencies@actionaid.org**](mailto:emergencies@actionaid.org)

Human Security Annual Review 2006
Available from: [**emergencies@actionaid.org**](mailto:emergencies@actionaid.org)

ActionAid Emergencies and Conflict website
Available at: <http://www.actionaid.org/main.aspx?PageID=23>

ActionAid's Accountability, Learning and Planning System
Available at: <http://www.actionaid.org/main.aspx?PageId=261>

Appendix 1

Specific questions for the Evaluation of the overall tsunami response As a component of the thematic review of Human Security

The evaluation of the Tsunami programme shall build on the large number of review and reflections on the programme already conducted (see section on “Further Documentation). It is intended as an end of programme evaluation of the Tsunami intervention and, as such it will also be shared with the Disasters Emergency Committee (DEC). The evaluation of the tsunami programme is also a key component of a thematic review of Human Security in Conflict and Emergencies. In particular, its finding shall also feed into the review of “How does Human security work fit into the broader humanitarian context?”

This appendix focuses on specific questions for the review. Please refer to the overall TORs for the overarching questions and context of the review.

Context

The Actionaid response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami was the biggest multi-country programme that we had ever implemented. This single project made up about 12% of Actionaid’s entire programme expenditure for three consecutive years. It took place in 6 countries. This included 3 countries (India, Thailand, Somaliland) where ActionAid already had an active presence and 3 countries (Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Maldives) where ActionAid had not worked before. The scale and scope of the programme, and the speed at which it was launched tested our systems and capacity to the limits, and so generated innovative solutions to new challenges.

The programme has been frequently reviewed with a range of processes. These reviews have examined the impact of each components of the programme on the ground. This evaluation is to build on these reviews and draw out the lessons from the programme as a whole. From these reviews we know about the strengths and weaknesses of the field programme and the impact against its objectives in each area and at different times.

Key questions

The purpose of the evaluation is for us to learn from the experience of the programming and delivery and so improve future emergency work.

The evaluation will report on:

1. Whether the assumptions underlying our programming are valid and so whether the approaches are appropriate within ActionAid’s overall strategy, Rights to End Poverty.

2. Whether our implementation of these approaches made the difference we intended at all levels (Local, national, international).
3. The effectiveness of our systems for programming, management, accountability and learning.

Question 1 and 2 will require reporting on the validity of the assumptions and approaches of ActionAid, and of the suitability, relevance, effectiveness and impact of the intervention undertaken (with particular attention also to our policy work).

To this end, the evaluation will need:

- a) to draw on the reports of reviews and audits, to produce a meta-narrative of programme impact over time.
- b) to seek evidence of impact of the policy work nationally and internationally.

As for question 3, the following specific questions apply

Specific questions

a. Programming

Were our programme processes consistent with ALPS, (ActionAid's accountability, learning and planning system)? Look in particular at:

Programme design processes:

- ♦ Were the assessments timely and appropriate?
- ♦ How did assessments represent poor peoples views?
- ♦ Were our programme objectives consistent with the assessment findings?
- ♦ How was the programme design (for both field work and policy work) informed by the assessments, coordination with others, and considerations of cost effectiveness?
- ♦ How was the policy programme design?

Monitoring, reviewing and learning processes

- ♦ Was the whole system of internal and external reviews appropriate and cost effective (in helping us see what we were actually doing compared to what we thought we were doing)?
- ♦ How did monitoring and reviewing represent poor peoples views?
- ♦ What were the specific advantages and challenges of each component of the system?
- ♦ Did the reviews actually lead to effective changes and adjustments of the programme?

Accountability processes

- ♦ How effective are the social audit, community review and community-based change plan processes in allowing poor people to hold us to account?
- ♦ How did we manage the concurrent processes of reporting to ActionAid and to other donors (especially the DEC)? How did these processes affect our partners and how did we help them overcome the challenges of reporting?
- ♦ Do our accountability mechanisms effectively engage stakeholders in a meaningful process to ensure that we are sufficiently challenged from outside the organisation to critically examine and be accountable for our work? How do our mechanisms for learning and accountability sits vis-à-vis other initiatives to improve quality and performance of the humanitarian work (e.g. Red Cross Code of Conduct, Sphere Standards, HAP-I)

b. Delivery

Did we cope adequately with the challenges posed; how did we overcome the challenges; and what can we learn to improve future performance in the following aspects of programme delivery?

Functions

- ♦ Having sufficient Human Resources and adequate HR systems in place
- ♦ developing sufficient capacity to deliver the programme (both AA staff, partners and community).
- ♦ Having adequate financial systems in place
- ♦ working with partners we had not worked with before (in terms of appraisals, inductions, reviews..).
- ♦ Having vastly increased media profile and communications demands
- ♦ Raising such a large amount of money and leaving official donor funds alone

Multi-country management

- ♦ Establishing a new management system after the 2006 management review.
- ♦ Managing in a matrix of geography (line management through the Asia Regional Office, despite Somaliland's inclusion) and theme (accountability for programme quality to the human security theme).
- ♦ Managing the impact of a massive emergency programme on existing country programmes (India, Thailand, Somaliland).
- ♦ Starting work in new countries (Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Maldives)
- ♦ Involving a partner (Care Society from Maldives) in the ActionAid management structure (Tsunami Management Team).
- ♦ Drawing on the institutional capacity of the organization (IECT, functions, staff)

Coordination

- ♦ Were the efforts to coordinate with other stakeholders sufficient and effective?
- ♦ Were there common needs identification processes/ convergence with the analysis of other stakeholders? Were there efforts to reach agreement with other stakeholders regarding what needed to be done and who would do what (as compared to doing what we wanted to do, regardless of plans and efforts of other stakeholders)?
- ♦ Were there efforts to achieve coordination at the community level or only at the agency level? What 'say' do people have? Were there efforts to achieve community-led coordination?
- ♦ Was there effective collaboration in policy work – in sharing and engaging with policy makers – at community, national, international level, both within the ActionAid programme, across organizations on the tsunami, and across different themes of Actionaid work?

Methodology

The overall methodological approach has been described in the broader TORs. In principle the review is expected to consist of:

- ♦ Analysis of key documents/reports
- ♦ Telephone/face to face interviews/conversations (with key AA staff, partner organisations, other NGOs, alliances, government officials, key institutions etc).
- ♦ A visit to field sites in a selection of AA country programmes and individual and group discussions with key stakeholders (in particular, poor and excluded groups).

The review will feed into peer review/sharing of findings November. It is expected that findings of the review will be packaged in a suitable way to feed into that process. We will also consider the participation of the reviewer to the peer review as an option.

Further documentation available on request from Actionaid

- ♦ Tsunami Disaster Response Strategy
- ♦ Tsunami Disaster Response Proposal
- ♦ Tsunami Disaster Response Reports 1 and 2
- ♦ Tsunami Extended Response Programme
- ♦ Tsunami Programme External Evaluation January 2006
- ♦ February 2006 – country PRRP? (I am not sure here)
- ♦ August 2006 – country PRRPs (Maldives, Thailand, India, Sri Lanka) + consolidated international review (which was based on the country review documents)
- ♦ February 2007 – country PRRPs (Maldives, Thailand, India, Sri Lanka) + consolidated international review (as above)
- ♦ July/August 2007 country PRRPs (4 countries as above) + we plan to review our 4 focus areas (only a desk review of DRR, VAW, Homestead land and livelihoods)

Appendix 2

Specific questions for the Evaluation of South Asia Earthquake response as a component of the thematic review of Human Security

The evaluation of the South Asia Earthquake response shall build on the review and reflections on the programme already conducted (see section on “Further Documentation”). The evaluation of South Asia earthquake programme is also a key component of a thematic review of Human Security in Conflict and Emergencies. In particular, its finding shall also feed into the review of “How does Human security work fit in the broader humanitarian context?”

This appendix focuses on specific questions for the review. Please refer to the overall TORs for the overarching questions and context of the review.

Context

ActionAid had launched a large-scale emergency response programme following the major earthquake that hit South Asia on October 8, 2005. The response covered Pakistan and India and was mainly funded by the DEC. While the work was much smaller than the tsunami response, it was the biggest earthquake response work ever undertaken by ActionAid in physical and political terrain much more difficult and complicated than the tsunami response. A first 9 month DRP (Disaster Response Programme) was followed by two 9 month ERP (Extended Response Programme), the second one of which will end in December 2007.

A major field-based evaluation of the programme has not been undertaken in either country and is being proposed as part of the review of ActionAid’s human security theme.

Key questions

The purpose of the evaluation is for us to learn from the experience of the programming and so improve future emergency work.

The evaluation will report on:

1. Whether the assumptions underlying our programming are valid and so whether the approaches are appropriate within ActionAid’s overall strategy, Rights to End Poverty.
2. Whether our implementation of these approaches made the difference we intended at all levels (Local, national, international).
3. The effectiveness of our systems for programming, management, accountability and learning.

Question 1 and 2 will require reporting on the validity of the assumptions and approaches of ActionAid, and of the suitability, relevance, effectiveness and impact of the intervention undertaken (with particular attention also to our policy work).

To this end, the evaluation will need

- a) to draw on the reports of reviews and audits, to produce a meta-narrative of programme impact over time.
- b) to assess what extent did the programmes achieve their respective objectives as laid out in their proposals, and the relevance of such objectives
- c) seek evidence of impact of the policy work nationally and internationally

For question 3, the following specific questions apply

Specific questions

a. Programming

Were our programme processes consistent with ALPS, (ActionAid's accountability, learning and planning system)? Look in particular at:

Programme design processes:

- ♦ Were the assessments timely and appropriate?
- ♦ How did assessments represent poor peoples views?
- ♦ Were our programme objectives consistent with the assessment findings?
- ♦ How was the programme design (for both field work and policy work) informed by the assessments, coordination with others, and considerations of cost effectiveness?
- ♦ How was the policy programme design?

Monitoring, reviewing, learning processes

- ♦ Was the whole system of internal and external reviews appropriate and cost effective (in helping us see what we were actually doing compared to what we thought we were doing)?
- ♦ How did monitoring and reviewing represent poor peoples views?
- ♦ What were the specific advantages and challenges of each component of the system?
- ♦ Did the reviews actually lead to effective changes and adjustments of the programme?

Accountability processes

- ♦ How effective are the social audit, community review and community based change plan processes in allowing poor people to hold us to account?

- ♦ How did we manage the concurrent processes of reporting to ActionAid and to other donors (especially the DEC). How did these processes affect our partners and how did we help them overcome the challenges of reporting?
- ♦ Do our accountability mechanisms effectively engage stakeholders in a meaningful process to ensure that we are sufficiently challenged from outside the organisation to critically examine and be accountable for our work? How do our mechanisms for learning and accountability sits vis-à-vis other initiatives to improve quality and performance of the humanitarian work (e.g. Red Cross Code of Conduct, Sphere Standards, HAP-I)

b. Delivery

Did we cope adequately with the challenges posed; how did we overcome the challenges; and what can we learn to improve future performance in the following aspects of programme delivery?

Functions

- ♦ Having sufficient Human Resources and adequate HR systems in place
- ♦ developing sufficient capacity to deliver the programme (both AA staff, partners and community)
- ♦ Having adequate financial systems in place
- ♦ working with partners we had not worked with before (in terms of appraisals, inductions, reviews..)
- ♦ Having vastly increased media profile and communications demands

Multi-level management

- ♦ Assessment of implications of the management line to International Emergency and Conflict Team (IECT) on the integration of the earthquake response into regional/international processes.
- ♦ Assessment of the role of IECT at different phases of the humanitarian response. What was the effectiveness of the role of IECT? Did the achievements match the expectations? What are the lessons to be learnt?
- ♦ Assessment of the role of the wider country programmes (India and Pakistan) in relation to the Earthquake response and of the integration of country programme with emergency response.
- ♦ What did we learn regarding the involvement of partners in the ActionAid management structure?
- ♦ Cross-border collaboration between the India and Pakistan programmes

Coordination

- ♦ Were the efforts to coordinate with other stakeholders sufficient and effective?
- ♦ Were there common needs identification processes/ convergence with the analysis of other stakeholders? Were there efforts to reach agreement with other stakeholders regarding what needed to be done and who would do

what (as compared to doing what we wanted to do regardless of plans and efforts of other stakeholders).

- ♦ Were there efforts to achieve coordination at the community level or only at agency level? What say do people have? Were there efforts to achieve community-led coordination?
- ♦ Was there effective collaboration in policy work – in sharing and engaging with policy makers – at community, national, international level?

Methodology

The overall methodological approach has been described in the broader TORs. In principle the review is expected to consist of:

- ♦ Analysis of key documents/reports
- ♦ Telephone/face to face interviews/conversations (with key AA staff, partner organisations, other NGOs, alliances, government officials, key institutions etc).
- ♦ A visit to field sites in the two AA country programmes and individual and group discussions with key stakeholders (in particular, poor and excluded groups).

The review will feed into peer review/sharing of findings November. It is expected that findings of the review will be packaged in a suitable way as to feed into that process. We will also consider the participation of the reviewer to the peer review as an option.

Further documentation available on request from Actionaid

- ♦ South Asia Quake Response Strategy
- ♦ South Asia Quake Response Proposal
- ♦ South Asia Quake Response Reports 1 and 2
- ♦ South Asia Quake Extended Response Programme
- ♦ South Asia Quake Response Internal Evaluation (early 2006)