**Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation (IAHE) of the response to typhoon haiyan in the philippines**

*Draft terms of reference, March 2014*

# Introduction

1. On 8 November 2013, Typhoon Haiyan (locally known as Yolanda) hit the Philippines. The intensity of the typhoon resulted in more than 6,000 deaths, more than 4.1 million people displaced from their homes, and more than 14.1 million people in 36 provinces affected. The most affected areas were the east coast of Leyte and the south coasts of Samar and Eastern Samar, in the Eastern Visayas regions. These areas were affected by a tidal surge comparable to a tsunami. Devastation from extreme winds and rain was also catastrophic.
2. After consultations with the IASC Principals and the Government of the Philippines, the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) formally activated an IASC system-wide level 3 (hereafter: L-3) emergency response to the disaster on 13 November 2013. Measures accompanying the L-3 declaration included providing the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) with empowered leadership, allocating USD 25 million from the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), and sending enhanced surge capacity through the Inter-Agency Rapid Response Mechanism (IARRM).
3. The establishment of a L-3 emergency response requires that an operational peer review (OPR) of the response be undertaken within 90 days of the crisis, as well an inter-agency humanitarian evaluation (IAHE) to be undertaken between 9-12 months after the declaration[[1]](#footnote-1). The OPR in the Philippines was conducted from 13 to 19 January 2014. It considered four areas: leadership arrangements, application of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle, use of appropriate coordination mechanisms and accountability to affected people. The IAHE of the response to Haiyan will build from the findings and recommendations of the OPR.

## Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations

1. In 2013, and on the basis of the three pillars of the Transformative Agenda[[2]](#footnote-2) (TA), the IASC Principals endorsed the TA Protocols. The Protocols are composed of eight reference documents[[3]](#footnote-3) that include a set of actions to address acknowledged challenges in leadership, coordination and enhance accountability for the achievement of collective results. These actions are:
* Establishing a mechanism to deploy strong experienced senior humanitarian leadership from the outset of a major crisis;
* The strengthening of leadership capacities and rapid deployment of humanitarian leaders;
* Improved strategic planning at the country level that clarifies the collective results the humanitarian community sets out to achieve and identifies how clusters and organizations will contribute to them;
* Enhanced accountability of the Humanitarian Coordinator and members of the Humanitarian Country Team for the achievement of collective results and of the humanitarian community towards the affected people; and
* Streamlined coordination mechanisms adapted to operational requirements and contexts to better facilitate delivery.
1. The fifth TA Protocol relates to the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC), which is defined as a coordinated series of actions undertaken to help prepare for, manage and deliver humanitarian response. The HPC consists of five elements: needs assessment and analysis; strategic response planning; resource mobilization; implementation and monitoring; and operational review and evaluation. OPRs and IAHEs are tools to assess and reflect on the extent to which the collective response has met its objectives and to provide information on areas of work that need to be improved in the future to make the response more effective.
2. OPRs and IAHEs complement each other and are substantively different. OPRs are management reviews and their main purpose is learning for course correction at an early stage of the humanitarian response. They are not an accountability tool. IAHEs, on the other hand, are conducted at a later stage of the humanitarian response and their main purpose is to promote accountability to donors and the affected population. The promotion of accountability includes the consistent application of quality standards -including the Operational Framework for Accountability to Affected Populations-, adherence to core humanitarian principles[[4]](#footnote-4), and fostering strategic learning for the humanitarian system. IAHEs are conducted in adherence to the international evaluation principles of independence, credibility and utility.
3. The present evaluation will be the first IAHE to be conducted since their creation [[5]](#footnote-5). As such, it is an important exercise that is expected to provide feedback on the usefulness of the IAHE guidelines, as well as reflect on the utility and feasibility of IAHEs overall, in addition to the specific objectives related to the response in Philippines.

## Purpose, Objectives, Scope and Use of the Philippines IAHE

1. The purpose of this IAHE is two-fold. First, it will provide an independent assessment of the extent to which planned collective objectives set out in the Strategic Response Plan (SRP) to respond to the needs and concerns of affected people have been met. Secondly, the evaluation aims to assess the extent to which response mechanisms, including the HPC and other key pillars of the TA have successfully supported the response, and recommend actions to improve the response, as well as inform longer-term recovery plans and support preparedness efforts.
2. The IAHE will therefore aim to:
* Assess how effectively humanitarian needs and concerns were identified and prioritized in the SRP, and to what extent the collective response adequately met those needs;
* Assess to what extent the collective response to the emergency met objectives as established in the SRP taking into account the amount and timing of funding received;
* Assess the effectiveness of fundraising efforts in ensuring funding across the strategic objectives, clusters, and sub-clusters;
* Capture lessons learned and good practices in order to enable collective learning from this humanitarian response;
* Provide actionable recommendations at both the policy and operational levels on how collective response mechanisms might be strengthened, particularly in light of changes in the humanitarian context, including the Humanitarian Program Cycle and the three pillars of the Transformative Agenda.
1. The evaluation will also constitute an opportunity to test the recently approved IAHE guidelines, and provide feedback on the appropriateness of the guidelines, their application, and the IAHE process in the context of the Philippines, and suggest possible ways to improve them
2. The evaluation will present findings that provide a transparent assessment of progress achieved against the objectives established in the Philippines response SRP. Evidence and findings of the IAHE will also include the views of disaster-affected people with regard to the overall quality and appropriateness of the assistance received.
3. The evaluation will be global in scope, in that it will cover all sectors of the emergency response to Haiyan. In terms of time, the evaluation will consider the collective response provided from the time of the L3 Declaration (November 2013) until the time in which the field visits are conducted (approximately August 2014).
4. The primary users of the IAHE will be the Philippines Humanitarian Coordinator and Humanitarian Country Team, which will use the results to ensure accountability and to learn for future similar response. Findings from the IAHE may, where relevant, identify areas that need to be addressed to improve the response, as well as inform longer-term recovery plans and support preparedness efforts. Evaluation results[[6]](#footnote-6) are expected to be available before the completion of the preparation of the new SRP. Findings and lessons from this IAHE will therefore serve as inputs to the upcoming SPR. The IAHE is also expected to generate information and analysis relevant to actors engaged in the on-going response, including local, national and donor stakeholders.
5. The secondary users of the IAHE are the IASC Principals, the IASC Working Group and Emergency Directors group, who are expected to use IAHE results and lessons learned as part of their overall monitoring strategies on key strategic issues at the global level, policy-making and conceptualization of the approach to future emergencies. The audience and potential users of the evaluation also include donors, the Government of the Philippines and other national responders, and affected population, which might use the evaluation results for learning, awareness and advocacy purposes.

## Evaluation Questions and Criteria

1. As per the guidance document “Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations of Large Scale System-Wide Emergencies (IAHEs): Guidelines”[[7]](#footnote-7), the following key areas of inquiry must be addressed by all IAHEs:
2. Were the results articulated in the Strategic Response Plan achieved, and what were both the positive and potentially negative outcomes for people affected by the disaster?
3. To what extent have national and local stakeholders been involved and their capacities strengthened through the response?
4. Was the assistance well-coordinated, successfully avoiding duplication and filling gaps? What contextual factors help explain results or the lack thereof?
5. To what extent were IASC core humanitarian programming principals and guidance applied?
6. In addition to these four core questions, the evaluation team will develop context-specific sub-questions during the inception phase of the individual IAHEs. Contextualization of the present Terms of Reference, taking into account the specific characteristics of the response and the context in which it has taken place, will be conducted in consultation with the HC/HCT during the inception phase of the evaluation. To this purpose, the IAHE Philippines Management Group will seek HC/HCT’s feedback on the IAHE TORs. Moreover, during the inception mission the evaluation team will conduct ample in-country consultations with all key response stakeholders, to ensure that their views on issues that need to be considered, potential sub-questions, etc are incorporated in the IAHE. HC/HCT and other stakeholders feedback collected will provide the basis for a contextualized inception report. The IAHE Philippines Management Group may add HC/HCT comments to the TORs as an annex, for consideration and inclusion during the inception phase.
7. The evaluation will draw evidence-based conclusions in relation to internationally established evaluation criteria drawn from UNEG norms and guidance[[8]](#footnote-8), OECD/DAC[[9]](#footnote-9) and the ALNAP criteria for the evaluation of humanitarian action,[[10]](#footnote-10) including: i) relevance, ii) coherence, iii) coverage, iv) connectedness, v) efficiency, vi) effectiveness, vii) impact, viii) sustainability, ix) coordination and x) protection. Not all criteria may necessarily be applicable, and the evaluation team will need to assess which criteria are most relevant during the inception phase of the IAHE.

## Methodology

1. The evaluation will use mixed method analysis, employing the most appropriate qualitative and quantitative approaches, data types, and methods of data analysis. To ensure maximum validity and reliability of data, the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.
2. The evaluation team will be guided by the major analytical frameworks that form the basis for drawing final conclusions and generating forward-looking recommendations, namely: the IAHE key questions, the SRP, as the main reference to assess whether the response objectives have been achieved, and the IAHE impact pathway, which outlines the components of an “ideal humanitarian response”.[[11]](#footnote-11)
3. During the inception phase, the evaluation team will propose a detailed methodology that the evaluation team will use to address key questions, develop sub-questions, and assess the results of the collective humanitarian response. The proposal should include a description of data sources, data collection and analysis methods/tools, indicators, triangulation plan, financial overview, factors for comparative analysis, and validation strategy, as well as how the team intends to incorporate the views of affected people in developing the methodology.
4. Methods of analyses may include, among others: the review of various sources of information, including review of monitoring data; field visits; interviews with key stakeholders (affected population, UN, NGOs, donors, government representatives and civil society organizations); (gendered) focus groups and cross-validation of data. Consultations will ensure that diverse stakeholder groups are included, paying specific attention to adequately engage women, men, boys and girls of different ages, and taking into consideration the existence of disadvantaged groups, such as people with disabilities. The evaluation approach will be in line with UNEG guidance on integrating human rights and gender equality, with ALNAP guidelines on evaluating humanitarian action, UNEG norms and standards and the International Humanitarian Principles.
5. In line with the System-wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) on gender equality and the IASC Gender Equality Policy Statement[[12]](#footnote-12), the evaluation will use gender analysis, and will specifically assess the extent to which gender considerations have been taken into account in the provision of the response. The final report should acknowledge how inclusive stakeholder and affected communities participation was ensured during the evaluation process and any challenges to obtaining the gender equality information or to addressing these issues appropriately.
6. The evaluation team will conduct field visits to the affected areas. The team should seek to spend the necessary amount of time during the field mission to conduct direct consultations with local communities affected by the disaster and that have received international assistance. The evaluation should, wherever possible, undertake systematic data gathering from both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries on the appropriateness and quality of the assistance provided. In deciding the amount of time to be spent in consultations with communities in the affected areas, it is important that the evaluation team keeps a balance in the need to identify high level and strategic themes, and the need to ensure sufficiently ample consultations. The IAHE guidelines establish an approximate duration of 3 weeks for the evaluation field mission. However, given the geographical spread of affected areas, during the inception field visit a final proposal for the duration of the evaluation field mission will be made, to ensure that there is sufficient time to collect the necessary data.
7. The inception report will also provide a detailed stakeholder analysis and a clear indication of on how/who of national entities and communities will be (a) consulted (b) engaged with (c) involved in the evaluation process as relevant. The evaluation team should explicitly describe in the inception report the approaches and strategies that will be used to identify and reach response beneficiaries and affected people, and to adequately engage women, men, boys and girls of different ages, taking into consideration the existence of disadvantaged groups. These strategies may include, among others, the selection of key informants, use of snowball sampling strategies, use of focus groups, etc. The advantages and limitations of the use of these methods should also be clearly explained.
8. Adherence to a code of ethics in the gathering, treatment and use of data collected should be made explicit in the inception report.
9. An evaluation matrix will be prepared during the inception phase in which sources of data, methods and criteria will be defined for each evaluation question.

## Management arrangements and Stakeholder Participation[[13]](#footnote-13)

1. **Philippines Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation Management Group (IAHE MG)**
2. The evaluation will be managed by the Philippines IAHE Management Group, which is chaired by OCHA. The Philippines IAHE Management Group will provide sustained support and guidance to the evaluation process, in order to ensure its relevance, independence and transparency, and promote the utilization of evaluation results. The Philippines IAHE Management Group will be comprised of the following organizations: WFP, UNICEF and FAO.
3. In accordance with IAHE Guidelines, IAHE Management Group members will act as point of contact for the evaluation for their organizations, and provide quality control and inputs to the IAHE (including during the development of the TORs, evaluation team briefing, review and approval of the inception report, and review of the draft report and presentations) and will facilitate dissemination and follow up of the final evaluation report cleared by the IAHE Steering Group.
4. The Chair of the IAHE Management Group will be OCHA’s Chief of the Evaluation Unit. He/she will be the main point of contact for the evaluation and will ensure day-to-day support and consistency throughout the evaluation process, from drafting the Terms of Reference to the dissemination of the report. OCHA’s Chief of Evaluation will also be the contact person for administrative and organizational issues, and will coordinate activities of the different stakeholders involved in the evaluation. He/she will organize and supervise the different phases of the evaluation process and ensure the quality of all deliverables submitted by the evaluation team.
5. The HC for the Philippines will appoint an in-country focal point for the evaluation to act as point of contact with the IAHE Management Group, facilitate access to pertinent information and relevant documents and to help organize the field visits.
6. Philippines IAHE In-country Advisory Group
7. An in-country Advisory Group for the IAHE will also be formed, to represent country-level stakeholders that have been directly involved in the response or affected by the disaster. The roles and responsibilities of this group include: to serve as the main link between the IAHE evaluation team and key stakeholder groups, to help the evaluation team identify priority questions for the evaluation, to provide feedback on key evaluation issues and evaluation deliverables such as the inception and draft evaluation reports, to help promote ownership of respective stakeholder groups, and to assist in the development and implementation of a communication strategy for the IAHE findings.
8. The membership of the In-Country Advisory group will be based on a “mapping” of key stakeholders. Stakeholders in the IAHE In-Country Advisory Group may include UN Agencies, international and local NGOs, key donors, national entities, government representatives, private sector representatives and civil society representatives. OCHA’s Country Office will assist in the mapping exercise of these stakeholders, and, if no other member of the IAHE In-Country Advisory Group volunteers, Chair and convene the Group. Members of the In-Country Advisory Group will be appointed by the HC.
9. **Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation Steering Group (IAHE SG)**
10. As per IAHE Guidelines, the IAHE Steering Group will approve the IAHE Terms of Reference, as well as final evaluation report, on the basis of the recommendations provided by the IAHE Management Group.

## Deliverables and Reporting Requirements

1. The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed according to the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation and the OCHA Quality Assurance System for Evaluations.
2. The inception and draft reports will be produced jointly by the members of the evaluation team and reflect their collective understanding of the evaluation. All deliverables listed will be written in good Standard English. If in the estimation of the Evaluation Manager the reports do not meet required standards, the Evaluation Team will ensure at their own expense the editing and changes needed to bring it to the required standards.

**A. Inception Report**

1. The Evaluation Team will produce an inception report not to exceed 15000 words, excluding annexes, setting out:
* The team’s understanding of the issues to be evaluated (scope), questions that the IAHE intends to answer, and their understanding of the context in which the IAHE takes place;
* Inclusion of a comprehensive stakeholders mapping and analysis;
* Description of how key stakeholders and the affected population were involved/ consulted in developing the inception report;
* Any suggested deviations from the ToRs, including any additional issues raised during the initial consultations;
* Evaluation framework, selected criteria of analysis and sub-questions;
* An evaluation matrix showing, for each question, the indicators proposed and sources of information;
* Methodology, including details of gender analysis and triangulation strategy;
* Data collection and analysis tools that will be used to conduct the IAHE (survey, interview questions, document with the preparation of field visit and schedule of interviews, etc.);
* Any limitations of the chosen methods of data collection and analysis and how they will be addressed;
* How will the views and concerns of the affected populations be addressed during the evaluation;
* How will protection and gender issues be addressed during the evaluation;
* Data collection and analysis plan;
* Detailed fieldwork plan;
* Detailed timeline for the evaluation;
* Interview guides, survey instruments, and/or other tools to be employed for the evaluation;
* Draft dissemination strategy of the evaluation findings (including with the IAHE Philippines Management Group and the IAHE In-Country Advisory group).

**B. Evaluation Report**

1. The Evaluation Team will produce a single report, written in a clear and concise manner that allows readers to understand what are the main evaluation findings, conclusions and corresponding recommendations, and their inter-relationship. The report should be comprised of:
* Executive summary of no more than 2500 words;
* Table of contents;
* Summary table linking findings, conclusions and recommendations, including where responsibility for follow up should lie;
* Analysis of context in which the response was implemented;
* Methodology summary – a brief chapter, with a more detailed description provided in an annex;
* Main body of the report, including an overall assessment, findings in response to the evaluation questions, conclusions and recommendations;
* Annexes will include: (1) ToR, (2) Detailed methodology, (3) List of persons met, (4) Details of qualitative and quantitative analysis undertaken, (6) Team itinerary, (7) All evaluation tools employed, (8) List of acronyms; and (9) Bibliography of documents (including web pages, etc.) relevant to the evaluation; (10) Assessment of the usefulness of the IAHE guidelines and process and main recommendations for their improvement.
1. For accuracy and credibility, recommendations should follow logically from the evaluation findings and conclusions, and be:
* Categorised as a) Critical, b) Important, or c) Opportunity for learning.
* Relevant, realistic and useful and reflect the reality of the context;
* Specific, measurable, clearly stated and not broad or vague;
* Realistic and reflect an understanding of the humanitarian system and potential constraints to follow-up;
* Suggest where responsibility for follow-up should lie and include a timeframe for follow-up.
* A rating on the achievement of specific SRP outcomes will also be included.

The draft report will be reviewed by the IAHE Management Group and the final version cleared by the IAHE Steering Group prior to dissemination.

**C. Other evaluation products.**

1. The Evaluation Team will also produce presentations, as requested by the Evaluation Management Group, including presentations to HC/HCT, IASC members, in-country presentations to local communities and affected people, etc.
2. The Evaluation Team will also provide regular feedback on the appropriateness of IAHE guidelines and the IAHE process, for each of the IAHE phases (inception, evaluation, reporting, dissemination), and suggest possible ways to improve them through conference calls with the IAHE Steering Group and Management Group, as well as a document to be included as an annex to the evaluation report. Lessons learned on the use of the IAHEs guidelines will be synthesised in a final written aide-memoire.
3. Additional evaluation products such as briefs, video presentations or précis may be proposed in the inception report.

## Dissemination and follow up

1. The Evaluation Team will conduct the following presentations:
* At the end of the field visit, the evaluation team will conduct an exit brief with the HCT, the IAHE Philippines In-Country Advisory Group and the IAHE Philippines Management Group to share first impressions, preliminary findings and possible areas of conclusions and recommendations. The brief will also help clarify issues and outline any expected pending actions from any stakeholders, as relevant, as well as discuss next steps;
* Upon completion of the draft evaluation report, the results of the IAHE will be presented by the evaluation team (or evaluation manager) to the IASC in New York and Geneva;
* Once the evaluation is completed, presentations of the main findings and recommendations will be made available to various fora as decided by the Emergency Directors Group and the IAHE Management Group. The Evaluation Team may be requested to assist with these presentations.
1. The IAHE final report will also be submitted to the IASC Working Group, the EDG and the Principals.
2. Once the evaluation results are finalized, national evaluators will help feed back results to communities who participated in the evaluation and to affected people and communities.
3. In addition to the Evaluation Report and oral briefings, the evaluation findings and recommendations can be presented through alternative ways of dissemination, such as video. The Evaluation Team will consider possible ways to present the evaluation and include a dissemination strategy proposal in the Inception Report.
4. The recommendations of the evaluation will be addressed through a formal Management Response Plan (MRP). The preparation of the MRP will be facilitated by the IASC Working Group Chair. Three months after the issuance of the IAHE report, the HC in Philippines will provide the ERC, the IASC Working Group and the IASC Emergency Directors with an update on the implementation of follow-up plans.

## *The Evaluation Team*

1. The Evaluation Team will be recruited through a competitive bidding process. The evaluation will require the services of an Evaluation Team of four members with the following collective experience and skills:
* Extensive evaluation experience of humanitarian strategies and programmes, and other key humanitarian issues, especially humanitarian finance and funding instruments;
* Experience with and institutional knowledge of UN and NGO actors, inter-agency mechanisms at headquarters and in the field;
* Extensive knowledge of humanitarian law and principles, and experience with using human rights, protection and gender analysis in evaluations (at least one of the team members should have experience in gender analysis);
* Good understanding of cross-cutting issues, such as gender, resilience, transition, etc;
* An appropriate range of field experience;
* Experience in facilitating consultative workshops involving a wide range of organizations and participants;
* The team leader should have excellent writing and communication skills in English.

All efforts should be made so that at least two of the evaluation team members are nationals of Philippines, as they are to play a key role in ensuring that the views of local communities and affected people are incorporated in the evaluation. They will also play a key role in disseminating the evaluation results to affected communities.

1. The Evaluation Team will include a Team Leader, who is responsible for the overall conduct of the evaluation in accordance with the ToR, including:
* Developing and adjusting the evaluation methodology;
* Managing the evaluation team, ensuring efficient division of tasks between mission members and taking responsibility for the quality of their work;
* Undertaking the inception field mission;
* Representing the Evaluation Team in meetings;
* Ensuring the quality of all outputs; and
* Submitting all outputs in a timely manner.
1. The Team Leader will have no less than 15 years of professional experience in humanitarian action, including experience in management of humanitarian operations. S/he will, further, have at least seven years of experience in conducting evaluations of humanitarian operations and demonstrate strong analytical, communication and writing skills.
2. To the extent possible, the Evaluation Team will be gender balanced and represent geographical diversity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluation Milestones |  |
| Preparation | **February - April 2014** |
| Constituting the Management Group |  February 2014 |
| Development of Terms of Reference |  March 2014 |
| Recruitment of the Evaluation Team (selection and contracting) April-May 2014 |
|  |  |
| Inception | **June-July 2014** |
| Inception Field Mission 1-7 June 2014 |
| Formation of In-Country Advisory Group 10 June 2014  |
| Production of draft Inception Report 20 June 2014 |
| Finalized Inception Report |  5 July 2014 |
|  |  |
| Data collection, fieldwork |  **August 2014** |
| Field mission with full team | 3-4 weeks August 2014 |
|  |  |
| Reporting |  **Sept. – Oct. 2014** |
| Production of draft report September 2014 |
| Finalized version of the report |  October 2014 |
| Final approval of the report by IAHE SG November 2014 |
|  |
| Communications/Dissemination/Use  |  **July-Dec. 2014** |
| Feedback to the IAHE on testing of the IAHE guidance (TOR and IR) July 2014 |
| Feedback to the IAHE on testing of the guidelines (ER) November 2014 |
| Presentation of final report to ERC and EDG December 2014 |

TIMELINE AND PHASES OF THE EVALUATION

Annex 1 – IAHE Impact Pathway

|  |
| --- |
| Coordinated Humanitarian Action Theory of Change/Impact Pathway |
| **Longer-Term Impact**  | Affected people protected, well-being and capacity to withstand/cope with/adapt to shocks improved | National preparedness and emergency response capacity improved |
| **↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑** |
| **Early Impact** | people protected | lives saved and livelihoods secured | Government leadership and ownership of the response  |
| **↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑** |
| **OUTCOMES** | humanitarian access secured | relevant response(high quality multi-sectoral)  | connectedness and Coodination between humanitarian stakeholders | Good coverage(equitable, fewer gaps and duplications) |
| **↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑** |
| **OUTPUTS** | coordination mechanisms  | Joint situation analysis | joint needs and capacity assessments | joint plans (erp/prp/srp) | joint advocacy | adequate financial and human resources  |
| **↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑** |
| **INPUTS** | leadership  |
| human resources, including surge capacity |
| pooled and agency funds |
| guidance and programming tools (HPC, MIRA, standards, etc.) |
| logistics |

1. A report will be available between 12-15 months from the time of the emergency declaration. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The three pillars of the Transformative Agenda are: accountability, leadership and coordination. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The eight Protocols are: 1. [Concept Paper on ‘Empowered Leadership’- revised March 2014](http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/downloadDoc.aspx?docID=6755); 2. [Humanitarian System-Wide Emergency Activation: definition and procedures;](http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/downloadDoc.aspx?docID=6459)  3. [Responding to Level 3 Emergencies: What ‘Empowered Leadership’ looks like in practice;](http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/downloadDoc.aspx?docID=6460)  4. [Reference Module for Cluster Coordination at the Country Level](http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/downloadDoc.aspx?docID=6461); 5. [Humanitarian Programme Cycle Reference Module Version 1.0](http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/downloadDoc.aspx?docID=6732) ; 6. [Accountability to Affected Populations Operational Framework;](http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/downloadDoc.aspx?docID=6632)  7. [Inter-Agency Rapid Response Mechanism (IARRM) Concept Note;](http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/downloadDoc.aspx?docID=6733)  8. [Common Framework for Preparedness.](http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/downloadDoc.aspx?docID=6676)  [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Humanitarian principles provide the foundation for humanitarian action and they are: humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence. For more information on humanitarian principles, please see: <https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/OOM_HumPrinciple_English.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Prior to 2014, a number of inter-agency real time evaluations were conducted, but the scope, methodology and objectives of such exercises were significantly different from those of IAHEs. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Either as a preliminary draft of the evaluation report, or a final version. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See “Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations of Large Scale System-Wide Emergencies (IAHEs): Guidelines” Developed by the IAHE Steering Group, April 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. See UNEG’s website: www.uneval.org. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. See the DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance Factsheet at: http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/49756382.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. See the *ALNAP guide for humanitarian agencies: Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD/DAC criteria* at www.alnap.org/pool/files/eha\_2006.pdf  [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. See Annex 1 of the ToR – Impact Pathway for IAHEs. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Approved by the IASC Working Group on 20 June 2008. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. For further details on the specific roles and responsibilities of the different IAHE stakeholders, please see “Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations of Large Scale System-Wide Emergencies (IAHEs): Guidelines, developed by the IAHE Steering Group, April 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)