INTER–AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP
60th MEETING

21-22 March 2005
WFP Rome

Humanitarian Response Review (HRR)

Inception Report

Circulated: 8 March 2005

Proposed Actions by the IASC WG members:

- Provide feedback on the Inception Report
- Contribute to and remain engaged in the Humanitarian Response Review Process

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background

There is a common perception that humanitarian response does not always meet the basic needs of affected populations in a timely fashion, that the response provided varies considerably from crisis to crisis and there may be insufficient humanitarian capacity to respond to the demands of concurrent major crises. While some of the factors affecting response are specific to an individual crisis – such as lack of access and obstruction of aid – some of the key challenges seem to be systemic in nature. In light of the high current levels of humanitarian demand, it is evident that there is a critical need to identify those factors that have hindered the speed and effectiveness of humanitarian response, including in the area of protection, and ensure that appropriate steps are taken to improve the timeliness and impact of humanitarian interventions.

The HRR objective is to develop a joint plan of action to improve the effectiveness and timeliness of the humanitarian response to emergencies. To this end, the Emergency Relief Coordinator, based on his General Assembly mandate (resolution 46/182) has initiated an independent in-depth system wide review of humanitarian response capacities. This review will analyse the overall humanitarian response capacities as well as the potential resources available to meet future demands for assistance and protection. The focus of the review will primarily give attention to UN, NGO, and Red Cross/Red Crescent capacities. This should help achieve a common understanding of both the current response capacity and available expertise and of how the humanitarian system can effectively mobilize and deploy them. In addition, it will identify possible gaps in expertise and resources that exist and recommend measures that need to be taken to address shortcomings.

Consequently the ERC appointed a team of four senior consultants to undertake a Review of the Humanitarian Response system-wide, and based on its findings prepare to submit a report with a set of recommendations to link.

This Inception Report represents the vision of the consultants of the tasks and plans they have committed themselves to accomplish in order to meet the objectives of the Review.

1. The Objectives and Scope of the Review

The Review is premised on 11 objectives and will cover a broad scope, system-wide assessments of interventions, and capacities and performance in the humanitarian sphere. It will focus, as a priority, on critical factors such as early warning, staff deployment and capacity, logistics and rapid mobilization capacity, funding, co ordination, standby arrangements and surge capacity, all of which govern and influence the ability of each organization, and collectively of the humanitarian community, to respond effectively and with speed to the urgent needs of populations in emergencies/disasters.

1.1   The Objectives of the Review.

The Objectives of the Review have been redefined by the HHR Team (see also "initial objectives " in Annex I and ToR in Annex V). While the objectives of the Review are generally respected, the Team examined them in detail and after having given due weight to realistically achievable tasks, has redefined them as follows:

i.   Define Benchmarks to be used by the different groups – organizations (UN Agencies, the Red Cross/Crescent Movement, NGOs), donors and beneficiaries – to measure the expected performance of the international response system in terms of scale, speed, intensity and impact, giving due weight to the quantity and quality of humanitarian assistance.

ii.   Undertake an inventory of current capacities (at HQ and Field Levels) in the key response sectors (such as shelter, food, water and sanitation, health, protection, education) of the UN, Red Cross/Red Crescent family and NGOs to respond to complex and major emergencies i.e. assess performance of the system against benchmarks as defined in (i) above.

iii. Review the existence, strength, relevance, effectiveness, and acceptance of coordination functions.

iv.   Review effectiveness of joint services within the UN system and pooled resources in the Red Cross/Red Crescent or the NGO systems, and assess the capacity and potential of such services to appropriately address emergency needs.

v.   Analyze the effectiveness and appropriateness of existing preparedness or surge capacity within the stakeholder organizations including in the area of protection; how recruitment, training, and deployment and distribution policies and procedures are enhancing their response capacity in terms of deployment of personnel and other critical resources.

vi.   Assess the timeliness, efficiency and effectiveness of external stand-by arrangements and pooled resources available to humanitarian agencies and how these contribute to meeting complex emergency/natural disaster needs.

vii. Review the effectiveness of existing arrangements for the provision of equipment, infrastructure and relief supplies.

viii. Review the relevant organizational structure, management, coordination and accountability mechanisms for system-wide covering of all stake-holders, for the collective humanitarian response including the role of the ERC and the HCs.

ix.   Identify existing best practices and gaps and develop practical and sustainable solutions to address these gaps both inside and outside the humanitarian systems (e.g from member states or the private sector).

x. Examine the adequacy, timeliness, and flexibility of emergency funding with particular focus placed on procedures facilitating the release of funds.

Note: The beneficiary perspective (participation of and accountability to) is being addressed under objective (i)

1.2. The Scope of the Review

While the review will address the critical factors and mechanisms that hinder the effective and timely response to humanitarian crises/disasters in depth, it will set some criteria for establishing the parameters within which it will operate. This will clarify and define the scope of the Review. The criteria will include:

(i) Time frame of 3-6 months for responding to emergencies/ disasters at their outbreak/onset leading to a flash appeal or other short term appeals as a first phase as expounded in Section 3.1 of this report.

(ii) Time frame of 6-12 months as a second phase intervention supported e.g. by a CAP or other appeals to ensure transition and recovery.

(vi) Limit the assessment of stakeholders to major operational UN humanitarian agencies, the Red Cross/Crescent movement, and a manageable number of humanitarian NGOs that constitute between them a significant share of resources, capacities and delivery of humanitarian assistance selected in consultation, inter alia, with the IASC Consortia of NGOs.

(iii) A recognition of the Military and Civil Defence Assets (MCDA) as an effective capacity for responding to mega natural disasters but since the Review is looking at the capability of traditional humanitarian actors it will not include an assessment of those assets.

(v) Taking cognisance of and analyzing major initiatives with the British proposal for a new Humanitarian Trust Fund and the French proposal for a Humanitarian Force.

(vii) The Team will use selected context- specific evaluations of complex emergencies and natural disasters conducted over the past four-year. (successes and failures) as proposed by consulted organisations and validate the findings through the analysis of regional experiences.

2. Description of the Proposed Methodology

2.1 Methodological Approach

(i) Organization of the Review

The Review falls under the direct oversight of the Assistant Emergency Relief Coordinator (AERC) and Director of OCHA

Geneva, reporting directly to the ERC/USG. The Policy Development Section, through the Task Manager and his HRR Task Team, supports the AERC. While it is the responsibility of the Task Manager to ensure that documentation and related facilities are made readily available to the HRR Team, it is their responsibility to review, analyze and research documents and arrive at conclusions to be reflected in the report. In this regard the Task Manager has established websites for the Team for both internal and external applications. The Team is also supported by an IASC Reference Group whose TOR include remaining in constant dialogue with the Team; discussing the Inception Report, as well as the thrust of the final Report and developing an Action Plan based on the recommendations of the Review.

(ii) The Process

The Review will employ a methodology of extensive desk reviews backed by interviews of and meetings with a number of heads of agencies and senior and middle level officials representing a broad spectrum of the major stakeholders in the Humanitarian field. The Review Team will also seize the opportunities of meetings, consultations and workshops to meet and interact with important actors in the humanitarian field. This already includes a meeting with the IASC Reference Group on 7th March; a meeting with the Humanitarian Liaison Working Group (HLWG) on 8th March; a participation in the UK/Ireland sponsored Conference on "Models for flexible funding of humanitarian action" on 10th-11th March; a meeting on the 17th March in Geneva with the Humanitarian Coordinators (HC) during their Retreat (15th-18th March). This will allow the Review to benefit from a variety of views and perspectives in an inclusive participatory process. The team will be calling on relevant organisations to contribute expertise on specific themes, e.g. shelters for Refugees and IDPs.

The types of background documents that will support the Review will include Agency/NGO Legal Frameworks (Mission Statements and Mandates, policy documents relevant to the Review); Evaluation Reports especially those addressing response capacities and effectiveness of overall response; studies on relevant thematic and regional issues and Monitoring Reports with statistics pertaining to the deployment of resources, personnel and finance.

The Team will establish a list of selected persons from a larger list to be provided by the stakeholders representing a cross-section of all the organizations from both Headquarters and the field to meet and interview. The conclusions of these interviews will feed into the report.

The Review will also link up with major on-going evaluation exercises whose findings and conclusions may feed into the report.

Amongst these are:

- Darfur Real-time Evaluation
- UNICEF/DFID Darfur Evaluation
- UNJLC Evaluation
- Joint Evaluation of Support to IDPs (Multi-Donor: Denmark, Netherlands, Sweden and European Commission[1])
- ALNAP/WHO/OCHA   Planned Joint Evaluations on specific themes of Tsunami response

In addition, as appropriate, the Review will also make use of any new evaluations that come into stream.

2.2   Data Collection Tools

The newly established HRR website library, into which all relevant documents will feed, will be the main depository of easily accessible information and data for the Team. The Team will not engage in conducting fresh surveys or studies for generating information. It will, however, draw on the conclusions and lessons learned of relevant evaluations of humanitarian operations conducted in the last four years. Interviewing major stakeholders will represent another essential tool. For beneficiaries and communities, the Team will rely on secondary information coming from stakeholders and Regional Institutions to be complemented by the observations of the Review Team.

2.3   Key Informants

The Team will consult with the IASC Member agencies/organisations and the IASC Reference Group, HCs, NGOs not represented in the IASC RG, the HLWG and eventually a Donor Contact Group, regional institutional organizations in recipient countries (e.g. AU, ASEAN, G77 etc.) In addition, the Team may consult independent experts, academics and practitioners with extensive experiences in the humanitarian field.

2.4   Key Review Questions

Questionnaires are being developed to facilitate the interviews and elicit from stakeholders vital information not covered in the background documentation. The questionnaire will be structured to obtain substantive information on Organisation Legal Framework (resolutions, mission statements, mandates, etc.); early warning and preparedness; staff deployment; recruitment policy and training plans; funding; finance and administrative procedures; logistics and rapid deployment; sectoral

---

[1]   The initial Grouping of 4 donors has later been expanded to also include USAID, DFID, Ireland, plus OCHA, UNHCR and WFP. The report has been published by Swedish SIDA in February 2005.

interventions; coordination management, accountability, advocacy and humanitarian policy.

2.5 Performance Criteria

An effective assessment of capacities can only be done by applying selected indicators measured against established benchmarks. Currently most agencies use outcome indicators especially at the sectoral level to measure performance. The Review will take these indicators into account and work towards establishing, collectively with the stakeholders, measurable benchmarks against which collective performance could be measured. The aim is to establish the broader picture of what a system-wide response is capable of delivering and what identified gaps will need to be addressed.

The Review will look at how organizations and donors measure their performance and whether there is consistency in terms of performance criteria. The criteria looked at will be at two levels:

- Sectorally in accordance with the mandates and niches of certain agencies and NGOs, appropriate indicators are applied against some established benchmarks to measure achievements: e.g. number of displaced populations fed (WFP), number of refugees sheltered (UNHCR), number of children immunized (UNICEF), number of disaster affected persons resettled (IFRC), number of people receiving potable water (OXFAM), number of casualties receiving treatment (ICRC).

- The Review will also look at coordination level type of performance criteria such as number of displaced populations having access to food and basic services, level of funding for respective emergencies and number of people saved in earthquakes.

The Review Team will be asking the agencies/organisations to provide - as far as they have already established or are engaged in establishing them - the indicators for measuring their own performance. They will also request the actors to describe how they perceive their performance against their own expectations and that of the donors. It will also carry out a similar exercise with the donors.

3. Issues To Be Reviewed

The analysis and conclusions of the major findings and recommendations of the Review will determine the content of the report. The major areas and issues to be reviewed will cover the concepts, definitions, indicators and benchmarks for emergencies/disasters and capacities; the status of mechanisms for preparedness and for timely and effective response; quantitatively and qualitatively. The assessment of sectoral gaps in the delivery of humanitarian assistance will also be conducted. The Review will also undertake an assessment of Joint Services and pooled resources; standby arrangements and surge capacity and their

contributions to effective response. Assessments of effectiveness of existing coordination and management and collective accountability mechanisms, especially as they relate to beneficiaries, will receive a special attention. The Team will identify best practices to develop and apply into programmes and interventions for sustainability.

3.1 Concepts, Definitions, Indicators and Benchmarks

The basic concept of the Review is built around the premise of a **"response capacity."** Efforts will be made to build a consensus on defining "humanitarian crisis/disasters", "capacity", "preparedness".

The Team proposes to retain the following definitions, drawn from IASC definitions for emergencies and disasters, from the Red Cross/Red Crescent movement for preparedness or established by the Team for response capacity.

(i)   Definition of Complex Emergencies (man made)

A humanitarian crisis which occurs in a country, region, or society where there is a total or considerable breakdown of authority resulting from civil conflict and/or foreign aggression; which requires an international response which goes beyond the mandate or capacity of any single agency; where the IASC assess that it requires intensive and extension political and management coordination.

(ii)   Definition of Major Emergencies (natural disasters)

A situation threatening the lives and well being of a large number of people or a large percentage of a population, and often receiving substantive multi-sectoral assistance.

(iii)   Definition of Response Capacity

The capability and means of a humanitarian entity or entities to individually or collectively deliver effective, timely, rapid and quality assistance to populations in need.

(iv)   Definition of Preparedness Capacity

The measures taken to prepare for and reduce the effects of emergencies; that is to predict and –where possible- prevent them, mitigate their impact on vulnerable population, and respond to and effectively cope with their consequences.

These definitions will also serve as the starting points for the Review to establish a common understanding of global crisis/disaster situations that call for effective and timely interventions.

3.2 Mechanism for Effective, Timely and Rapid Response

A number of mechanisms and systems influence the ability of agencies, individually and collectively to respond effectively and in a timely manner to emergencies/disasters. These include preparedness, staff and other assets deployment (in terms of quantity, quality and speed). The Review will examine these elements to determine how they are performing, what the gaps are in the system, and how these could be addressed.

3.3 Assessment of Sectoral Gaps

At a glance the obvious gaps in the humanitarian capacity appear to be in the following sectors:

- Protection
- Water and Sanitation
- Camp Management
- Shelter
- Nutrition
- Health
- Logistics
- Joint Services/Pooled resources

The Review will be looking at the existing and non-existing leadership and coordination in different sectors, and try to identify gaps and propose measures for improvements. Protection, especially for IDPs, is a challenging sector that will require special attention.

3.4 The Central Emergency Revolving Fund

The Central Emergency Revolving Fund (CERF) established by GA Resolution 46/182 is not being used extensively because of its reimbursable revolving nature. The Review will look at it and eventually make recommendations on how to make it work.

3.5 Joint Services/Pooled resources, Standby Arrangements and Surge Capacity

Efforts have been made by several agencies in the UN system to establish some common services, viz JLC and UNHAS. Mechanisms for pooling resources exist for the Red Cross/Crescent Movement or some NGOs. In addition the UN has collaborated with member governments to establish standby arrangement for rapid staff deployment for assessment (UNDAC), and emergency staffing (NRC, RSA, RC RedR, etc.) Certain governments, as the UK, Norway, Denmark, and Sweden have initiated standing arrangements for the rapid deployment of staff to augment agency capacities for surge capacity.

The Review will look at those standby arrangements to determine what worked, what did not and how these arrangements could be strengthened further to give a real back-up support to effective humanitarian response.

3.6 Responses to different crises

The Review will examine responses to different crisis in terms of their type (Complex Emergencies and Natural Disasters) and of their quality (effective and less effective).

The review will analyze e.g. why the response seems to have proved effective in the case of the tsunami and not so effective in the case of Darfur. It will also look at some other examples of successes and failures in order to see if any recurrent pattern in terms of response can be found in natural disasters as opposed to complex emergencies.

3.7 Role of the Private Sector as Donor in Humanitarian Assistance

Whereas up to now the role of the private sector in providing humanitarian assistance has been limited, the tsunami opened up opportunities for this sector to play an important role in the humanitarian field. The Review will look at to what extent the involvement of the private sector as donor (cash and kind) has brought improvement in the response.

3.8 The Political Dimension

The Review will look at improvements of the system within limits imposed by the context (political, access, security etc.), but will not address the political dimensions or the contextual factors of the crisis analyzed as a specific topic.

3.9 The New Initiatives

The Review will take into account the number of new initiatives currently underway that might have a far-reaching effect on the humanitarian system globally.

(i) Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD)

The Review will look at recent developments in terms of funding models that are being discussed and tested in the context of the GHD initiative undertaken by donors, and how these impact on the adequacy, timeliness and flexibility of emergency funding.

(ii) UK Proposal for a New Humanitarian Trust Fund

Rt Hon Hilary Been, Secretary of State for International Development, has proposed the establishment of a new Humanitarian Trust Fund to the tune of $1 billion a year, placed under the control of UN Secretary General and

administered by the USG/ERC. The UK has made a pledge of £100 towards the Fund. The Fund is seen as a facility from which the Humanitarian Coordinators can draw funds early or when a crisis threatens, without waiting for additional resources, to deploy staff and assets in crises where there are most pressing unmet needs.

(iii)   International Humanitarian Force

The French President Jacques Chirac has proposed the establishment of a standing International Humanitarian Force of about 5,000 to respond to major emergencies/disasters of the magnitude of the recent tsunami. The Team will look at the French proposal in the wider context of the framework of the Stand-by Arrangements.

(iv)   Initiatives by EU Member States and Institutions

The review will look at and take into account the three following EU initiatives related to humanitarian response capacities:

a.   EU Action Plan on Reinforcing the Union Response Capacities (of 31st January 2005)

b.   EU Crisis management Capacity including the European Rapid Reaction Force, and

c.   The European Civil Protection Community Mechanism

3.10   Coordination, Management and Accountability Systems

Coordination is crucial to timely and adequate delivery of Humanitarian Aid.

Currently, a specific role is given to the ERC and the HCs. Different mechanism have been developed over time in order to have stronger interaction between the different humanitarian actors (UN agencies, Red Cross/Red Crescent Members, NGOs) in coordinating and guiding the delivery of assistance. However, the system can only work if it secures the cooperation and collaboration of all stakeholders especially at the field level.

 The Review will examine how the global humanitarian system is working and how it is responding to augment the system-wide response. The Review will give special attention to the management of assets and systems in the humanitarian arena and how this is helping to cultivate a culture of accountability, especially towards the beneficiaries.

3.11   Humanitarian Advocacy in Support of Response

The role of humanitarian advocacy in support of an effective response will receive a special attention. The Review will look at how advocacy

supports effective response by, inter alia, triggering timely and adequate funding and political support/action.

4. Plan of Work

Annexes I and II present the initial Objectives and global Work Plan of the HHR.

Annex III presents a Matrix outline of the key tasks envisaged by the Team. Essential elements are:

- The completion of the Inception Report by end of February
- Mid-Term Appraisal by end of March/beginning of April
- Interviews/Visits – Second week of March until third week of May
- Desk Review of Documentation by end of April
- Draft Report by mid/end June
- Final Report submitted to OCHA by end June/mid July

Further tasks, mentioned in the global HHR work plan, which fall under the responsibility of ERC-OCHA / IASC, are:

- Final Report Dissemination by mid/end July
- Management Response Matrix of Recommendations by mid-Aug
- Follow-up on Management Response by end of August

Those last tasks are also reflected in Annex IV.

5. Timetable

The Matrix in Annex III gives also a timetable of the major tasks the HRR team is committed to accomplishing to meet the deadlines indicated. Annex IV, representing the OCHA HRR Task Team's key tasks in support of the HRR team, is a substantive complement to the HRR process.

6. Reporting

The requirements and timetable for reporting in the interim and finally are clearly reflected in Annex III. The major written reports are the Inception Report, the Draft Report and the Final Report. The Team will present a mid-term Appraisal of its work by the end of March, on the assumption that the requested background documents are received by the end of February.

7. Annexes

Annex I	INITIAL OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW
Annex II	INITIAL GLOBAL HRR WORK PLAN
Annex III	MATRIX FOR KEY TASKS FOR HRR TEAM
Annex IV	KEY TASKS FOR OCHA TASK TEAM
Annex V	ToR

ANNEX I

OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW
(as initially presented)

(i)   Define the Benchmarks for the expected performance of the international humanitarian response system in terms of scale, speed, intensity and impact.

(ii)   Undertake an inventory of current capacities (at HQ and Field level), in the key response sectors (such as shelter, food, water and sanitation, health, education, protection, joint services) of the UN, NGOs and the Red Cross family to respond to humanitarian emergencies, i.e. assess performance of the system against benchmarks as defined in (i).

(iii)   Review the establishment, strength, relevance and role of coordination functions.

(iv)   Review joint services and assess the capacity and potential of such services to appropriately address emergency needs.

(v)   Examine the adequacy, timeliness and flexibility of emergency funding, including Central Emergency Revolving Fund (CERF).

(vi)   Analyze the effectiveness and appropriateness of existing surge mechanisms, including in the area of protection.

(vii)   Assess the timeliness, efficiency and effectiveness of external stand-by arrangements available to humanitarian agencies and how these contribute to meeting emergency needs.

(viii)   Review the effectiveness of existing arrangements for the provision of equipment, infrastructure and relief supplies

(ix)   Review relevant management structures and accountability mechanisms for the collective humanitarian response, including the role of the ERC and the HCs. Particular focus should be placed on procedures facilitating the release of funds and the deployment of personnel and other critical resources.

(x)   Identify existing best practices and gaps and develop practical and sustainable solutions to address these both inside and outside the humanitarian systems (e.g. from member states or private sources).

(xi)   Assess the degree of participation of and accountability to beneficiaries.

ANNEX II

INITIAL GLOBAL HRR WORK PLAN

1.   The Team

It is foreseen to have **4 senior consultants with one being the team leader**, responsible for managing the team and ultimately for delivery of the agreed services according to the TOR and to the time frame below. The senior consultants may have to be **assisted by research assistants/sector specialists**.

2.   Time Budget

50 working days for each consultant **between February 2005 and June 2005:** This is almost equivalent to a **full-time assignment for a period of 3 months (February 2004 through April 2005), with some additional work to be done between May and June 2005.**

3.   The Process Benchmarks

	Process Benchmarks	**Deadlines**	**Resp**	**Nr of days**
1	Establishing & Clearing of ToR	30/11/2004	OCHA	
2	Selection Process of Consultants	December 2004	OCHA	
3	Briefing of Consultants	2-3 February 2005	OCHA	
4	Desk Review of Documentation	February - April 2005	Cons.	60
5	Inception Report	28/2/2005	Cons.	5
6	Field visits of consultants (1-2 locations) to be determined	Mid April 2005	Cons.	40
7	Intermediary report - Mid-term progress review	End of March/Beginning of April 2005	Cons./ OCHA	10
8	Draft Report	Mid-June	Cons.	40
9	Consultation of Draft Report	30/5/2005	OCHA/ IASC RG	
10	Final Report, submitted to OCHA	End July	Cons./ OCHA	20
11	Final Report Dissemination	Beginning of August	OCHA/ IASC RG	
12	Management Response on Recommendations	15/8/2005	OCHA/ IASC RG	
13	Follow-up on Management Response	31/8/2005	OCHA/ IASC RG	

ANNEX III

MATRIX FOR KEY TASKS FOR HRR TEAM

The Matrix defines the tasks the team is committed to undertake, the methodology it will apply, the timetable for completing the tasks and respective responsibilities for the tasks. It is in two parts ----- a mapping exercise and a process of the tasks to be completed

	KEY TASKS	PROPOSED METHODOLOGY	ANTICIPATED TIME FRAME	LEAD + WORKING DAYS/ADDITIONALEXPERTISE REQUIRED**
	I. MAPPING EXERCISE			
1	Definitions come up with a definition of each of the following;	Using existing definitions or suggest new ones	Done and reflected in the Inception Report	Consultants 1
	-"Emergencies 6-12 months"			
	-"Response capacities"			
	-Others?			
2	Completion of the Inception Report describing methodology and approach based on TOR and on discussions held in Geneva and Oslo	Preparations and Review of documents	End February Done	Consultants 8
3	Define benchmarks for the expected performance by looking at 3-5 qualitative benchmarks for each of the following group of stakeholders:	Desk Review and Consultation with stakeholders	Mid-May	DSB 7
	- Beneficiary			
	- Agency/organisation			
	- Donors			
4	Undertake an inventory of humanitarian responses of current capacities of humanitarian organisations at headquarters and field levels	Analyze background documents including evaluations, questionnaires and results of interviews	End-May	HL/RW 10
5	Review existence, strengths, relevance, effectiveness and acceptance of coordination functions	Desk review, meeting with HCs & interviewees	End-May	CA/DSB 8
6	Review joint services and pooled resources	Analyze background documents including evaluations, questionnaires and results of interviews	End- May	DSB 7
7	Analyze effectiveness and appropriateness of existing surge capacity of stakeholder organizations	Desk review and interviews	End-May	RW 5

8	Asses the timeliness, efficiency and effectiveness of Standby Arrangements and Pooled Resources	Desk Review analysis of questionnaires	End- May	RW 5
9	Review effectiveness of existing arrangements for provision of equipment, infrastructure and relief supplies	Desk Review	End- May	RW/HL 5
10	Review relevant structures, management and coordination and accountability mechanisms system wide covering all stakeholder	Desk Review and interviews with stakeholders	End May	CA/RW 10
11	Identify best practices and gaps within and outside the humanitarian system	Desk Review	End May	DSB 6
12	Examine adequacy, timeliness, and flexibility of emergency funding	Desk Review	End May	CA 5
	II. PROCESS TASKS			
1	Liaise and organize consultation process with NGOs	Meetings and telecom and exchange of documents	Started & continuing	HL/RW/DSB 5
2	Organize consultative workshops with NGOs (Europe and North America)	Consultative workshops and their conclusions and recommendations	Second week April for Europe. Third week April for USA	HL/RW/DSB 10
3	3.1 Develop Questionnaires	Review and finalization of questionnaires	7th March	HL/RW 15
	3.2 Dissemination of questionnaires to all stakeholders	Wide distribution of questionnaires to all stakeholders	9th March	CA/DSB 3
4	4.1 Establish a list for people to be interviewed	Ensure all stakeholders submit their respective lists for persons to be interviewed	7th March	CA & Team 1
	4.2 Assignment of Team members to interview various stakeholders	Agreed assignment list for Team members to interview	9th March	CA & Team 1
5	Visits & interviews	Visits to and meetings with interviewees and field visits	Second week March - third week May	Team 80
6	Desk Reviews	Review of documents and preparations of findings and conclusions	2nd March- End April	Team 20
7	Mid-Term Appraisal	Presentation	End March/beginning April	Consultants 8
8	Draft Report	Presentation	Mid/end June	Consultants 20
9	Final Report submitted to OCHA	Submission	End June/Mid July	Consultants 10

**The distribution of the working days is based on a global figure of 200 working days
 (50 days per consultant) + additional 50 working days to be provided through an additional
support to the Team.

ANNEX IV
KEY TASKS FOR OCHA TASK TEAM

Item Nr.	What	By whom	When

1.	NGO involvement:
	   a) Provide list of NGOs under each consortium
	   b) Provide list of NGOs participating in CAP
		CH
		
		CH/ TL
			14/2/2005
			
			14/2/2005

2.	Link with ongoing major evaluation and other similar initiatives:
	  • Relevant tsunami Evaluations
	  • UNJLC
	  • Darfur real time evaluation
	  • French initiative on IHF
	  • UK initiative (Hilary Benn..)
	  • Good Humanitarian Donorship
	  • Tsunami evaluation framework
		DSB with:
		
		CH/YES
		CH
		CH /SF
		CH
		CH
		CH
		CH / SF
			
			All asap
			
			(London 9/2)
			
			(Geneva 23/2)

3.	Set up meetings for HRR Team	7th March – IASC Reference Group 8th March – HLWG 17TH March – HCs	
4.	Dissemination of Inception Report to IASC Reference Group, Donor, HCs and NGOs	CH with IASC/RG & ODSG	First week March
5.	**5.1** Meeting with HLWG (Organizations and facilitations) **5.2** Meeting with Donor Contract Group and Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) organization and facilitation	CH/ODSG CH/ODSG	8 March May
6.	Involvement of Recipient Countries See how to link through G77 quartely lunches under the auspices of Switzerland, Brazil, Chile, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Iran, Malaysia, Sweden	CH to check with Swiss Mission and Ext.Relations	Asap

	Further discuss with ERS		
7.	Setting up calendar of main events for Team members to attend e.g. WHO-OCHA-ALNAP meeting	CH / Team	Continuous
8.	Organization and facilitating travels of Consultants	Team IP	Continuous
9.	Final Dissemination Report	OCHA/IASC	Mid/End July
10.	Management Response Matrix of Recommendations	OCHA	Mid August
11.	Follow-up on Management Response	OCHA	End August

HRR Task Team OCHA:
YES: Yvette Stevens
CH: Claude Hilfiker   :
KL: Katja Laurila
ESB: Kashka Huyton
DRS: Donor Relations Section (Erik Kastlander)
CRD: Afia Blasco
IASC: Secretariat (Kirsi Madi, Louise Gentzel)

Consultants Team
CA: Costanza Adinolfi
RW: Roy Williams
HL: Halvor Fossum Lauritzen
DSB: David Bassiouni
IP: Isabelle Porcu (Assistant of DSB)

ANNEX V

TOR FOR THE HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE REVIEW

1.   Background:

There is a common perception that humanitarian response does not always meet the basic needs of affected populations in a timely fashion, that the response provided varies considerably from crisis to crisis and there may be insufficient humanitarian capacity to respond to the demands of concurrent major crises. While some of the factors affecting response are specific to individual crises – such as lack of access and obstruction of aid – some of the key challenges seem to be systemic in nature. In light of the high current levels of humanitarian demand, it is evident that there is a critical need to identify those factors that have hindered the speed and effectiveness of humanitarian response, including in the area of protection, and ensure that appropriate steps are taken to improve the timeliness and impact of humanitarian interventions.

Objective, Purpose and Scope of the Review

The objective is to develop a joint plan of action to improve the effectiveness and timeliness of the humanitarian response to emergencies.

To this end, the Emergency Relief Coordinator, based on his General Assembly mandate (resolution 46/182) has initiated an independent in-depth system wide review of humanitarian response capacities. The review will analyse the overall humanitarian response capacities as well as the potential resources available to meet future demands for assistance and protection. The focus of the review will primarily give attention to UN, NGOs and Red Cross/Red Crescent capacities. This should help achieve a common understanding of both the current response capacity and available expertise and of how the humanitarian system can effectively mobilize and deploy them. In addition, it will identify possible gaps in expertise and resources that exist and recommend measures that need to be taken to address the shortcomings.

This exercise should result in the identification of gaps in current capacity, as well as identifying trends in response. Based on this analysis it will develop a set of recommendations to address identified shortcomings in line with the principles and approaches envisioned in UN GA Resolution 46/182. The outcome of the review could help ensure that the UN and NGO response capacity, in terms of overall management, human and financial resources, tools and mechanisms, as well as equipment and relief supplies is adequate and appropriate to the changing humanitarian environment. This should ultimately assist humanitarian agencies to meet future challenges through improved response mechanisms and delivery, strengthened emergency funding as well as provide clarification of respective roles based on resources and expertise.

Key Review Tasks:

Define Benchmarks for the expected performance of the international humanitarian response system in terms of scale, speed, intensity and impact.
Undertake an inventory of current capacities (at HQ and Field level), in the key response sectors (such as shelter, food, water and sanitation, health, education, protection, joint services) of the UN, NGOs and the Red Cross family to respond to humanitarian emergencies, i.e. assess performance of the system against benchmarks as defined in (i).
Review the establishment, strength, relevance and role of coordination functions.
Review joint services and assess the capacity and potential of such services to appropriately address emergency needs.
Examine the adequacy, timeliness and flexibility of emergency funding.
Analyze the effectiveness and appropriateness of existing surge mechanisms, including in the area of protection.
Assess the timeliness, efficiency and effectiveness of external stand-by arrangements available to humanitarian agencies and how these contribute to meeting emergency needs.
Review the effectiveness of existing arrangements for the provision of equipment, infrastructure and relief supplies
Review relevant management structures and accountability mechanisms for the collective humanitarian response, including the role of the ERC and the HCs. Particular focus should be placed on procedures facilitating the release of funds and the deployment of personnel and other critical resources.
Identify existing best practices and gaps and develop practical and sustainable solutions to address these both inside and outside the humanitarian systems (e.g. from member states or private sources etc).

Review Methodology

The details of the review methodology will be developed by the team and outlined in the team's inception report. It can be anticipated that this review will consist of:

(i)   A physical mapping out of the existing capacities in the key sectors by visiting, interviewing and documenting relevant existing and prospective humanitarian partners.
(ii)   Review of factors that affect the rapid deployment of such capacities. (These could address issues such as: financing mechanisms for contingency planning and response preparedness).
(iii)   In-depth interview and dialogue with humanitarian partners, donors, host governments, communities and others stakeholders to help review the current response capacities. Relevant studies on response to past emergencies should be examined.
(iv)   Based on the above, a set of recommendations for improving humanitarian response capacity in assistance and protection.

It is expected that the recommendations from the review will be discussed by the IASC WG, which will develop a plan of action for their implementation to be presented to the IASC Principals.

The review will be based on an initial examination of relevant materials, followed by interviews with key informants, including agency focal points and focus groups. The team should also supplement the data collection with a survey among current, potential and/or former humanitarian aid workers.

5.   Administrative Arrangements for the Review

A three-person team of senior external consultants will conduct this independent review, which is being commissioned by the Emergency Relief Coordinator. The team will consult regularly with the ERC, during the course of the review. OCHA Geneva will provide Secretariat support for the review under the leadership of the Assistant Emergency Relief Coordinator (AERC) who will be assisted by the Evaluation and Studies Unit of OCHA. The AERC will be the focal point for consultations with the humanitarian community, on behalf of the ERC.

The consultants should combine the following skill set: in-depth knowledge of UN and NGO humanitarian assistance, common service provision, monitoring and evaluation, experience with undertaking institutional surveys, good grasp of sectoral capacity issues, in particular for the issues raised above, and possess management expertise, as well as hands-on operational experience in emergencies. Additional specific sectoral expertise may be brought in as required. The ERC will seek external funding from donors for the Review.

It is proposed that each agency appoint a senior focal point for the review and that the IASC form a reference group. The role of the reference group would be to work alongside with the team, ensure inter-agency participation and reflection, promote the implementation of the survey and provide the team with an agency-specific perspective. In addition, it may be opportune to work with donors to ensure full donor engagement.

6.   Review Timeline

The review will start in December 2004 and with a final output expected for May 2005.

Prepared by: Costanza Adinolfi, David S. Bassiouni, Roy Williams, Halvor Fossum Lauritzsen,
February 2005