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The SOHS study measured the size and scope of the humanitarian system by quantifying its organisational, human and financial resources and comparing them to quantified measures of need. This was done through organisational mapping, caseload analysis and financial analysis.

The research team for SOHS 2015 was composed of Humanitarian Outcomes Partners and Research Associates. ALNAP (Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action), the commissioner and institutional home of the SOHS project, provided management and direction of the study.

As in previous years, the research had six main components:

1. compilation and analysis of descriptive statistics
2. review and synthesis of formal evaluations and other secondary literature
3. key informant interviews
4. field visits
5. surveys of humanitarian actors and host government representatives
6. surveys of humanitarian aid recipients.
ANNEX 2

EVALUATION SYNTHESIS AND LITERATURE REVIEW
### Evaluation synthesis matrix categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code category</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID#</td>
<td>Unique number assigned for reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Published</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative quality score (not shared)</td>
<td>Sum of scores for conceptual framing, openness and transparency, appropriateness and rigour (out of 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual framing</td>
<td>• Does the study acknowledge existing research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the study construct a conceptual framework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the study pose a research question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the study outline a hypothesis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness and transparency</td>
<td>• Does the study present or link to the raw data it analyses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the author recognise limitations/weaknesses in their work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness and rigour</td>
<td>• Does the study identify a research design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the study identify a research method?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the study demonstrate why the chosen design and method are good ways to explore the research question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cogency</td>
<td>• Does the author &quot;signpost&quot; the reader throughout?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are the conclusions clearly based on the study’s results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>• Country-wide, programme, project, or sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic scope</td>
<td>e.g. local, national, regional, global</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Code category | Explanation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Formal evaluation or other type of document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Real time or retrospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiator</td>
<td>Commissioning entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area/Function</td>
<td>E.g. rapid response, chronic crisis support, resilience-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage/ sufficiency</td>
<td>Score: 1-poor, 2-fair, 3-good, 4-excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage/sufficiency-explanation</td>
<td>Summary notes and quotes from document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance/ appropriateness</td>
<td>Score: 1-poor, 2-fair, 3-good, 4-excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance/appropriateness-explanation</td>
<td>Summary notes and quotes from document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Score: 1-poor, 2-fair, 3-good, 4-excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness-explanation</td>
<td>Summary notes and quotes from document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Score: 1-poor, 2-fair, 3-good, 4-excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency-explanation</td>
<td>Summary notes and quotes from document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>Score: 1-poor, 2-fair, 3-good, 4-excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness-explanation</td>
<td>Summary notes and quotes from document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>Score: 1-poor, 2-fair, 3-good, 4-excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence-explanation</td>
<td>Summary notes and quotes from document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Score: 1-poor, 2-fair, 3-good, 4-excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact-explanation</td>
<td>Summary notes and quotes from document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code category</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core conclusions</td>
<td>Summary notes and quotes from document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summation</td>
<td>Score: 1-very negative, 2-negative 3-positive 4-very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summation-explanation</td>
<td>Summary notes and quotes from document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
<td>Technical (inadequate levels of expertise, technology or staff quality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses-explanation</td>
<td>Summary notes and quotes from document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Practices</td>
<td>Summary notes and quotes from document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Recommendations</td>
<td>Summary notes and quotes from document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other notes or relevant quotes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ANNEX 3
ORGANISATIONAL MAPPING METHODOLOGY
The organisational mapping exercise utilised data from the Global Database of Humanitarian Organisations (GDHO), an online, global compendium of organisations that provide assistance to people affected by humanitarian crisis. The database can be accessed online (www.humanitarianoutcomes.org/gdho), and includes basic organisational and operational information on these humanitarian providers, including international non-governmental organisations (grouped by federation), national NGOs that deliver aid within their own borders, UN humanitarian agencies, and the International Red Cross and Red Crescent movement. All organisations included in the database have responded to humanitarian needs in at least one emergency context, individually or in partnership with other organisations, even if their stated mission is not strictly humanitarian. Not included, however, are NGOs devoted to development, human rights, or political causes that have never operated in emergency settings.

For international organisations, the mapping exercise encompassed:

1. UN agencies that are full members of the Inter-agency Standing Committee (IASC) 1, as well as the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and the UN Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA);
2. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC);
3. International NGOs that have participated in humanitarian response, as indicated by inclusion as a recipient or provider agency on OCHA’s Financial Tracking Service (FTS), registration with a major consortium or registry of international aid organisations2, a past implementing partnership with one of the UN humanitarian agencies, or receipt of humanitarian funds from a large government donor or the European Commission3.

For national organizations, it included:
• National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
• National NGOs that have received funds from UN humanitarian agencies or IOM and a limited set of international NGOs (drawn from agency partnership lists and FTS), or are registered with a regional or international consortium or registry of aid organisations4. National NGO registries were used with caution, as in many countries a large portion of the registrants were no longer active.

Imputation methodology
Because of the large numbers of organizations and the inherent difficulty in obtaining data for all of them, the database has developed a system for imputing the missing data.

All organisations in the database are divided into one of ten tiers. NGOs are divided into the following tiers, according to overseas program expenditures:

- Tier 1 > $500M
- Tier 2 = $100-499M
- Tier 3 = $50M-99M
- Tier 4 = $25M-49M
- Tier 5 = $10M-24M
- Tier 6 = $5M-9M
- Tier 7 = $2M-4M
- Tier 8 = $1M-3M
- Tier 9 = $500K-999K
- Tier 10 = $100K-499K

1 The top 20 as defined by the size of total contributions reported to FTS as of 2010: United States, European Commission, Japan, United Kingdom, Sweden, Canada, Norway, Germany, Spain, Denmark, Australia, Switzerland, Netherlands, Saudi Arabia, Belgium, France, Finland, United Arab Emirates, Italy and Ireland. The team was able to obtain lists of humanitarian partner organizations from all of these donors except the United Arab Emirates.
2 The same list of donors, consortia and registries were used for both national and international NGOs.
3 Overseas expenditure figures are compiled from annual reports, 990s, and USAID VolAg Reports, and other sources. Roughly only forty organizations are in tiers 1 and 2, but they represent the majority of funding and operational presence.

Footnotes:
1. FAO, OCHA, UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP and WHO
2. These were: AlertNet, International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA), VOICE, and InterAction.
All other organisations are categorized into one of the following tiers:

- UN agencies and IOM
- ICRC and IFRC
- National Red Cross Societies

The tiers are used to calculate staff and budgetary averages for the purpose of filling in missing data, on the reasoning that similarly sized organizations have similar operational configurations, presence levels, and staff-to-budget ratios. For the following fields, if actual data is not available, figures are then populated using tier averages:

- Total number of staff
- Number of international staff
- Number of national staff
- Overseas program expenditures (OPE)
- Humanitarian expenditures (HE)

The imputation method used in the database is as follows, in order of priority:

**First level imputation – using data from other years to estimate missing data for an NGO:**

For organizations where staffing numbers are available for some but not all years, the database calculates the average ratio of annual overseas program expenditure to field staff for that organization, using figures from the years where that data was available, and use this ratio to calculate the staff number for the missing years for that individual organization.

Similarly, to get a breakdown of international and national staff, the database uses the average percentage of international and national staff in that organization's data history.

**Second level imputation – using tier averages to estimate missing data**

For organizations where no staff numbers are available for any of the years, the number of staff is estimated based on the average expenditure to staffing ratio of the other organizations in the same tier. Again, the breakdown of international and national staff is derived using the average percentage of international and national staff for all organizations in that tier.

**Limitations in the methodology and data collection**

Due to the inherent difficulty, or in some cases, sensitivity, in obtaining all staff and budgetary figures, there are some limitations to the comprehensiveness of the GDHO. First, the exercise would exclude national NGOs that have no current or past links to the international system, i.e. that receive funding solely from other national actors (such as the national government, or the general public), and who do not participate in any coordinated humanitarian activities with other members of the system.

In addition, the top 20 government donors were selected based on the size of their contributions as reported to FTS. But since not all donors consistently report their contributions to FTS, there may be some government or IGO/IO donors who have NGO partners that are potentially excluded.
ANNEX 4

ONLINE SURVEY
TEMPLATES
Thank you for participating in this survey. This survey will contribute to the “State of the Humanitarian System” study, led by ALNAP, which every three years assesses the overall performance and progress of the international humanitarian system. Your responses will contribute to reports that will be read by policy makers and practitioners in aid organisations and governments. All of the questions should be answered in relation to one specific humanitarian response where you are working now, or where you worked at some point since 2012. Your responses will be kept confidential. You are not required to provide the name of your organisation. Quotes may be cited anonymously in the report.

Country or duty station where you currently live and work, or have worked at some point since 2012. [Please note that all questions below should be answered in relation to this one particular field setting.]

Name of your organization or agency (optional)

Type of organization or agency (required)

- National or local NGO
- International NGO
- National Red Cross/Red Crescent Society
- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) or the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
- UN agency (or fund, program, office) involved in humanitarian aid (IOM included)
- Other, please specify

Please answer the following questions in relation to your current job posting or in relation to one specific humanitarian response you have been involved in between 2012 and 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What sector do you work primarily? (Choose one.)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ All / multi-sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Camp coordination and camp management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Disaster risk reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Early recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Emergency telecommunications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Food security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Mine action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Water, sanitation and hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What is your opinion on the adequacy of funding available for the humanitarian response in your setting?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Enter an answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Comments (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Far below the needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ More than sufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gaps: Were there any humanitarian sectors that you think particularly lacked the resources and capacity to meet the needs? (Choose as many as apply.)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ All / multi-sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Camp coordination and camp management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Disaster risk reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Early recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Emergency telecommunications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Food security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Mine action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Water, sanitation and hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>In the past two years, has the ability of humanitarian actors to reach all populations in need of assistance in your setting:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enter an answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1. Declined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 2. Stayed about the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 3. Somewhat improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 4. Much improved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>If there are obstacles to accessing all populations in need, are they mainly due to</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Physical / logistical constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Bureaucratic restrictions or interference in delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Insecurity (active fighting or attacks on aid operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Did your organization participate in any joint (interagency) needs assessments?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ I don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>How would you rate the level of involvement of local actors in assessing and prioritizing needs?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enter an answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1. Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 2. Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 3. Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 4. Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How has the quality of humanitarian needs assessment changed over the past two years?

Enter an answer
Comments (optional)

1. Decline
2. Stayed about the same
3. Somewhat improved
4. Much improved

Please give your opinion on how well you think your sector (or the system as a whole if you work across sectors) performed in your setting.

☐ Speed of response
☐ Coordination
☐ Participation/consultation of local authorities
☐ Prioritization/addressing the most urgent needs
☐ Meeting objectives
☐ Adherence to standards and best practices
☐ Overall leadership
1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Excellent

How has the quality of monitoring and evaluation changed in the past two years?

Enter an answer
Please explain

1. Declined
2. Stayed about the same
3. Somewhat improved
4. Much improved

Overall, how would you rate the quality of aid personnel, in terms of qualifications, skills, attitudes and experience to effectively plan and implement programmes, in your setting?

Enter an answer
Comments (optional)

1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Excellent

Overall, how well do aid organizations in your setting address issues of gender, age and disability?

Enter an answer
Comments (optional)

1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Excellent

Overall, how well do aid organizations provide information to aid recipients (beneficiaries) and allow them lodge complaints, in your setting?

Enter an answer
Please explain

1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Excellent

In your setting, how well do international aid organizations and donors support capacity building for local actors?

Enter an answer
Please explain

1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Excellent
In your setting, how would you rate the ability of local NGOs to access direct funding from international donors?

Enter an answer
Comments (optional)
1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Excellent

In your setting, how would you rate the participation of local actors in interagency coordination mechanisms?

Enter an answer
Comments (optional)
1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Excellent

How would you rate the quality of leadership of the actors below in your setting?

- Cluster/sector leads
- Humanitarian Coordinator/Resident Coordinator
- Agency heads
- Local or national authorities
1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Excellent
5. Don't know / NA

In your opinion, are the demands of humanitarian coordination mechanisms in your setting (time spent in meetings, additional reporting requirements, etc):

- Far too high – coordination tasks detract from programming
- Somewhat too high – on balance, not worth the burden for the organization
- Not too high – the benefits of coordination are worth the extra work
- There are no significant costs or drawbacks to coordination
- Comments (optional)

Are coordination meetings conducted in the national language of the country or with translation available for nationals?

1. Never
2. Sometimes
3. Usually
4. Always

In your opinion, how well did your organization / agency demonstrate respect for and adherence to the core humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence? See definitions below:

- Humanity
- Impartiality
- Neutrality
- Independence
- Not seen as relevant
1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Excellent
**Humanity**: Human suffering must be addressed wherever it is found. The purpose of humanitarian action is to protect life and health and ensure respect for human beings.

**Impartiality**: Humanitarian action must be carried out on the basis of need alone, given to the most urgent cases of distress and making no distinctions on the basis of nationality, race, gender, religious belief, class or political opinions.

**Neutrality**: Humanitarian actors must not take sides in hostilities or engage in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature.

**Independence**: the autonomy of humanitarian objectives from the political, economic, military or other objectives that any actor may hold with regard to areas where humanitarian action is being implemented.

---

**In your experience, where has the humanitarian system showed the greatest improvement over the past two years? (Select one.)**

- Programming quality and performance standards
- Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) leadership
- Sector leadership
- System-wide and inter-sectoral coordination
- Needs assessment
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Cooperation with host government authorities and local organizations
- Consultation/participation of aid recipients
- Funding availability and flexibility
- Logistics
- Other, please specify

---

**In your opinion, what is the single biggest problem, or area of weakness, hindering effective humanitarian response in your setting? (Select one)**

- Weak presence – too few aid workers/organizations to meet the needs
- Lack of effective leadership at Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) level
- Poor program quality
- Poor needs assessment
- Inadequate funding
- Insecurity (violence, crime)
- Poor communication and consultation between host government authorities and international actors
- Limited access to certain areas/populations
- Other, please specify

---

**Can you describe a particular innovation, in any aspect of aid, that you think is worthy of note? Any final thoughts on the performance of the overall humanitarian system as you have experienced it in your setting?**

---

If you are interested in being interviewed personally by the research team on these issues, please include your email address here:

---

**Thank you!**

We would be grateful if you would consider circulating this survey to your colleagues, especially national and local staff members.

Please use this link:

Thank you for participating in this survey. This survey will contribute to the “State of the Humanitarian System” study, led by ALNAP, which every three years assesses the overall performance and progress of the international humanitarian system. Your responses will contribute to reports that will be read by policy makers and practitioners in aid organisations and governments.

All of the questions should be answered in relation to one specific humanitarian response where you are working now, or where you worked at some point since 2012.

Your responses will be kept confidential. You will not be asked to enter your name or your department, but you will be asked what national government you represent. Quotes may be cited anonymously in the report.

Please enter below the national government for which you currently work or have worked at some point since 2012. [Please note that all questions below should be answered in relation to this country context and within the past two years.]

Name of your ministry, department or agency (optional)

Type of emergency for which international aid was received in past two years

- Conflict-related emergency
- Sudden-onset natural disaster
- Slow-onset natural disaster
In which aid sector do you primarily work? (Choose one.)

- All / multi-sector
- Camp coordination and camp management
- Coordination
- Disaster risk reduction
- Early recovery
- Education
- Emergency telecommunications
- Food security
- Health
- Logistics
- Mine action
- Nutrition
- Protection
- Shelter
- Water, sanitation and hygiene
- Other, please specify

Who are your principal interlocutors in the international humanitarian community? (Choose all that apply)

- The UN Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator
- The UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)
- Representatives of cluster or sector lead agencies
- International NGOs
- ICRC
- Other, please specify

Do you frequently interact with national NGOs or national Red Cross, Red Crescent societies?

- Yes
- No
- Comment (optional)

How important are international agencies and funding to your country’s humanitarian efforts?

1. Not important
2. Somewhat important
3. Highly important
4. Indispensable

How would you rate the quality of the working relationship between international actors and your government?

Enter an answer
Comments (optional)

1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Excellent

How would you rate the adequacy of the overall aid response in terms of human and physical resources?

Enter an answer
Comments (optional)

1. Far below the needs
2. Insufficient
3. Sufficient
4. More than sufficient

In the past two years, has the ability of humanitarian actors to reach all populations in need of assistance in your setting:

Enter an answer
Comments (optional)

1. Declined
2. Stayed about the same
3. Somewhat improved
4. Much improved

Did international actors engage with your government in collaborative efforts to assess and prioritize needs?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know
How would you rate the accuracy and quality of the needs assessments carried out by international actors?

Enter an answer
Comments (optional)
1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Excellent

In general, how has the quality of humanitarian needs assessment changed over the past two years?

Enter an answer
1. Declined
2. Stayed about the same
3. Somewhat improved
4. Much improved

Please give your opinion on how well you think your sector (or the system as a whole if you work across sectors) performed in your setting.

- Speed of response
- Coordination of efforts
- Participation/consultation of local authorities
- Prioritization/addressing the most urgent needs
- Meeting objectives
- Adherence to standards and best practices
- Participation of aid recipients
  1. Poor
  2. Fair
  3. Good
  4. Excellent

How has the quality of monitoring and evaluation of the humanitarian aid projects changed in the past two years?

Enter an answer
Comments (optional)
1. Declined
2. Stayed about the same
3. Somewhat improved
4. Much improved

Over the past two years, how has your government’s capacity to deliver humanitarian response changed?

Enter an answer
Comments (optional)
1. Declined
2. Stayed about the same
3. Somewhat improved
4. Much improved

In your setting, how well do international aid organizations and donors support capacity building for local actors?

Enter an answer
Please explain
1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Excellent

In your setting, how do you rate the participation of local actors in interagency coordination mechanisms?

Enter an answer
Please explain
1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Excellent

In your setting, how would you rate the participation of local actors in interagency coordination mechanisms?

Enter an answer
Comments (optional)
1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Excellent
In your opinion, how well did your department / ministry / agency demonstrate respect for and adherence to the core humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence? See definitions below.

**Humanity**
Human suffering must be addressed wherever it is found. The purpose of humanitarian action is to protect life and health and ensure respect for human beings.

**Impartiality**
Humanitarian action must be carried out on the basis of need alone, given to the most urgent cases of distress and making no distinctions on the basis of nationality, race, gender, religious belief, class or political opinions.

**Neutrality**
Humanitarian actors must not take sides in hostilities or engage in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature.

**Independence**
the autonomy of humanitarian objectives from the political, economic, military or other objectives that any actor may hold with regard to areas where humanitarian action is being implemented.

In your experience, where has the humanitarian system showed the greatest improvement over the past two years? (Select one.)

- Programming quality and performance standards
- Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) leadership
- Sector leadership
- System-wide and inter-sectoral coordination
- Needs assessment
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Cooperation with host government authorities and local organizations
- Consultation/participation of aid recipients
- Funding availability and flexibility
- Logistics
- Other, please specify

In your opinion, what is the single biggest problem, or area of weakness hindering effective humanitarian response in your setting? (Select one)

- Weak presence – too few aid workers/organizations to meet the needs
- Poor coordination
- Lack of effective leadership at Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) level
- Poor program quality
- Poor needs assessment
- Inadequate funding
- Insecurity (violence, crime)
- Poor communication and consultation between host government authorities and international actors
- Limited access to certain areas/populations
- Other, please specify

Can you describe a particular innovation, in any aspect of aid, that you think is worthy of note? Any final thoughts on the performance of the overall humanitarian system as you have experienced it in your setting?

If you are interested in being interviewed personally by the research team on these issues, please include your email address here:

Thank you!

We would be grateful if you would consider circulating this survey to your colleagues, especially national and local staff members.

Please use this link:
http://humanitarianoutcomes.org/humanitarian-survey