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Appendix I - Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference:
Final Evaluation of the Emergency Capacity Building Project

I. Introduction

CARE representing the Inter-Agency Working Group on Emergency Capacity Building1 is seeking a consultant group or consultants to carry-out an external-led final evaluation of the Emergency Capacity Building Project which is funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and Microsoft Corporation. The evaluation team should be comprised of individuals with experience in the evaluation of international development and relief capacity building programs and in learning and collaboration process evaluation.

These Terms of Reference describe the objectives and scope of the required services, the envisaged outputs, deliverables and consultancy inputs, the reporting requirements and the arrangements for the management of the services.

II. Background

2.1 Background and Purpose

The Emergency Capacity Building Project (ECB) is a cooperative undertaking of the Inter-Agency Working Group (IWG), a consultative membership of seven large humanitarian agencies aiming to improve their emergency response capacity. One of the first challenges that the IWG took on during their first meeting in early 2003 was to agree on a few key areas where collaboration could significantly improve the quality of our collective humanitarian actions. Based on an external study of their emergency capacities, the IWG identified four critical areas to focus on capacity-building efforts and approached the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Microsoft Corporation to enlist financial support for a two-year project that was launched in March 2005.

ECB Project Goal: Improved speed, quality, and effectiveness of humanitarian community in saving lives, improving the welfare, and protecting the rights of people in emergency situations.

Initiative 1. **Staff Capacity:** Improved agency effectiveness in sourcing, developing, and retaining quality staff for humanitarian action

Initiative 2. **Accountability and Impact Measurement:** Enhanced agency accountability to humanitarian sector standards and improved practices in impact measurement of humanitarian action

Initiative 3. **Risk Reduction:** Improved capacity for risk reduction and emergency preparedness among IWG members

Initiative 4. **Information and Communications Technology (ICT):** Enhanced resources for field set-up, rapid and reliable ICT, with training for humanitarian field staff

2.2 Description of Mid Term Review

A mid-term project review was carried out in April – May of 2006 with a report being produced in June of 2006. The methodology used was qualitative as the consultant used key information interviews with staff.

---

1 IWG is comprised of the following agencies: World Vision International, Save the Children International, Oxfam GB, Mercy Corps, IRC, CRS, and CARE
and at each of the agencies to respond to a series of questions related to organizational development process, learning and to determine broad views on how successful the project was in meeting expectations and goals in each of the four strategic initiatives.

The methodology of the mid-term review consisted of the following:

- A review of project documentation including project proposal, donor correspondence, work plans, activity reports and governance structures;
- Discussions with Internal Project actors, including - ECB Program staff, IWG Agency staff Initiative Advisors, Focal Points and IWG Principals (Emergency Directors);
- Personal interviews with other IWG agency staff who have been involved with the project – a list will be provided by the Project Director, and by Agency Focal Points. Included in this group will be selected field staff who have interacted with the ECB Project;
- Personal Interviews with external actors from networks, and agencies working with or in proximity to the ECB Project;
- Telephone and/or e-mail interviews with field representatives of several of the participating country offices;
- Interviews with representatives of Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Microsoft, McKinsey and Co. and other contributors of the project;
- A review of governance systems, communications systems, and administrative and financial grant making systems;
- Carry-out debriefings on major findings with both ECB project Staff and IWG Focal Points (Lead project advisors from each of the IWG agencies ) to confirm that findings take into account project staff and focal point experiences;
- The Consultant is encouraged to include a section on unexpected findings so that the project can these into account as it moves forward.

III. Objective and Overview of the Final Evaluation

The objective of the Final Evaluation is to facilitate review of project design, implementation, effectiveness, outcomes and results whilst reflecting on processes used to promote organizational learning and development across and internally within the humanitarian sector, with a view to inform future design and operations of emergency capacity building projects.

The Consultants will determine achievement status in the following three key areas:

- **Achievement of IWG agencies toward the project’s overall goal** to: “improve the speed, quality and effectiveness of the humanitarian community in saving lives, improving the welfare, and protecting the rights of people in emergency situation.”
- **Project’s achievement toward activity outputs and stated outcomes**
- **Effectiveness and efficiency of project’s collaborative approach and processes** (Process evaluation) to promote organizational learning and development at participating agencies (includes IWG members and partners).

3.1 Principle Constituents of the Evaluations

The primary audience of the Final Evaluation will be Senior Managers at the IWG agencies, the Interagency Working Group Emergency Directors, project donors; the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and Microsoft Corporation, agency staff working on the project (Focal Points, Advisors, and particularly field staff who have interfaced and participated with project activities such as pilot projects, research, evaluations, etc.). The Final Evaluation will cover all aspects of project implementation; including institutional, administrative, organizational, technical issues; which may have an impact on the performance of the project and on its continuing viability.

3.2 Specific Issues to be Addressed by the Evaluation
Project and Agency Achievements towards Plan – Results and Outcomes

- How far have IWG organizations come in improving their emergency capacities. Have agencies been able to measurably move toward their goal commitments?
- Were the project’s objectives and outcomes appropriate?
- What challenges, if any, did ECB face in meeting its operational plans?
- How well is the project aligned to the interests of its member agencies?
- Are IWG member agencies likely to adopt, and sustain policy and practice changes?
- How effective have participating agencies been in building awareness of the opportunities presented by the project within their respective agencies?

Partnership and collaboration

- Has the Project supported the collaborative effort of IWG agencies? Is there evidence that field stations/country offices are increasing levels of collaboration due to ECB?
- Is the Governance structure hindering or enhancing the partnership?
- What needs to be done to strengthen the collaboration in the future: what are the lessons learned?

External contributions

- How successful has the project been in extending these benefits beyond IWG membership to the greater humanitarian community? What constraints does the project face in extending benefits?
- How well has ECB done in identifying other on-going humanitarian efforts and linked-up with those efforts to heighten their effectiveness?
- What can practically be achieved given the time and resource constraints of the project

Organization Learning and change – Process

**Indicators of progress**

1. Does the project have clear governance agreements, membership structures, so as to make decisions and resolve conflicts?
2. How successful has the project been in engaging agency staff level participation in sufficient numbers (both HQ and Field Staff)? (“The larger the numbers involved the greater the weight given to collaborations”.)
3. How representative of each of the member’s interest has the project been?
4. How successful has the project been in communicating and sharing information out to members about project opportunities and actions? How have agencies dealt with internal communications and information exchange in relation to the ECB project?
5. How persistent or compelling have project personnel been in making in ensuring that ECB remains in the headlights of participating members in light of multiple competing initiatives?
6. Has the Project managed to engage the right or key individuals – especially influential figures in the organisation / policy area?
7. Has ECB used both formal and informal links to promote learning within and across organizations?
8. Has the project been able to complement or align with existing agency structures? (by their nature, networks add most value by complementing rather than duplicating official structures)
9. How could the project have been more effective in enhancing organizational learning within agencies? Where there approaches to organizational learning that ECB should have pursued?
10. How well did the Project do in representing the interests of agency field staff in decision making?
IV. Structure of the Report

The report should include but not be limited to discussions or sections in the following areas:

- **Project Chronology** – Key events in life of project (beginning with formation of IWG)
- **Review and analysis of key strategy** / direction changes in ECB
- **Finding’s Section** by Initiative and for overall project
- **Recommendations section** - with focus agency learning strategies, intra-agency coordination, interagency collaboration, project structure and governance systems, etc.
- **Recommendations for future design** and management decision makers for Phase II of ECB in terms of design, operations and process management
- **Views from the field**: Field involvement, input and experiences in ECB
- **Review of four key roles** from actors in project (Focal Points, Principals, Initiative Advisors and Project Staff)
- **Key factors or elements of success** – following and updating focus provided by mid-term review.

V. Management of the Consultant Team

The Consultant Team will report directly to the Project Director of the ECB Project. A Project final evaluation committee will be formed from the participating IWG Agencies; this will include key actors within the agencies that are directly leading their agency participation in ECB, such as Focal Points and potentially Emergency Directors. This Review committee will monitor the work of the Final Evaluation Consultant Team to ensure necessary support is provided to allow the TEAM to successfully meet the terms of their contract.

To ensure objectivity and credibility of the Final Evaluation, the Evaluation will be led by an external consultant who has made no prior commitment or major contribution to the Project. The Evaluation is planned to start in late **April of 2007**, which is approximately a year since the mid-term review was carried out.

VI. Methodology and Approach

Information collection, analysis and report writing for the Final Evaluation will be conducted by a team of two external consultants over a 20 to 25 day period from mid-April to May of 2007.

**The evaluation should be equally balanced** in effort and final content between evaluating the performance of the project and participating agencies towards goals, and in terms of the documenting the processes of organizational learning and collaboration.

The methodology of the Final Evaluation review will consisted of:

- **A review of project documentation** including project proposal, mid-term review, donor correspondence, work plans, activity reports; governance systems, communications systems, and administrative and financial grant making systems
- **Telephone and personal Interviews with key project actors** - ECB project staff, Initiative Advisors, Focal Points, IWG Principals (Emergency Directors), as well as beneficiaries in the field identified by the ECB project staff
• **Telephone Interviews with other IWG agency staff** who have been involved with the project – a list will be provided by the Project Director, and by Agency Focal Points. Included in this group will be **selected field staff** who have interacted with the ECB Project
• **Develop a questionnaire to facilitate light Peer Review** and analysis of the project. This would look at how agencies felt in terms of agency equitability in terms of contributions and sharing.
• **Telephone Interviews with external actors** from networks, and agencies working with or in proximity to the ECB Project
• **Interviews with donor representatives**; including Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Microsoft, and other contributors of the project
• **Carry-out debriefings on major findings with both ECB project Staff and IWG Focal Points** (Lead project advisors from each of the IWG agencies) to confirm that findings take into account project staff and focal point experiences
• The Consultants are encouraged to include a section on unexpected findings, so that the project can take these into account as it moves forward.

**VII. Consultant Selection process**

Interested consultants or consultant groups should put forward names to fill the anticipated two-person final evaluation team consisting of a Capacity Building Evaluation Specialist and a Organizational Learning and Change Specialist. Both candidates should have knowledge or experience in collaborative partnerships.

**7.1 Consultant Team**

1) **Capacity Building Evaluation Specialist**

- Evaluation Specialist in the humanitarian sector
- Experience in the evaluation of capacity building projects in the humanitarian sector
- Knowledge and experience or understanding of the humanitarian assistance sector. Preferably with knowledge of some or all of the seven IWG agencies (IRC, Mercy Corps, CARE, WVI, Oxfam GB, Save the Children USA, CRS)
- Strong interpersonal skills e.g. ability to listen, hear and translate views of various informants into a coherent report
- Proven analytic and report writing skills
- Knowledge of complex global organizations and how they operate.
- Candidates should not have been involved in either the design or management of the ECB project

2) **Organizational Learning and Change Specialist.- Process Evaluator**

- Experience in carrying out process evaluations
- Knowledge of and or experiences in organizational development and knowledge management
- Knowledge and experience or understanding of the humanitarian assistance sector. Preferably with knowledge of some or all of the seven IWG agencies (IRC, Mercy Corps, CARE, WVI, Oxfam GB, Save the Children USA, CRS)
- Strong interpersonal skills e.g. ability to listen, hear and translate views of various informants into a coherent report
- Proven analytic and report writing skills
- Knowledge of complex global organizations and how they operate.
- Candidates should not have been involved in either the design or management of the ECB project

**7.2 Selection Process**
- Candidates or consultant organizations are requested to submit their CV’s to the ECB Project Administrative Officer Ms. Aziza Abdurazakova at abdurazakova@care.org by 26th March 2007.
- Short-listing of candidates will take place on the April 9th 2007. Selection of short listed candidates will be selected based primarily on experiences in project evaluation of organizational development projects or approaches.
- Telephone interviews will be held in mid-April with short listed candidates. The 5 person Final Evaluation Committee will conduct interviews with each of the short listed candidates.
- The consultancy will begin in late April 2007 for period of 20 – 25 working days.

VIII. Outputs

- A draft report of no more than 30 pages plus annexes; including an executive summary section, and a final section on findings and recommendations.
- A final Report that incorporates corrections and input from ECB staff and Final Evaluation Review committee members.
Appendix II – Document List

Key ECB reference documents

- ECB Proposal
- Good Enough Guide
- ECB2 Rome Final Report 7.2.07
- Proposal to NetHope
- ECB Fourth Semi Annual Report - Final March 2
- ECB Mid-Term Review Final Report
- ECB External Communications Plan Final Dec8
- Governance Structure -7-14-05
- ECB Revised Implementation Plan final
- Implementation Plan Letter to Gates
- Knowledge Fair Materials April 2007
- IWG Responses Letter Emergency Capacity Initiative Final
- ECB3 four point strategy June 06
- 4th Semi Annual Report Annex Section final March 2 07.doc
- Timeline for Phase II
- ECB Phase 2 Draft 5 and 6
- ECB LogFrame March 12 07

Initiative 1 Documents

- Building Trust Pilot
  - ECB Building Trust in Teams Scoping Study
  - ECB Building Trust Pilot 2 – page summary
  - ECB Building Trust Scoping Study Executive Summary
  - Building Trust Sri Lanka Short Report
  - ECB Building Trust Pilot Proposal v20Oct06 Final
  - ECB Building Trust CASTLETON Proposal Nov 06
- Dashboard Pilot Project
  - Comparison of Data, Indicators, and 28 Factors
  - ECB Staff Capacity Metrics Pilot Description
  - Field Visit Report (Final)
  - Field Visit Summary Oct 06
  - Staff Capacity Building Metrics Project ToR1a
- Retention Study
  - Employee Perspective Phase 1 – Executive Summary Feb 2006
  - Employee Perspective Phase 1 – Final Report Feb 2006
- Metrics Study
  - ECB Executive Summary
  - ECB Progress Review Document REVISED
  - Metrics v18May05
Surge Capacity Research
  • ECB1 Concept Paper Surge Capacity
  • ECB1 Draft Proposal for Surge Capacity Research

National Staff Development Pilot
  • National Staff Pilot Concept Paper (7 June 06)
  • National Staff Concept Paper v26Jun06
  • National Staff Proposal Final v22Nov06
  • National Staff Action Plan Final v22Nov06

ECB1 Implementation Plan (draft) v12July05b
Notes from Start-up Meeting
Action Points Amsterdam Jun 05
Minutes Addendum Agency Presentations Amsterdam Jun 05 draft v2
Mid-point review notes NY Oct 05 draft
Mid-point review Agenda
Learning Event Summary Report
Meeting Notes Geneva June 06
Review of Staff Capacity Building Goals and Achievements
Summary of Action Points from Staff Meeting Atlanta
Appendix – ECB1 Timeline
Appendix – Staff Capacity Building Updates
Appendix – Update Metrics Pilot
Appendix – Considerations for Washington Learning Event
Detailed Proposal from People in Aid Final
Best of the Best Surge Capacity Tools
Metrics Project Extension Proposal
Review of Staff Surge Capacity Building Goals and Achievements
ECB1 Discussion Points Telecon 13Jul05
PeopleinAid Draft Proposal for publishing and disseminating ECB1 outputs June 2006

Initiative 2 Documents

- ECB2 Overview Final April 7 ‘06
- GEG Flyer UKUS
- Good Enough Guide
- Draft Outline for Guide 14 12 05
- Good Enough Guide Module ToR, concept note
- Draft Guide May 2006 22.05.06 (2)
- Good Enough Approach - KF
- CRS GEG Learning Plan Draft 26 Feb 07
- Save the Children Learning Plan
- WV Learning Plan 20 March 07
- ECB2 Overview Final April 7 ’06
- Lisbon Meeting Notes Feb 2007
- Nairobi Meeting Notes Feb-March 2006
- ECB2 Nov 7-9 Learning Event Notes
Social Impact, Inc.

- ECB2 Rome Final Report 7.2.07
- Monthly Progress report March 2007
- End of Project Summaries (IRC, MC, CRS, CARE, WV, SCF)
- End of Project Survey Summary 30.3.07
- Overview of Quality and Accountability Networks

**Initiative 3 Documents**

- ECB3 Workplan 25 May 05 working
- ECB3 End of Project Learning Event Indonesia
- ECB3 Indonesia Summary of Lesson Learned
- Indonesia SOW Learning Event
- Indonesia- SOW Learning Event 16Feb07
- ECB3 Indonesia Pilot Project Proposal
- Guatemala End of Learning Event Report
- Guatemala Information Center Proposal Draft 2
- ToR Multi Agency Evaluation for Team Leader
- SOW Guatemala Case Study
- 3.2 report
- ECB3 Learning Event Ethiopia Draft note
- Revised Plan Ethiopia
- ECB3 Indonesia Pilot Project Proposal
- Review of Disaster Risk Reduction Practice in Ethiopia
- Promising Practices For Risk Reduction, Draft - June 1, 2007
- Tajikistan SOW for Consultant
- Tajikistan Proposal March 16 FINAL

**Initiative 4 Documents**

- Proposal to NetHope ECB
- ICT Skills Building Proposal
- ICT Assessment Report
- ERICT Resources Center Proposal
- ICT and Humanitarian Relief Pilot Project
- Project Recap and Go Forward Plan wayforward630(2)
- Meeting with Microsoft Nov 7 2005

**ECB Project**

- ECB Fourth Semi-Annual Report-Final March 2
- ECB 4th Semi-Annual Report Annex Section Final March 2 07
- ECB Semi-Annual Report No3 July, 1 2006
- ECB Sec Semi-Annual Report Draft 1
- ECB Report June 2005-final
- ECB Overview
- Gates Proposal
- Report on Emergency Capacity
- ToR for Event Coordinator
- Participant briefing
- ECB Funding Management Mechanism October 3
- ECB Implementation Plan Final
- Governance Structure -7-14-05
- ToR for Initiative Management Committee 8-Aug28-wp
- ToR-Initiative Teams -28 aug05_wp
- Risk Management Plan 2 -Sept19 05
- ECB Newsletter submission guidelines
- ECB Document naming protocols
- ECB E-mail guidelines
- ECB Document Sharing guidelines
- ECB SharePoint policies
- Exit Procedures for ECB staff
- ECB External Communications Plan
- Implementation Cover Letter
- May 2006 – Revised Log Frame
- May 2006 – Revised Implementation Plan
- ECB Mid Term Review Final Report
- Notes for IWG Meeting NY May 4th Final
- ECB Learning Event Knowledge Fair materials

**Additional References**

- Assessing Strategic Partnership The Partnership Assessment Tool. (2003) The Strategic Partnership Taskforce in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in conjunction with the Nuffield Institute at the University of Leeds, Leeds, UK.
Appendix III – Logical Framework Analysis

This appendix is the Logical framework found in the ECB Forth Semi-annual report. The primary observations on the framework, its modifications over time and on the achievements to date are covered in the main report. Specific notations are listed here by the evaluation consultants in bold italic and green color (third color may vary by computer).

Appendix A
Revised Monitoring Log Frame for ECB Project
Achievements through December 2006

**All additions, unless otherwise noted, are from ECB Fourth Semi-Annual Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and Evaluation Log Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Project Goal:</strong> To improve the speed, quality, and effectiveness of the humanitarian community in saving lives, improving the welfare, and protecting the rights of people in emergencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Overall Outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning and Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies’ practice is compliant with their own policies and these policies stand up to peer review within a framework of ECB findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Inter-agency collaboration**

Collaboration between IWG member agencies is strengthened at headquarters and field levels

- No. country offices where IWG collaboration has spread beyond headquarters; evidence of member collaboration includes new consortia, MOUs signed, joint assessments, coordinated geographic or sectoral-based initiatives, new networking opportunities.
- Amount of funds or in-kind donations IWG member agencies make to internal resource investments and matching commitments for new collaborative projects.

- ECB has project activities in six countries (Guatemala, Indonesia, Ethiopia, Niger, Pakistan, Sudan)
- IWG Agencies in these countries have either created time and space for informal but regular meetings to further collaborative efforts, or are have jointly submitted proposal together due to relationship started by element of ECB
- WVI, CARE, Mercy Corps have all made investments in Phreeway an active learning network formed to take advantage of IWG relationship
- All IWG agencies have reached or exceeded their match amounts on ECB

**Changes/Improvements in the Humanitarian Sector**

The ECB project will have increased donor financial commitment to capacity building of the humanitarian sector;

The ECB Project will have “Raised the donor community’s awareness of the importance of capacity building in the Humanitarian Assistance Sector”

The ECB Project will have significantly contributed to improved quality of the work within the humanitarian community

- Three or more capacity building supportive grants committed to IWG members resulting from the ECB during life of the project
- Increased donor investment in capacity building of the emergency sector: literature review, interviews, qualitative research
- # publications from ECB that are posted by leading technical agency networks (at least five publications in humanitarian literature either in print or accepted); and/or # of presentations of ECB’s work at large, international humanitarian forums
- Wide dissemination and evidence of initial use of research, tools, models, and standards in seven IWG and at least 10 non-IWG humanitarian agencies.
- Evidence that ECB has led to improvements in information flow, and coordination between responding agencies in at least two humanitarian action responses.

- ECB has received two substantive supported grant or contributions: Microsoft Corp $1 Million & an in kind donation from McKenzie Inc for estimated at $1 Million
- ECB has been one of many projects that have emerged since 2004 in response to needs of a challenged emergency sector. Evidence of investment includes Clinton Initiative, TEC Survey, UN Humanitarian Response Review, etc.
- ECB has currently three publications – with many more to come
- ECB has presented itself at Inter Action forums on 2 occasions, once at VOICE, once with Canada’s Emergency Forum (PAGER) and at 6 out of the 7 agencies HQ’s. ECB has also sponsored two large sector wide forums is a contributor to EPN and NETHOPE where we have where ECB has presented several times over the LOP. ECB also presented at UN, DIFCO, DIFD meetings.
- Lebanon and Guatemala are most vivid examples where coordination has improved due to IWG/ECB
### Initiative I

**Initiative I Outcome:** Improved agency effectiveness in building and maintaining staff capacity for humanitarian action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Level Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Agencies will be prepared to respond faster in emergencies and provide higher quality responses with better trained and more rapidly deployed staff | • # agencies able to measure staff capacity and monitor staffing performance  
• # agencies reporting performance improvements  
• level of improvement reported by agencies  
(\textit{Some agencies are progressing towards systematically measuring and monitoring their capacity, and there are initial indications that agencies’ country offices are better prepared to deliver quality work in emergencies}) | • All agencies are reporting increased numbers of staff in key emergency posts, compared to the Emergency Capacity Review of 2004. Some agencies are reporting increased levels of preparedness for emergency response in vulnerable countries.  
• No IWG agencies currently have in place systematic tracking or reporting for global staff capacity, nor speed / quality of emergency responses. Some have anecdotal evidence of improved emergency responses in 2006 and of reduced demand on unreliable back-up systems such as rapid recruitment mechanisms.  
• “We have seen clear improvement in the timeliness of deployment of staff and the effectiveness of our programming in large scale responses in the past two years” [World Vision]  
• “Around 30 new or existing emergency responses during this period. The main assessment we currently have of timeliness and appropriateness is through Real Time Evaluations, usually conducted one month into the response. Timeliness was judged good in Java and Lebanon, with Philippines more problematic due to some poor choices. Judgments on appropriateness of programming for all three was fairly favorable but with some notable exceptions, particularly in the period after the emergency relief phase.” [Oxfam]  
• “Over the last six months the primary accomplishment has been expansion of the number of staff dedicated to emergencies at CARE.”  
• “CARE USA has invested considerably in developing emergency preparedness guidelines and has worked with 10 countries to build the capacity of country offices to respond to emergencies.”  
• “The expansion of the global Emergency Response Team (ERT) and revamping of the Internal Emergency Roster (IER) over the last twelve months have provided dividends to the agency in relation to our emergency response capabilities. The IRC now has the capability to respond to multiple emergencies.”  
• “The Global Response Team – Mercy Corps’ internal emergency response roster – was initiated in the summer of 2005. The team grew from 17 in the first year to 34. Creation of the team represents a major commitment of Mercy Corps to integrated emergency response.”  
• “CRS has recently finalized its Emergency Strategy. This focuses increased efforts on preparedness and places emphasis on the importance of learning. The Emergency Response Team (ERT) has been expanded to
There will be evidence of adoption of improved HR management practices by all IWG member agencies and by other humanitarian organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured via self reporting by participating agencies and peer review</th>
<th>IWG agencies report that ECB project is raising awareness of staff capacity at senior management level. There is increased readiness (and in some cases increased capacity) to adopt improved practices.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“There is a new level of awareness and commitment to measure how well we source, develop and retain staff” [Mercy Corps]</td>
<td>“Because of greater awareness of staff capacity and development as a priority, a Staff Development Director has been put in place in Mercy Corps”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Mercy Corps has realized that AIM must be part of the basis orientation of expatriate and national staff in order to mainstream it throughout the organization”</td>
<td>“There have been changes in strategies and directions to help the speed and efficiency of interventions. These include an emphasis on National Staff development as stated in the Strategic Objectives for the next three years, diversity and the metrics that should enable us to measure the impact we have in emergencies.” [Oxfam]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A priority for the next few months will be to review critical HR policies and procedures. We have already held several meetings to identify HR practices that need to be strengthened” [CARE]</td>
<td>“The ECB project has been a catalyst in strengthening internal partnerships to advance priorities and in strengthening external partnerships” [CARE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Save the Children held a staff capacity and HR workshop in Bangkok in June 2006 at which the recruitment goal and procedures of the agency were better defined.”</td>
<td>“Based on ECB learning the agency has developed an abridged version of its Employee Manual for rapid induction in an emergency.” [SCF]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“While not reflected in policy, a change in Agency practice is the mobilization of all HQ Departments to actively participate in emergency responses. Thus at the onset and throughout an emergency, the capacity and</td>
<td>a total of eleven people, each deployable to respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “CRS executives have recognized the importance of getting national staff included into the Agency HR database so that their skills can be better utilized in staffing emergency programs. A plan is being developed to accomplish this in the current fiscal year. Once national staff are included in this database, CRS management will be in a stronger position to identify staff capacities and expertise needed to respond to emergencies.”</td>
<td>• Save the Children assisted its country offices [COs] in first drafts of emergency preparedness plans. “These CO plans include action plans and resource allocations to build capacity to respond to small scale emergencies, large scale emergencies and pandemics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The metrics pilot project will help improve the accuracy of reporting by introducing management tools that may be used at country level for capturing key indicators.</td>
<td>• Measured via self reporting by participating agencies and peer review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
resources of the entire Agency are leveraged to effectively manage a response. The Agency is indeed undergoing a change in culture in which all Departments recognize and understand that responsibility for emergency response lies across all Departments and that emergencies are a part of everyone’s job.” [SCF]

- There is increasing engagement between IWG agencies and the wider sector to share experience and insights in staff capacity: all 7 IWG agencies participated in the Emergency Personnel Network (EPN) in Geneva, 2007; 6 IWG agencies are members of People in Aid and all 7 are members of LINGOs.
- Collaboration between ECB and People in Aid has led to insights from ECB work being widely included in People in Aid publications and seminars. People in Aid report that engagement with ECB has had positive impact on their work generally. ODI Humanitarian Practice Network paper on Staff Turnover by ECB and People in Aid has been widely distributed throughout the sector with much positive feedback.

### Increased internal and external funding for staff capacity management activities

| More donor resources to fund work in emergency capacity building initiatives with demonstrated value is available |
| In-kind commitments from agencies to support project objectives are made |

| All agencies committing significant staff time to Initiative I. |
| Most agencies unable to report total value of internal staff capacity building activities, but most indicate increased resourcing levels in emergency departments |
| Indications that key constraint is not financial resources but management time and attention. Agencies report growing awareness and engagement by senior executives. |
| CRS has created a new post of Director of Organizational Learning, Knowledge Management and Internal Communications. This very positive move brings together at executive level responsibility for the key themes that probably have the greatest overall impact on global staff capacity. |
| IRC has created new post of Director, Organizational Development |
| Mercy Corps has created new post of Director, Staff Development and Learning. |
| CARE USA’s HR department allocated two full time staff to work in collaboration with the CARE International Emergency Group in strengthening global HR systems to ensure rapid identification, deployment and retention of emergency staff. |
| Save the Children and CARE have both newly appointed Staff Wellness managers |
| McKinsey pro-bono consultancy valued at $1M |
### Result 1.1 IWG members' current approaches to developing staff capacity evaluated, and best practices and underlying determinants of staff retention identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Monitoring Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1.1. HR Performance Measurement Metrics study by McKinsey Consultants to develop performance indicators for emergency staffing and produce baseline data. | • Comparative evaluation of how people management contributes to achieving emergency program goals, building on previous work by People in Aid and other organizations.  
• A common approach to measuring the performance of emergency staffing functions that can be used by all IWG agencies for baseline analysis and to track future improvements in staff capacity.  
• Baseline data for all IWG agencies.  
• A report detailing the results of the survey, discussing major findings, and providing recommendations on how to move forward.  
• Presentation at IWG learning event for HR managers and senior line managers. | • Metrics report published among IWG agencies.  
• Feedback from CEOs, Emergency directors, Regional directors and HR directors.  
• Agency ability to measure and monitor recommended indicators, commitments to implement/upgrade systems if needed.  
• External publication and feedback from non-IWG agencies, including # agencies adopting the recommended performance indicators. | • McKinsey completed substantial metrics study including recommended “Staff Capacity Dashboard” (October 2005).  
• Report reviewed internally by each agency and formally accepted. See previous report for quotations from participating agencies. Published externally as IWG Metrics Study Report (March 2006).  
• Most agencies do not currently have systems able to track even the most basic indicators for all staff (typically they currently monitor only expatriate staffing metrics, i.e. 2-10% of total workforce).  
• All IWG members committed to improve the measurement, monitoring and management of staff capacity by tracking and comparing performance data. Further development of the Staff Capacity dashboard transferred to pilot project under Result 1.2.  
• Report shared informally with other agencies…initial indications of interest. It was the subject of a keynote presentation at June 2006 EPN conference. |
1.1.2-4 Analysis of current practice amongst member agencies

Desk research, interagency meetings and a series of facilitated visits between IWG agencies, involving both program line managers and human resources managers at HQ and Country Offices to raise awareness and investigate current practices across all key areas of staff capacity for emergency response.

Specific activities will include:

- Identify a common set of core competencies, bringing together the individual work of member agencies, to facilitate a shared understanding of member agencies’ expectations of staff and the teams in which they work. Identify the key gaps/hard-to-fill areas. (activity 1.1.4);
- Collate information on systems, approaches and levels of dedicated resources to sourcing staff and creating effecting teams. Investigate the relative success and cost-effectiveness of these systems. (1.1.2); and
- Share best practice on existing staff development initiatives and performance management practices – including, but not limited to, inductions, appraisals, formal and on-the-job training, coaching and mentoring systems – and retention approaches/incentives including debriefings and end of contract appraisals etc for short-term staff.

New insights and shared understanding of current practices across all key areas of staff capacity, including workers’ roles and competencies and approaches to sourcing, development and retention of quality staff for humanitarian action.

- Peer-based identification of what are current “best” practices in each aspect of workforce capacity management, including:
  - Matrix of aid worker roles and expected competencies, levels of knowledge and responsibility;
  - Analysis of hard to fill areas;
  - Recruitment systems and internal rosters;
  - Performance management systems and staff development practices;
  - Approaches to staff retention and organizational learning;
  - “Quality of life” initiatives for humanitarian staff; and
  - Incentive systems for experienced professionals.

- Documented guidelines including staff development/hiring/retention tools and a curriculum of how to apply humanitarian agency competencies, with particular attention to national staff hired at the field level.

- Presentations at IWG learning event by selected managers of “best practice” approaches, to describe their experiences and answer questions from peers.

- Identification by each participating agency of immediate and longer-term opportunities for improvements that can be implemented based on practices observed at others,

Levels of engagement by HR managers and program line managers in meetings and visits associated with this work package.

- Agreement by participants on a comprehensive model of factors affecting staff capacity for emergency response.

- # tools and techniques shared by participating agencies with evidence of successful application.

- Self reporting by participating agencies of “quick wins” implemented and benefits derived from collaboration.

- Internal publication of Good Practice report detailing the findings of this work package.

- # agencies committing to institutionalize identified best practices.

- External publication and feedback from non-IWG agencies, including # agencies adopting improved HR practices based on IWG recommendations.

- Exchange visits took place August – October 2005. All IWG agencies participated: 5 agencies hosted HQ visits, 4 hosted field visits. Strong positive feedback from participants (see previous report)

- Report on Current Practices in Developing and Maintaining Staff Capacity published internally and externally (includes conceptual framework building upon work by McKinsey consultants and IWG; also list of common challenges and promising practices identified during exchange visits)

- 11 “best” practices identified and developed into case studies. Published internally and presentations at learning event.

- Additional work on surge capacity planned for 2007.
### 1.1.3
- Review meeting in New York (October 17-19) to consider what are current “best” practices among those observed.
- Internal activities within each agency to assimilate “quick wins” and planning of longer-term work needed to fully institutionalize best practices.

### 1.1.4
also deepening relationships between HR and line managers and with peer agencies for ongoing shared learning and collaboration.
- External publications to assist non-IWG organizations in implementing best practices, based on the experience and example of participating agencies.

### 1.1.5
Analysis of relevant practice from outside the sector

**Compare and contrast current systems and approaches with three selected industries outside the sector through a series of facilitated visits by key staff from participating agencies to other organizations which tackle similar people management issues.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with other organizations that address similar people management challenges to those faced by the participating agencies.</td>
<td>Professional development of key staff in participating agencies through better understanding of different approaches to HR management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation learning on how key problems are tackled in other industries.</td>
<td>Subsequent engagement between other organizations visited and IWG members to help implement alternative approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of systems and approaches that could be piloted and adopted in the humanitarian sector.</td>
<td>External publication and feedback from non-IWG agencies, including #of agencies deriving benefit from IWG observations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A presentation at a learning event for IWG member agencies describing lessons learned and opportunities identified during the process. | • Visit by IRC and CRS to NYPD, December 2005
• Visit by Oxfam to TNT, January 2006
• Visit by Mercy Corps and World Vision to Microsoft pending
• Reports published internally and presented at Learning Event
• NYPD visit inspired Simulations pilot project
• TNT visit led to recognition of critical importance of internal communications in promoting organizational learning and change.
• Oxfam: “Finding the right kind of concise user-friendly communications remains one of our biggest challenges” |
| A paper describing the process and findings for external publication via People in Aid, HPN and/or other established channels. | • Levels of engagement by HR managers and program line managers in visits to other agencies.
• Feedback from participants about “quick wins” identified and benefits derived from visits.
• # pilot projects proposed, based on innovations identified from other industries.
1.1.6 Employees’ Perspective

Conduct research among experienced and former aid workers to identify key elements of retention and loyalty.

- One major study conducted among all seven IWG agencies.
- Better understanding of who an aid worker is, how they get into the system and how agencies succeed or fail in keeping them.
- Set of case studies of aid worker career paths (entry points, motivation, and how agencies succeed or fail in keeping them).
- Recommendations for specific actions that can be taken to improve retention and loyalty of high performing staff in key leadership roles.

(ODI publication on retention distributed throughout NGO sector, People in Aid to publish best practices case studies)

- # agencies participating.
- # staff per agency participating.
- # former staff participating.
- range of experience and key roles represented by participants.
- # case studies developed.
- # key elements of retention and loyalty identified.
- # agencies announcing plans to change practices based on recommendations.

1.1.7 Learning Events

Start-up meeting for agency advisors, Amsterdam, June 2005.

Meeting for HR and program line management representatives from each participating agency in Oxford, February 2006.

- Present findings of initial research, explore innovative solutions and refine work plan based on learning.

- Level of engagement and participation by relevant managers of IWG agencies.
- # agencies presenting best practices identified by peers.
- # agencies reporting “quick wins” already implemented.
- # agencies announcing plans to institutionalize identified best practices.
- quality and range of innovative proposals for collaborative pilot projects.

All agencies participating but progress not identified past Feb 2007 (from Good Enough Approach KF Doc.)

- People in Aid qualitative study undertaken December 2005 – January 2006
- Capacity building teams from all agencies participated in study design. 111 current and former emergency program managers of 6 agencies completed questionnaires.
- Findings published internally and externally, also forming basis of article in People in Aid Newsletter (April 2006) and paper by Humanitarian Practice Network (June 2006).

- IWG Staff Capacity Learning Event held in Oxford UK, February 2006, with 27 senior program and HR managers from all IWG agencies. Report published internally.
- 11 “best practice” presentations, with representation by all 7 IWG member agencies
- 7 pilot projects identified (see result 1.2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Capacity Metrics Dashboard</td>
<td>▪ Toolkit for country managers in any humanitarian agency to measure staff capacity and monitor emergency staffing performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Field level agreement to set of common metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Database implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ # agency country programs using database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ feedback from users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ # non-IWG agencies adopting this approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Project launched February 2006; budget extended in December 2006 to allow activities to continue until June 2007. All agencies participating; Mercy Corps lead agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Three countries participating: Ethiopia, Indonesia, Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Two field visits to each country during 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Pilot database developed; total of 20 agency country programs currently collecting data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ A secondary benefit of this work has been the emergence or strengthening of interagency HR networks as a platform for sharing and learning in each of the participating countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The project has been very complex and difficult given the volatile environments that CARE works in, however staff in the field have expressed that the information and tool that the metrics project can provide will be invaluable in preparing for emergencies, assessing progress and measuring change.” [CARE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ “We have integrated the metrics into design and future implementation of our HR management information system” [Oxfam]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The Global Staffing Director will incorporate the metrics work at a headquarter level [WVI]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Review meeting scheduled for Nairobi, March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Additional interest from programs in Guatemala and Kenya.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Build national staff capacity of member agencies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Pilot programs for national staff tested and ready for implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ # staff who have participated in a pilot program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ # agency country programs able to report improved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Pilot project working group formed of managers responsible for national staff development, regular interagency conference calls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social Impact, Inc.

**Emergency Capacity Building Project Final Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equip individuals and organizations with easily navigable sources of good management practice</th>
<th>Improving agency ability to recognize and develop core competences</th>
<th>Practice emergency response procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Toolkit of “best of best” surge capacity tools | - Tools for staff selection and development, building upon new insights into humanitarian core competencies | - Multi agency emergency simulations  
  - Simulation exercise with administration guide developed, tested and published for use by any agency country program.  
  - Increased agency capacity to facilitate simulation exercises  
  *(Activities added since ECB Project Implementation began) – Document 1* |
| - Comprehensive toolkit published and in use  
  - # agencies promoting tools for use by their staff  
  - Testimonials from managers who have found the tools useful | - Recruiting managers better able to identify transferable skills  
  - Staff development processes more focused on priority skills  
  - Fewer unfilled vacancies | - # agencies participating in simulations  
  - # emergency response staff participating in simulations  
  - # agencies reporting performance improvements as a result of practice  
  - Number of simulations facilitators within each agency who have participated in other agencies’ exercises and/or training of facilitators.  
  - Select organizations participating in the pilot project put into practice the |

(Research into accreditation methods has been commissioned and will commence shortly)

- Staff capacity  
  - # agency country programs reporting improved preparedness for emergencies  
  - # agencies reporting an increased rate of promotion of national staff into emergency leadership positions  
  - Level of improvements reported

- Commenced in May 2006; CARE and Oxfam nominated as lead agencies.  
- Saved the Children UK joins working group, alongside Save the Children USA.  
- Pilot project manager appointed October 2006; visited agency HQs to finalize direction and scope; detailed plan and budget approved by all agencies in November.  
- Six agencies participating in the pilot project, strong levels of commitment.  
- Learning Needs Analysis completed in November 2006 via email survey of selected staff in participating agencies to determine curriculum; external publication due early 2007.

- Agency representatives decided not to pursue this concept, instead focusing resources on other activities.

- Six agencies participating; CRS nominated as lead agency.  
- Study to collect information about previous agency experience of simulations and determine focus for pilot project.  
- Team meeting scheduled Jan 2007  
  - *Between January and June, the team designed and piloted one single-agency simulation in Ethiopia (2 days), modified the design to accommodate a multi-agency simulation with a*
### Result 1.3: Experience and lessons learned are shared and made available to the wider sector through broad engagement with the humanitarian sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Monitoring Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Documentation and publication of findings and learning of the initiative | • Publication of results in media suitable for IWG, sectoral partners and think tanks, southern organizations, major donors, in accordance with ECB communications plan | • # documents produced  
• target audiences (number and type)  
• Quality of reports published  
• Citations and references to IWG work | • Four external reports published to ECB web site  
(Metrics study, Retention study, Review of Current Practice in developing and maintaining staff capacity, Humanitarian Competencies)  
• Retention study featured as main article in People in Aid newsletter, April 2006 (distribution approx 2500 HR and line management) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Impact, Inc.</th>
<th>Emergency Capacity Building Project Final Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Evaluate the initiative through a light peer review process to determine impact
  - Open sharing of HR practices among all IWG agencies
  - # agencies participating in peer review process
  - # agencies openly sharing HR information
  - Peer review scheduled for 2007
    (A light peer review process is being planned to assess agencies’ capacity-building achievements)

- Work in partnership with other actors to promote improved practice at annual events
  - Increased IWG participation (# and intensity) in humanitarian recruitment or staff-related partnerships/organizations (EPN/PIA)
  - # IWG organizations fully participating in staff or HR-related partnerships/organizations
  - # IWG organizations participating in HR-related annual events or conferences
  - 6 IWG agencies are members of People in Aid; CARE is considering membership.
  - 7 IWG agencies are members of LINGOs
  - ECB project provided support to EPN annual conference, June 2006. All IWG members attended, alongside total 70 HR managers from 50 humanitarian agencies
  - ECB project supporting EPN events in Rome, Nairobi and Bangkok during 2007

- HPN Network Paper on Staff Turnover published July 2006 (distribution approx 5000 HR and line management professionals in humanitarian organizations worldwide)
- People in Aid editing “best practice” case studies for external publication, early 2007
- People in Aid editing “best practice” case studies for external publication, early 2007
- People in Aid editing “best practice” case studies for external publication, early 2007
- People in Aid editing “best practice” case studies for external publication, early 2007

- Evaluate the initiative through a light peer review process to determine impact
  - Open sharing of HR practices among all IWG agencies
  - # agencies participating in peer review process
  - # agencies openly sharing HR information
  - Peer review scheduled for 2007
    (A light peer review process is being planned to assess agencies’ capacity-building achievements)

- Work in partnership with other actors to promote improved practice at annual events
  - Increased IWG participation (# and intensity) in humanitarian recruitment or staff-related partnerships/organizations (EPN/PIA)
  - # IWG organizations fully participating in staff or HR-related partnerships/organizations
  - # IWG organizations participating in HR-related annual events or conferences
  - 6 IWG agencies are members of People in Aid; CARE is considering membership.
  - 7 IWG agencies are members of LINGOs
  - ECB project provided support to EPN annual conference, June 2006. All IWG members attended, alongside total 70 HR managers from 50 humanitarian agencies
  - ECB project supporting EPN events in Rome, Nairobi and Bangkok during 2007

- Evaluate the initiative through a light peer review process to determine impact
  - Open sharing of HR practices among all IWG agencies
  - # agencies participating in peer review process
  - # agencies openly sharing HR information
  - Peer review scheduled for 2007
    (A light peer review process is being planned to assess agencies’ capacity-building achievements)

- Work in partnership with other actors to promote improved practice at annual events
  - Increased IWG participation (# and intensity) in humanitarian recruitment or staff-related partnerships/organizations (EPN/PIA)
  - # IWG organizations fully participating in staff or HR-related partnerships/organizations
  - # IWG organizations participating in HR-related annual events or conferences
  - 6 IWG agencies are members of People in Aid; CARE is considering membership.
  - 7 IWG agencies are members of LINGOs
  - ECB project provided support to EPN annual conference, June 2006. All IWG members attended, alongside total 70 HR managers from 50 humanitarian agencies
  - ECB project supporting EPN events in Rome, Nairobi and Bangkok during 2007
### Initiative II – Accountability and Impact Measure

**Initiative II Outcome:** Enhanced agency accountability to humanitarian sector standards and improved practice in impact measurement of humanitarian action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Level Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IWG agencies establish interagency processes that strengthen accountability and impact measurement capacities at field level.</td>
<td>• Identify common accountability and impact measurement elements that IWG agencies agree are feasible to apply in the field (the ‘good enough’ basic elements).</td>
<td>• Field staff and advisors, with ALNAP, HAP-I and Sphere participation, defined basic elements of accountability and impact measurement and a ‘good enough’ approach during a workshop in February 2006 (see previous report).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish and deploy an interagency standing to identify and promote good practice in the field using the agreed basic elements.</td>
<td>• Members of the standing team deployed to Niger in June and Guatemala in July 2006 to build skills on AIM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Good enough’ practice documented and used to define a How-to Guide on the practice of accountability and impact measurement.</td>
<td>• Version 4 of the Good Enough Guide tested in the field from May to September 2006 in countries such as Guatemala, Indonesia and Sri Lanka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good policies and or practices of accountability and impact measurement based on the ‘good enough’ approach considered for adoption by at least three IWG agencies,</td>
<td>Agency comments consolidated by each advisor and sent to the editorial committee in October. Guide revised and endorsed by agencies in November.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interagency mechanisms in place to promote continued collaboration to improve practice on accountability and impact measurement.</td>
<td>• A Good Enough module on the Guide planned for 2007 as well as training of Standing team members on the module so that practice as set out in the Guide spreads. Three agencies taking steps to incorporate Guide into emergency manuals and trainings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Parts of the ‘Good Enough Pack’ first developed in February, updated with standing team members in November 2006. Further revisions to be done before project end so that agencies can use the Pack for future collaborative efforts on accountability and impact measurement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Result 2.1: Baselines and focus areas for accountability and impact measurement work defined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Monitoring Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Stakeholder analysis/mapping   | • External stakeholder map of humanitarian accountability and impact measurement produced. | • # relevant external agencies engaging in the process  
  • # documents reviewed  
  • Synthesized map of findings produced | • 16 external agencies asked their views on good practice on accountability and impact measurement.  
  • 19 documents reviewed  
  • Two papers produced that synthesized findings                                                                                                                                 |
|                                 | • Assessment of current practice of IWG agencies on accountability and impact measurement produced. | • # agencies completing assessment process  
  • Paper produced and disseminated within IWG agencies | • Seven IWG agencies completed self-assessments  
  • A paper summarizing the findings produced and disseminated to IWG agencies.                                                                                                                                 |
|                                 | • Report on accountability and impact measurement thinking and practice of IWG members and other actors completed and disseminated. | • # IWG agencies and other actors receiving the report.                                                                                   | • The three papers above used for decision-making in the September 2005 planning meeting. They are working papers and have not been synthesized into one document.  
  *Basic elements of accountability and impact measurement agreed upon at Nairobi conference (Annex B)* |

### Result 2.2: Initial draft of how-to guide developed to promote continued improvements in the practice of accountability (to local people) and impact measurement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Monitoring Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Implementation team meeting to identify priority focus areas | • Focus of the guide agreed and rationale documented                  | • # IWG agencies participating  
  • # other relevant actors participating  
  • Written report on the process and follow up action plan produced | • All seven agencies participated in a planning meeting in September 2005.  
  • ALNAP, HAP-I and Sphere also participated.  
  • A draft work plan for developing the Good Enough Guide defined. |
Learn from tsunami joint evaluations and incorporate into draft how-to guide

- Evidence that learning from tsunami evaluations incorporated into draft guide
- # IWG agencies staff participating
- Brief summary on learning from tsunami evaluations about accountability and impact measurement
- All three IWG agencies that participated in the tsunami evaluation provided names of field staff to be interviewed. 20 field people interviewed, and two joint evaluation tsunami reports reviewed to inform the Guide.
- Brief paper prepared summarizing above learning and sent to all seven agencies.

Learning from other joint evaluations.

- Evidence that learning from other joint evaluations takes place
- Procedural documents e.g. draft ToRs, for doing interagency work produced.
- # interagency evaluations completed
- # agencies participating in the evaluations
- Brief summaries of learning on accountability and impact measurement from each MAE produced.
- Four MAEs completed by IWG agencies since 2005 and all posted on the ALNAP public evaluation database.
- Generic ToRs drafted for MAEs. These documents are under review and will be revised before project end and incorporated into a MAE learning publication.

Field reference group engagement

- Evidence that input from field practitioners informs how-to guide development and content.
- # and diversity of field reference group members
- # and types of engagement by members.
- The FRG formed in December 2005 now has 11 members (10 women and 1 man) from 5 agencies. The 14 member standing team is part of the group bringing it to 25 staff from six agencies.
- All standing team members and three FRGs participated in a November workshop where the final version of the Good Enough Guide was reviewed and agreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 2.3: How-to guide to strengthen the practice of accountability and impact measurement tested and improved.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Establish interagency standing team | - Team and their operating procedures developed  
- Basic elements on accountability and impact measurement agreed | - # and diversity of standing team members  
- # agencies appointing members to team  
- Basic elements documented  
- Draft guide version | - There are 14 standing team members – 6 women and 8 men from 7 national backgrounds and with a diverse range of skills.  
- Six IWG agencies appointed standing team members. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Impact, Inc.</th>
<th>Emergency Capacity Building Project Final Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ How-to guide content and format more clearly defined</td>
<td>revised based on input from the standing team and field reference group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Basic elements were agreed and documented during the February 2006 workshop. Standing team and field reference group members were the primary informants of the Good Enough Guide content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries participate in learning from deployments</td>
<td>Deployments completed that identify practice in relation to the basic elements, strengthen field capacity and document learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Total # and type of deployments</td>
<td>▪ In June, IWG agencies in Niger (slow onset emergency) setting) had a standing team deployment to strengthen their NGO coordination forum. This forum was created as a result of the MAE done in 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ # deployments conducted in different emergency contexts (rapid onset, slow onset, complex emergency)</td>
<td>▪ In July a deployment took place in Guatemala (rapid onset emergency setting) to inform IWG agencies of the draft Good Enough Guide and to set up a field test with Oxfam and CARE on the tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ # learning reports produced</td>
<td>▪ Learning reports on each deployment completed and shared with the advisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ A deployment to Southern Sudan (complex emergency) was planned for September but postponed due to rain, It will take place in February 2007.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Collaborate with HAPI on guide development

- How-to guide produced that can be used as a module in larger HAPI manual and still reflects the “good enough” basic elements approach agreed by IWG agencies

- Editorial committee for guide established with HAPI membership
- # committee reviews of the guide
- # and type of field tests done on guide in relation to HAPI standards development process

- Good Enough Guide Editorial Committee established in March 2006 with HAP-I as a member and Oxfam as the chair. The Committee met in May, August and October to review comments from the agencies and others on the guide (104 people commented) and agree changes to it and ensure its complementarity to HAP standards manual.
- Initiative members involved in HAP test of the standard and feedback Funds provided to HAP to support their regional workshops in Africa and Asia, plus field research on the HAP standard in Somaliland, Sri Lanka, and Senegal. This work together confirmed the complementarity of the two pieces of work.

### Interagency Review processes to finalize the how to guide (Good Enough Guide)

- How-to guide designed that meets IWG member needs

- # IWG agencies participating in decision-making processes e.g. telecons, advisors meeting and interagency learning event in November
- # learning reports submitted both by individuals within agencies and through interagency deployments
- Final version of how-to guide signed off by most IWG agencies produced

- Six of the seven agencies actively involved in decision-making processes including signing off on budgets, ToRs, deployments and workshops.
- Learning reports produced for the Guatemala and Niger deployments and one will be done for the Southern Sudan deployment and circulated to advisors.
- The final version of Good Enough Guide signed off by the six participating agencies during a review and planning workshop in November.

### Result 2.4: Project results shared widely and how-to guide considered for adoption within each IWG agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Monitoring Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing engagement with the wider sector</td>
<td>Results and learning from field work shared with and informed by other humanitarian actors</td>
<td># and type of events where learning is shared and debated</td>
<td>ALNAP, HAP-I, and Sphere commented on each version of the Good Enough Guide and participated in the November 06 workshop where the final Guide version was endorsed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initiative presented on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publish findings</th>
<th>Multi-agency evaluations (MAEs) at an ALNAP roundtable in June, the European Evaluation Association in October, the American Evaluation Association in November and the ALNAP bi-annual in December.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Papers/reports prepared and placed in the public domain | ▪ # publications/articles produced  
▪ # agencies receiving publications.  
▪ # how-to guides published and disseminated  
▪ All four MAEs were posted in the ALNAP public evaluation database.  
▪ Articles produced for CARE, VOICE and Interaction newsletters and the ODI Humanitarian Exchange Magazine.  
| Policies and plans for mainstreaming the accountability and impact measurement guide are being developed. | ▪ In September, agencies agreed to produce a training module on the Guide and train standing team members so they can spread practice across their agencies in 2007.  
▪ Three agencies-Save, Mercy Corps and World Vision plan to incorporate Guide into their emergency manuals and trainings. |
| IWG agencies develop plans for future self-assessment on accountability and impact measurement | ▪ Strategy and TOR for redoing self-assessment in 2007 developed.  
▪ # IWG agencies participating in strategy and TOR development  
▪ # IWG agencies planning to conduct a self-assessment  
▪ Agencies agreed to complete an end of project survey by March 07.  
▪ Discussions on an accountability framework consultancy began in July. By the end of 2006, most agencies agreed to a consultancy to design an accountability framework to use in a peer review in phase II. This will start with a self-assessment. |
| How-to guide on accountability and impact measurement practice shared with major actors in the humanitarian sector. | ▪ A multi-stakeholder event held in Rome December 4-5 with 80 participants including UN (4), government donors (8), NGOs (40), and networks (12) and others (16), to
whole.

- Rome participant comments indicate support for the Good Enough Guide.

| whole. | share progress to date and discuss next steps in promoting accountability and impact measurement within the IWG agencies.
|        | • Rome participant comments indicate support for the Good Enough Guide. |
### Initiative III

#### Initiative III Outcome: Improved capacity for disaster risk reduction among IWG agency staff, affected communities, and local & national authorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes:</th>
<th>Outcome Level Indicators:</th>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. IWG agencies will have implemented a variety of promising community-based DRR projects in at least 3 pilot countries, and disseminated the results widely</td>
<td>• # of promising practices implemented in each pilot country&lt;br&gt;• # of external agencies/networks involved in the development of promising practices in each pilot country&lt;br&gt;• A results report produced from each pilot project&lt;br&gt;• # of external stakeholders who receive results and/or lessons learned of the pilot projects</td>
<td>• Several promising practices implemented in each of 3 pilot countries, especially in the 9 pilot projects led by 5 of the 7 IWG agencies.&lt;br&gt;• Agencies/networks directly engaged with IWG agencies in this initiative include ADSam, SC-Canada, Oxfam Canada, IIRR, national and local government agencies (e.g. DPPA), Bahir Dar University (BDU), several community representatives, FAO, OCHA, and other UN agencies, Red Cross/Crescent, CARITAS, CARDI, and several other smaller local partners in each pilot country.&lt;br&gt;• [Eth] Results reports available for all except the writeshop/DRR handbook, which has its own deliverables. Results shared with rural communities, GOs, esp. woreda and regional DPPA/FS offices, NGOs, UN agencies, higher education institutes, extension workers, donor agencies, farmers, CBOs, CSOs, IWG agencies’ program staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Targeted local communities in the 3 pilot countries are better prepared to respond effectively to disasters</td>
<td>• # of local level operational preparedness and response plans augmented and/or developed</td>
<td>• [Eth] The 3 community-managed disaster risk reduction (CMDRR) trainings all had an HVC analysis and preparedness plans carried out by the participants for 3 sites – submitted to the agencies that facilitated the field practicum.&lt;br&gt;• (Indo) Community-based disaster risk reduction capacity building in Western Sumatra.&lt;br&gt;• (Gua) Managing integrated risk reduction as a tool for disaster risk reduction and mitigation in four municipalities of Solola. Strengthened preparedness and risk reduction capabilities in several other regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local and/or national authorities in the 3 pilot countries, and/or at least 1 academic institution are more aware of DRR principles</td>
<td>• # of sessions attended and # of individuals from local and/or national authorities and/or academic institution members participating in collaborative training and community mobilization sessions on DRR</td>
<td>• [Eth] 1 workshop, which the IWG agencies organized in collaboration with BDU, was attended by almost 60 individuals from the university, regional office of DPPA, USAID, Gondar University, CRDA, regional Food Security office, local and international NGOs and other local government officials. The theme of the workshop was Awareness Creation and Capacity Building of various stakeholders in DRM. A 1-week long CMDRR training in collaboration with IIRR (25 participants) from local NGOs, BDU, and GO participants, and senior staff of IWG agencies, that included a visit to the community. (A 2nd round of this training is planned for late Jan 2007). An Addis Ababa-hosted, ECB-led, National Conference on Mainstreaming DRR in Dec 2006 drew participants from many external agencies, regional government officials, donors, UN agencies and academic institutions (AAU[5], BDU), DPPA, local and international NGOs, and private consultants. The DRR handbook writeshop, an excellent learning forum by itself, was attended by BDU, government offices (federal and regional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DPPA), WFP, research institutes, local and international NGOs, community representatives, extension workers, UN agencies, donors, and IWG agencies.

- [Ind] At a national level, PMT members have attended workshops organized around DRR. At a local level, a training was organized in West Sumatra by an ECB partner for the local government. In the pilot areas, nine communities have developed disaster preparedness plans.
- On-going direct work with local, municipal, and national government within each pilot country

For Guatemala, The IWG agencies have continued a productive and growing collaboration with national, municipal, and local government officials to develop or revise DRR policies. ECB has successfully advocated for local governments to update their emergency response plans and officially recognize and engage with community-based emergency preparedness and response committees

| Result 3.1: Models and promising practices for disaster risk reduction (DRR)² designed and tested in three pilot countries |
|---|---|---|---|
| Activity | Outputs | Monitoring Indicators | Achievements to Date |
| 3.1.1 Research promising practices of IWG agencies and key local actors in each pilot country on disaster risk reduction (DRR) | • IWG agency staff and local communities have contributed to the identification of promising practice models and tools for DRR  
• In each pilot country, IWG agencies have collectively agreed on, terminology to be used in the pilots, identified promising practices for DRR, and shared this information | • # of promising practice models documented  
• # of IWG agencies involved in DRR activities in target areas  
• Common terminology and definitions list agreed by each pilot country management team.  
• DRR tools applied in pilot projects. | • [Gua] At least 3 models and more than 20 promising DRR practices identified by the 6 IWG agencies present – practices in the process of final documentation. Several agencies with DRR experience from post-Hurricane Mitch, such as the CAMI project.  
• [Eth] Several promising practices of the 7 IWG and other agencies were documented in 3 complimentary studies. Most of these were not implemented as targeted DRR projects, but they utilized the same principles. All the 7 IWG agencies are involved in DRR activities directly or indirectly. e.g. WVE has formed a new ECB Unit, informed directly by the ECB project, that focuses on DRR, MC has a large conflict mitigation program, and as a follow up to the promising practice study it conducted, OGB is soon planning to work on CBDRR.  
• [Ind] DRR experience mapped of the 6 IWG agencies present.  
• In all pilot countries, a common reference terminology and definitions agreed. ECB3 advisors agreed to use the UN/ISDR DRR terminology as a common reference point. An |

² “Disaster risk reduction” or “DRR” is used here as a generic term to refer to a wide sector of work on disaster mitigation/ prevention/ risk reduction/ preparedness/ vulnerabilities. In the absence of collectively agreed definitions, a working proposal of the ECB risk reduction initiative is to refer to the common terminology of the UN/ISDR & UNDP: disaster risk reduction (DRR) is “The conceptual framework of elements considered with the possibilities to minimize vulnerabilities and disaster risks throughout a society, to avoid (prevention) or to limit (mitigation and preparedness) the adverse impacts of hazards, within the broad context of sustainable development.” (UN/ISDR: Living With Risk: A Global Review of Disaster Reduction Initiatives, 2004; pg. 17). The term “DRR” will be used throughout the rest of the document.
ECB-funded terminology conference in Guatemala is planned for Feb 2007.
- Basic instruments used to conduct DRR processes, emergency plans, risk mapping, scenarios and reduction plans.
- Few promising practices yet documented at HQ level.
- A large scale DRR survey was completed by the IWG agencies, plus several other NGOs working in the DRR sector in Europe and USA.

### 3.1.2 Review of promising practices, and development of recommended models on DRR

| **Report produced at end of project on promising practice models and appropriate tools for DRR. To include case studies and lessons learned of DRR projects incorporating local partnerships, where appropriate. (Report produced in English and main local language in each pilot country.)** | **Report produced and disseminated among the IWG agencies, as well as other relevant organizations and collaborative networks**
- Majority of IWG agencies agree on promising practices for inclusion in lessons learned report | **Report outline being developed to set pilot country work in context of known promising practices of IWG agencies and the wider sector.**
- Investigating the recruitment of consultant to assist at the HQ level
- [Gua] Report on models and promising DRR practices drafted for the 1st phase; currently in process of drafting the report for the 2nd phase of developing recommended DRR models; due Mar 2007. At present 4 of the IWG agencies sharing promising DRR practices, to incorporate them into their lessons learned; in the process of systematizing their experiences in DRR.
- [Eth] Practical DRR guidebook on DRR in Ethiopian context being written collaboratively, promising practice documents, and a review of NGO experience of DRR in Ethiopia. |

| **Community-based DRR projects implemented in 3 pilot countries, each with approval/ involvement of majority of IWG agencies.** | **# of agencies involved in DRR activities in target areas**
- # of pilot projects initiated as a result of this project
- Majority of IWG agencies agree on approach and models for pilot testing new DRR initiatives | **9 approved pilot projects: All agencies except IRC and WVI engaged in leadership of pilot projects.** |

### 3.1.3 IWG agencies collectively design and implement collaborative capacity building DRR projects in 3 pilot countries

**Ethiopia** (involving 3 of the 7 IWG agencies, plus SC-Canada, IIRR, government, and several local partners):
1. DRR strategies in CARE’s, CRS’, and Mercy Corps’ operational areas of W & E Harrarghe (led by MC).
2. Flood risk mitigation (led by CRS).
3. A Handbook on Disaster Risk Reduction – a “writeshop” proposal with IIRR (led by SC-US); and
4. DRR sensitization workshop – “Breaking the Cycle of Disasters – Mainstreaming DRR into Development Programming” through Save the Children Canada (led by SC-US)

**Guatemala** (involving 5 of the 7 IWG agencies, plus government, UN, and several local partners)
5. Strengthening preparedness and risk reduction capacities in Senahú, Alta Verapaz and surrounding communities (led by CARE with MC).
6. Community and municipal strengthening of risk management and disaster preparedness (led by CRS).
7. Managing integrated risk reduction as a tool for...
### Disseminate intermediate results and learning processes of capacity building DRR projects to broader international community through established and recognized mechanisms, publications, and fora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1.4</th>
<th>Regular reports produced on the output of DRR pilot projects. (Reports produced in English and main local language in each pilot country.)</th>
<th>Report produced and disseminated among the IWG agencies, as well as other relevant organizations and collaborative networks. <em># of agencies involved in DRR activities in target areas</em></th>
<th>Regular pilot project reports, research reports, and other documents freely shared between the IWG agencies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[Gua]</strong> 3 IWG agencies promoting lessons learned in DRR through pilot project reports. 5 IWG agencies are working on DRR activities in 4 distinct geographic regions. 4 project proposals written between the 5 implementing IWG agencies to apply for funding for future DRR projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[Eth]</strong> 6 IWG agencies, along with several others participated in collaboratively authoring a DRR handbook based on the Ethiopian context. 3 agencies (CARE, CRS and MC) are involved in E. &amp; W. Hararghe, along with local partners. An ECB &amp; DM unit established in WVE to work exclusively on Disaster Risk Reduction – projects, trainings, mainstreaming etc. Discussions are going on in other agencies – individually and in partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[Ind]</strong> All 6 IWG agencies are involved in DRR activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Through ECB contacts, WVI LACRO DRR case study published in UN/ISDR 2006 book &quot;Real Risk&quot; (UN/Tudor Rose).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All proceedings from external DRR workshops/conferences attended by IWG agencies and ECB staff shared amongst all; e.g. UN/ISDR &amp; UNDP conferences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

disaster reduction and mitigation in 4 municipalities of Sololá (led by MC with SC-US).

8. Strengthening emergency preparedness capacities in Nuevo Amanecer, Guatemala City (a high-risk peripheral urban settlement) (led by OGB)

Indonesia (involving 2 of the 6 IWG agencies, plus government, UN, Red Cross, and local partners):

9. Community-based disaster risk reduction capacity building in West Sumatra (led by CRS, with a local sub-grant to Mercy Corps).

- Inconsistent attendance at field pilot management team meetings has hampered progress on consensus, but generally agreement has been reached in each pilot country.
- **[Eth]** Majority of IWG agencies agree on DRR approach and the “risk formula” as a preferred model for pilot testing new DRR projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Monitoring Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1 Identify and/or develop appropriate community-based DRR training resources based on collected promising practices of IWG members and local communities</td>
<td>• Collaborative training materials (including advocacy techniques) are shared and/or developed by each of the 3 pilot countries (in English and main local language).</td>
<td>• # of IWG agencies participating in training</td>
<td>• [Gua] 6 agencies are taking part in the program of integrated training in disaster risk management, facilitated by the ECB project in Guatemala. Rather than writing new materials, those already existing have been used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• # of appropriate training materials shared and/or developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2 Provide at least 3 country and/or regionally-specific DRR trainings to program staff and other relevant stakeholders</td>
<td>• DRR trainings for program staff completed in each of the 3 pilot countries. • Project-related attendees of trainings sensitize their agencies on DRR learning</td>
<td>• # of IWG agencies participating. • # of program staff and other relevant stakeholders (including local NGO staff, community leaders, university staff, government officials, etc.) attending DRR training courses • # of pre- and post-training assessments of participants on their awareness and knowledge of DRR • # of IWG agencies who are sensitized on DRR training elements</td>
<td>• All IWG agencies have actively taken part in DRR trainings in the pilot countries. All IWG agencies sensitized and trained in DRR. • [Gua] An average of 36 IWG and other agency staff have attended ECB-led DRR trainings. Almost 1,500 community leaders, teachers, students and other actors trained in DRR. • [Eth] CMDRR training given in 2 rounds, (1 regional) – program staff (Head Office and field), university staff, government offices, and local NGOs attended. At each 25 to 30 were trained. The DRR handbook writeshop was attended by over 40 individuals from IWG agencies and other stakeholders, including government and community representatives. Pre-training expectations and post training written feedback revealed very positive change on knowledge and awareness on the subject. Trainings included developing action plans to share learning with colleagues. Accordingly, MC, SC, OGB and IRC reported successful sharing. CARE had organized its own internal staff training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Indo) Nine communities in the pilot project area of West Sumatra have begun implementing DRR activities. In December, a successful and very well-attended earthquake and tsunami evacuation simulation was organized in seven villages. Local government officials, NGOs, media, and police participated. However, there is only one pilot project in Indonesia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.3 At least 3 local DRR trainings provided in each of 3 pilot countries, for a total of 9</td>
<td>• 3 local DRR trainings for program staff and community members completed in each of the 3 pilot countries. • Plans/processes for</td>
<td>• # of IWG agencies participating. • # of program staff and community members attending training courses</td>
<td>• [Gua] All 6 IWG agencies are taking part in ECB-led DRR trainings. 4 of 6 DRR trainings completed for IWG agency staff and community members. Approximately 10 communities are incorporating elements of DRR through the pilot projects. • [Eth] One large DRR workshop with Bahir Dar...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings involving community members</td>
<td>Sharing results and helping other non-IWG agencies to institutionalize practice are defined. • Capacity-building training tools identified, that are relevant, promising, and usable at the field level.</td>
<td># of pre- and post-training assessments of participants on their awareness and knowledge of DRR • # of community-based organizations who explicitly incorporate DRR training elements into on-going training programs</td>
<td>University (two from 1 IWG agency [SC] and about 60 participants in total) focused on the Amhara region and brought together the regional DPPA, regional Food Security office, staff of Gondar and Bahir Dar Universities, local NGOs and other local government officials. The 3rd and final round of CMDRR training in Jan 2007 is expected to draw participants from local governments, local NGOs, and field staff of all 7 IWG agencies. Some of the action plans mentioned above included training of local counterparts. At each training round, at least 2 program staff and 2 local government/community members actively participate. • [Ind] All 6 IWG agencies have taken part in local DRR trainings. As noted above, there has been only one training session and there is only one pilot location in Indonesia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Result 3.3: Advocacy initiatives piloted in three countries to promote the acceptance of and commitment to disaster risk reduction principles by local and/or national authorities and other key stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Monitoring Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1 Review and analyze national policies on DRR in 3 pilot countries</td>
<td>• Report produced on the national and local policies relevant to DRR in each of the 3 pilot countries. (Report produced in English and main local language in each pilot country.)</td>
<td>• # of IWG agencies participating. • # of completed national DRR policy reviews</td>
<td>• [Gua] 5 IWG agencies are actively advocating for DRR to the government. National policies in DRR are currently being developed with support of the IWG agencies. Advocacy success has already been achieved in having DRR elements inserted into the national school curriculum. • [Eth] 1 study reviewed the NPDPM (National Policy on Disaster Prevention and Management); 4 IWG agencies reviewed the draft. 3 papers produced on national policy review – 2 were presented at the ECB-sponsored National Conference on Mainstreaming DRR held in Addis Ababa on 12th Dec 2006. • [Ind] The majority of IWG agencies supporting MPBI and other INGOs in advocacy with the national government to endorse the National Disaster Management Bill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3.3.2 Advocate (directly or indirectly) independently, or in alliance with others, national policy makers to incorporate community DRR into national plans and policies in 3 pilot countries | • Support given to DRR sensitization workshops • Collaborative planning process begun in each of 3 pilot countries for future DRR work with key stakeholders, including IWG agencies, government and academic institutions | • # of IWG agencies participating. • % of local and/or national governmental personnel actively engaged with this ECB project • % of participants in community-based DRR trainings from local, municipal, and/or national authorities. • # of IWG agencies and/or other key stakeholders working on national DRR plans | • [Gua] 5 of the 6 IWG agencies are actively advocating for DRR to the national government, mainly assisting the construction of the new legal framework for the relief/ development sector for Guatemala. Advocacy is proceeding with the President’s Department of Planning & Programming, to implement DRR projects at the municipal level. There are currently more than 40 persons in the public sector that are involved in the ECB project, including municipal mayors, members of congress and members of the Federal Government’s National Coordinating Body for Disaster Reduction (CONRED). More than 10% of the participants of the ECB training processes are community leaders, and local and municipal authorities. Several IWG agency local partners are being trained in/ sensitized to DRR through the ECB project. • [Eth] 2 advocacy workshops organized – one in Bahir Dar with BDU and one in Addis Ababa with SC-Canada – both aimed towards sensitizing relevant regional & federal government offices to DRR. Attended by 1 and 4 IWG agencies respectively. 2nd and 3rd CMDRR training comprised of 35- 45% of the participants from the community and government reps. • [Ind] All 6 IWG agencies have agreed to support advocacy-based organizations promoting the DRR sector to the government. Advocacy activities to local government undertaken at location of pilot project in West Sumatra by MC and local partners. At the pilot project location in West Sumatra, ECB organized a successful simulation of an earthquake/ tsunami that was... |
very well attended and received.

- In Oct 2006, ECB instigated the creation of a new US-based Risk Reduction Working Group, based at InterAction. This major forum will hopefully act as an opportunity for member NGOs of the largest US NGO coalition to discuss openly DRR matters, and liaise with USAID. The working group is co-chaired by MC and American Red Cross, and has been setup to coordinate with and learn from similar working groups in the UK (the BOND DRR working group, with OGB as a key ECB link) and the Netherlands (the Dutch National Platform, with CARE Nederland as the key ECB link).
- ECB and WVI have made very strong connections with UN/ISDR and UNDP in helping to setup a Global Network of NGOs on Community Resilience to Disasters, as well as ongoing research groups on community-managed DRR, including training modules.

3.3.3 Collaboration with at least 1 academic institution in at least in 1 of the 3 pilot countries to develop new and/or improved DRR training elements

| Collaboration towards DRR elements produced as part of a teaching curriculum or short course in at least one academic institution | # of academic institutions actively engaged in integrating DRR into curriculum | # of new students reached through this curriculum | [Gua] Success at indirect DRR advocacy with the academic sector, though not an active part of ECB work plan. *The Ministry of Education integrated a risk reduction curriculum into the social and life sciences program at schools for children ages 4 to 14.*  

- [Eth] In 2006, BDU has opened a new degree program on DRM and Sustainable Development. ECB3 is working closely with the university in providing trainings and developing and/or sharing training materials. There are two batches now each having about 45 students. Students are expected to benefit from the ECB-sponsored DRR guidebook, which will also have direct faculty engagement in its writing.  

- [Ind] Most of the IWG agencies are directly supporting the Indonesian Society for Disaster Management and other agencies in joint advocacy with the national government, rather than through academia.
### Initiative IV Goal: Improved information communication technology support to humanitarian action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes:</th>
<th>Outcome Level Indicators:</th>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IWG Agencies have greater internal coherence in understanding the greatest challenges faced in information technology and requirements</td>
<td>IWG agencies jointly develop ICT proposal together and input and approval processes involve cross-departmental efforts</td>
<td>Portfolio of pilot projects demonstrate a broader understanding of IT challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project is operated at agencies using TEAM approach where both IT and Program staff are on the teams from each agency</td>
<td>Mid Term Review entirely positive about past progress and future potential of Initiative IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Official records demonstrate that: -Program concerns are included in relevant ICT discussions -ICT is included in planning and project development for emergency response</td>
<td>Critical discussions about further mainstreaming of IT into emergency response have started in the Emergency Response Working Group within NetHope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Fourth Semi Annual Report</td>
<td>Initiative IV has sought cross-departmental approval on all relevant projects (see narrative report for details; e.g. Data Collection Resources to involve assessment and monitoring staff).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved links between IT and humanitarian assistance departments</td>
<td>Evidence of greater input from field staff in IT solutions</td>
<td>On project-by-project basis, all lead agencies report increased links between IT and emergency units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior IT staff are more regularly deployed to the field</td>
<td>Overall agency reports suggest Initiative IV has raised awareness of IT issues significantly (see narrative report).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT units assign point person for emergency response unit</td>
<td>Agencies also report increase in both the number of IT staff involved in emergency response, and in level of input into strategic planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved links between IT and humanitarian assistance departments</td>
<td>Evidence of greater input from field staff in IT solutions</td>
<td>All IT units with sufficient capacity have assigned emergency focal points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior IT staff are more regularly deployed to the field</td>
<td>On project-by-project basis, all lead agencies report increased links between IT and emergency units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT units assign point person for emergency response unit</td>
<td>Overall agency reports suggest Initiative IV has raised awareness of IT issues significantly (see narrative report).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agencies also report increase in both the number of IT staff involved in emergency response, and in level of input into strategic planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All IT units with sufficient capacity have assigned emergency focal points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Result 4.1: ICT challenges identified through comprehensive assessment of IWG agencies in the humanitarian sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Monitoring Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment carried out at headquarters levels of seven IWG agencies</td>
<td>• Inputs provided across unit structures of seven organizations</td>
<td>• Report published and distributed to contribute to ICT</td>
<td>• Assessment Report launched to a wide audience – massive increase in visits to ECB website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Final Global Report produced</td>
<td>• Report demonstrates agency contributions at HQ and field levels</td>
<td>• Feedback on Report universally positive, and reports of Findings being used by other agencies (NRC staff call the report a “godsend” which enabled them to engage senior management).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Report published and distributed to contribute to wider understanding within sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Workshop held to discuss key findings with ECB agencies and external partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business plan or proposal developed allowing agencies to work together</td>
<td>• Business plan / process</td>
<td>• Agencies jointly determine directions forward</td>
<td>• Complete portfolio of projects developed to address critical common challenges based on agency priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to address common challenges in ICT</td>
<td>• Proposal defined</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustainability plan developed to carry forward collaboration, particularly working with NetHope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Result 4.2: On-line-shared workspace improves communication within ECB project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Monitoring Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and set-up intranet working space for ECB</td>
<td>• Group site established</td>
<td>• Improved coordination and communications in ECB</td>
<td>• Intranet consistently used to share project documents, organize meetings and teleconferences, and to collaborate on specific issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Result 4.3: Tangible solutions to address breaches in effective and efficient response identified and pilot activities begun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Monitoring Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot activities to address challenges identified and agencies</td>
<td>• Three pilot activities completed leadership taken by IWG agencies</td>
<td>• Pilots are incorporated either into agency practices or pilots further defined and</td>
<td>• Wide range of projects developed and approved by agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Adjusted from five pilot activities)</td>
<td>ownership transferred to network involved in ICT for humanitarian practice</td>
<td>• 40% of projects have agreed sustainability plans with NetHope;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pilots are successfully implemented, leading to either:</td>
<td>• 30% of projects will need to be adopted by individual agencies or groups of agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes in agency practices, or</td>
<td>• 30% of projects will disappear at the end of ECB life cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of resources for the wider community</td>
<td>• Where appropriate (e.g. ICT Skill Building) projects have been specifically built around existing agency capacity and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lead agency or groups of agencies invest in projects through effective management of Microsoft grants</td>
<td>• (Some pilots have been adopted by individual agencies but)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pilots extended where appropriate with sustainability through partnership with other initiatives or organizations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sustainability remains a concern and success depends on agencies taking responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix IV – Detailed Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2003</td>
<td>Creation of Inter-Agency Working Group (IWG)</td>
<td>The purpose of the group was to advance more effective delivery of humanitarian assistance by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) through a joint capacity building strategy. Goals were to create sustainable new mechanisms to share best practices, tap into the analysis of other specialist organizations, test innovative practices collectively in NGO field operations, and produce shared definitions and standards that can be applied across the humanitarian sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2004</td>
<td>Report on Emergency Capacity</td>
<td>The review found that while, IWG members had made progress in building their emergency capacity, most notably in rapid funding and response systems, major capacity gaps remained, inhibiting both the speed and effectiveness of humanitarian action, as well as coordination with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2004</td>
<td>ECB Project Grant Proposal</td>
<td>The ECB grant proposal, with CARE as the lead agency for seven agencies, was submitted to the Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation for assistance in developing Initiatives 1, 2, and 3 of the ECB Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2005</td>
<td>ECB Project Implementation</td>
<td>Implementation was delayed by three months, from January 2005, by the South East Asian tsunami and subsequent humanitarian relief response. The ECB project began in March, 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25-27, 2005</td>
<td>ECB Project Start-up Workshop (Washington DC)</td>
<td>The workshop’s objective was to launch the ECB with a strong leadership team guided by a shared understanding of goals, objectives, and key activities. During the workshop an integrated management model was developed, which was intended to delineate the roles and responsibilities of project actors. Other topics included budget and financial management, sub-grant policies and procedures, project communications, and strategies for promoting change and building capacity both within the IWG agencies and the humanitarian sector as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2005 – (March 2007)</td>
<td>Indonesia Pilot Project Developed</td>
<td>Field pilot project developed with local government capacity building component as the main focus. It was designed to ensure that a community emergency preparedness planning model was developed with the inputs of the IWG members, the local government, and other major stakeholders. The strategic objective included advocacy and capacity building components at the district level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11-13, 2005</td>
<td>Start-up Workshop: Staff Capacity Initiative (Amsterdam)</td>
<td>Work began to obtain the necessary evidence and deliver the tools needed by participating agencies to design and implement effective HR emergency policies. Networks built through project implementation were anticipated to evolve into strong and sustainable mechanisms of interagency collaboration, increasing the cohesion of the sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July – September 2005</td>
<td>Metrics Study</td>
<td>Addressing a need for more systematic and collaborative human resource performance metrics, the metrics study was planned to have a major impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of emergency responses, by developing and/or strengthening both the capacity of emergency responders and the HR instruments that source, develop, deploy and support staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2005 – (January 2007)</td>
<td>Guatemala Pilot Project</td>
<td>The project was designed with an initial objective of assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the ECB’s role in the emergency response to Hurricane Stan, taking into specific consideration inter-agency coordination as well as coordination with national systems. It was planned around Water and Sanitation, Public Health and Food Security. A risk reduction training program that incorporated relevant social actors and stakeholders was intended to follow with a focus on reduction of risk variables and on reducing risk in new investments and projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2005 – March 2006</td>
<td>ECB 4 Assessment Report: IT Requirements</td>
<td>The report was intended to identify the IT gaps and needs in the humanitarian response field and explore tangible solutions by completing an in-depth assessment of current IT uses in the field and by analyzing two emergency responses to identify the collective lessons learned and provide guidance to ECB 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5, 2005</td>
<td>Meeting with Microsoft: IT/Communications Initiative</td>
<td>The meeting introduced the two key concepts of: Dashboard and Pilot Guatemala. Dashboard was planned as a relational database for analysis and communication of data in a clear, concise, understandable and consistent format. Pilot Guatemala was seen as an opportunity to create a shared workspace during an emergency that would be an area where staff can share assessments and post Sit-reps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2005 – January 2006 (Oxford)</td>
<td>Retention Study (Conducted by People in Aid)</td>
<td>The aim of the retention review was to make a significant contribution to each of the participating agencies’ ability to retain staff. The review was designed to provide evidence based understanding of the key factors which influence retention in participating agencies; evaluate the agencies both collectively and individually against these key factors so that each agency can understand its strengths and areas for development; and to identify examples of good practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14-16, 2006</td>
<td>Learning Event: Staff Capacity Initiative</td>
<td>This Learning Event was a culmination of the research activities in the Staff Capacity Initiative, and a springboard for agencies to draw from each others’ experiences when improving their ability to develop and maintain staff capacity. Identification of best practices had proceeded to publication of eleven case studies, which will be shared with the wider sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 21- March 1, 2006</td>
<td>ECB 2 Meeting Nairobi</td>
<td>This was a pivotal meeting where 20 of the accountability initiative members from seven agencies met to redesign direction and focus for their work drafting the Basic Elements Working Document. The focus become the Good Enough approach and launched the idea of developing a field guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February – May 2006</td>
<td>On-line Learning Center Project: At the core of the Learning Center will be a Knowledge Base that is designed to include contributions from the humanitarian sector, vendors and other third parties. The center will provide learning, case studies, resources, examples, best practices and other materials that will strengthen humanitarian organizations' ability to collaborate, coordinate and communicate in emergency situations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb/Nov 2006</td>
<td>Metrics Pilot Activity: ECM agencies are working to implement a shared “dashboard” of prioritized humanitarian staffing indicators. This pilot project involves data collection, refining and proving the feasibility of selected indicators over time, in Ethiopia, Sudan and Indonesia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April – August 2006</td>
<td>Guatemala Information Center Pilot: The aim of the Guatemala Information Center (GIC) is to build a common understanding within the humanitarian community of the immediate post-emergency situation in Guatemala, specifically focusing on clearly identifying needs and requirements; gaps between the humanitarian assistance provided and the communities in need; and the efficiency and accountability of the response..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22, 2006</td>
<td>NetHope/ICT Skills Building Proposal: The pilot program was designed to develop and deliver a large-scale ICT training program for ECB/NetHope organizations that has measurable impact on ICT skills and overall productivity. In addition, the project aimed to build an approach that encouraged trained staff to support their colleagues, spreading their skills throughout the organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2006</td>
<td>ECB Project Mid Term Review: This report presented the findings of the review of the first twelve months of the ECB project including the potential solutions it had identified to that point, and commentary on the project objectives, intended outcomes, activities and outputs. The review found that the pace at which the activities progressed and their internal impact varied significantly and depend on the quality of the initiative designs, alignment with the agencies policy priorities, the body of knowledge and implementation practices that related to the size, strength and influence of the advisor groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2006 – January 2007</td>
<td>Ethiopia Pilot: ECB3 Ethiopia was a pilot project that was intended to focus on disaster risk reduction and improved capacity for risk reduction and emergency preparedness among IWG agency staff, affected communities, and local &amp; national authorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2006 – June 2007</td>
<td>Trust Pilot: This pilot project is designed to use practical tools to build trust within diverse teams involved in emergency response in order to improve their collective performance and enhance the skills and competence of individual staff and managers. The first phase of work (duration 6 months) has included a scoping study followed by the development and testing of tools in an initial “pioneer” country. An optional second phase (duration 3 months) will include additional action research to test and refine the tools in an additional two countries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: November 7-9, 2006 (St. Albans)</td>
<td>Learning Event: Accountability and Impact Measurement Initiative</td>
<td>This meeting expanded the ECB 2 group to include field reference group members who had been providing input on the Good Enough Guide (GEG) on accountability and impact measurement. In addition to interagency events such as visits by standing team members to country offices, support for a multi-agency evaluation and the co-creation by all of the GEG, each of the agencies represented had made individual progress on accountability and impact measurement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: November 2006 – June 2007</td>
<td>National Staff Development Pilot</td>
<td>The National Staff Development Program is a pilot project aimed to lower barriers between senior managers and national staff by designing and testing a sustainable, replicable program to increase the number of agency staff at the national level capable of leading and managing emergency programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: December 4-5, 2006 (Rome)</td>
<td>Translating Standards into Practice</td>
<td>The objectives of this gathering were to share lessons and challenges and develop recommendations for action, primarily for ECB member agencies, within the following thematic areas: accountability (to disaster-affected populations), impact measurement, collaboration, and coordination. The conference involved seventy-eight participants including donors, UN representatives, international and local NGOs and humanitarian network representatives. It began with presentations and continued with workshop debates to formulate and prioritize recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: February 2007</td>
<td>Publication of Good Enough Guide</td>
<td>The basic elements of accountability and impact measurement are the foundation on which The Good Enough Guide was developed. The 'good enough' approach favors simple solutions over elaborate ones and encourages the user to choose tools that are safe, essential, quick, and simple to implement. Following publication CRS, SC, and WV developed learning plans to promote awareness, knowledge, skills and favorable attitudes towards using the Good Enough Guide (GEG) among staff and partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: February 1, 2007</td>
<td>Surge Capacity Pilot Proposal Drafted</td>
<td>This proposal is to build on the learning that is already underway, by including in the ECB 1 initiative, a simple collaborative research process which would consolidate lessons and best practices on surge capacity across the seven agencies. It will review existing documentation of lessons learned, and consolidate a report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: March 12-14, 2007 (Guatemala City)</td>
<td>Learning Event: Risk Reduction Initiative</td>
<td>This event aims to present the current perception of risk management in Guatemala, by incorporating the cumulative learning gained through the implementation of ECB Project activities and including perspectives external to the project, in the hopes of presenting a holistic view of the state of risk management at the national level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: March 20-21</td>
<td>Learning Event:</td>
<td>This event presented and shared reflections on the collaborative process within and between agencies on the ECB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 (Jakarta)</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction Project</td>
<td>Attendees included project staff, IWG members, local government, International and local NGO and others to review and understand ECB3 pilot project implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March–June 2007</td>
<td>Tajikistan Project</td>
<td>DRR is a key theme for all program interventions in Tajikistan. The goal of this Working Group was to share the best practices and lessons learned (integrated, multi-level, multi-sectoral collaboration) among agencies working in disaster risk reduction in Central Asia, as well as to develop training materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 12-13, 2007 (Washington, DC)</td>
<td>ECB Project Event</td>
<td>Teams of ECB professionals from around the world gathered with senior executives from their organizations and invited experts from the wider sector to share their learning and jointly address the challenges that lie ahead. The event highlighted developments in the Project’s four initiative areas: building staff capacity; improving accountability and impact measurement; controlling vulnerability through disaster risk reduction; and understanding information and technology requirements in emergencies. Attendees also reflected on the collaborative experience itself: how ECB developed and took forward common goals across organizational, functional and geographical boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2007</td>
<td>Development of ECB2 Accountability Framework</td>
<td>The objectives of this framework is to produce a common humanitarian accountability framework for 5-6 IWG agencies, highlighting those benchmarks that should be useful for agencies to develop meaningful accountability systems and as a point of reference for future peer reviews that focus on humanitarian accountability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Annual Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECB1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2005: Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2006: Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2006: Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2007: Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2007: Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECB2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2005: Washington DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2005: New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2006: Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2006: Washington DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2007: Lisbon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Annual Report Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECB First Semi-Annual Report: July 1, 2005 (Jan – May 2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V – Partnership Survey Results Charts

**Has Participation in ECB furthered your own organization’s capacity to support emergency response?**

- Number of Responses (N=20)

  - 1= Not at all
  - 2
  - 3= to some extent
  - 4
  - 5= to a significant degree

**Has your involvement in ECB permitted you to leverage new or additional donor funding for emergency response preparation?**

- Number of responses (N=17)

  - No
  - Yes

**How well is the ECB project aligned with your organization’s response activities?**

- Number of responses (N=22)

  - 1= Not at all
  - 2
  - 3= to some extent
  - 4
  - 5= to a significant degree

**Has participation in ECB meetings/activities led to improvements in your own capabilities?**

- Number of responses

  - 1= Not at all
  - 2
  - 3= to some extent
  - 4
  - 5= to a significant degree

**Has your organization experienced closer coordination and relationships with IWG agencies as a result of the ECB?**

- Number of Responses (N=22)

  - 1= Not at all
  - 2
  - 3= to some extent
  - 4
  - 5= to a significant degree
Developing and maintaining trust (between IWG members)

Number of Responses (March 2005 - N=18; June 2007 - N=21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Mar-05</th>
<th>Jun-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developing and Maintaining Trust (with IWG partners)

Number of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Mar-05</th>
<th>Jun-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clear partnership arrangements

(Clarity in ECB project management including communications among IWG members)

Number of Responses (March 2005 - N=19; June 2007 - N=22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Mar-05</th>
<th>Jun-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clear partnership arrangements
(Clarity in ECB project management processes including communications between IWG members and partners)

Number of Responses (March 2005 - N=14; June 2007 - N=17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mar-05</th>
<th>Jun-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1= Not at all</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monitor and Measure

Number of Responses (March 2005 - N=18; June 2007 - N=22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mar-05</th>
<th>Jun-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1= Not at all</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning

Number of Responses (March 2005 - N=15; June 2007 - N=18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mar-05</th>
<th>Jun-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1= Not at all</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustainability

Number of Responses (March 2005 - N=18; June 2007 - N=12)

1= Not at all  2  3= to some extent  4  5= to a significant degree

Mar-05  Jun-07