

Guidelines for Consultants in use of Humanitarian Indicator Tool for Slow Onset Emergencies

The evidence needed for each standard under the indicator needs to be checked for quality and effect.

Standard	Evidence	Quality check
<p>1</p> <p>Rapid appraisal of facts within 24 hours of pre-defined trigger, plans in place and scale-up or start-up commenced within three days</p> <p>Examples of triggers could be the IPC results, Fewsnets, State of Emergency declared.</p> <p>Trigger such as the categorisation may not be appropriate if this was late – if the country does use this as a trigger, consultant needs to look at other agencies and the overall response to assess Oxfam timeliness</p>	<p>Initial assessment report – partner and Oxfam</p> <p>Other agency assessment reports</p> <p>RTE report</p> <p>Sitreps from first two weeks</p> <p>Request for CatFunds</p> <p>Date of first concept note</p> <p>Telecon notes with region or HD</p> <p>Date of new PIP or project on OPAL</p> <p>BBC website</p> <p>JCAS</p> <p>Contingency plans</p> <p>Other agency response – such as Save the Children</p>	<p>Check JCAS and contingency plans for predefined triggers</p> <p>Check BBC website for Oxfam and predictions on slow onset</p> <p>Check the date of the assessment report – both when the assessment was carried out and when the report was written</p> <p>Check that assessment report has proposed intervention included</p> <p>Check the RTE under benchmark 1 and 2 for mention of timeliness but also of pre-trigger monitoring</p> <p>The Sitreps should give the date of first implementation</p> <p>The request for CatFunds will also show timeliness as it should be within first week</p> <p>Check for telecons around triggers and need to respond</p> <p>Check the contingency plan as this should identify different scenarios and which triggers will be used</p> <p>Look for evidence of monitoring of the situation and a reaction to the data</p> <p>If there was no reaction and the response was late, look for good reasons such as lack of media interest and donor reluctance – media reports</p>
<p>2</p> <p>Coverage uses 10% of affected population as a planned figure with clear justification for final count</p> <p>It could be that the target was for advocacy purposes only</p>	<p>Coverage assessment using the scale -</p> <p>RTE reports Initial assessment report</p> <p>Telecon notes stating categorisation</p> <p>Minimum standards in place¹</p> <p>Concept notes with proposed aspirational coverage</p> <p>Proposed budget for aspirational figure</p>	<p>Look at the assessment report and the concept note for the total number of affected</p> <p>UN reports will also give total number affected</p> <p>The RTE will give an estimate of programme targets and whether these have been reached</p> <p>In the case where 10% of the population has not been reached, the explanation needs to have been documented</p> <p>If the explanation is plausible and unavoidable, the rating can be met – these could be lack of access, insufficient funding, Oxfam prioritising marginalised communities whose needs are not being met by others, scattered populations such as pastoralists where it</p>

¹ HR, logistics and finance minimum standards for faster implementation
VM Walden 2013

		Revised coverage figure and budget with justification UN reports for actual affected figures	would not be cost effective to cover large numbers, government decisions for INGO involvement, UN or government having a good response Check in telecon minutes that categorisation was agreed and minimum standards put in place The coverage should be cumulative without too many sudden upsurge in numbers especially during last months of programme – look at responsiveness to needs (use the Sitreps for tracking) If most of the activities are advocacy look for evidence of effect such as increased access or more funding being pledged that potentially would increase the number of beneficiaries without it being possible to give a figure
3	Technical aspects of programme measured against Sphere standards Note: the word “Sphere” may not be mentioned but the standard itself should be used (for example mentioning the amount of water per person but not the word Sphere) – check the Sphere standards handbook if in doubt If there is clear justification for not using Sphere standards this should have been documented	Proposals MEAL strategy and plans PH and EFSL strategies Technical adviser visits Training agendas and presentations LogFrames and monitoring frameworks donor reports RTE and other evaluation reports learning event or review reports	Check proposals and strategies to see if standards are mentioned not just as a possibility but that they are considered in the context of the response – this might mean that Sphere has been adapted to suit the context The indicators on the LogFrame for technical areas should reflect Sphere standards The MEAL strategy should have Sphere as indicators and for data collection methods Check adviser reports for mention of standards and how these were implemented Check the RTE report for mention of Sphere standards Check WASH and EFSL strategies and adviser reports to see if any training was carried out for staff and partners Check review and evaluation reports for mention of standards
4	MEAL strategy and plan in place and being implemented using appropriate indicators	LogFrame in proposals Logic model and outcome statements in PIPs Monitoring framework Evidence of formats for data collection being used Reporting – technical reports, donor reports Evaluations	Check the indicators – are they SMART? Is there a target, quantity and quality? Are there indicators at the different levels that reflect that level? Are the same indicators used at different levels? Do the indicators reflect gender? Are there clear Means of Verification (MOV)? Is there a monitoring framework with MOVs and a timeline? Is there evidence of monitoring data collected and analysed against indicators being used to inform programme progress and maintain activity quality?

		Outcome statement on OPAL	<p>Check the logic model (for the PIP) and an outcome statement that is replicated in the project LogFrame</p> <p>Check if there has been an evaluation that looks at the outcome indicators – what was the method used and is it robust enough to measure outcomes?</p> <p>Check the donor reports for mention of monitoring and measurement of outcome – are the conclusions plausible and well demonstrated?</p> <p>Check monthly/quarterly reports for mention of monitoring and measurement of progress towards meeting indicators</p> <p>Check if unintended outcomes have been reported or documented in internal or donor reports</p> <p>Are sex and age disaggregated data being collected and reported?</p>
5	Feedback/complaints system for affected population in place and functioning and documented evidence of information sharing, consultation and participation leading to a programme relevant to context and needs	<p>Assessment reports with comparison with final proposals to check needs expressed and addressed</p> <p>Feedback/complaints system protocol</p> <p>Follow up mechanism and database</p> <p>Reporting format and collation of complaints form</p> <p>MEAL strategy and reports</p> <p>Technical reviews and visit reports</p> <p>Pictures of banners, billboards and ration cards with numbers</p> <p>Donor reports</p> <p>Media reports and productions (both internal and external)</p> <p>Case studies</p> <p>Feedback session reports from community (if available)</p> <p>RTE reports and other evaluations</p> <p>Sitreps (a sample)</p>	<p>Check evidence of a system in place including logging of feedback/complaints and a method for follow-up</p> <p>Check for evidence of feedback/complaints leading to changes in programming</p> <p>Check for evidence that serious complaints were dealt with appropriately (satisfactory outcome for both complainant and Oxfam) –may be in Sitreps</p> <p>Check for evidence of consultation with the population regarding methods in place and satisfaction levels with the system (look at evaluation reports, RTEs and MEAL reports)</p> <p>Check assessment reports for degree of consultation (especially more in-depth assessments)</p> <p>Check especially technical reports for degree of community participation and decision-making</p> <p>Check MEAL strategy and technical strategies for participation of communities in MEAL</p> <p>Check to see if OI MEAL minimum standards and dimensions are mentioned anywhere</p> <p>Check to make sure information was given out and the feedback system for complaints about lack of information</p> <p>Check evaluation reports to see if needs were addressed</p>
6	Partner relationships defined, capacity	Partnership agreements	Oxfam International has a policy around partnership and an

	assessed and partners fully engaged in all stages of programme cycle	<p>Partner assessment report</p> <p>RTE reports</p> <p>Planning meeting minutes</p> <p>Evaluation reports</p> <p>Technical adviser visits</p> <p>Partner reports</p> <p>Training agendas and participant lists</p>	<p>assessment tool – check that these are known and have been followed</p> <p>Check partnership agreements that they have been carried out and signed</p> <p>Check that partnership agreements clearly state expectations and outcomes for both parties</p> <p>Check agreements for mention of capacity building and how this will happen</p> <p>Check assessment report for mention of partner engagement</p> <p>Check planning meeting reports and technical adviser reports for partner involvement</p> <p>Check monitoring and accountability framework/strategy for partner involvement</p> <p>Check learning event reports for partner involvement</p> <p>Check technical adviser reports for mention of partner training or capacity</p> <p>Check partner reports for satisfaction around partnership</p> <p>Check evaluation reports for partner capacity assessment and views on Oxfam</p> <p>Interview partners (if possible) for their perceptions around the working relationship</p>
7	Programme is considered a safe programme: action taken to avoid harm and programme considered conflict sensitive	<p>Assessment report</p> <p>Gender analysis and strategy</p> <p>Protection analysis Protection</p> <p>HSP report (if applicable)</p> <p>Advocacy strategies</p> <p>Technical reports</p> <p>RTE reports</p> <p>Evaluation</p> <p>Affected population feedback session reports</p> <p>Protection and other advisor visit reports</p> <p>Other protection actor reports (according to Sphere Protection Principles and sector-specific protection standards)</p>	<p>Check that protection was considered and that a risk analysis was carried out (proposals and Sitreps)</p> <p>In situations deemed to be risky, check that protection was integrated into the programme (protection strategy)</p> <p>If above check that Sphere protection standards or other sector-specific standards were used</p> <p>Check in early Sitreps if protection staff were requested and when the request was filled</p> <p>Check WASH and EFSL strategies to ensure that dignity and safety were considered and addressed</p> <p>Check reports for evidence of feedback from separate women and men's groups</p> <p>Check that Oxfam staff are aware of other actors protection activities if not being addressed by Oxfam</p> <p>Check advocacy strategy to see if protection issues were considered</p> <p>Check evaluations for mention of protection and addressing issues</p>

			Check feedback/complaints from community for protection issues and were these addressed
8	Programme (including advocacy) addresses gender equity and specific concerns and needs of women, girls, men and boys and vulnerable groups ²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment report Gender analysis Gender strategy MEAL plan Gender adviser reports and debrief notes Technical strategies Technical reports RTE reports Evaluation Affected population feedback session reports Pictures of adjusted services for vulnerable groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check the assessment report for a rapid gender analysis Check the proposal for sex and age disaggregated data and a plan for addressing needs for separate groups Check that a in-depth gender analysis and strategy had been done and evidence that it has influenced programming Check that women's as well as men's needs were taken into consideration in programming Check that feedback was obtained from both men and women regarding specific needs and whether the programme addressed these Check if vulnerable groups were identified and how the identification process was chosen Check if facilities provided took into account the needs of vulnerable groups Check if vulnerable groups were involved in the different stages of the interventions and in evaluating the services provided Check if gender- specific indicators and related gender outcomes exist in the programme LogFrame and that gender specific monitoring data is being collected and analysed Check if Oxfam Minimum Standards of Gender Equality and Women's Rights in Emergencies were used or mentioned in any document
9	Evidence that preparedness measures were in place and effectively actioned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contingency plan Staff register (country and regional) Emergency response team named Job profiles for ongoing programmes mention scale-up responsibility Existing DRR programme OPAL pages stating outcomes Telecon notes or emails Media reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check contingency plan for preparedness measures, risk analysis including environmental) and surge capacity Check if emergency response team named in plan were still in post and responded Scale-up HR plans still relevant Were PCVA done for any communities and were these documented and used for the response? Check RTE report for mention of preparedness measures that affected the response Check evaluation reports for preparedness Check JCAS for preparedness measures and surge capacity plans

² Elderly, disabled, HIV positive, single women, female-headed households are examples
VM Walden 2013

		Scale-up plans and proposals linking preparedness RTE report Evaluation report PCVA reports and community plans if available JCAS	
10	Programme has an advocacy/campaigns strategy and has incorporated advocacy into programme plans based on evidence from the field	Advocacy strategy Correspondence with field offices Evaluation reports RTE report RiC telecon minutes Blogs and other media work Examples of lobbying on national and international targets National or international policy changes reflecting Oxfam focus on advocacy and campaigns (Oxfam website, BBC, Alertnet, Reliefweb) OpEds	Check the strategy for: realistic objectives given the timeframe but linked to longer term goals Mentions working with national/local partners but also INGOs, research institutes and think tanks Includes gender and protection as part of the response Check that country teams programme teams and other advocacy staff have been consulted Check that the MEAL plan includes a theory of change, regular monitoring and a yearly evaluation Do a web search for mention of Oxfam's influencing in the response Number of times mentioned on the BBC website Number of hits for blogs
11	Country programme has an integrated approach including reducing and managing risk through existing longer-term development programmes and building resilience for the future If this had not been possible (complex emergency) there needs to be documented justification	Proposals Staffing plans and organigrams Long-term programme strategy Transition/ Recovery strategy RTE report Evaluation reports Capacity planning spreadsheet (HR) JCAS Environmental risk analysis	Check contingency plans for risk assessment (including environmental) and strategy for response Check if village disaster plans are in place and if PCVA was carried out and subsequently used Were risk assessments used in the response – check reports, proposals and evaluations Check organigrams for number of long-term staff slotted into emergency programme positions – compare organigrams in contingency plan with programme ones Check for transition/recovery for mention of resilience building
12	Evidence of appropriate staff capacity to ensure quality programming	Job profiles compared to competency frameworks Interview questions and tests TOR for HSPs End of deployment appraisals	Check job profiles against competency frameworks Check self-assessment reports against actual deployments If possible, ask country for sample of staff objectives and personal development plans (without names or job titles) If possible ask for end of deployment appraisals without names or

		Country self-assessment reports Job profiles and team objectives show surge capacity RTE and other evaluation reports GOLD – turnover data + absence data	job titles
--	--	---	------------