

Global Humanitarian Indicator: Degree to which humanitarian responses meet recognised quality standards for humanitarian programming

RAPID ONSET – EARTHQUAKE, SUDDEN FLOODS, TSUNAMI, CYCLONES, TYPHOONS, HURRICANES, SUDDEN CONFLICT WITH DISPLACEMENT, AWD OUTBREAKS

Number	Quality standard	Met (score6)	Almost met (4)	Partially met (score 2)	Not met (score 0)
1	Timeliness - rapid appraisal/assessment enough to make decisions within 24 hours and initial implementation within three days				
2	Coverage uses 25% of affected population as an planned figure (response should reflect the scale of the disaster) with clear justification for final count				
3	Technical aspects of programme measured against Sphere standards				

Number	Quality standard	Met (score3)	Almost met (score 2)	Partially met (score 1)	Not met (score 0)
4	MEAL strategy and plan in place and being implemented using appropriate indicators				
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				
6	Partner relationships defined, capacity assessed and partners fully engaged in all stages of programme cycle				
7	Programme is considered a safe programme: action taken to avoid harm and programme considered conflict sensitive				
8	Programme (including advocacy) addresses gender equity and specific concerns and needs of women, girls, men and boys.				

9	Programme addresses differentiated needs of clearly identified vulnerable groups ¹				
10	Evidence that preparedness measures were in place and effectively actioned				
11	Programme has an advocacy/campaigns strategy and has incorporated advocacy into programme plans based on evidence from the field				
12	Country programme has an integrated approach including reducing and managing risk through existing longer-term development programmes and building resilience ² for the future				
13	Evidence of appropriate staff capacity to ensure quality programming				

¹ Elderly, disabled, people living with or affected by chronic illness, single women, female-headed households, religious, ethnic or socio-economic minority / marginalised groups are examples

² Oxfam defines resilience as the ability of women, men and children to realise their rights and improve their wellbeing despite shocks, stresses and uncertainty

Guidelines for collecting evidence

N.B the following are not scenarios but suggestions for judgement of score – recognising that each situation will be different

Quality standard	Evidence needed	Met (score 6)	Almost met (4)	Partially met (score 2)	Not met (score 0)
1	Initial assessment report – partner and Oxfam Other agency assessment reports RTE report Sitreps from first two weeks Request for rapid response funds including DFID and CatFunds Date of first concept note Telecon notes with region or HD Date of new PIP or project on OPAL BBC website	Emergency preparedness plans in place and used Evidence of initial appraisal of facts or assessment within one day and decisions made Implementation within first three days Implementation team accompanied assessment team Rapid onset PIP or project on OPAL	Emergency preparedness plans in place but no evidence of use Evidence of initial appraisal of facts or assessment within one day and decisions made Implementation within first five days Clear justification for slow start discussed with region or HD Rapid onset PIP or project on OPAL	Emergency preparedness plans in place but no evidence of use Evidence of initial appraisal of facts within five days and decisions made Implantation within first week Some justification for slow start	No preparedness plan or if in place not used If evidence of appraisal of facts within two days, no evidence of decisions made Implementation later than a week with no justification
2	Coverage assessment using the scale - RTE reports Initial assessment report Telecon notes stating categorisation Minimum standards in place ³ Concept notes with proposed coverage Proposed budget for planned figure Revised coverage figure and budget with justification	25% of affected population reached Or Justification ⁴ for not reaching this figure with agreement from region or HD Beneficiary numbers increase according to need – there are no spikes especially in last months of programme	NA	Planned figure meets the 25% and plans made accordingly Funding does not match the planned activities Partial justification for not meeting target but not agreed with region or HD Or Response may meet target but does not	Planned figure below the 25% in plans funding does not match the planned activities– no plans for adjustment no revised budget no justification for lower figure

³ HR, logistics and finance minimum standards for faster implementation

⁴ Lack of funding, middle income country, sparsely populated areas, nomadic populations, Oxfam targeting most marginalised etc

				reflect Oxfam's capacity to scale-up Spikes in numbers but not according to need	
3	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	Sphere standards proposed and put in place with adjusted standards for context Training in standards carried out for staff and partners using the word Sphere Indicators use standards and monitoring against standards takes place regularly Standards evaluated Sphere mentioned by name	Sphere standards proposed and put in place with adjusted standards for context Training in standards carried out for staff and partners Indicators use standards and monitoring against standards takes place regularly Standards evaluated Although Sphere standards are used, the name is not mentioned	Sphere standards proposed and adjusted to context Standards mentioned in proposals and LogFrames but not monitored against Some evidence of training but not widespread (staff but not partners or only in one area)	Standards only mentioned in proposals but not replicated in plans Or No mention of Sphere in any document

Quality standard	Evidence needed	Met (score 3)	Almost met (2)	Partially met (score 1)	Not met (score 0)
4	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 Outcome statement on OPAL	LogFrames indicators replicated in MEAL strategy and plan Indicators reported against in donor reports both activities, outputs and outcomes MEAL staff in post Evidence of use of OI Minimum MEAL standards	LogFrames indicators replicated in MEAL strategy and plan Indicators reported against in donor reports both activities and outcomes MEAL staff in post	LogFrames indicators replicated in MEAL strategy and plan Indicators not regularly reported against – or just on activities but not outcomes MEAL plan not being used on a regular basis and data collection	LogFrames and indicators in donor proposals only No MEAL plan or dedicated MEAL staff OPAL has outcomes and indicators but not matching proposals and not being updated

		<p>Data collected, analysed and fed back to staff and partners</p> <p>Evidence that data are being used to adjust programme activities</p> <p>Review or learning days held with technical staff</p> <p>Budget reflects MEAL activities</p> <p>OPAL has MEAL plan in place and is updated regularly</p> <p>Final evaluation planned</p>	<p>Evidence of use of OI Minimum MEAL standards</p> <p>Data collected, analysed but not fed back to staff and partners</p> <p>Budget reflects MEAL</p> <p>OPAL has MEAL plan in place and is updated regularly</p> <p>Final evaluation planned but no review or learning events held</p>	<p>sporadic</p> <p>MEAL staff not present in all locations</p> <p>No budget or insufficient allocation for MEAL</p> <p>OPAL has MEAL plan but not updated</p> <p>No evaluation planned</p>	
5	<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 form community (if available)</p> <p>RTE reports and other evaluations</p> <p>Sitreps (a sample)</p>	<p>Evidence of complaints being addressed and reported on to complainant</p> <p>Evidence of feedback incorporated into planning – changes made to programmes after consultation</p> <p>Evidence of consultation with community on programme areas such as targeting, preferences for cash/food, siting of latrines and design, distribution etc</p> <p>Evidence of information provided to communities – posters, billboards, ration cards as examples</p> <p>Evidence of consultation regarding information channels</p>	<p>Evidence of complaints being addressed and reported on to complainant</p> <p>Evidence of consultation with community on programme areas such as targeting, preferences for cash/food, siting of latrines and design, distribution etc</p> <p>Evidence of information provided to communities – posters, billboards, ration cards as</p>	<p>System in place but only some evidence of complaints being addressed and reported on to complainant</p> <p>Some evidence of community consultation but not widespread through all activities and mostly during assessment</p> <p>Some information sharing evidence but not consistent</p> <p>No documented feedback from communities</p> <p>No evidence of changes made due to feedback</p> <p>Some consultation during evaluations</p>	<p>Donor proposals include accountability dimensions but not carried out in practice</p> <p>Little mention of accountability in reporting</p>

		<p>Feedback shows that information received is sufficient</p> <p>Examples of good practice captured and shared</p> <p>Feedback from communities around needs and concerns is positive</p> <p>Evaluation reports state that programme is relevant to needs and context</p>	<p>examples</p> <p>Some feedback from affected population on inadequate information</p> <p>No evidence of change made to programme after feedback</p> <p>Communities feedback shows gaps in addressing needs (Oxfam areas of expertise only)</p>		
6	<p>Partnership agreements</p> <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>Partner capacity assessment carried out</p> <p>Capacity building plan in place (if needed)</p> <p>Documented evidence of Oxfam support to partner on capacity building (training or staff secondment for example)</p> <p>Partner agreement clearly states expectations and outcomes for both parties</p> <p>Partner actively involved in planning, monitoring and evaluation</p> <p>Partner feedback is positive</p>	<p>Partner capacity assessment carried out</p> <p>Capacity building plan in place (if needed)</p> <p>Partner agreement clearly states expectations and outcomes for both parties</p> <p>Partner involved but not consistently – for example in planning but not in evaluation</p> <p>Partner feedback mixed</p>	<p>Partner capacity assessment carried out</p> <p>Capacity building plan in place (if needed) but not acted upon</p> <p>Partner agreement does not state expectations and outcomes and is not clear on Oxfam's commitment</p> <p>Partner more of a contractor and is only involved in evaluation as an interviewee</p> <p>Feedback from partner poor</p>	<p>Partner agreement lacks clarity of expectations</p> <p>Partner only works as contractor</p> <p>Partner feedback poor or non-existent</p>
7	<p>Assessment report</p> <p>Gender analysis and strategy</p> <p>Protection analysis Protection HSP</p>	<p>Assessments look at safe access to services and other protection issues</p>	<p>Assessments look at safe access to services and other</p>	<p>Assessments look at safe access to services and other protection</p>	<p>No protection issues addressed during assessment or</p>

	<p>report (if applicable) Advocacy strategies Technical reports RTE reports Evaluation Affected population feedback session reports Protection and other advisor visit reports Other protection actor reports (according to Sphere Protection Principles and sector-specific protection standards)</p>	<p>Documented evidence that programmes respond to identified protection issues Protection issues identified by other actors acted upon Protection expertise called in when programme requires it Technical teams do safe programming Advocacy strategy includes protection and action is taken</p>	<p>protection issues identified but only partially addressed Protection expertise called in when programme requires it Technical teams do safe programming Advocacy strategy includes protection but no action taken</p>	<p>issues No evidence that programme has acted upon identified protection needs Identified need for protection expertise but not acted upon</p>	<p>implementation despite there being evidence from other actors</p>
8	<p>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</p>	<p>Gender analysis carried out, well documented and strategy written. Evidence that this is used to guide design and delivery Sex disaggregated data collected, reviewed and used to make appropriate adjustments. Programme and advocacy planning addresses needs, roles and power relations of men and women Evidence that programme contributes to gender equity (services provide for men/women needs as appropriate) Gender minimum standards used and adhered to Programme partners with capacity and support to</p>	<p>Gender analysis carried out and documented but poor or no strategy Some sex disaggregated data collected, but not systematic Programme and advocacy planning includes attention to needs and roles of both men and women Mention of gender standards only in proposals. Partners' capacity in gender is inconsistent.</p>	<p>Gender equity mentioned in all proposals Gender analysis carried out but poorly documented No disaggregated data Some evidence of attention to needs of men and women and vulnerable groups but not consistent Gender mainstreaming capacity of partners is weak</p>	<p>No mention of gender equity or special needs in proposals and plans – only a general paragraph on gender No disaggregated data No evidence of attention to specific concerns and needs of women and men</p>

		mainstream gender throughout the programme cycle			
9	<p>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</p>	<p>Differentiated vulnerability analysis/assessment data identify especially vulnerable groups, and used to inform design and appropriate actions to meet their specific needs (link also to standard 7 and safe programming). Evidence of balanced representation of vulnerable people in managing assistance provided and ongoing feedback/ consultation. Evidence that intervention design and delivery ensures vulnerable groups have full access to assistance and protection services.</p>	<p>Some evidence of special needs of vulnerable groups documented in assessments. Addressed in technical programme but not consistent Inconsistent efforts to ensure adequate representation. Variable evidence demonstrating active or appropriate response to feedback</p>	<p>Reference to vulnerable groups largely generic No documentation of special needs addressed in technical programmes. No evidence of special efforts to ensure ongoing participation and feedback</p>	<p>No evidence of attention to concerns and needs of vulnerable groups</p>
10	<p>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 Scale-up plans and proposals linking preparedness RTE report Evaluation report PCVA reports and community plans if available</p>	<p>Contingency plan in place, updated regularly and used Risk Analysis and resilience strategy including : - Power analysis - Environmental Impact analysis - Climate Change Analysis - PCVA reports Evidence of links to existing preparedness programmes</p>	<p>Contingency plan in place updated regularly and used Evidence of links to existing preparedness programmes Staff database in place with surge capacity Emergency response team responded</p>	<p>Contingency plan in place but not updated Some evidence of use Some evidence of links to existing preparedness programmes Emergency response team in place but not used</p>	<p>No contingency or preparedness plan No existing programmes</p>

	JCAS	Staff database in place with surge capacity Emergency response team responded Evidence of success of preparedness programmes on current response			
11	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	Advocacy strategy in place and evidence that it was written with input from programmes and field endorsed by OI RiC Campaign Management Team with SMART objectives for change Campaigns/policy and media staff in place Budget sufficient for strategy implementation MEAL plan in place including evaluations Proactive and reactive media work including press conferences, blogs and journalist trips Evidence of lobbying at national and/or global level Evidence of outcome from advocacy messages but not necessarily Oxfam alone Global – involvement of global RiC Campaign network including teleconference, lobbying in capitals, sharing of products	Advocacy strategy in place with evidence of input from programmes and field endorsed by OI RiC Campaign Policy and media staff in place but no campaign Budget for campaign and advocacy work Basic MEAL plan in place including yearly evaluation Some lobby and advocacy work on national and possibly international level Proactive and reactive media work including press releases, blogs Global – some involvement of global RiC Campaign network	Advocacy strategy in place but not written with input from programmes and field and not endorsed by the OI RiC Campaign Management Team Policy/advocacy staff in place, but not campaign leadership or media staff Basic MEAL plan One evidence-based policy paper for public release and sharing at national and if relevant, international level Reactive media work Global – no involvement of RiC Campaign network	No campaigns and advocacy strategy No budget for advocacy, media or campaigns work No humanitarian advocacy and campaigns staff in place No support plan for programme staff to deliver focused advocacy work

			– telecons and sharing of products		
12	<p>Proposals Staffing plans and organigrams Long-term programme strategy Transition/ Recovery strategy RTE report Evaluation reports Capacity planning spreadsheet (HR) JCAS Environmental risk analysis</p>	<p>Risk analysis informs both contingency plans and long-term programme strategy Contingency plans show surge capacity from within existing programmes Capacity planning spreadsheet show national staff and posts filled Long-term programme strategies are designed to reduce and manage/ respond to risks identified. Evidence of plans for resilience programming for future or links to existing programmes Evaluation of resilience measures already in place</p>	<p>Risk analysis informs both contingency plans and long-term programme strategy Contingency plans show surge capacity from within existing programmes Capacity planning spreadsheet show national staff and posts filled No or poor long term strategies Some evidence of plans for resilience programming No evaluation of resilience measures already in place</p>	<p>Risk analysis informs both contingency plans and long-term programme strategy Contingency plans show some surge capacity from within existing programmes but not updated limited evidence of plans for resilience programming for future or links to existing programmes</p>	<p>No risk analysis done Contingency plans do not mention surge capacity No evidence of plans or links to existing programmes</p>
13	<p>Job profiles compared to competency frameworks Interview questions and tests TOR for HSPs End of deployment appraisals Country self-assessment reports Job profiles and team objectives show surge capacity RTE and other evaluation reports GOLD – turnover data + absence data</p>	<p>Job profiles match competency frameworks Interviews conducted using frameworks Inductions systematically carried out Majority of end of deployment appraisals are positive Development programme staff have scale-up in their JDs</p>	<p>Job profiles match competency frameworks Interviews conducted using frameworks Inductions systematically carried out Half of end of deployment appraisals are</p>	<p>Job profiles do not match competency framework Interview questions do address humanitarian needs Some inductions but not systematic Development staff do not have scale-up in their JDs</p>	<p>No evidence of use of competency frameworks No inductions No surge capacity included anywhere</p>

		Staff stay for duration of contract Evidenced coordination with technical OI counterpart	positive Development staff do not have scale-up in their JDs		
--	--	---	---	--	--