



Philippines

Humanitarian

2014/15

## Evaluation of Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda) response

Super-typhoon 'Yolanda', known internationally as Typhoon Haiyan, made landfall over Guiuan in Eastern Samar in the Philippines in the early morning of 8 November 2013. Haiyan is the most powerful storm ever recorded and resulted in rain falling at rates of up to 30 mm per hour, winds reaching upwards of 315 km/h and massive storm surges up to 6 metres high hitting Leyte and Samar islands. The Government of the Philippines estimates that the typhoon affected 14.1 million people and left 4.1 million displaced with an estimated 1.1 million houses damaged, and thousands of people reported dead, injured and missing. Oxfam developed its response strategy two days after the first landfall of the typhoon with the total number of target beneficiaries at 500,000 for the first four months. Objectives of the response were to meet the protection of rights and needs of women, girls, men and boys during the humanitarian response by ensuring affected households had immediate food needs met, and supporting the restoration of livelihoods through market support interventions and access to income generating activities to restore productive assets. The response also projected to give 500,000 disaster affected people access to safe water and sanitation facilities, and enabled them to protect themselves from public health risks. There was also an advocacy element on access to assistance and protection so the response contributed to longer-term social and economic development, and built disaster resilience.

## Evaluation design

The programme was evaluated using the Humanitarian Indicator Tool (HIT), a methodology designed to estimate the degree to which the programme meets recognised quality standards. The tool has 13 quality standards each with defined benchmarks, which allow evaluators to assess and score whether the standard was 'met', 'almost met', 'partially met' or 'not met'. The score is weighted and scored with a rating out of 6 for the first three standards due to their relative importance. The other standards are given a rating out of 3. The HIT is carried out as a desk study by an external evaluator using documented evidence that then generates a score against each standard and a cumulative total. For details on evaluation design, see the 'How are effectiveness reviews carried out?' document, and the full report for how these designs were tailored by individual reviews.

Response date: November 2013 - July 2014

Evaluation: August 2014

Publication: January 2016

# Results

| Quality standard evaluated  | Level of achievement | Rating         |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|----------------------|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|
|   |                      | 1              | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1. Timeliness: Rapid appraisal of facts within 24 hours, plans and scale-up or start-up commenced within three days   | Almost met           |                |   |   | 4 |   |   |
| 2. Coverage uses 25% of affected population as a planned figure   | Fully met            |                |   |   |   |   | 6 |
| 3. Technical aspects of programme measured against Sphere standards   | Partially met        |                | 2 |   |   |   |   |
|   |                      |                | 1 | 2 | 3 |   |   |
| 4. MEAL strategy and plan in place and being implemented using appropriate indicators   | Almost met           |                |   | 2 |   |   |   |
| 5. Feedback/complaints system in place and functioning and documented evidence of consultation and participation leading to a programme relevant to context and needs | Fully met            |                |   |   |   |   | 3 |
| 6. Partner relationships defined, capacity assessed and partners fully engaged in all stages of programme cycle   | Partially met        |                |   | 2 |   |   |   |
| 7. Programme is considered a safe programme   | Fully met            |                |   |   |   |   | 3 |
| 8. Programme (including advocacy) addresses gender equity and specific concerns and needs of women, girls, men and boys   | Fully met            |                |   |   |   |   | 3 |
| 9. Programme (including advocacy) addresses specific concerns and needs of vulnerable groups  | Almost met           |                |   | 2 |   |   |   |
| 10. Evidence that preparedness measures were in place and effectively actioned  | Almost met           |                |   | 2 |   |   |   |
| 11. Programme has an advocacy/campaigns strategy based on evidence from the field   | Fully met            |                |   |   |   |   | 3 |
| 12. Evidence of appropriate staff capacity to ensure quality programming  | Almost met           |                |   | 2 |   |   |   |
| 13. Programme has an integrated approach  | Fully met            |                |   |   |   |   | 3 |
| <b>Final Rating</b>   |                      | <b>36 / 48</b> |   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>Percentage Equivalent</b>  |                      | <b>75%</b>     |   |   |   |   |   |

The first three standards are weighted and scored out of 6 due to their relative importance. The other standards are scored out of 3.

## Going forward

The Philippines country programme was a small team prior to the response, with only four dedicated staff in the humanitarian team. However, there was capacity for livelihoods development programmes, advocacy for economic justice and a gender justice programme. The programme had to scale up rapidly and the team is justly proud of their achievements and areas of high ratings. The new country strategy has a Rights in Crisis goal with a better focus on technical skills and on partners, which should address the low rating for the standard on standards and the one on partner relationships. The strategy also has a clear direction on Adaption and Risk reduction laws, policies and programmes by the national and local governments, a timely and coordinated government and other relevant actors response to disasters; Oxfam's technical leadership in WASH (Water, Sanitation and Hygiene) and EFSVL (Essential Food Security, and Vulnerable Livelihoods) with a gender and protection lens. The team has since adopted the Core Humanitarian Standard and are using it as the benchmark to evaluate the response one year on. There have also been several smaller typhoon emergencies in the Philippines and the country team have demonstrated their ability to respond in a timely and appropriate manner.

Photo credit: Simon Roberts/Oxfam