

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

	Page
Introduction	1
1. Response environment	3
2. Concern emergency response	5
2.1 <i>Emergency response and the Alliance 2015</i>	
3. Quality and nature of the evaluations	6
3.1 <i>Wrap up meetings</i>	
4. External evaluations – a synopsis of key issues and findings	8
4.1 <i>Haiti</i>	
4.2 <i>Pakistan</i>	
4.3 <i>East Africa</i>	
4.4 <i>DRC</i>	
4.5 <i>Mozambique</i>	
5. Concern emergency response – how have we done?	14
5.1 <i>Relevance and appropriateness</i>	
5.2 <i>Effectiveness and timeliness/co-ordination</i>	
5.3 <i>Efficiency and Cost Effectiveness</i>	
5.4 <i>Sustainability and Connectedness</i>	
6. Having an impact – organisational learning and room for improvement	24
6.1 <i>Strengths</i>	
6.2 <i>Challenges</i>	
7. Measuring up to previous meta evaluations	27
8. Recommendations for improving and evaluating emergency response	28
Annexe I – Emergency Response Evaluations 2009 – 2012	29
Annexe II – Concern Emergency Response Projects and Programmes 2009 – 2012	31

Introduction

Evaluations are only as good as the level of information, analysis and learning they provide the end user. As mentioned in the Emergency Unit Evaluating *emergency interventions – towards good practice*, evaluations can focus on policy, a function, a programme, a project, practice, or set of procedures. They can be conducted at an early stage of the intervention, at the midpoint or at the end.

Evaluations of our emergency responses are carried out to achieve two key outcomes¹ – *accountability* which is the process of taking responsibility for the intervention and accounting for it to different stakeholders, the beneficiaries of the intervention, those who financed it, and other humanitarian agencies, and *learning* which is the process through which the experience of the intervention leads to change and improvement in addressing future emergencies. Evaluations of emergency responses differ from other forms of evaluation in

¹ Taken and adapted from the *Evaluation of Humanitarian Action Pilot Guide* – ALNAP, May 2013:
<http://www.alnap.org/eha>

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

that the response operating environment can be incredibly challenging due to chaos on the ground in the aftermath of the emergency or disaster; the level of urgency required to assess, plan, design and implement quickly; the lack of baseline data available (especially if the response agency has no prior presence in the area); security and access constraints and the high turnover of staff; and the loss of institutional memory resulting from the short-cycle deployments of international staff that often characterise the larger responses.

Between 2009 and 2012, Concern conducted or commissioned 40 evaluations of its emergency programmes in 14 countries². This is in keeping with the organisational commitment to high standards in projects, programmes, policies and practices, and an acknowledgment of the primacy and usefulness of evaluations. A further nine evaluations were undertaken by consortia (DEC³, CBHA⁴ and COSACA⁵), DFID⁶ and the Alliance2015⁷, which featured aspects of Concern's emergency responses. Concern is also part of the international humanitarian aid system and a further nine external evaluations covering large scale emergencies in Haiti, Pakistan and Bangladesh have also been included in this meta-analysis for scrutiny as to the prevailing state of the humanitarian aid community during the period under review.

This report is the continuation of a process of organisational learning from Concern's emergency responses. An original meta evaluation of emergency response was first conducted in April 2001, covering the period 1990 to 2000, the findings of which underpinned the development of the *Approaches to Emergencies paper*. A second meta evaluation was carried out in April 2005, covering the period 2000 to 2004, and a third was carried out in July 2009, covering the period 2005 to 2008.

The current meta evaluation provides an analysis of emergency response evaluations that took place within Concern's countries of operations between 2009 and 2012 and considers a broad range of documents and includes – internal and external, single and multi-sector project and programme evaluations; end of project and programme evaluations; mid-term evaluations and monitoring missions; real time evaluations; peer evaluations (as part of a consortium or alliance); multi-agency and joint evaluations; donor evaluations, informal reviews and lessons learning exercises and workshops.

It specifically examines and considers the approach, effectiveness, impact, take-up, and benefit of the emergency projects or programmes implemented and evaluated. These have been assessed against key humanitarian external performance standards for humanitarian disaster relief assistance, offered by the Red Cross Code of Conduct, Sphere, and People in Aid, and have incorporated and been shaped around the following key DAC principles – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability⁸.

Finally, it identifies key organisational and programme learning, identifies gaps, and makes recommendations for improving future emergency responses.

In compiling this report, the meta evaluation considered a total of 58 evaluation reports (40 internal and 18 external) and covered emergency response projects or programmes in 14 countries. Ten of the countries

² It is interesting to note that some of the evaluations conducted in 2009 and 2010 were of emergency responses which had been implemented in 2008

³ DEC – Disaster Emergency Committee – UK based Humanitarian Funding Agency – Action Aid, Age International, British Red Cross, Care, CAFOD, Christian Aid, Concern, Islamic Relief, Merlin, Oxfam, Plan, Save the Children, Tearfund, World Vision <http://www.dec.org.uk>

⁴ CBHA – UK based Consortium of British Humanitarian Agencies – Action Aid, ACF, Care, CAFOD, Christian Aid, Concern, Help Age, IRC, Islamic Relief, Oxfam, Save the Children, Tearfund, World Vision <http://www.thecbha.org>

⁵ COSACA – Mozambique based Consortium of International NGOs – Concern, Save the Children, Care

⁶ DFID, UK Department for International Development <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-international-development>

⁷ Alliance2015 – Acted, Cesvi, Concern, Hivos, Ibis, Welthungerhilfe <http://www.alliance2015.org/>

⁸ *Guidance for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies* – OECD/DAC, 1999 <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2667294.pdf>

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

where emergency response(s) were evaluated were located in Africa, three in Asia and one, Haiti, in the Caribbean.

Countries: Chad, DRC, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Niger, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, Haiti

External Agencies⁹: Alliance 2015, ALNAP, CBHA, COSACA, DARA, DEC, DFID, ERRF, HC, IASC, OCHA, Oxfam, Groupe URD

The evaluations broadly break down into the following categories and types:

- 40 of the evaluations were carried out by Concern or commissioned by Concern on behalf of donors and specifically looked at Concern emergency projects or programmes
- 9 were external and looked at the overall humanitarian community response in a number of large scale emergencies – Bangladesh, Haiti, and Pakistan
- 9 were external and carried out on behalf of donors or consortia – DEC (4), COSACA (2), CBHA (1), DFID (1) and the Alliance 2015 (1) and looked at the member agencies (including Concern) emergency response in a number of large scale emergencies – DRC, East Africa Crisis, Haiti, Mozambique and Pakistan
- 12 were Haiti specific – Concern (4) and external (8)
- 9 were Pakistan specific – Concern (4) and external (5)
- 6 were Bangladesh specific – Concern (5) and external (1)
- 5 were Somalia specific – Concern (5)
- 5 were India specific – Concern (5)
- 4 were DRC specific – Concern (3) and external (1)
- 4 were Kenya specific – Concern (4)
- 9 were commissioned by Concern of ECHO funded projects
- 4 were commissioned by Concern of Irish Aid funded projects
- 9 were commissioned by Concern of programmes funded by other donors – OFDA, DFID, CBHA, Norwegian MoFA, and UNHCR

A full list of the emergency response evaluations that took place between 2009 and 2012 (and that are included in this meta evaluation) are to be found in Annexe I.

1. Response Environment

The period under review has been characterised by a steady increase in political conflicts and, by 2012, there were nearly 400 reported political conflicts and 43 high intensity conflicts or wars, in the world¹⁰. In the same period, reported global natural disaster events, had increased significantly to 2,124 as compared to 1,589 in the previous four year period, 2005 to 2008¹¹. Two of these, the 2010 Haiti earthquake which killed

⁹ ALNAP – The Active learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action - <http://www.alnap.org/>; DARA – Spanish Based International Organisation for Improving Aid Effectiveness <http://daraint.org/>; ERRF – UN administered Emergency Relief Response Fund in Haiti <http://haiti.humanitarianresponse.info/funding/emergency-relief-response-fund-errf/>; Humanitarian Coalition – Canada based Coalition of NGOs: Save the Children, Oxfam, Plan and Care <http://humanitariancoalition.ca/>; IASC – Inter-Agency Standing Committee <http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/>; OCHA – UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs <http://www.unocha.org/>; Group URD – France Based independent institute specialising in analysis of practice and development of policy for the humanitarian sector <http://www.urd.org/?lang=en>

¹⁰ Conflict Barometer – Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research, University of Heidelberg, <http://www.hiik.de/en/konfliktbarometer/>

¹¹ World Disaster Report 2012– International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, pages 260 – 283 <http://www.ifrc.org/publications-and-reports/world-disasters-report-2012/> and CRED Crunch – Disaster Data: A

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

225,500 people, and the 2009/2010 Pakistan floods which affected over 20 million people, were truly massive in scale and impact, and global in terms of the emergency response that they generated.

The IFRC and CRED data shows that there have been 2,124 natural and technological disaster events worldwide between 2009 and 2012, affecting more than 884 million people. Approximately 368,737 people lost their lives in that period, and an estimated \$709 billion of damage was caused worldwide.

- 60% of the total loss of life occurred from just one natural disaster event – the Haiti earthquake
- Approximately 80% of the people affected by global natural disasters live in Asia
- Over 50% of the annual global natural disasters were caused by flooding, with approximately 90% of those affected by flooding living in Asia
- An estimated 58% of reported damage and economic loss occurred in Asia
- The number of natural disasters in 2012 was roughly only half that of each of the previous three years, yet they resulted in financial losses, relatively speaking, were five times those of 2009, and twice those of 2010. It appears from the data that the cost per natural disaster event, in terms of damage and financial loss, is steadily increasing, but this is also informed by where such events occur

	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
No. of natural disaster events	598	646	570	310	2,124
Population affected – millions	223,956	343,900	209,566	106,890	884,312
Population killed	17,660	304,474	37,333	9,330	368,737
Damage – billion \$	49	156	366	138	709

According to the *Conflict Barometer*, an annual review of global conflict, between 2009 and 2012, the number of annual global political crisis events rose from an annual estimate of 365 to 396. The number of high intensity violent conflicts and wars rose from an annual estimate of 31 to 43, with Africa, Asia and the Middle East accounting for over 88% of major conflicts and wars.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Political conflicts	365	363	388	396
High intensity conflict/war ¹²	31	28	38	43
Africa	9	6	12	19
Asia	9	9	8	10
Middle East	8	9	13	9
Americas	3	2	4	4
Europe	2	2	1	1

With the exception of the long-term dispute between Israel and the OPT (Occupied Palestinian Territories); the Syrian conflict affecting Syria, Lebanon, Turkey and Israel; the conflicts in the Great Lakes involving DRC, Rwanda and Uganda; and in the Horn of Africa between Sudan and South Sudan, all of the high intensity conflicts and wars are considered domestic and have been conducted within the boundaries of national states. It is estimated that approximately 55,000 people lose their lives every year as a result of armed conflict¹³.

Balanced Perspective Issue No. 31 – The Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, 31 March 2013 <http://reliefweb.int/report/world/credcrunch-newsletter-issue-31-march-2013-“disaster-data-balanced-perspective”>

¹² Countries experiencing high intensity conflict and war in 2012 include: **Africa** – DRC, Libya, Mali, Nigeria, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan; **Asia** – India, Myanmar, Pakistan, Tajikistan; **Middle East** – Afghanistan, Iraq, Israel/OPT, Lebanon, Syria, Turkey, Yemen; **Americas** – Mexico; **Europe** – Russia http://www.hiik.de/en/konfliktbarometer/pdf/ConflictBarometer_2012.pdf

¹³ Data on conflicts and conflict related deaths are taken from Global Burden of Armed Violence, The Geneva Declaration Secretariat, October 2011 <http://www.genevadeclaration.org>

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

2. Concern Emergency Response

In the period under review, Concern responded to 166 emergencies in 26 countries, directly assisted an estimated 13.106 million people, and spent in excess of €220 million on humanitarian responses¹⁴. See Annexe II for a complete annual breakdown of country – type of emergency, type of response, and number of direct beneficiaries.

Many of the emergency responses have been relatively small and localised and have been relatively short in duration. The major exceptions are the Haiti earthquake response in 2010, flooding in Pakistan in 2009/2010, and the drought response in Somalia, in 2011. Others responses in complex emergency situations such as Sudan, South Sudan, Somalia, Chad and DRC, have been going on for many years - in some cases, for decades - with little sign of their abating. All of the responses have taken place in countries where Concern had a prior presence, with the exception of the Indonesia earthquake response, in 2009.

	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
Emergency responses	45	41	37	43	166
Countries	18	16	19	20	26
Population assisted – million	2.497	3.718	3.931	2.96	13.106
Expenditure – € million	31.418	59.420	68.690	61.436	220.964

It is interesting to note that expenditure relative to the number of responses and the population assisted, nearly doubled between 2009 and 2012, but that the number of people assisted fell significantly in 2012 when compared to 2010 and 2011.

Recurrent conflict, displacement, extreme weather – drought and floods, disease, and food insecurity have been the main causes of emergencies in Africa, with the Horn of Africa having the greatest incidence of these. Concern continues to respond, year on year, to significant emergencies in all of its countries of operation in the Horn of Africa. Earthquakes, cyclones and floods were the predominant cause of disasters in Asia. In 2010, Concern spent €21 million in Haiti on emergency response and a further €17 million on responding to the floods in Pakistan that affected more than 20 million people.

Concern's humanitarian interventions covered the whole spectrum of services and material support, including: CTC; supplementary feeding; general food relief; food for work; cash for work; food and cash transfers; food vouchers; revolving loans; health, water and environmental health; seeds and tools; livestock support; shelter; NFIs; camp management; social protection; psychosocial interventions; case finding; infrastructure rehabilitation; house construction; capacity building of local partner NGOs; DRR; emergency education; emergency preparedness; and the prepositioning of emergency supplies and materials.

2.1 *Emergency response and the Alliance2015*

Over the last four years, Alliance2015 members have been increasingly collaborating on emergency responses and have collectively worked in twelve countries¹⁵, providing support in the areas of nutrition, WASH, education, social needs, shelter, NFIs, food security and health. Concern has actively collaborated in responses in eight of these countries with various levels of cooperation ranging from information sharing and joint assessments to joint programming, financial support and secondment of specialist staff.

¹⁴ Data on Concern emergency response 2009 – 2012, is compiled from information submitted to the Overseas Directorate and detailed in the Annual Programme Progress reports 2009 to 2012 and the Concern Annual Reports 2009 to 2012

¹⁵ 2009 – Indonesia and Myanmar; 2010 – Pakistan, Kyrgyzstan, Haiti; 2011 – Kenya, Somalia, Ethiopia, Cambodia, Liberia; 2012 – Pakistan, Libya, Somalia, Haiti, Cambodia, South Sudan

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

The Alliance2015 response to the Pakistan floods in 2010 was the largest joint collaboration by Alliance2015 members to date. Over a two year period, five alliance members worked together to deliver a multi sectoral response in four provinces with a combined catchment population of several million people and a direct target group of over 430,000 people. In total, the alliance received five large grants from ECHO for this intervention, with different alliance partners taking the lead on successive grants. An evaluation of the third phase of this project was undertaken in October 2012 and found:

- Excellent project activity achievement rate
- Clearly identified and urgent needs were addressed with limited delays
- Good cooperation and coordination amongst the five members
- Very effective grant management by the lead agency – ACTED
- The WASH component achieved very high coverage
- The shelter component was a major success
- Good and uniform targeting across the agencies
- Good adherence to standards, especially Sphere
- All agencies developed or tried to develop CRMs – Complaints Response Mechanisms

The evaluation also found a number of less successful aspects:

- Due to the wide geographic spread of affected areas and organisational responses, there were very few opportunities for field level interaction and information sharing and exchange amongst the alliance partners
- There was limited harmonisation of project packages and kits, and coverage strategies were not uniform
- Gender was poorly mainstreamed across the programme in spite of activities specifically designed to target women
- The response was not well integrated and some of the partners only included selected components from their activities portfolio, while some villages were only targeted with a limited set of activities
- Due to the size and scope of the response, it was suggested that an overarching programme coordinator could have been appointed to provide greater linkages between the partners
- While accountability to beneficiaries was considered very high, there was much less consideration given to keeping the authorities informed of activities and progress
- M&E was weak

3. Quality and Nature of the Evaluations

	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
Number of Concern emergency responses	45	41	37	43	166
Number of countries with Concern emergency responses	18	16	19	20	26
Number of countries that produced Concern emergency response evaluations	7	9	6	11	14
Number of evaluations which featured Concern responses directly or as members of a consortium/alliance	10	11	12	16	49

In the period under review, Concern conducted or commissioned 40 evaluations of its emergency programmes. A further nine external evaluations carried out by various external agencies – DFID, consortiums (DEC, COSACA or CBHA) and the Alliance2015 – featured Concern emergency programmes as a member or funded agency. The evaluations were largely limited to significant emergency and disaster responses or looked at specific programme approaches such as cash transfers and nutrition. While the number of evaluations that Concern commissioned has nearly doubled when compared to the previous meta

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

evaluation reporting period¹⁶, a large number of Concern countries do not appear to have evaluated their emergency responses. This issue of country programmes not carrying out evaluations was highlighted in the last meta evaluation, in 2009, where *roughly half of the Concern countries that had carried out emergency responses in the period 2005 to 2008 have not followed up with any subsequent evaluation*¹⁷.

- Of the 26 Concern country programmes that have responded to emergencies between 2009 and 2012, only 14 have produced evaluations – see annex I and II for further details. Of these, six countries – Pakistan, Haiti, Bangladesh, Somalia, India and DRC - are responsible for 32 of the 49 evaluations that have featured Concern responses.
- A number of the countries that have not produced evaluations, reviews or lessons learning have seen responses that have either been one-offs or very small in terms of the number of affected people assisted – Burundi, Indonesia, Malawi and Zambia.
- But others – Afghanistan, Cambodia, Liberia¹⁸, Sudan, South Sudan and Tanzania - have reported emergency responses in successive years (and in some cases year on year) over the four year reporting period.
- In the reporting period, there were 166 emergency responses reported across 26 countries of operation. However, it has not been possible to determine how many of these responses were evaluated or included in the evaluations that were carried out. Presenting the responses separately in annual reports, etc. would provide a clearer basis for determining which responses were evaluated, when they were evaluated, and in which countries.

Overall, the quality of the evaluations has generally been good but the formats and types have varied depending on the type and scope of the evaluation – narrow or broad, technical or general, project or programme - and the intended final audience – Concern, a specific donor, or the humanitarian response community in general.

In 2009, the Concern Emergency Unit developed a set of standard guidelines¹⁹ to assist country programmes to think through the evaluation planning process, apply appropriate criteria, and to produce suitable evaluation Terms of Reference. This has been reflected in the quality of the Concern led evaluations (and their ToRs) that have been reviewed as part of this meta evaluation.

With the exception of a number of lessons learning reviews that have been undertaken in India and which would be considered as being a lower order of analysis than may have derived from a full evaluation, the vast majority of the Concern led evaluations (and all the external evaluations) have been quite systematic in their application and use of common and acceptable humanitarian criteria to guide their work, namely the DAC criteria and Sphere standards and, to a much lesser extent, the Red Cross Code of Conduct, People in Aid, and HAP. A combination of timeliness, relevance, impact, effectiveness, and efficiency have been central to almost all of the evaluations reviewed, with other focus areas including targeting, participation, gender, protection, staffing, coordination, coherence, LRRD and sustainability, M&E and partnership, featuring in many. All of the evaluations include findings and conclusions and make recommendations for improvement or change that generally appear valid, relevant and appropriate. It is important to note that, taken together, the evaluations presented some hundreds of recommendations – eighty alone in one Ethiopia evaluation – and there were no accessible documented management responses or feedback to show how the evaluation recommendations were addressed or progressed by the organisation – something that would be an important and valuable analysis, learning and accountability tool.

¹⁶ Concern conducted or commissioned 22 evaluations of its emergency programmes in the meta evaluation reporting period 2005 to 2008

¹⁷ Review of humanitarian action and emergency response meta evaluation, 2005 – 2008, Emergency Unit, July 2009

¹⁸ Given that an internal review of the response to the influx of refugees into Grand Gedeh, Liberia was conducted in July 2011, a decision was taken by the regional desk that a full evaluation would not be conducted

¹⁹ *Evaluating Emergency Responses – towards good practice*, Concern Emergency Unit, February 2009

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

Almost all of the evaluations reviewed have included references to accountability, HAP and CRMs and are increasingly including references to social protection and the Programme Participant Protection Policy (in the case of Concern led evaluations). While staffing is almost always discussed and commented on, there continues to be little mention of People in Aid or the Red Cross Code of Conduct as part of overall evaluation criteria, with the exception of evaluations conducted for the DEC, when the DEC were still carrying out their own evaluations.

In terms of cross cutting issues, gender equality and protection are increasingly being included in evaluations, but other cross cutting themes including HIV/AIDS and social protection are rarely mentioned unless they formed part of the actual programme intervention.

3.1 *Wrap up meetings*

Organisational wrap-up meetings occurred after the 2010 Haiti earthquake and the 2011 Somalia drought emergency. These meetings aim to provide the organisation with an opportunity to review the degree of coherence at head office level at the time of scale-up, in terms of preparedness and response in terms of programme management decision making, staffing, communications and fundraising. While both wrap-ups looked at what did and did not go well and made recommendations to improve organisational coherence, and the Haiti wrap-up concluded with an action plan, neither session included any follow up or documented progress with regard to recommendations made. It is interesting to note that the Haiti wrap-up took place six months after the earthquake, and the Somalia one a year after the emergency response commenced. Additionally, the Pakistan flood emergency in 2010 was of sufficient scale and level of complexity to have justified carrying out an organisational wrap-up.

4. External Evaluations – a synopsis of key issues and findings

There have been a number of significant external evaluations conducted following the major emergencies in Haiti, Pakistan, East Africa, DRC and Mozambique. These evaluations provide an important insight into how the global humanitarian aid system has performed. More and more donors, particularly ECHO, are encouraging humanitarian agencies to work in consortia and are increasingly funding collective integrated response programmes. In addition to the DEC consortium, which has been around for fifty years, and the Alliance2015, which has been in existence for 10 years, a number of other consortia have been established in recent years to reflect this growing approach, both globally and country/emergency specific – consortia like the CBHA in the UK, COSACA in Mozambique, and the Canadian based Humanitarian Coalition.

4.1 *Haiti*²⁰

The earthquake which struck Haiti on January 12th 2010, killed more than 200,000 people and injured an estimated 300,000 more. Over a million were left homeless. Public buildings and tens of thousands of houses were either destroyed or damaged beyond repair. Roads were blocked and power lines collapsed. Phone lines and mobile masts came down making communication impossible and both the port and airport were badly affected which crippled trade and significantly hampered the humanitarian response.

At the peak of displacement it is estimated that as many as 2.3 million people left their homes, relocating with friends and family in the capital city or moving further afield to rural areas outside of the affected area, placing a huge burden on families hosting earthquake survivors. The earthquake left the government severely limited in its capacity to take charge of the response.

The total damage has been estimated to have been in excess of the country's total GDP for 2009. 23% of Haiti's schools were damaged and 60% of its hospitals were severely damaged or destroyed, including the

²⁰ Content drawn from external evaluations of the Haiti emergency response carried out by the following agencies between 2010 and 2012 – Groupe URD, OCHA, ALNAP, DEC, ERRF, Humanitarian Coalition and IASC. See Annex I for details of these evaluations

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

Ministry of Health building which collapsed killing 200 staff. There was also a considerable impact on farmers living in the earthquake-affected area who lost an estimated 32% of their seed stock. Water supplies were badly affected, with piped water being cut, significantly reducing the availability of drinking water. The earthquake compounded the extreme human vulnerability which already existed in Haiti.

The combination of extreme vulnerability, coupled with the huge loss of life and massive destruction wrought on Haiti's largest urban area and political and commercial centre, left hundreds of thousands of people traumatized and without the means necessary to sustain life and livelihood.

Logistics and transport were a nightmare in the aftermath of the quake, and fuel was very hard to come by. The US military quickly took control of the airport and the airspace around the capital which afforded a degree of order and regulation of aid movements arriving by air, but this was never going to be sufficient to deliver the volume of aid that was needed. Port facilities were badly damaged and this affected aid movements arriving by sea, forcing agencies to rely on moving goods cross border from the Dominican Republic – something that presented its own challenges.

Security in the capital became a major concern due to the trend of political and civil disturbance. The UN military mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH) was given an expanded role by the UN and their numbers were increased to over 12,500 personnel. In addition to MINUSTAH, more than 30,000 military personnel were sent to Haiti and were involved in relief operations. The US deployed more than 20,000 marines within a few days of the quake.

NGOs mobilised quickly and many agencies that were already working in Haiti transferred staff working on programmes outside of Port-au-Prince into the city to boost capacity. There was very weak coordination between international humanitarian agencies, national authorities and national NGOs. The Haitian authorities were very slow in making decisions due to the devastating loss of so many lives and so much infrastructure and communications, and it took them a long time to gain any control of the response and the coordination of the response. The UN system in Haiti was in "shock" after the quake and it took over three weeks for the first interagency strategic coordination meeting to take place. It should be noted that the two most senior members of UNDP were killed in the quake, and the main UN building was devastated. Humanitarian leadership was weak, coupled with poor early assessment of the humanitarian situation and needs priorities of the affected population. This led to response delays and major gaps in geographic and sector targeting and coverage. Clusters were quickly activated but were then swamped by the arrival of so many humanitarian agencies that were new to Haiti. In the first month after the quake, more than 30 national Red Cross Societies and more than 1,000 international NGOs arrived to work in Haiti, particularly from the US – many of which had differing mandates and experience. This further complicated the coordination system. It was estimated, in one evaluation, that less than 20% of newly arrived NGOs had the capacity, the skill sets and the equipment needed to deal with the challenges they faced²¹. As more and more NGOs arrived, it became normal practice to have more and more cluster meetings and the sheer volume and scale of coordination efforts did not translate easily into action. In total, twelve clusters were established, but each cluster has four or five working groups²² – many of which met simultaneously, making it impossible to attend them without committing large numbers of staff to co-ordination at a time when most organisations lacked sufficient staff to programme effectively. In addition, there were various co-ordination meetings (the NGO co-ordination group, the HCT, separate NGO and UN security co-ordination groups, military liaison co-ordination, etc.), as well as meetings to discuss joint assessments and their findings, etc. Most organisations necessarily failed to manage these competing demands. Both ICVA and InterAction attempted to establish a number of key principles for NGO coordination, but it is unclear how effective these were. A further challenge was that, with the influx of organisations, many cluster meetings were conducted in English rather than the French

²¹ Real Time Evaluation of the Response to the Haiti Earthquake – Groupe URD (for French MoD), April 2010

²² The education cluster initially proposed setting up fifteen working groups before settling on setting up one group to make recommendations as to how many groups there should be.

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

which had previously been used, so reducing access for national NGOs and frustrating many government personnel.

Early food distributions were very problematic and MINUSTAH and the military established a general food distribution system at 16 controlled and secured sites throughout the capital. WFP and USAID tried to make their implementing partners carry out food distributions from these locations under military supervision, but many of the larger NGOs did not accept this and carried out their distributions in different sites and without military escort or military presence.

After one month, over 60% of the displaced were still without shelter or in makeshift shelters with little protection from the elements. There was much debate early on as to what to do and what type of shelter (or mix of types) to use and where to set up displaced camps, and it took a lot of time for government authorities to decide where to locate these camps. Within three months, more than 425 IDP sites had been established; many of them unplanned and spontaneous, resulting from communities trying to remain as close to their home areas and neighbourhoods as possible.

A number of key findings were highlighted by various evaluations, and a mapping of evaluations exercise that was carried out by ALNAP which concluded:

- Humanitarian agencies mobilised very quickly but had very limited understanding of responding on a major scale in an urban context. There are increased global urban risks and humanitarian agencies need to learn the “new rules of the game” with regard to complexity, space, range and number of actors and sheer concentrations of affected people in much more confined areas. Responding in an urban context on a major scale like this was very complex and humanitarian actors were not as experienced at this as they were in more rural contexts or where the disaster was spread out over a large geographic area. As such, the humanitarian aid system needed to strengthen and improve its approaches and strategies for delivering high volume aid and recovery programmes in urban environments
- The humanitarian leadership structures were very weak and there was a need to improve relations with all major stakeholders, especially the military. 26 countries provided significant military assets to the Haiti response and they took their guidance and direction more from MINUSTASH/DPKO than from OCHA. While there was a civil-military coordination mechanism set up by OCHA, they had limited influence over military decisions. The military felt that they were not being provided with strategic direction through the cluster system and, as a result, relied almost totally on their own assessment of the situation rather than being guided by the humanitarian civilian leadership as should have been the case if they had followed the Oslo Guidelines governing the use of military and civil defence assets (MCDA) in disaster relief
- There were wide variations in the interpretation of ‘principle of last resort’ amongst aid agencies
- There was a need for greater clarity in terms of how to engage with the military in non-conflict disaster response situations, especially in urban contexts
- There was a need to massively improve coordination on all levels, but especially at cluster level, and cluster leads must be competent in building relationships with the host government and government agencies. With over 8,000 national and international humanitarian and aid agencies operating on the ground, coordination structures have to be more robust, realistic and action oriented
- There is a need to ensure that NGOs are the primary providers of humanitarian assistance as their approaches are more conducive to working closely with the population than those of the military
- There is a need to use police assets rather than the military when managing security, especially in urban contexts. It was, however, recognised that the police did not have the resources to meet all the demands placed on them to support NGOs
- The importance and suitability of cash based programming, especially in an urban context as a short term approach to aid recovery and stimulate markets, was highlighted. However, cash based programmes took a very long time to get up and running due to the lack of preparation and capacity to implement such programmes on such a massive scale, issues related to the disbursement of cash, the time taken to

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

identify suitable community based activities, poor targeting of beneficiaries, and the difficulties associated with carrying out community based work in cities. Evaluations have shown that while appropriate in the emergency phase, cash based programmes have not had a major impact on reviving household economies due to insufficient cash being injected into the households to fully support a revival. Greater analysis needs to be carried out to determine how relevant cash programming is as a transition and recovery tool

- There needs to be a clearer distinction made between cash-for-work (where the main objective is to assist people gain access to cash in a dignified manner) and work-for-cash (where the focus is on the work result to be realised). A mix of both of these approaches was used in Haiti and there were strong indications that work-for-cash (using very measurable indicators and results) was by far the better of the two approaches in this type of setting. Where cash-for-work is used, greater care must be given to ensuring that the work is meaningful, properly carried out, carefully monitored, and where payment is provided for results and not just for being part of the programme
- The cluster system did not adapt well to cash programmes and it was a number of months before cash based programmes found their place in the coordination system. There is a need for this to be addressed
- The importance of getting the balance right between short term shelter and longer term settlements was recognised, with transitional shelters being a very appropriate option over tents
- The need to re-look at international standards, especially Sphere, in an urban context was also noted. Many agencies reported that Sphere standards were unworkable and unrealisable, especially in relation to shelter and space allocation, water points and sanitation. Criticism appears to have been more to do with indicators rather than the standards themselves
- The need for sound principles of urban planning when thinking through recovery programmes and the more vulnerable returning to their neighbourhoods
- The need for clearly identified exit strategies, especially in the urban context, especially the transition from emergency to longer term rehabilitation. In many cases, exit was driven by cessation of funding rather as part of a planned and agreed process
- There was a need for programming and analysis tools designed for working with a complex group of stakeholders in an urban context
- The importance of the *IASC 2010 final strategy for meeting humanitarian challenges in urban areas* which has identified six main strategies and over 90 tools and approaches for making urban response more effective and to accelerate recovery - namely the need to: develop early operational strategies that ensure multi-stakeholder partnerships to enhance assistance, coordination and impact; strengthen technical surge capacity for first response; develop (or adapt) humanitarian approaches and tools for urban settings; promote protection of vulnerable people from exploitation and violence; restore urban livelihoods to assist recovery; mainstream preparedness
- There was a need for greater collaboration with the private sector, when operating in an urban context
- Protection and environment issues were badly neglected. Gender and accountability were much better mainstreamed

4.2 Pakistan²³

The 2009 floods in Pakistan were considered amongst the major disasters of the 21st Century, and the largest disaster ever recorded in terms of geographic area and numbers of people affected. Over 20 million people, more than 10% of the population, were affected, and an estimated 1.6 million houses were destroyed or badly damaged following heavy monsoon rains that lasted for eight weeks and swelled the Indus River to more than 40 times its normal size and submerged a fifth of the countries land mass. The emergency was difficult to read as the flooding did not affect everywhere at once and took time to spread out, and for its sheer scale to properly unfold. The Pakistan military deployed very quickly but many agencies characterised the overall response as supply driven rather than needs based and far too slow and far too late to be considered lifesaving, with the exception of a few areas. Agencies were slow to get moving due to the sheer

²³ Content drawn from external evaluations of the Pakistan emergency response carried out by the following agencies between 2011 and 2012 – DARA, DEC, DFID, CBHA, Alliance 2012. See Annex I for details of these evaluations

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

size and scale of the disaster and caseload of affected persons, the limited level of preparedness, underlying political issues, limited access and security constraints, limited presence of humanitarian actors throughout the country, inadequate human and financial means, and limited capacity amongst staff. As soon as agencies began to scale up, they were quickly stretched to the utmost in terms of resources and capacity. A number of agencies (including Concern) with a prior presence in some of the affected areas and a prior relationship with a number of national partners and good preparedness planning, were able to get up and running much more quickly than many others.

The cluster system approach was considered overly cumbersome, to the extent that many felt it to be counterproductive, as the sheer scale of the disaster made it impossible for the humanitarian community to effectively respond through eleven clusters. In reality, there appeared to be little appetite amongst the lead agencies for the cluster process and there existed significant tensions between OCHA and UN agencies. Geographical coverage was largely limited to accessible areas and the cluster system did not produce a clear division of labour amongst the responding agencies to ensure optimal coverage and cut out duplication. Procurement and logistics pipelines were quickly overwhelmed and national production capacity for essential relief materials was heavily disrupted.

Major efforts were made to carry out rapid joint assessments – by NGOs and between NGOs and the UN - but many of the assessments used different formats, making the consolidation and collation of information and data difficult. Many agencies rushed in and there was poor prioritisation in terms of where and how to programme and coordinate effectively. This was further compounded through poor coordination and problematic information sharing between humanitarian agencies and the government.

The selection of target areas was deemed to be subordinated to political agendas and political interference and, overall, targeting was considered particularly weak with little use made of vulnerability criteria. As a result, large amounts of relief were not specifically targeted at the most vulnerable within the affected communities and areas. Those in official camps were better assisted than those hosted by less affected households, and the principled approach of impartial, neutral and independent humanitarian assistance was not always closely followed. The government however provided tax exemption on relief supplies and provided visas to deployed humanitarian personnel upon arrival in the country, which greatly assisted relief efforts and expedited a lot of relief materials.

The sheer breadth of the disaster made it extremely difficult to apply international standards and, in some cases, the government insisted on standards that were resource driven. The use of the military as a provider of humanitarian aid became a major issue of debate in the flood response as the military were already party to the conflict being waged in some of the flood-affected parts of the country²⁴.

Pakistan was an example of where donors, particularly DFID and ECHO, were funding more joint programming and consortia, with one lead agency per consortium, and a number of evaluations were focused on these consortia approaches. Overall, it was felt that there was a need for greater cohesiveness when working as part of a consortium, and the added value of this type of approach, whereby a number of agencies would implement one single coherent action, did not quite materialise. In the main, agencies tended to revert to separate projects and single actions, to the extent that in some cases, a number of agencies working together were providing different resources and packages to beneficiaries under the same project activities. In one of the consortia, the CBHA's early recovery programme, individual agencies took responsibility for a consortium-wide programming approach – bringing added value through better information sharing, institutional relationships building, approach harmonisation and standardisation and better coordination – and backstopping six cross cutting themes, one per agency – protection/gender, advocacy, monitoring and

²⁴ In March 2010, OCHA issued MCDA guidelines for Pakistan taking the view that as some areas included elements of conflict, that all areas of the country should be informed by MCDA, rather than the 'Oslo' guidelines which would be more specific to natural disaster events

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

evaluation/accountability and learning, nutrition, capacity building and DRR. This was considered an example of an emerging good practice.

A 2011 DFID evaluation of the Concern response to the Pakistan flooding in 2010 found that the response used well-established approaches that were effective, and their strategy to implement using partners made good sense. Cross cutting issues – gender, accountability to beneficiaries, protection and DRR were well considered throughout the intervention. The intervention was timely and there were very sound linkages between emergency response and early recovery built into the programme from an early stage. The distribution of solar lights was considered a very important input from a protection perspective. DFID considered the programme to be very good value for money and one of the best programmes delivered in Pakistan by any of DFID's partners in terms of quality and cost.

4.3 *East Africa*²⁵

The DEC evaluations of the East Africa crisis were limited to the responses in Kenya and Ethiopia, even though it was Somalia that was most affected and where the challenges of programming were greatest. The crisis in East Africa was brought on as a result of inflated food prices and the stress of successive years of drought and resource competition. This led to crop failure, loss of assets and income generating capacity, distress migration, acute water shortages, especially in pastoralist areas, and very high levels of malnutrition. Early warning systems that use key risk indicators – rainfall, crop yields, and market price changes – were widely used and largely accurate, however the international community along with national governments failed to heed the clear warnings that were emanating from these early warning systems. Overall, there was a humanitarian systems-wide failure to heed the warning signs, a general failure of preventative action in 2010, and a collective failure to scale up when the situation was deteriorating in early 2011. Many agencies failed to get fully operational until the last quarter of 2011, by which time the ominous signs of famine had already been evident for six months or more. As such, this was not a timely response, and the failure to respond early has not been adequately explained as many agencies reported that they saw this coming by late 2010. It was not until the situation became a full scale crisis in Somalia and when famine was declared by the UN in parts of the country that the international community responded to what was happening in the wider region.

Response agencies used their existing partners and long term development programme base as a platform for scale up and to extend coverage. This played to their individual strengths and competencies and proved a very efficient way of operating. This approach also assured a good fit and strong linkage between the emergency response and longer term programmes in the same geographic areas. The most successful responses were those that adjusted scale and priorities from existing longer term programmes and recognised the need to build resilience in the knowledge that similar shocks will occur again in the future. When coupled with effective surge capacity, these adapted programmes were able to effectively expand to cover the emerging needs.

The sheer scale of demand brought with it issues of quality in terms of service delivery and post distribution monitoring. Agencies found it difficult to find effective partners and had to rely very heavily on internal recruitment and secondment – staff turnover was considered very high across the agencies and this brought with it issues for institutional memory.

The commitment shown by agencies to standards and best practice was considered impressive and this aspect of the programme received a great deal of monitoring and very deliberate efforts to achieve Sphere standards. Where Sphere was not met, this was often down to funding or access constraints. Good accountability mechanisms were evident although gender was not well addressed by all agencies.

²⁵ Content drawn from Real Time Evaluation East Africa Appeal Synthesis Report – DEC, January 2012

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

4.4 DRC²⁶

Four key areas affected the speed with which agencies were able to scale up their response to the displaced crisis in Eastern DRC in 2008/2009: availability of pre-financing; the existence (or lack) of contingency plans; partnership arrangements in place; and the availability of suitably qualified and experienced staff. As DEC funds took a long time to arrive, agencies that were able to pre-finance interventions were able to get started in a timely fashion. Staffing the scale up was a major issue for all agencies involved and was achieved through a combination of recruitment of new staff and the redeployment of staff from other project areas throughout the country. Many of the DEC agencies did not have any contingency plans in place for dealing with a major displacement crisis, and this hampered efforts to get up and running quickly.

The use of cash vouchers was still something of an innovative approach in 2008 and 2009. As such, agencies implementing such programmes took a long time to get their mechanisms and systems up and running. Appropriate needs assessments were carried out and targeting was very effective as a result, with strong community participation. However, not enough was done for IDPs in spontaneous camps and those being hosted by communities.

Cash voucher schemes, while slower to establish than the more traditional distributions of food and non-food items, were considered highly appropriate and effective, with a very high impact due to low logistical cost, private sector involvement, the stimulation of local markets, and the fact that they allowed beneficiaries to choose how to use the vouchers, so allowing them a greater degree of dignity and empowerment.

Overall, it was felt that much more needed to be done to ensure agency staff and partners streamlined humanitarian standards and codes into their operations, and that interagency coordination, information sharing and experience exchange needed to be strengthened. Greater consideration also needed to be given to interventions that went beyond the relief phase and reduced future vulnerabilities amongst these very fragile populations who depend on very uncertain livelihoods.

4.5 Mozambique²⁷

Working within specific geographic areas and with the existence of prepositioned contingency stocks ensured timely response in both Gaza and Zambezia provinces in 2012, the COSACA consortium ensured a more effective response capacity and capability for member agencies responding to major emergencies in Mozambique. On the downside, the almost total dependence on government-led assessments, which did not provide accurate or timely information, affected the member agencies capacity to plan and design interventions effectively and impacted on targeting and timely access.

5. Concern emergency responses – How have we done?

The following DAC criteria and definitions²⁸ have been used to separate out the performance of the Concern emergency programmes, based on the evaluations that are included in this report.

Relevance	The extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor. Appropriateness is included in this criteria and looks at how well the activity is tailored to local needs and increasing ownership, accountability and cost effectiveness
Effectiveness	The extent to which the activity achieved its purpose and the quality and speed of the response. Timeliness and Co-ordination are included in this criterion

²⁶ Content drawn from DRC Monitoring Mission Report – DEC, July 2009

²⁷ Content drawn from Rapid Real Time Evaluation of the Response in Gaza – COSACA, February 2012 and Evaluation of Response in Zambezia – COSACA, May 2012

²⁸ *Guidance for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies* – OECD/DAC, 1999

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

Efficiency	The degree of uptake/usage by the beneficiaries. Efficiency measures the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – achieved as a result of inputs. Cost Effectiveness is included in this criterion
Sustainability	The extent to which the activity or impact is likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Connectedness is included in this criterion and looks at whether short term emergency activities are planned and carried out in a context that takes longer term problems into account

The following data and content is drawn from the 40 Concern emergency programme evaluations that were carried out between 2009 and 2012. See Annex I for a complete reference by year and by country.

5.1 *Relevance and Appropriateness*

A 2009 evaluation of the emergency response in **Haiti**, found that the programme responded very well to the havoc wrought by four hurricanes over a three week period in late 2008. Numbers reached were impressive and the intervention contained six separate activities that were all very relevant to the needs of the affected population, although most beneficiaries only benefited from one of these activities. Questions were raised as to whether the programme had been able to prioritise the needs of the affected people as everyone wanted to be part of the cash-for-work component of the programme.

A 2009 evaluation of the 2008 emergency response in North Kivu, **DRC** focused largely on the provision of cash and voucher transfers through cash-for-work programmes and food and non-food fairs. This approach was considered very relevant and appropriate to the needs created by mass displacement due to the conflict. Good assessments were carried out that accurately identified priorities, with an emphasis on the replacement of essential household goods that were lost when people were displaced. The conditions for implementing fairs were carefully established and put in place – traders to supply items, support from authorities and total buy in from beneficiaries. Risk assessments were carried out to ensure that beneficiaries would not face any undue or additional risks as a result of participating in the programme. Vouchers were used for pre-selected articles and for the payment of school fees. Prices were fixed in advance and monitored throughout the implementation period.

A 2010 evaluation of the 2008 response to cyclone Sidr in **Bangladesh**, was considered very appropriate and based on a sound needs assessment. There were a number of components to the programme, all of which were well targeted, although there were some issues with delays with some of the service delivery.

The **DRC** Masisi response programme in 2008/2009 was very well designed and achieved a fair degree of success considering the challenging security situation at the time, which severely hampered programme access. There was very good community participation from design through implementation. Targeting was based on sound vulnerability criteria that were agreed with the communities in advance and then followed by a verification process. However, the selection of participants for the cash-for-work component of the programme was not considered fully transparent and there were suggestions made that supervisors had a big say in who was selected.

The **Somalia** emergency response in 2008/2009 addressed immediate needs as identified by sound stakeholder analysis and consultation. Thorough needs assessments were carried out and the affected population were fully consulted at all stages of the planning and design process. The targeting of participants was good and the process of beneficiary selection transparent. MoUs were developed for each community to ensure transparency and accountability in terms of expectations.

The use of mobile phone technology to affect cash transfers in the **Kenya** post-election recovery project in 2008/2009 was an appropriate and innovative way of delivering an emergency intervention. Targeting for food support was based on sound vulnerability criteria, although the targeting for business start-up grants

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

was not fully based on poverty criteria, but on having had and then lost a livelihood, thus excluding those households that had no livelihood prior to the election violence.

The **Pakistan** Siran Valley rehabilitation programme that was evaluated in 2009 was considered to be of very high quality, technically sound, and appropriate and relevant to the context. There was a very good mix of on-farm/off-farm activities, rural infrastructure and socio economic benefits. Stakeholder participation was strong due to a very high level of involvement of the target community as a result of sound community mobilisation. The programme targeted areas where other agencies did not work due to remoteness and access issues, and there was very appropriate targeting of extremely poor and vulnerable living in difficult to access locations.

In the **Zimbabwe** cholera response in 2009 there was a concentration on working in hotspots in the early part of the response which did not prevent the cholera from spreading and getting worse. Part of this was due to poor coverage by the national MoH, but also poor access and lack of rural transportation preventing infected people from getting to treatment centres. Good use was made of MoH volunteers and cholera prevention messaging and food distributions to cholera treatment centres were appropriate interventions, however there was only capacity to chase new cases. There was an over reliance on UNICEF to provide materials and there were not enough NFIs and water trucking facilities to meet the emerging needs. Overall, the response was appropriate in terms of managing new cases, and death rates in the intervention areas decreased dramatically and numbers of affected were ultimately stabilised.

In 2009, the **Zimbabwe** programme carried out a pilot project to assess the benefits and costs of three different types of transfers – cash, a combination of cash and food, and food only. The programme had been distributing food relief in Zimbabwe since 2002 and wanted to determine the efficacy of using cash as an alternative. This project was considered very appropriate and relevant as it provided Concern with information and data that would contribute to decision making and response planning, while at the same time provided affected populations with much needed assistance. All three types of intervention were appropriate and the majority of recipients, who received cash, used it to purchase food, which was the identified need that the programme was addressing. Targeting of cash only transfers created tensions in areas where food was normally shared as sharing did not take place with cash as it would with food.

The **Ethiopia** response that was evaluated in 2009 addressed priority needs and the mix of interventions – nutrition and seed distributions - was very appropriate to the level and type of need identified. However, greater consideration should have been given to engaging in other sectors, where there were clearly identified needs, especially in the area of water provision.

The **Somalia** response in 2009/2010 again demonstrated very good understanding between the programme and major stakeholders and written agreements and MoUs were signed with communities, store keepers, partners and remittance companies. These agreements clearly laid out the roles and responsibilities expected from both the programme and the relevant stakeholders. Thorough multi-sector assessments were carried out which included assessments of needs, security assessments and what other agencies were doing, or were planning in the intervention areas to ensure that there was no duplication. Good community based targeting made the beneficiary selection process both transparent and easy to achieve. The use of cash transfers was very appropriate and improved the food security situation of those who were assisted, enabled many to gain access to credit and, as a result, increased morale and dignity and stimulated local trade and local markets.

The **Pakistan** IDP RAPID Fund programme in 2009/2010 that was administered by Concern on behalf of OFDA was considered very relevant as it provided access to funding for small NGOs which had not been previously possible.

An expansion of the **Zimbabwe** cash transfer programme in 2010 experienced a number of issues with targeting due to political interference in terms of selection of geographic areas for inclusion on the

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

programme. As such, the programme was deemed to have been delivered based on population size rather than vulnerability.

In 2010, the **India** programme carried out a lessons learning exercise where they looked at ten years of disaster recovery programmes. Key success areas were the development of a local Emergency Response Team which included member of other NGOs as well as Concern, with defined roles, which could quickly carry out assessments when disaster struck.

The response to the 2010 **Haiti** earthquake was the largest response since the Great Lakes in the Nineties. Staff increased from 100 to 290, with over 40 international staff, and a budget of €28 million. Very good multi-sector assessments were carried out which drove decision making and there was a willingness to take on complex and unpopular sectors like camp management and shelter based on sound needs identification. Concern was one of the first agencies to launch cash transfer projects, which proved very appropriate. Targeting in an urban context, where so many had been affected was complex, and the programme used sound vulnerability criteria very successfully to identify their core target groups. A very good mix of targeted activities and services was developed that met the identified needs of the affected population. While the programme was dealing with the difficulties of procurement and getting relief goods into the capital, partial distributions were carried out before all items could be sourced due to the needs, which was an appropriate approach.

The **Bangladesh** response to the Hoar Flood emergency in 2010 was considered appropriate, and targeting was good. Using cash transfers and cash for training was a highly relevant approach, as was the use of cash transfers in the **India** Cyclone Alia early recovery programme, in 2010.

A desk review of the **Somalia** emergency response in 2011 found that the programme reached very high numbers through its multi-sector approach and a sound basis for community targeting was followed. The review highlighted the need for greater consideration to be paid to the extent to which aid was contributing to the conflict in the country.

The livelihoods recovery programme for flood affected populations in **Pakistan** in 2011, was considered highly relevant to the identified needs of the people affected by the floods in Sindh and Punjab. The combination of agriculture inputs and cash transfers provided a much needed financial boost to the affected population.

The 2011 response to the monsoon floods in **India** was the first time that cash transfers had been used to deliver an emergency programme in India on such a major scale and was considered highly appropriate and innovative.

The 2011 emergency response in **Kenya** was considered highly relevant and appropriate to the needs of the affected population, through a combination of a food voucher scheme, that provided households with 30-50% of their monthly households needs, coupled with a livestock support component that provided the basis for rebuilding herds lost due to the drought. Overall, an appropriate mix of interventions aimed at ensuring food security at household level, while strengthening livelihood security and household independence.

The 2011 response to the Thane cyclone in **India** used cash transfers as a major delivery component of the programme and this was considered very appropriate as cash transfers supported markets, provided choice and raised the dignity and confidence of the beneficiaries. There were issues regarding assessments and targeting and the lessons learning workshop that was conducted after the intervention had finished highlighted the need for assessments to be more standardised, with clearer definitions of vulnerability criteria and the need for more joint assessments. The main issue with targeting was that the needs far outweighed the available resources and, as a result, programme planning was based more on the availability of financial resources than on meeting the identified needs.

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

The 2011/2012 emergency response in North Kivu, **DRC** implemented a mix of voucher fairs which proved very appropriate to the context and compared very favourably with more traditional methods of food and NFI distributions. The programme showed they had taken on board lessons learnt in the past from earlier evaluations that recommended this approach as suitable to the context - security and access permitting.

5.2 *Effectiveness and Timeliness/Co-ordination*

The response to the hurricanes in **Haiti** were slow to scale up as key staff were unavailable (the CD and ACD were out of the country and the Emergency Co-ordinator had just left the organisation). This had implications for decision making and driving the response. Other key factors highlighted were the need for Concern and her partner agencies to be able to better assess emergency needs, monitor and improve response capacity to produce good quality proposals and reports. The need for a PEER plan to be developed and followed was very apparent. According to the evaluation report, the response could have started earlier and lasted longer and having six separate components was overly complicating in terms of planning and support. It is suggested that fewer components broken down into two key phases – a cash-for-work phase to provide immediate benefits, and a later phase focused on livelihoods and recovery - would have been a more effective approach.

The cash and voucher transfer programme in North Kivu, **DRC** was considered very effective and innovative, providing beneficiaries with choice and stimulating local markets that had been stressed due to security and access issues. The option to pay school fees was very popular amongst beneficiaries and demonstrated real control over the decisions as to how the transfers could be spent. Staff showed skill and flexibility in developing the transfer approach, which was new to the programme and required significantly more administration than in-kind distributions due to the need to establish systems and relationships with traders.

The Masisi response in **DRC** proved very effective in difficult circumstances in terms of security and access. Good technical staff and a strong relationship and good cooperation with the partner NGO enabled the programme to overcome access difficulties. NFIs distributed were compliant with Sphere and distributed in a timely manner, although there was widespread selling of NFIs due to major delays in general food distribution by other partners. The roads rehabilitation component of the programme which was operated with cash-for-work set itself the target of having a minimum 25% participation rate for women – a figure that was surpassed as, ultimately, 37% of those engaged in the programme were women - and was a very popular intervention as it brought much needed cash into the area. There was strong evidence of compliance with HAP and People in Aid standards, and a complaints response mechanism was established and worked well.

The **Somalia** response in 2008/2009 was implemented in a timely and effective manner although the security situation caused delays in the delivery of some aspects of the programme from time to time. Over 45% of the cash-for-work participants were women, and the project met Sphere standards in terms of quality.

The **Kenya** post-election recovery programme in 2008/2009 was a very effective intervention both in terms of what it delivered - a mix of cash transfers and business start-up grants - and its use of mobile phones to deliver the cash transfers. The cash transfers were index linked to safeguard against food price increases and the mechanism for delivery, MPESA was tried and proven in a pilot project a year before, and was a well-known method of sending cash, especially in the urban areas.

There was very good community resilience and DRR built into the Siran Valley Rehabilitation programme in **Pakistan**, and the needs of men and women were well considered throughout the project. However, no cross cutting issues other than gender were considered, which was a shortcoming. This failure to adequately consider cross-cutting issues was also deemed to be a feature of the emergency response in **Chad** in 2009, where it was felt that staff required a greater understanding and awareness of cross cutting issues and the

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

importance of gender disaggregated data in their assessments and analysis. The Chad programme though demonstrated very good practice in carrying out lessons learning events throughout the programme cycle.

The response to the **Zimbabwe** cholera outbreak was very slow to get up and running and this was attributed to a number of factors. Although there were early calls by many donors, the programme only submitted a proposal to OFDA and this took a long time to finalise. The programme took a long time to determine where and how it might intervene, and funding delays, and a lack of capacity to deal with a rapid onset emergency further slowed things down. There was no WASH programme prior to getting involved in the cholera response and, as a result, the programme and staff went through a very steep learning curve in terms of staffing, planning, procurement and coordination.

The scale of the **Ethiopia** response that was evaluated in 2009 was considered impressive and of high quality. The programme was able to carry out its response without negatively impacting on other longer term programmes, which reflected their preparedness and capacity for emergency response at country level. The Ethiopia programme staff showed great commitment and willingness to engage when they were needed to be involved in the response. However, agencies and the government were aware of the looming crisis some months before through effective early warning systems and greater efforts should have been made to engage earlier and get interventions started sooner. It was suggested that there was scope for greater lobbying and advocacy to mitigate the deteriorating situation before it became a major crisis. Cross cutting issues – HIV/AIDS, gender and accountability - were considered at programme design level but were not effectively addressed through the activities.

As part of the **Zimbabwe** cash transfer programme in 2009, a complaints response mechanism was set up at community level. However, the local population felt they were unable to make complaints as the complaints procedure included the village authorities and, as such, was not considered a correct channel for raising grievances and getting a fair and unbiased hearing.

An evaluation of an expansion of the **Zimbabwe** cash transfer programme in 2010 found that while cash brought a greater benefit to the household than food, as it provided choice, the overall preference was for food as cash was being spent almost exclusively on food and food prices were going up when the cash was disbursed. This preference for food was much higher amongst women than amongst men. The key aim of the expanded project was to provide cash to women to empower them, provide dignity, and improve their influence within the household, a big ask for a project with only a five month timeframe. The evaluators felt the project timeframe was far too short and unrealistic to be able to determine if these aims were realised.

In the **Somalia** emergency response in 2009/2010, the identified needs of the IDPs were very high, and the intervention was considered a very timely one. The affected community was informed of its entitlements, complaints response mechanisms were established, copies of Sphere in Somali were distributed to communities in target areas, and meetings were held to highlight specific standards. Sphere standards were generally met. Accountability standards in the programme were high and communities were directly involved in monitoring progress and had access to correct and useful information. Elements of HAP were used to get messages across to storekeepers that people needed to be treated with respect and had the right to receive the correct quality and quantity of food. Limiting the numbers of beneficiaries per store also ensured that the risks and the benefits were spread around which proved very effective. Overall, good use was made of local capacity – staff, partners, local stores and business and remittance companies. HIV/AIDS did not feature in the intervention as this is a highly sensitive issue in Somalia and has to be treated very carefully.

The RAPID Fund administered by Concern in **Pakistan** in 2009/2010 provided grants for 17 interventions to NGOs that covered a multitude of sectors and geographic areas. The majority of these grants were not approved within the stipulated timeframe of six days, with many taking up to 15 days to gain approval. Generally, cross cutting issues, specifically gender and protection, were well addressed in the grant applications.

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

The **India** programme lessons learning exercise in 2010 found that successive interventions had been timely, needs based and very well targeted with good participation of stakeholders – partners and beneficiaries. Good co-ordination facilitated timely decision making. Similar findings were made following the **Bangladesh** Hoar Flood emergency response in 2010.

The **Haiti** response in 2010 was scaled up very quickly and a number of key sector and operations specialists arrived in a timely manner. However, there were major challenges in the early days to fill key posts, and there were some staffing gaps in a number of sectors that caused delays in getting some aspects of the programme properly resourced and up and running. It was felt that the ERT and RDU had not been used to full effect and that it was important for the organisation to ensure that these functions were working effectively and could be deployed where they were most needed. Co-ordination was very complex and difficult due to the very significant time factor involved in attending so many co-ordination meetings, but the programme demonstrated real commitment to participate actively in coordination fora which was admirable under the conditions and demands that existed. There was a strong awareness of Sphere amongst programme staff and partners and the programme made efforts to establish and meet humanitarian standards. There was evidence of strong accountability practices and systems and a strong commitment to providing information to beneficiaries, to actively consult with them and to seek their participation in programme design. A complaints response mechanism was also established. Gender and protection were considered in planning and design, with a strong focus on women specific activities and facilities. The programme was held in high regard by donors, particularly ECHO.

The response to the **Pakistan** floods in 2010 was considered very timely as there was very good emergency preparedness in place that resulted in an early response. There was very good collaboration with partners which ensured the programme was able to achieve wide reach and good adherence to international performance standards, especially Sphere. Transparent accountability systems were established and a complaints response mechanism was put in place. DRR was considered from the outset and DRR related activities integrated into the programme.

The **Somalia** desk review of the 2011 emergency response found that the programme demonstrated good levels of preparedness that allowed for a timely intervention. However, co-ordination was weak at the cluster level, with far too much emphasis on planning and not enough emphasis on action and reporting on achievements. The fact that the clusters were based in Nairobi and were operated remotely led to major information and data gaps throughout Somalia due to the limited number of operational NGOs allowed to work in areas controlled by Al Shabab. OCHA were seen by some to have failed to fulfil their mandate by not co-ordinating effectively, and there needed to be greater regard paid to humanitarian principles, with the UN system challenged to ensure that the African Union troops adhered to these principles and showed greater respect for humanitarian efforts and approaches.

An evaluation in 2011 of the infant feeding response in **Haiti** one year after the earthquake found that there had been very good co-ordination and collaboration with the nutrition cluster, and that the intervention was very effective and produced very good results. Gender and HIV/AIDS aspects were specifically integrated into the programme, but no exit strategy had been formulated, which was a major shortcoming for an intervention of this nature.

The livelihoods recovery programme for flood affected populations in **Pakistan** in 2011 was provided in a very timely fashion and there was a strong awareness amongst village committees of accountability measures put in place and how they should be used by the communities. Male and female village committees were established which contributed to very effective targeting.

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

The 2011 response to the monsoon floods in **India** was very well targeted and used sound vulnerability targeting criteria amongst the affected population. A key achievement of the programme was the integration of DRR into interventions related to infrastructure.

The 2011 evaluation of the Kaijado nutrition programme in **Kenya** found issues with the exit strategy in place as there were questions raised over the capacity of the MoH to take over the outreach component of the programme, due to lack of resources, once Concern phased out its support.

Overall, the 2011 emergency response in **Kenya**, was very well targeted and implemented and adhered well to performance standards – Sphere and LEGS. There were issues raised over the level of post distribution monitoring and it was felt that the partner NGO required additional training and support to be more effective in this regard. The evaluation also suggested that there was a need to develop simple and practical monitoring tools and to allocate resources to ensure these could be easily and effectively applied.

The 2011 emergency response programme in **Ethiopia** was considered very timely, effective and proportional to the identified needs. The programme responded early with rapid surveys that also looked at nutrition, livelihoods and WASH around which the emergency programme was designed. The output was considered very high and over a quarter of a million people were reached with assistance. The programme adhered to international performance standards, and Sphere standards were met. HAP was integrated and a complaints response mechanism was piloted and was very positively received by the target communities. Gender and HIV/AIDS were included from the outset in project planning, design and activities. Each component of the intervention had its own lessons learning exercise which were carried out at the end of the project cycle and which included all key stakeholders.

The 2011/2012 emergency response in North Kivu, **DRC** used vulnerability criteria for targeting which, while effective, raised issues at community level as so many people were vulnerable and there were just not enough resources to include everyone. This highlights the dilemma faced by emergency programmes, where resource availability determines ultimately how many households can be included in any given intervention. This is an issue that has to be raised more effectively with donors, who play a central role in allocating resources to meet identified needs. Due to insecurity, the programme did not reach all of the intended beneficiaries with all of the intended components of the programme, and the programme was stopped a number of times, during periods of heightened insecurity, which affected its timely delivery. As a result, targets had to be revised down in consultation with the donors which was done effectively. There was good adherence to international standards and codes, especially Sphere. A complaints response mechanism was established that operated well.

The 2012 response to the cholera outbreak in **Sierra Leone** was effective in a number of aspects – social mobilisation, training of volunteers (many of whom were women), reaching a catchment population of nearly 200,000 people with hygiene promotion and community sensitisation messages, and supporting district health management teams to do their work in terms of logistics and data collection. While highlighting shortcomings, the evaluation concludes that “Overall, Concern Worldwide’s response made a tangible impact... [and] contributed to keeping case fatality rates down in both operational areas”.

However, the evaluation also highlights internal and external challenges which “reduced the extent of the impact”: the intervention – as with those of almost all organisations - took a long time to scale up and staff capacity was very stretched with insufficient skills and experience in this type of response. This was, in part affected by the government’s late declaration of an emergency, and the donors’ consequent slow mobilisation of resources for organisations seeking to respond. Although a PEER plan was in place, the country programme was totally unprepared for this emergency and it was “hectic because of lack of experience with cholera combined with normal programming responsibilities”. There was very limited capacity to carry out assessments and this affected targeting. The response was further affected by weak co-ordination structures, the lack of a national cholera response plan, the lack of preparedness plans, slow donor

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

mobilisation of funds, and the fact that it took a long time for the government to declare a national emergency. Overall, it was difficult to meet Sphere standards as there were issues with different preventative packages being offered by different agencies. This could have been rectified through better and more robust co-ordination. Post distribution monitoring was also a major problem as staff were stretched and distributions of inputs were not done in a timely manner – a general feature of the overall response by agencies. Access was hampered by a poor roads network and incessant rains that made many of the roads impassable. There was no formal exit strategy and this was highlighted as a major shortcoming of the response. In this type of intervention, there needs to be clear and defined indicators for when the emergency is over and when the intervention can scale back and be phased out.

5.3 *Efficiency and Cost Effectiveness*

The **DRC** cash and voucher transfer programme was considered to be more expensive when compared with in-kind distributions but overall an efficient and ultimately cost-effective way of providing relief due to the element of choice, the value that beneficiaries placed on the programme, support to local markets, and being able to pay schools fees as part of the process. The selection of articles available at the fairs could have been wider and the lack of small denomination vouchers reduced flexibility amongst the beneficiaries as traders did not provide any change and beneficiaries had to purchase multiple items from the same trader or receive change paid in soap or salt. However, the use of vouchers discouraged the selling on of unwanted goods, as beneficiaries were able to choose what they wanted to receive.

Using mobile phone technology in **Kenya** in the post-election recovery programme proved to be a very cost effective and secure way of delivering an emergency intervention. The majority of recipients viewed the cash transfer as a contribution to household cash and used it on the most pressing need at the time. In general, households spent money on food until members of the household had consumed two meals in a day, and then money was spent on other item such as school expenses, medical costs, livestock, clothes, on “the issue of most importance” at the time.

The **Pakistan** Siran Valley rehabilitation programme was considered a very good fit with outstanding output and outcome levels that exceeded programme objectives in a number of cases. Cost efficiency throughout the programme was very high.

Given our experience of responding to large scale crises in **Ethiopia**, there were an number of issues identified that contributed to a degree of inefficiency in programming during the 2008 emergency response – no one person was assigned from the outset to coordinate the nutrition programme, and this had implications for the quality of service delivery in the early part of the intervention; inconsistency in reporting and data collection that was never fully rectified throughout the life of the intervention; no mechanisms were established to share experiences and learning between the different intervention areas; and vague roles and responsibilities assigned to staff which affected planning and co-ordination. Due to inadequate general food distributions in the affected areas and sharing of supplementary food at household/community level, many children remained malnourished for a very long time, leading to a relatively cost inefficient programme.

The **Zimbabwe** cash transfer programme in 2009 provided a very useful basis for cost benefit analysis of three different types of transfer. Overall, a mix of cash and food was preferred by recipients, but the lower cost of providing cash only transfers made it a far more realistic option in terms of scale up, assuming the security risks associated with cash could be effectively managed and mitigated. The evaluation also found that while the operational cost of cash was much lower than providing food only, the opposite was the case in terms of overall cost of the programme, as local traders charged much more for their food – food that Concern was able to make savings on by bulk sourcing and transporting. Getting prior agreement from traders on guaranteed fixed prices for commodities would produce much more favourable trading conditions for recipients, a very useful lesson to be learnt from the programme.

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

During the **Somalia** emergency response in 2009/2010, security assessments were carried out to ensure the cash transfer approach would work from a risk perspective. Based on these assessments, remittance companies were used to transfer the money – an efficient way of operating in the high risk environment. The programme was considered very cost efficient with over 80% of all expenditure going directly to project beneficiaries.

During the **Haiti** response in 2010, Concern established strategic partnerships with other agencies, especially members of the Alliance2015, which led to some joint programming and the establishment of a joint logistics base in the Dominican Republic that brought efficiencies in terms of procurement and transport.

The response to the **Pakistan** floods in 2010 was considered very good value, when compared to other agencies, achieved largely by the fact that the programme was implemented through partners.

The 2011 emergency response in **Kenya** was considered very cost efficient as it would have been much more costly to replace lost livestock, compared to the cost of supporting livestock that were stressed due to drought.

During the 2011/2012 emergency response in North Kivu, **DRC**, it was reported that prices tended to increase when the voucher fairs were taking place, which detracted from some of the cost efficiencies of this particular type of approach. Further work has to be done in the future with traders to ensure that prices remain more stable for beneficiaries to realise the full intended benefit of the intervention. Overall, this approach was considered to be cost effective and based on sound approaches that have been tested a number of times in the past.

5.4 *Sustainability and Connectedness*

Both the **DRC** and the **Somalia** responses in 2008/2009 considered both short and longer-term livelihood needs when planning their intervention, and catered to aspects of both in their implementation – cash-for-work which provided an immediate emergency benefit and rehabilitation works and activities that would provide a longer term benefit to the communities – road rehabilitation providing greater access to markets in DRC and the rehabilitation of water systems in Somalia

The **Ethiopia** response in 2008 linked up with the national CMAM programme very effectively and highlighted the need for the national programme to be more focused on high risk geographic areas and to improve their capability to scale up more quickly and efficiently when crisis looms. The Ethiopia programme were clearly taking the lessons of the 2003 emergency on board and good learning reviews were carried out to ensure lessons learnt were captured for future analysis and to contribute to future preparedness.

The **Uganda** Pader support programme to returnees was successful in developing a strong advocacy network around key policy issues that were very relevant to the returnees, namely issues around land rights and land use, gender and GBV and HIV/AIDS. The programme was also able to develop a number of community based livelihood organisations that were robust enough to benefit from local government development programmes and those of other partners.

The **Kenya** post-election recovery programme in 2008/2009 well considered the links between relief and recovery by combining food support with longer term livelihood support. Cash transfers were provided in the short term as well as providing business start-up grants to replace lost livelihoods.

In the **Haiti** earthquake response in 2010, early consideration was given to livelihoods recovery, and planning for recovery began at an early stage, which enabled the programme to move later into recovery with a degree of ease and more seamlessly than was apparent with many other agencies.

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

An evaluation in 2011 of the infant feeding response in **Haiti**, one year after the earthquake found that it had produced positive behaviour change and suggested that this could be sustained in the future if the programme could reach more household influencers - fathers and grandmothers, in addition to mothers.

The 2011 emergency response in **Ethiopia** highlighted the need to create greater linkages between emergencies and recovery and the need for working with relevant partners to ensure more is done to develop national guidelines and approaches that ensure recovery forms a more integral part of the national emergency response cycle.

In the 2011/2012 emergency response in North Kivu, **DRC**, improved local market access was reported as a result of the road building component of the programme. Local traders were boosted by the voucher approach which had ensured their continued presence in local areas, benefiting the local population. There were good linkages reported with LRRD and sustainability as people used vouchers to pay school fees and to purchase agricultural inputs. It was highlighted however, that many of the roads that were rehabilitated would require on-going maintenance every few years and that, without periodic support, they would deteriorate in a relatively short time.

The evaluation of the 2012 response to the cholera outbreak in **Sierra Leone** highlighted the need for integrating cholera prevention messaging into on-going WASH and education programmes as a means of ensuring cholera prevention remained a focus for agencies, the government and communities. This needed to be complemented with the development of a national strategy for cholera prevention, and the development of generic cholera response plans that clearly defined roles and responsibilities for all major stakeholders.

6. Having an impact – organisational learning and room for improvement

6.1 *Strengths*

Many of the evaluations of the Concern emergency responses show that the organisation continues to apply learning, adapt and innovate based on experiences of previous emergencies and existing/emerging good practice.

In the four years under review, **over 13 million** people have benefited directly from Concern's emergency interventions. Responses are increasingly using many different forms of cash transfers, when security and market conditions exist which demonstrates continued innovation, application and a willingness to try and ensure that our responses are appropriate to the identified needs of the beneficiaries but which also has consider efficiencies in terms of cost and value for money, and linkages in terms of supporting local market structures. In every case, the impact of using cash transfers has been very high as it allows the benefit of choice, increases dignity, independence and confidence amongst the beneficiaries and supports local markets.

Responses are increasingly multi-sectoral and are thus attempting to meet the growing multitude of inter-related needs faced by communities – typically in the areas of shelter, NFIs, livelihoods, nutrition, and WASH.

Responses are increasingly collaborative and are being implemented through international and national consortia and alliances that bring efficiencies, extend coverage and reach, strengthen coordination and meet growing donor requirements.

Responses are also increasingly being implemented through partnership with local and national NGOs, especially in Asia, where many of the responses are implemented solely through partners. This approach brings much efficiency, strengthens local capacity, provides local knowledge and awareness, contributes very positively to programme acceptance, extends coverage and reach and, in the case of some of the more

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

difficult complex emergency settings, allows Concern to operate in conditions where access can be limited or constrained.

Recovery and sustainability are increasingly being built into emergency response planning and design, which generally allows for recovery programmes that are more fit for purpose and relevant.

Cross cutting issues appear to be addressed much more frequently and comprehensively in our emergency responses, especially in the area of gender and protection and, to a lesser extent, HIV/AIDS and social protection.

Accountability appears to be improving, and our responses are including, as routine, more and more downward accountability to beneficiaries in terms of participation, consultation, information sharing and exchange, feedback, and the development of complaints response mechanisms.

The use of vulnerability criteria in targeting is almost commonplace and generally demonstrates a good awareness of the different types of vulnerability that exist within disaster affected operations.

Adherence to humanitarian standards, especially Sphere is increasingly common and demonstrates a good awareness amongst staff as to the importance of meeting or at the very least aspiring to meet standards.

6.2 *Challenges*

There is still plenty of room for improvement, and a number of areas where Concern emergency response programmes could improve and demonstrate greater consistency.

While we state that we recognise the value and importance of evaluations, only 14 (out of 26) countries evaluated their emergency responses in the period under review. A number of countries that have not carried out evaluations have responded to successive or year on year emergencies. It has also not been possible to determine how many of the 166 responses across the 26 countries have been evaluated or included in the evaluations carried out.

Documented management responses to recommendations made in the evaluations have not been routinely produced as part of the overall evaluations process.

While organisational wash-up meetings have taken place following the major emergencies in Haiti (2010) and Somalia (2011), they have not taken place in a timely fashion, nor have they documented progress with regard to recommendations made. No wash-up meeting took place following the Pakistan flood response in 2009/2010.

All of the formal evaluations have used the extended DAC criteria, and the results have been very consistent in including references to Sphere standards and, increasingly, HAP and the P4. However, other standards such as the Red Cross Code of Conduct and People in Aid have not been looked at as consistently across all of the evaluations. It is important that all of the standard performance codes are included to provide a comprehensive analysis from the full perspective of our agreed approaches, material outputs, HR input, and accountability to present as full a picture as possible as to the completeness of the response.

Lack of capacity of staff and partners has been an issue in a number of responses, and the organisation must continue to strive to ensure that every response is implemented by staff who possess the requisite competence, experience and technical skill to implement our interventions effectively, that field and head office management move swiftly and efficiently to fill international and national staffing gaps that are identified, and partners are provided with the resources and support to deliver on their commitments and meet the expectations of both Concern and the beneficiaries in an efficient and effective manner. It is acknowledged that there will always be times and places where we just cannot staff and resource every

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

single emergency response effectively, even with elements of support from head office, but there are clear indications in a number of evaluations that there is still room for improvement in this critical area.

Evaluations of our emergency responses are not routinely including or looking at the percentage of the total affected population that were targeted. If this was included, it would provide a sounder basis for analysis in terms of how reliable and applicable are the targeting criteria, and how well they are being applied.

A number of evaluations cited the lack of emergency preparedness or lack of preparedness planning at the onset of the emergency. Only two evaluations actually mentioned PEER, and in one of these cases a PEER plan was in place, but the programme was still very unprepared for the emergency when it arrived. How well a programme is prepared to face an emergency is very important from a learning perspective and all evaluations should look at levels of preparedness and PEER as a core aspect and include this in the evaluation criteria.

A number of evaluations cited poor or weak monitoring systems, especially with regard to post-distribution and impact monitoring. This was mentioned both in relation to monitoring by programme staff and by partners on a number of occasions and requires greater programme emphasis and improvement on a number of levels.

A number of evaluations cited the need to pay greater attention to cross cutting issues, both from the mainstreaming perspective to ensure that cross cutting planning and design intentions are translated into tangible activities. Gender equality has received a lot of attention in recent emergency responses as, to a lesser degree, have some aspects of protection. HIV/AIDS is being used increasingly as a vulnerability criterion for targeting and beneficiary selection, but there appears to have been little progress in fully mainstreaming HIV/AIDS into our emergency response approaches and programmes.

Although not an issue raised in the individual evaluations, given the number of cholera responses to which we have responded – and the extent of the cholera outbreaks in Zimbabwe, Sierra Leone and Haiti - clear guidance on what, when and how to intervene and conclude interventions should be developed.

Several evaluations cited the lack of an exit strategy as a major oversight and shortcoming of the response. In a number of cases it was indicated that exit from the emergency was more a function of availability of resources than a natural phasing out of an intervention once the emergency was over. It is an important part of the project cycle to ensure that a sound exit strategy is developed at the same time as the response is planned and designed.

A small number of evaluations indicated that the programme they evaluated had not optimised institutional donor funding available for a particular emergency or had perhaps over-focused on one main donor and then run into problems when the donor funds were late arriving. Other evaluations cited the fact that targeting was determined by the availability of funding. The importance of utilising as many donors as possible cannot be overemphasised. Such an approach spreads any risk that may exist from over-dependence on a single donor and ensures that the programme maximises the available funding resources to meet as many of the identified needs of the target group as possible.

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

7. Measuring up to previous meta evaluations²⁹

Concern's emergency response programmes continue to show progress and improvement in a number of areas, when compared to the previous meta evaluations:

- With few exceptions, the emergencies for which evaluations were conducted were responded to in a timely fashion. Notable amongst the exceptions were the two cholera responses in Zimbabwe and Sierra Leone
- In the main, programme and sectoral choices have been appropriate and are increasingly demonstrating suitable choices and mix of activities and approaches to meet the identified needs of those being targeted. The use of cash transfers has been particularly successful
- Awareness of and adherence to Sphere is almost routine and where Sphere is not met, there are generally sound and logical reasons for this
- Some progress has been made to integrate cross-cutting issues into emergency response, especially in the areas of gender equality, protection and HIV/AIDS
- With very few exceptions, the programmes are being very well targeted and are demonstrating much improved accountability to beneficiaries – consultation, participation in programme planning and design, information sharing and exchange with regard to entitlements, expectations and the P4, and through the establishment of mechanisms for making complaints. There is increasing evidence of the use of HAP standards and the use of HAP and accountability language in programme design
- Programmes increasingly work through partners, national and international, and there are a large number of joint collaborations with national and international alliances and consortia. These partnerships are giving programmes demonstrably greater reach and bringing greater efficiencies of scale

Issues and challenges that have been highlighted in previous meta evaluations, continue to persist in a number of areas:

- While there has been some improvement in regard to the recruitment and retention of international staff in emergency responses, but some of the evaluations have highlighted a continued problem in this regard – there were problems with timely resourcing of key posts in Haiti after the earthquake, and indications that the ERT and RDU had not been used to full effect
- Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues into our emergency response programmes remains a significant challenge and while there has been some progress with regard to gender equality, protection and HIV/AIDS, they still fall very short of being fully mainstreamed, and a number of evaluations have highlighted this. Many programmes are still encountering major challenges to effectively integrate HIV/AIDS and social protection into their emergency responses
- There continues to be little evidence in the evaluations that the organisation has found its advocacy voice. However, advocacy is an area that has not been looked at specifically by evaluations and has not appeared as an “ask” in any terms of reference. It is not unreasonable to assume that where we are using advocacy, it is going relatively unnoticed and this is an area that future evaluations should be routinely looking at
- Post distribution monitoring and impact monitoring remain a challenge and a number of evaluations have highlighted this as a shortcoming
- A number of evaluations have highlighted the lack of country level “emergency preparedness” in some of the responses, especially in terms of analysis and mechanisms for scale up
- A number of evaluations have highlighted the lack of capacity of staff and partners to effectively respond to emergencies

²⁹ Analysis of emergency evaluations – a discussion paper, Emergency Unit, April 2001; Analysis of emergency evaluations – an updated discussion paper, Emergency Unit, April 2005; Review of Humanitarian Action and Emergency Response Meta Evaluation, 2005 – 2008, July 2009

8. Recommendations for improving and evaluating emergency response

Although Concern commissioned or carried out 40 evaluations of emergency response programmes in the reporting period, nearly half of the countries (12 out of 26) that implemented emergency programmes did not carry out any evaluations. Nor is it clear how many of the 166 emergency responses were evaluated or included in evaluations that were carried out. It is acknowledged that some of the responses were of a very small scale, but some of those that have not been evaluated have been large-scale or have been on-going for some time. This is a major loss of learning and value to the organisation and a greater commitment needs to be made to ensure that all emergency response are evaluated and in a timely fashion and that even the smallest response is looked at critically from an accountability and learning perspective.

Recommendations made in evaluations need to be followed up with documented management responses as to how and when the recommendations were addressed or progressed by the organisation. This will build organisational analysis and learning, and will reinforce accountability.

Following every significant emergency, organisational wash-up meetings need to take place at head office in a timely manner to ensure the organisation fully realises the opportunity to reflect on and the potential to learn from the specific response.

In addition to standard and accepted evaluation criteria – Red Cross Code of Conduct, People in Aid, Sphere, HAP, P4 and DAC – emergency response evaluations should also consider criteria related to advocacy, programme monitoring, exit strategies, and levels of preparedness (PEER) as standard, to be included in each terms of reference. Targeting analysis should more routinely reflect the total affected population, in addition to the affected population that was targeted by the response. It should also be noted that greater emphasis and weight needs to be given to the Red Cross Code of Conduct and People in Aid, when carrying out an evaluation, than is currently the practice.

The mainstreaming of cross cutting issues needs to be much better addressed at all stages of the emergency response cycle – from planning through design and implementation. Much greater emphasis on training and awareness and consistency of application are required in this area.

Monitoring in our emergency responses needs to improve and become more systematic and consistent. Generic impact and post distribution monitoring tools need to be applied that are easy to use, flexible and which can be easily adapted to different emergency situations and contexts.

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

Annexe I – Emergency Response Evaluations 2009 – 2012

Emergency Response Evaluations – 2009

Country	Title	Agency
Zimbabwe	Real Time Review of Concern's response to the Zimbabwe Cholera Epidemic 2008 to 2009 – April 2009	Concern
Ethiopia	Evaluation of the 2008 Emergency Programme – April 2009	Concern
Pakistan	Siran Valley Livelihood rehab Project 2007/2008 – July 2009	Concern
DRC	DEC 2008/2009 Monitoring Mission – July 2009	DEC
Chad	Evaluation of Concern Worldwide Programmes in Goz Beida, Eastern Chad – August 2009	Concern
Haiti	Evaluation of Concern's 2008/9 Haiti Hurricane Response – September 2009	Concern
DRC	Emergency Response in North Kivu – September 2009	Concern
DRC	End Evaluation of Concern Masisi Programme – September 2009	Concern
Somalia	Final evaluation of the Bay and Galgaduud Integrated Emergency Intervention in South Central Somalia – November 2009	Concern
Somalia	Final Evaluation of the Galad II recovery Project – November 2009	Concern

Emergency Response Evaluations – 2010

Country	Title	Agency
Uganda	Evaluation of Pilot Phase of Pader Support to Returnee Resettlement and Livelihoods Recovery Programme – January 2010	Concern
Bangladesh	Emergency and Rehab Response to Cyclone Sidr 2008 – January 2010	Concern
Kenya	Post-Election Violence recovery Prog 2008/2009 – February 2010	Concern
Kenya	Moyale Cross Sectorial Emergency Response Project 2009/2010 ECHO – May 2010	Concern
Haiti	RTE of the Response to the Haiti Earthquake – April 2010	Groupe URD
India	Building Resilient Communities Through Disaster Recovery – Lessons learned – July 2010	Concern
Zimbabwe	Evaluation of Zimbabwe Emergency Cash Transfer (ZECT) Programme – July 2010	Concern
Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe Gender and Cash Transfer Lessons Learning Study – September 2010	Concern
Haiti	Concern Response To Haiti Earthquake – October 2010	Concern
Somalia	Benadir and Afgoi Road Settlements Humanitarian Intervention – Phase II (BARSHI II) 2009/2010 – October 2010	Concern
Uganda	Evaluation of ECHO Funded Projects in Pader – October 2010	Concern
Pakistan	Responding to Pakistan's Internally Displaced RAPID Fund 2009/2011 Mid Term review – November 2010	Concern

Emergency Response Evaluations – 2011

Country	Title	Agency
Haiti	Evaluation of OCHA Response to the Haiti Earthquake – January 2011	OCHA
Haiti	Haiti Earthquake Response – Mapping and Analysis of Gaps and Duplications in Evaluations – February 2011	ALNAP
Niger	Evaluation effect of cash transfers on Nut Outcomes for Children in Niger-March 2011	Concern
Pakistan	Interagency RTE of the Humanitarian Response to the 2009 flood crisis – March 2011	DARA
Haiti	Urban disasters – lessons from Haiti. Study of member agencies' responses to the Haiti earthquake – March 2011	DEC
Pakistan	DEC Real Time Evaluation Report	DEC
Bangladesh	Hoar Flood Emergency Response – Lessons Learning Extract – April 2011	Concern
India	Alia Cyclone Early Recovery Project 2009/2010 West Bengal – April 2011	Concern

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

Somalia	Desk Review of 2011 Emergency- April 2011	Concern
Haiti	Real-time evaluation of humanitarian action supported by ECHO in Haiti 2009 to 2011 – April 2011	Groupe URD
Haiti	External Evaluation of the Haiti Emergency Relief & Response Fund (ERRF), 2008 to 2011 – April 2011	ERRF
Pakistan	Evaluation of Emergency Shelter, WASH and Basic HH Needs Programme – June 2011	DFID
Haiti	Evaluation of Infant Feeding Response in Haiti – one year after the earthquake (plus Annex(s) – June 2011	Concern
Pakistan	Emergency Response to 2010 Floods – June 2011	Concern
Somalia	Bay, Galgaduud and Lower Shabelle Emergency Project – July 2011	Concern
Bangladesh	Emergency Food Security and Livelihood Support in Cyclone Aila Affected Areas – Lessons Learnt – November 2011	Concern
Haiti	Transitional Shelter Prog – Haiti Emergency Response 2010/2011 Internal Programme Review - 2011	Concern

Emergency Response Evaluations – 2012

Country	Title	Agency
Bangladesh	Evaluation of Emergency Food Support in the Cyclone Aila Affected region of Bangladesh – January 2012	Oxfam
Bangladesh	Water Logging Response – Lessons Learnt – January 2012	Concern
Haiti	Haiti 2010 Earthquake Response Final Evaluation Report – January 2012	Humanitarian Coalition
Haiti	Interagency RTE of the Humanitarian Response to the Earthquake in Haiti – January 2012	IASC
East Africa	DEC Real Time Evaluation – East Africa Crisis Appeal Synthesis Report	DEC
Pakistan	Evaluation of the CBHA Early recovery Programme in Pakistan – February 2012	CBHA
Mozambique	Rapid Real Time Evaluation of the COSACA Response in Gaza – February 2012	COSACA
Pakistan	Livelihoods recovery for Flood Affected Populations in Sindh and Punjab 2011 – March 2012	Concern
India	Monsoon Floods 2011 Humanitarian Response – April 2012	Concern
Kenya	Kaijado Nutrition Prog 2009 to 2012 – May 2012	Concern
Kenya	Marsibit County Emergency Response Project 2011/2012 – May 2012	Concern
Mozambique	Evaluation of COSACA Response in Zambezia – May 2012	COSACA
DRC	Concern Emergency Response in North Kivu – July 2012	Concern
Bangladesh	Emergency Assistance Support to Water Logging Affected Populations in Bangladesh – Lessons Learnt – July 2012	Concern
Ethiopia	Emergency Response Programme 2011 – August 2012	Concern
India	Thane Cyclone Response Lessons Learnt – August 2012	Concern
India	Evaluation of Building Disaster Resilience of Vulnerable Communities in Orissa and West Bengal – September 2012	Concern
Pakistan	A2015 Provision of multi-sectoral humanitarian assistance to the flood and conflict affected population – October 2012	Alliance 2012
Sierra Leone	Evaluation of Emergency Response to 2012 Cholera Outbreak – November 2012	Concern

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

Annexe II – Concern Emergency Response Projects and Programmes 2009 to 2012³⁰

In 2009, Concern responded to 45 emergencies in 18 countries and directly assisted 2.497 million people			
Country	Type of Emergency	Type of Response	No. Direct Beneficiaries
Afghanistan	Conflict, Flooding	Shelter, cash for work, NFIs, irrigation, prepositioning	66,863
Bangladesh	Flooding	Water logging, shelter, WASH, livelihoods	192,205
Cambodia	Flooding	Food, livelihoods	27,210
Chad	Conflict, Flooding	Site management, NFIs	60,189
DRC	Conflict	NFI, vouchers, cash for work, livelihoods, WASH	83,839
Ethiopia	Drought, Malnutrition	Nutrition, WASH, livelihoods, health	66,866
India	Flooding	Shelter, NFIs, WASH, DRR	180,495
Indonesia	Earthquake	Shelter, cash for work, WASH	7,830
Kenya	Conflict, Drought	Cash transfers and vouchers, WASH, nutrition,	191,494
Liberia	Pest Infestation		3,500
Indonesia	Earthquake	Shelter, WASH	7,830
Niger	Flooding, Malnutrition	Nutrition, health, NFIs	78,712
Pakistan	Conflict	NFIs, WASH, health, livelihoods	77,360
Somalia	Conflict, Drought, Flooding	WASH, cash for work, cash transfers, shelter, NFIs, nutrition, food, livelihoods, psychosocial	280,456
South Sudan	Conflict, Flooding	NFIs, livelihoods, nutrition, health	27,752
North Sudan	Conflict	Health, nutrition, WASH, livelihoods, camp management, NFIs	350,666
Tanzania	Drought	Livelihoods	2,500
Uganda	Conflict	WASH	16,560
Zimbabwe	Food Insecurity, Cholera	Food, cash transfers, health	782,983

³⁰ Data taken from Concern Annual Programme Reports 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 (Draft)

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

In 2010, Concern responded to 41 emergencies in 16 countries and directly assisted 3.718 million people			
Country	Type of Emergency	Type of Response	No. Direct Beneficiaries
Afghanistan	Conflict, Flooding	Shelter, cash for work, NFIs, irrigation, DRR	30,416
Bangladesh	Flooding	Water logging, shelter, WASH, livelihoods	85,160
Cambodia	Fire	Support to Fire Victims	257
Chad	Conflict	Site management, NFIs, health , shelter	72,180
DRC	Conflict	NFIs, vouchers, cash for work, livelihoods, WASH	57,461
Ethiopia	Drought	Nutrition, WASH, livelihoods, health, livelihoods	161,426
Haiti	Earthquake	Nutrition, WASH, NFIs, shelter, camp management, education, cash for work, protection, cash transfers	461,262
India	Flooding	Shelter, NFIs, WASH, DRR	230,300
Kenya	Food Insecurity, Drought	Livelihoods, nutrition, social protection, cash transfers, food vouchers,	69,047
Niger	Food Insecurity, Drought	Nutrition, health, NFIs, livelihoods, cash transfers	331,035
Pakistan	Conflict, Flooding	NFIs, WASH, health, livelihoods, shelter	1,059,236
Somalia	Conflict, Flooding, Drought	WASH, cash for work, cash transfers, shelter, NFIs, nutrition, food, livelihoods, psychosocial	324,363
South Sudan	Flooding	NFIs	1,790
North Sudan	Conflict	Health, nutrition, WASH, livelihoods, camp management, NFIs	422,313
Tanzania	Flooding	WASH, NFIs, Livelihoods	25,505
Uganda	Conflict	WASH	8,125
Zimbabwe	Food Insecurity, Cholera	Food, cash transfers, health	378,242

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

In 2011, Concern responded to 37 emergencies in 19 countries and directly assisted 3.931 million people			
Country	Type of Emergency	Type of Response	No. Direct Beneficiaries
Afghanistan	Drought	Cash for work, cash transfers	16,306
Bangladesh	Flooding	Cash for Work, NFIs, WASH, livelihoods	42,721
Cambodia	Flooding	Food, NFIs	25,509
Chad	Conflict, Food Insecurity	WASH, food	99,253
DRC	Conflict	NFIs, vouchers, cash for work, livelihoods, WASH	54,775
Ethiopia	Drought, Flooding	Nutrition, WASH, livelihoods, health, livelihoods, shelter, education	299,989
Haiti	Earthquake	Nutrition, WASH, NFIs, shelter, camp management, education, cash for work, cash transfers, protection, livelihoods, DRR	273,620
India	Flooding	Shelter, NFIs, cash for work	168,270
Kenya	Food Insecurity	Livelihoods, nutrition, cash transfers	190,014
Liberia	Refugees	WASH, food, camp management, NFIs, livelihoods	25,057
Niger	Food Insecurity	Nutrition, livelihoods	25,311
Pakistan	Conflict, Flooding	Nutrition, NFIs, WASH, food, livelihoods, shelter	1,745,830
Somalia	Conflict, Drought, Food Insecurity	WASH, cash for work, shelter, NFIs, nutrition, food, livelihoods	343,440
South Sudan	Returnees	NFIs	7,695
North Sudan	Conflict	Health, nutrition, WASH, livelihoods, camp management, NFIs	428,029
Tanzania	Flooding, Civil Crisis	WASH, NFIs, Livelihoods, tracing, First Aid	47,625
Zimbabwe	Food Insecurity	Food, cash transfers	90,578
Zambia	Food Insecurity	DRR, WASH	46,407
Uganda			

Emergency Response Meta Evaluation 2009 – 2012

Emergency Unit – August 2013

In 2012, Concern responded to 43 emergencies in 20 countries and directly assisted 2.960 million people			
Country	Type of Emergency	Type of Response	No. Direct Beneficiaries
Afghanistan	Drought, Flooding	Cash for work, livelihoods, infrastructure, DRR	53,711
Bangladesh	Flooding	Water Logging, cash for work, NFIs, WASH, shelter	6,977
Burundi	Returnees, Refugees	Food, NFIs	3,426
Cambodia	Flooding	Food, WASH, cash transfers, livelihoods, DRR	43,842
Chad	Conflict, Food Insecurity	WASH, food, livelihoods, cash transfers, nutrition, health	83,195
DPRK	Cyclone	Infrastructure, education, livelihoods, DRR	2,075
DRC	Conflict	NFIs, vouchers, cash for work, infrastructure, livelihoods,	48,309
Ethiopia	Drought, Flooding	Food vouchers, nutrition, livelihoods, DRR	53,365
Haiti	Earthquake	WASH, shelter, camp management, cash for work, livelihoods, DRR, protection	207,560
India	Flooding, Fire	Shelter, cash for work, cash transfers, DRR	57,241
Kenya	Food Insecurity	Livelihoods, nutrition, cash transfers	359,856
Malawi	Food Insecurity	Nutrition, cash transfers	1,691
Mozambique	Flooding	Livelihoods, food, shelter, infrastructure	5,744
Niger	Food Insecurity	Nutrition, livelihoods	332,064
Pakistan	Flooding	NFIs, WASH, shelter	947,681
Sierra Leone	Cholera Response	WASH, NFIs	256,321
Somalia	Conflict, Drought	Food vouchers, WASH, shelter, nutrition,	385,904
South Sudan	Conflict, Returnees	NFIs	662
Sudan	Conflict	Health, nutrition, WASH, livelihoods, health, NFIs	106,819
Uganda	Food Insecurity	Nutrition, case finding,	3,433