The NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project Phase 2

NHRPII Evaluation

19 July 2013

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all those who provided assistance and support for this evaluation.

ICVA's project coordinator, DRC's compliance manager and the former NHRPII project managers shared valuable insights. Staff of ACF, ACTED, CAFOD and DRC, consultants, agencies and networks in Côte d'Ivoire, Pakistan, Somalia and Zimbabwe gave their views of the project despite web access or phone connections that were sometimes difficult.

I am particularly grateful to Mikkel Jensen who responded to numerous requests for documentation, to Liliane Bitong who kindly translated evaluation invitations and questions from English into French, and to CWS in Pakistan who endeavoured to engage informants in the evaluation.

Responsibility for all omissions or errors of fact or interpretation is my own.

Sara Davidson

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms

ACF	Action Contre La Faim
ACTED	Agence d'Aide à la Coopération Technique et au Développement
CAFOD	Catholic Agency for Overseas Development
CRDA	Christian Relief and Development Association (Ethiopia)
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
ECHO	European Community Humanitarian Office
ERF	Emergency Response Fund
ESC	Emergency Shelter Cluster
FPA	Framework Partnership Agreement
HAP	Humanitarian Accountability Partnership
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
HINGO	Humanitarian INGO Forum (Ethiopia)
HR	Human Resources
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
ICVA	International Council of Voluntary Agencies
IRIN	Integrated Regional Information Networks
NANGO	National Association of NGOs (Zimbabwe)
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NHN	National Humanitarian Network (Pakistan)
NHRPII	NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project Phase II
OCHA	See UNOCHA
OFADEC	Office Africain pour le Développement et la Coopération (Senegal)
PAM	See WFP
PHAP	Professionals in Humanitarian Assistance and Protection
PHF	Pakistan Humanitarian Forum
SHOC	Somali Humanitarian Operational Consortium
TOIL	Time off in lieu
UN	United Nations
UNOCHA	UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WASDA	Wajir South Development Agency
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WFP	United Nations World Food Programme

Executive Summary

Effective humanitarian partnerships are about more than mechanistic relationships where actors come together to achieve a set of common objectives, dividing up responsibilities and planning joint work. [1]

The first NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project (NHRPI) ended prematurely in 2010 after a review of funding priorities by its donor, DFID. In January 2011, ICVA proposed a second project to ECHO. The aim of NHRPII was to improve humanitarian response through better NGO coordination and better engagement with international and national humanitarian coordination mechanisms.

ICVA, together with a group of international NGOs, began a four-month start-up phase, funded by ECHO, in September 2011. Agencies participating were ACF, ACTED, ActionAid, CAFOD, and the Danish Refugee Council (DRC). ICVA provided overall project coordination and led on global policy issues. DRC as grant holder led on financial and compliance management.

NHRPII focused on Côte d'Ivoire (ACF), Ethiopia (CAFOD), Pakistan (ACTED), Somalia (DRC) and Zimbabwe (ActionAid). Three months into the start-up phase in November 2011, an application for a 16-month project was submitted to ECHO.

The longer project was scheduled to begin in January 2012 and end in April 2013. Because of uncertainty about the application's success, most of the participating agencies postponed recruitment of project managers in focus countries. This in turn delayed the start of the substantive project in all countries but Ethiopia where the project nevertheless ended in early 2012 after government approval was withheld.

Participating agencies were represented at global meetings of a core group by a senior policy manager. In each focus country, a NHRPII project manager reported to his or her host agency via its country director, and to ICVA's project coordinator in Geneva.

NHRPII and its aims were well understood by stakeholders in Ethiopia and Zimbabwe where NHRPI had taken place but less so initially by host agencies and/or NGO networks in Côte d'Ivoire, Pakistan and Somalia. Late recruitment, change of focus country, staff turnover in host agencies or lack of adequate consultation at project design stage contributed to challenges.

Project manager workloads were high, in part owing to the scale and context of the project and its fixed deadline. The shortened time frame and multiple reporting lines also added to challenges in focus countries and in Geneva. However, project activities were relevant and project staff in focus countries and Geneva were commended by most informants for doing difficult jobs well.

Anne Street, Humanitarian partnerships: what do they really mean? *Humanitarian Exchange Magazine*, HPN Issue 50, April 2011

Capacity-building was inclusive. It was delivered in locally appropriate languages by national and international providers and, where possible, away from capital cities. Capacity-building was very well-received and providers of formal and informal learning in Côte d'Ivoire, Pakistan, Somalia and Zimbabwe highly regarded. In post-crisis contexts in Zimbabwe and Côte d'Ivoire, NHRPII contributed to preparedness and to linkages with recovery and development.

Some INGO informants were sceptical about capacity-building, believing that it raised false expectations and was weakened by lack of follow-up. However, NHRPII was able to demonstrate how demand for capacity-building, essential to underpin other aspects of NHRPII, could be met. In Somalia NHRPII contributed to the inclusion of capacity-building in the longer term work of the NGO Consortium, INGOs and the Somalia Consolidated Appeal (CAP).

Work to strengthen NGO coordination mechanisms extended their scope of work or geographic reach, and encouraged national and international NGOs to take up or make better use of places in Humanitarian Country Teams, national and regional clusters, and funding boards. Strengthening coordination mechanisms was regarded by informants as an important task requiring longer-term support.

ICVA's role in global policy lacked an explicit strategy and could have invited greater involvement by global partners. However, NHRPII staff and project participants informed and influenced issues of concern to NGOs at global level. Global outputs include a Humanitarian Reform glossary, first developed in Pakistan and further developed for global use, changes to the global guidelines of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee on distribution of the ERF, and information on Humanitarian Reform and the Transformative Agenda for NGOs, donors and governments. Visibility of these outputs and achievements, including research documentation, would have been enhanced by easier access to the ICVA website.

With funding from AusAid, NHRPII brought a group of national NGO leaders to Geneva. A dedicated symposium, followed by the annual ICVA conference, provided opportunities for participants to share experience on coordination and advocacy. It also demonstrated partnership and how leaders whose voices are infrequently heard in global forums can and should participate in international policy discussion.

NHRPII helped national NGOs to forge stronger links with one another and with INGOs, with OCHA, national government and / or UN agencies in focus countries. While it was important to demonstrate the outcomes of partnership in terms of effectiveness and efficiency, the partnership pillar of Humanitarian Reform also encompasses the principle of equality. Partnership as a value was appreciated by national NGOs in countries where relationships between national and international agencies were not strong or previous approaches to partnership perceived as top-down.

It was too soon to see the impact of NHRPII on large-scale operations in focus countries where humanitarian response operations were ongoing. Exit strategy, part of relationship-building and accountability to partners, needed to be more proactive in most focus countries. Nevertheless, NHRPII contributed to greater awareness of NNGO rights, roles and status in HCT meetings, funding forums, and operational partnerships. Evidence includes outreach or follow-up on capacity-building by OCHA in some

countries, closer NGO relationships with governments, and the amendments to ERF procedures. The cascading of training and the leveraging of financial resources for capacity-building from major INGOs and the Somalia CAP are likely to contribute to further change.

NHRPII was effective in raising awareness of leadership by national NGOs and networks frequently omitted, sidelined or excluded from coordination mechanisms or seen as junior implementing partners. It provided NGOs and networks with additional resources and expertise. Because of NHRPI and NHRPII, it is difficult to think of international humanitarian coordination, funding or leadership without thinking about the role of NGOs in general and that of national NGOs in particular.

Recommendations to ICVA

a. Capacity-building

CB1 ICVA should consult stakeholders to develop a core 'menu' of topics and methods for capacity-building for NGOs and NGO networks in the context of Humanitarian Reform. Stakeholders should be involved in deciding objectives and outcomes.

CB2 Stakeholders consulted should include participants in NHRPI I activities; members of the public in communities receiving humanitarian assistance from NHRPII participants; former project staff and training providers (including inter-agency groups such as InterAction and standards networks); staff of existing coordination mechanisms; representatives of NGOs, governments, global clusters, ICVA members and OCHA.

CB3 Core capacity-building will include coordination, funding, leadership, and accountability to affected persons. Capacity-building on leadership should include the particular challenge of leadership in alliances, consortia, networks, partnerships or clusters as well as leadership in unitary organisations.

CB4 ICVA's core 'menu' should draw on the work of existing capacity-building and Humanitarian Reform learning providers. This will avoid duplication, build on and share good practice and assist NGOs in making direct links with providers.

CB5 ICVA should consider competences that underpin Humanitarian Reform processes and knowledge that advances understanding of context. Capacity-building can include advocacy, assertiveness, cross-cultural understanding, diversity, effective meetings, gender, history, governance, relationship building, etc.

CB6 In developing options, ICVA should continue to consider how it can target key staff who habitually miss out on learning, for example senior managers or those in rural

areas, and whether to accredit learning for individuals, in accordance with good practice in the sector.[2]

b. Strengthening coordination mechanisms

CM1 ICVA should develop information in locally appropriate languages for national and international staff of UN agencies, governments, cluster lead agencies and NGOs about the role of NGOs in Humanitarian Reform structures and the principles of partnership.

CM2 ICVA should inform and involve OCHA in Geneva and at national level during planning, implementation and exit in order to maximise opportunities for support, sustainability and complementarity.

CM3 ICVA should avoid lending personnel to support network secretariats unless a counterpart is available to make the role sustainable (and see GP2).

CM4 Representatives of existing coordination mechanisms and NGO networks should be among stakeholders consulted and involved in capacity-building and project design (see CB2).

c. Informing and advancing global policy discussions

GP1 Global and national advocacy on NGOs and Humanitarian Reform should be supported by an explicit strategy. Information should be freely available in hard copy, at country level in locally appropriate languages, and on open access web pages.

GP2 In addition to promoting access to pooled funds for NGOs, ICVA should advocate for donor contributions to core funding to strengthen the secretariats of national and international NGO networks. This will assist such networks in playing a greater role in humanitarian coordination and preparedness. Without core funding, national NGOs lack collective visibility and are at a disadvantage compared with government, INGO or UN agencies.

GP3 ICVA should inform and involve the global clusters in its work on Humanitarian Reform. It should work with cluster lead agencies to bring national NGO/network representatives to policy forums, meetings and conferences to enable NNGO voices to be heard and to demonstrate partnership.

GP4 Campaigns that target UN agencies and INGOs need to be sustained and repeated in order to address the problem of short contracts and rapid staff turnover.

d. Collaboration and partnership

P1 In accordance with the principles of partnership and equality and the primary role of national actors in humanitarian response, ICVA should challenge the notion of a single,

---

[2] People In Aid (2003), People In Aid Code, Principle 6, http://www.peopleinaid.org/code/online.aspx

international 'humanitarian architecture.' It should seek to strengthen understanding of national responsibility for humanitarian response and national systems. Where possible, ICVA should include national government, local NGOs and local staff in capacity-building programmes, as teachers as well as learners.

P2 ICVA should continue to represent partnership as a value and as a pillar of Humanitarian Reform and demonstrate this in its work on capacity-building, strengthening coordination mechanisms, and on global policy (see GP3).

P3 Capacity-building should include leadership in collaborative alliances (see CB3). The building of partnership and collaboration should begin *before* an emergency, during development, preparedness or transition wherever possible.

P4 Having worked via INGO partners in NHRPI and NHRPII, ICVA should consider how to co-locate regional work on Humanitarian Reform and NGOs with national NGO hosts. This would also enable ICVA to build on the work of the NNGO symposium and ICVA conference of 2013.

e. Impact and sustainability

IS1 ICVA should decide with its stakeholders the changes and outcomes in respect of Humanitarian Reform they wish to see. Key stakeholders for this purpose will include NGOs, cluster lead agencies, OCHA and UN agencies, as well as donors.

IS2 Attributing change to any one agency or programme is difficult when agencies collaborate and systems overlap. ICVA should seek assistance from members and partners to develop indicators of change, sustainability and impact in work on Humanitarian Reform.

IS3 Lessons from NHRPI and NHRPII on project design and implementation as well as on Humanitarian Reform should be collated in order that ICVA and its members can enhance work in future partnerships, collaboration and coordination.

1. Introduction

1.1   Evaluation Background

The first NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project (NHRPI) started in 2008. It sought to challenge a debate often seen as polarising opinion on Humanitarian Reform, with UN agencies on one side and NGOs on the other. The inter-agency project acknowledged the roles and responsibilities of national and international NGOs in implementing Humanitarian Reform and began to focus on leadership by them.[3]

Project officers hosted by British NGOs in Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia and Zimbabwe were implementing the recommendations of initial studies when the project closed following a review of funding priorities by its donor, the UK Department for International Development.[4]

In January 2011, ICVA submitted a concept note to ECHO for a two-year project in six countries, which would build on the earlier project's findings and recommendations. Its aim was to involve those agencies that had participated in the earlier project and other NGOs.[5]

ICVA's concept note emphasised the importance of involving national NGOs and existing NGOs networks in country choice and project design. The choice of focus country rested with ICVA, DRC and other participating NGOs, with some input from ECHO.

The substantive project was shortened to 16 months following discussions on cost with OCHA.[6] In September 2011, a four month start-up phase funded by ECHO began. This phase was intended to allow time for assessments in Côte d'Ivoire, Libya, and Zimbabwe, for work to begin in Ethiopia and Somalia, for final choice of focus countries and for recruitment of field-based programme managers ahead of the substantive project scheduled to start in January 2012.

The choice of focus country narrowed to Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Libya, Somalia, and Zimbabwe. However, by November 2011 the humanitarian response in Libya was ending and ACTED instead chose Pakistan as focus country.[7] By March 2012, the

---

[3] Andy Featherstone, (2010), *Fit for the Future? Strengthening the leadership pillar of Humanitarian Reform, NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project*

[4] Letter from CHAD to ActionAid, Department for International Development, 4 August 2010

[5] NGOs and Humanitarian Reform project (NHRP): the second phase,   Concept Note for ECHO 21 January 2011

[6] Core Group Discussion, ECHO Proposal on NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Friday, 8 April 2011, 12:00, Meeting Note by ICVA

[7] Draft core group decisions and action points November 2011, NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project Phase II Meeting of Core Group 21st November 2011, Decisions and Action points

Ethiopian government continued to withhold approval for NHRPII or grant a visa. The project there effectively ended.[8] Notwithstanding changes of focus country, however, initial work in Libya and Ethiopia resulted in studies, strategies, recommendations and/or advocacy, and the start-up consultant in Ethiopia became project manager in Pakistan.

NHRPII was implemented via a consortium of agencies responsible for leading on strategic management.[9] Participating agencies were to recruit, host and 'embed'[10] NHRPII project managers with help from nominated core group members and head offices. NHRPII project managers would report to country directors but receive technical guidance and support from successive global project coordinators appointed by ICVA.[11] A list of participating agencies and their roles by the end of the project in April 2013 is shown below.

NHRPII: role of participating agencies, April 2013

Agency	Focus country	Global
ACTED	Pakistan	Core group member
Action Contre la Faim (ACF)	Côte d'Ivoire	Core group member
ActionAid	Zimbabwe	Core group member
CAFOD	Ethiopia	Core group member
Danish Refugee Council (DRC)	Somalia	a) Core group member
		b) Compliance manager
ICVA	-	a) Core group member
		b) Project coordinator

Each participating agency was required contribute to the 20% of total budget not met by ECHO. A draft terms of reference asked core group members, most policy managers in their agencies, to advise the project coordinator appointed by ICVA, and to communicate any issues raised by their host agency via quarterly meetings chaired by ICVA or DRC.[12]

A contract for a 16-month implementation period ending in April 2013 was signed by DRC and ECHO at the end of January 2012. Each participating agency signed a contract with DRC which appointed a compliance manager.

The principal objective of NHRPII was

---

[8] NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project Phase II, Meeting of Core Group - 2 March 2012 , Minutes. The minutes suggest that non-receipt of a report on NHRPI was among the reasons in Ethiopia where the role and status of INGOs in general remain controversial (Lautze et al, 2009).

[9] https://icvanetwork.org/node/6129

[10] Core Group Discussion, ECHO Proposal on NGOs and Humanitarian Reform, Friday, 8 April 2011, 12:00, Meeting Note by ICVA

[11] NGOs and Humanitarian Reform project (NHRP): the second phase, Concept Note for ECHO 21 January 2011

[12] Draft as of 5 April 2011, ToRs for the Core Strategic Group of the *NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project Phase II*

Improved humanitarian response through better NGO coordination and engagement with (international and national) humanitarian coordination.

Its specific objective was

To enhance NGO (national and international) representation, participation and leadership in Humanitarian Reform and other coordination forums for improved performance.

1.2 Evaluation Purpose and Objectives

In accordance with the Terms of Reference (Annex D), the overall purpose of this evaluation is to evaluate results against the objectives set out in the NHRPII application to ECHO, based on the agreed indicators, and to give recommendations for future activities to strengthen NGO engagement and leadership in Humanitarian Reform and the Transformative Agenda.

To fulfil this objective, the evaluation is expected to consider but not be limited to a) project relevance, b) collaboration and partnerships, and c) impact and sustainability.

1.3 Methodology

The evaluation employed desk review, semi-structured interviews and written responses to questions.

a) Desk review

The purpose of the desk review was to identify activities undertaken by ICVA, core group agencies and others in order to establish what outputs have been achieved. It also considered the impact of these activities to the extent that this could be ascertained.

b) Semi-structured interview

Questionnaire and / or informant interviews involved key stakeholders in Europe, Asia and Africa, including

- Current and former NHRPII project staff and/or consultants in Côte d'Ivoire, Pakistan, Somalia and Zimbabwe
- Core group members from ACF, ACTED, CAFOD and DRC
- Host agency representatives in Côte d'Ivoire, Pakistan and Somalia
- External partner agency representatives in Côte d'Ivoire, Pakistan, Somalia and Zimbabwe

Just over 50 informants responded. A sample questionnaire and a list of informants are included at Annexes B and C respectively.

1.4 Limitations

The following limitations apply to the evaluation.

(i)   Initial selection of informants a was made by the project coordinator in conjunction with project managers for Côte d'Ivoire, Pakistan and Somalia. Staff changes meant that successive core group members and the project manager at ActionAid were unavailable. In this case, informants in Zimbabwe were sought via ICVA in Geneva.

Invitations to participate in the evaluation were distributed by the consultant in English in Pakistan, Somalia and Zimbabwe, and in English and French in Côte d'Ivoire. In Côte d'Ivoire, NHRPII's project manager distributed written questions to a large group of national NGOs. This was highly effective in increasing response though may inadvertently have introduced bias.

(ii)   No travel was undertaken with the exception of a briefing visit to Geneva. Much of NHRPII's field work and research was conducted in local languages in areas where internet access was limited. Though a large number of evaluation informants responded to invitations in English or French, face to face interviews would have increased and enriched findings from speakers of Somali or Urdu.

(iii)   Some internal reporting on activities and meetings was oral rather than written hence this report may have understated some activities.

2. Findings

2.1   Work plans

National work plans were initially based on the global template developed in Geneva. This reflected an extensive range of activities due to take place over the course of a 16 month project scheduled to start in January 2012 and end in April 2013.

The 16-month application to ECHO was submitted in November 2011.[13] Owing to uncertainty about funding, the recruitment and deployment of project managers in most host agencies began only in February 2012. In Ethiopia, the start-up coordinator remained in post until March 2012. Project managers began work in Somalia in late February, Pakistan and Zimbabwe in May 2012 and in Côte d'Ivoire in July after re-advertisement of the post.

All but one project manager was an expatriate. Three were new to the countries in which they worked. Job descriptions and person specifications refer to networking and the building of stakeholder relationships and the need for such activities was well understood by project managers.[14]

> *For the first month or two, I didn't do very much, to be honest, because I didn't know anyone and had to make contact with local people and agencies. (Project manager)*

> *I think [project manager] did a huge amount of work with agencies, talking to them, getting a sense of where they were. (Pakistan)*

> *I had an OCHA list with 140 names and one line per organisation. (Project manager)*

The approach taken by project managers is exemplified in an August 2012 paper from Zimbabwe, which describes the process of building consensus among stakeholders around capacity-building for the NANGO network in Zimbabwe.[15] However, the building and sustaining of relationships did not feature in work plans. The 'invisibility', of soft management issues coupled with the delayed start may help explain frustration by some counterparts.

> *By the time [project manager] was recruited, we were four months into the project … we were six months in before [project manager] could perform. (Host)*

---

[13] NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project Phase II, Meeting of Core Group, 21st November 2011, Decisions and Action points

[14] NHRPI's work on leadership highlights the need for understanding of 'softer' issues (Featherstone, 2010).

[15] Joram Chikwanya, 18 August 2012, Consensus Building on the need to build the capacity of NANGO for Humanitarian Coordination

Relationship building was also necessary to repair trust sometimes damaged before project managers arrived. Lack of involvement during the planning stage or lack of communication with key partners, including NGO networks, resulted in confusion or even suspicion among key counterparts in two countries.

Host agency country directors had not always been involved in discussions about the NHRPII project. Staff turnover meant that some who *had* been involved were not in post by the time NHRPII project managers began work. Host agencies were required by their contracts with DRC 'to ensure swift and smooth implementation and supervision of [project] activities in accordance with the agreed work plan.' Country offices worked hard to provide support. However, competing priorities or agency administrative controls sometimes frustrated project managers whose role required them to be fast-acting change-makers.

> *We want to be more involved at global level in coordination … so this project fits with the strategy and involvement in … global coordination … I wouldn't say it fits because [our agency] is beginning in this field so we are not used to doing this kind of project. (Host)*

> *[I was] isolated from the rest of the office, work delayed by sign-off from country representative, long delays in receiving salary/expenses, didn't receive time off in lieu owed for work required outside of usual office hours. (Project manager)*

One country director, having read the contract, not unreasonably concluded that the country team rather than the NHRPII manager was responsible for managing, delivering and monitoring project outputs in accordance with normal agency procedures.

> *From the wording of the MoU … we'd assumed we were implementing the project. (Host)*

Such factors contributed to pressure on project managers in posts where work loads were high. The project manager for Somalia covered a country divided in three and was based in a fourth country, Kenya, from where many INGOs led their programmes. The first project manager for Pakistan, previously the start-up coordinator in Ethiopia, left her post early. In Côte d'Ivoire, the need to re-advertise the post meant that the NHRPII manager began work approximately six months after the project was scheduled to start.

Project managers were generally praised by informants for hard work and commitment in seeking to build relationships and achieve a range of high quality outputs in limited time. The project coordinator and compliance manager in Geneva provided support for project managers and made field visits to help explain the project, financial management and reporting to host agencies. The comment below from Pakistan found an echo in other focus countries.

> *I think the credit for any success it has had is to the individuals involved who were prepared to work with what they had. The lesson learned going forward is to ensure that there is full consultation. (Pakistan)*

2.2 Activities

Work plans specified the following project activities:

- Build structures, capacity, and skills for NGOs to assume active membership and leadership in Humanitarian Reform forums (Result 1)
- Strengthen in-country coordination mechanisms (Result 2)
- Ensure that country-level challenges and good practices inform and advance global policy discussions (Result 3)

Each of these is considered below.

a) Capacity-building

Capacity-building was viewed positively by national NGOs. Leadership workshops for national NGOs in Pakistan were significantly over-subscribed and had to be repeated. A workshop on advocacy for international NGOs, planned in conjunction with the INGO network Pakistan Humanitarian Forum (PHF) in Pakistan was also appreciated.

> *The best thing they did? The workshop they did with national NGOs … I don't think they [NNGOs] fully understood that they had an absolute right to attend meetings that are of operational relevance to them. (Pakistan)*

> *It was an excellent training … these people were going to high-level meetings with the UN, with the government: but how do we affectively engage and take on that role when this isn't something we've necessarily done before? (Pakistan)*

In Côte d'Ivoire and Zimbabwe, emergencies were largely over and the transition to development under way. NHRPII's relevance was questioned by some but capacity-building was generally viewed positively and seen as contributing to preparedness.

> *This phase of the project should have been implemented in 2011 … at the same time the NGOs would not have had the same amount of time to be trained, organised, etc... [If] new coordination mechanisms are set up, the place of NGOs will be more efficient in those bodies. (Côte d'Ivoire)*

> *We are now attending cluster meetings and also representing other organisations in these cluster meetings … Capacity building programmes were relevant and good. (Zimbabwe)*

In Côte d'Ivoire, capacity-building was delivered in French by organisations that included Bioforce and ICRC, and experience shared by the Senegalese NGO OFADEC.

> *OFADEC, a Senegalese NGO, was invited to the partners' meeting. They showed how a NNGO can be represented and can participate in coordination and humanitarian finance mechanisms. (Côte d'Ivoire)*

National NGOs in Somalia undertook leadership training delivered by PHAP in Nairobi, alongside counterparts from Ethiopia and Zimbabwe, then cascaded training.

> *NHRP, they trained our programme coordinator in leadership and innovation, which is very important for us. He trained our local NGOs. (Somalia)*

Given the primacy of national actors in humanitarian response, learning about national context and national humanitarian structures might also have been of value for international NGOs.[16] Two INGO informants in Pakistan said they had expected to learn more from the experience of NHRPII and humanitarian coordination in other countries, for example, how national and international response systems interacted.

> *[Pakistan has] a very strong government state and they don't necessarily want international assistance and so we were looking at what works in other countries? What systems are in place in other countries? (Pakistan)*

CARE in Pakistan saw NHRPII's role in capacity-building as complementing its support for advocacy with national NGOs.

> *The leadership training ... has been useful and good. Some of the work … was linking to our project … and [that] has been helpful. (Pakistan)*

NHRPII contributed to the inclusion of capacity-building in the work of the Somali NGO Consortium and the Somalia Consolidated Appeal (CAP) 2013-2015.

> *The experience of interacting with NHRPII discussions are so helpful as currently CARE Somalia and Oxfam have a partnership that is … building capacity of local Somali NGOs as part of the Consolidated Appeal for Somalia (2013-2015). The experiences from NHRPII remains key in the proposed activities by this program. (Somalia)*

> *This project highlighted the importance of the capacity-building of NGOs. We have assisted in the first stand-alone capacity-building CAP proposal. We were able to push that. That was a very, very good contribution of this project. (Somalia)*

Workshops and training on Humanitarian Reform, including, leadership, standards, accountability, evidence-based programming and preparedness, were seen as appropriate during or after the emergency phase by national NGOs. However, some INGOs cautioned that capacity-building raised false expectations and was of limited value in contributing to change, particularly if follow-up was not possible.

> *You can make one or two workshops but it's not sufficient for really improving people's knowledge about how emergency aid is working. (Côte d'Ivoire)*

> *The leadership training was taking place with Somalis who had no access to the process at all … What we needed was a very massive campaign at capital level to say 'You're being paid to do this stuff, OCHA! What is going on?' (Somalia)*

---

[16] NGO Code of Conduct: Principle 6; Sphere Core Standard 2

They could have utilized their funding in such a way that it focuses more on follow up activities, rather than reaching out to as many organizations as possible through trainings. (Pakistan)

b) Strengthening coordination mechanisms

A key aim of NHRPII was support to existing forums and consortia in order to strengthen local and international humanitarian coordination. With the exception of Côte d'Ivoire, all focus countries had humanitarian NGO forums in place.

In Pakistan, MoUs were drawn up between ACTED, ICVA and two networks, PHF and NHN in May 2012. A work plan was agreed with the Somalia NGO Consortium in Nairobi to ensure roles did not overlap. In Zimbabwe, support work with NANGO, the main NGO forum, included discussions with stakeholders and an external evaluation to strengthen its communication with members and to bolster the representation of national NGOs in Humanitarian Reform and transition structures.

In Ethiopia, the start-up coordinator worked with members of the Humanitarian INGO Forum (HINGO), started during NHRPI, to provide secretariat support and develop a 2012 strategy and work plan. Similar support was offered to the NNGO network, CRDA. Strategy included accountability to affected communities, and the project manager worked to bring the HAP (Humanitarian Accountability Partnership) members' working group in Ethiopia into HINGO

NGO forums also strengthened NHRPII. Project managers for Pakistan and Somalia were partly co-located with NGO forums. This helped give NHRPII local visibility. It aided managers in building relationships with individual consortium members and in developing local advisory groups for NHRPII's work. However, for project managers already reporting to a host agency and Geneva, it added another reporting line, to consortium directors. It also placed additional responsibilities on small secretariats.

In addition, alliance managers needed operational autonomy if they were to manage different stakeholder expectations and contribute to change. In one focus country, a project manager was torn between roles in local and global advocacy, the latter seen as low priority locally,

> *It was very awkward for [project manager] being between three entities … we all demanded slightly different things … (Network)*

In circumstances such as these, one informant suggested, providing additional human resources to an organisation such as OCHA, to assist it in involving NGOs in Humanitarian Reform, might have been a way forward.

The relationship with national NGOs and forums appears to have been easier and support by project managers was welcomed: national NGOs generally had fewer funds or staff and fewer opportunities for generic training, particularly outside capital cities. In Pakistan, the first project manager provided secretariat support to NHN and helped it extend activities to

provincial and district levels. NHRPII also helped bring NHN and PHF, both members of the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT), closer.

> *If the space for INGOs is shrinking in Pakistan and at the other side space for NNGOs is increasing … In this situation … what NHRP did was much needed. … Without the help of NHRPII, I don't think NHN would have been in a position to build this structure. (Pakistan)*

> *… we started an advocacy programme with NHN. Through that, we started working closely with [NHRPII project manager] … There was a lot of complementarity on how to strengthen NHN. (Pakistan)*

> *The project took up some of the plans that PHF had and moved them forward faster than perhaps would have happened without – for example … trying to do joint advocacy was spearheaded by the NHRPII project. That might not have been the particular aim of it but it did bring us together faster. (Pakistan)*

NHRPII was seen as strengthening awareness of Humanitarian Reform structures and how agency roles within them could be better used.

> *… when you had people at cluster meetings [before], they were not necessarily contributing to them … I started to get information from the HCT that I wasn't being made aware of before. (Pakistan)*

> *National NGOs were already in the HCT and ERF board but there was a sense that this was being managed too centrally via NANGO in Harare – through this project, the next representatives will come from regionally based NGOs. (Zimbabwe)*

Monthly networking meetings in Côte d'Ivoire started with six NNGO participants, rose to nearly 50 and averaged 24 by the project's end when a NNGO network and web portal were established. An additional seat for NGOs was secured in the HCT in Côte d'Ivoire and research on partnership there valued.

> *A great job was done in the view of local NGOs, and it enabled them to strengthen capacity and form a network. (Côte d'Ivoire)*

> *This project also made it possible for these organisations [NGOs] to have greater representation at national level in respect of humanitarian coordination (the HCT). They went from two representatives to three though it had been thought they would be given only one place this year. (Côte d'Ivoire)*

c) Informing and advancing global policy discussions

NHRP is 'A chance to influence the humanitarian system.' Its key aim was to influence global decision-making through a "bottom-up" approach that would establish priorities in focus countries and build on these in work at global level. [17]

---

[17] NGOs and Humanitarian Reform project (NHRPII): the second phase, Concept Note for ECHO

The project commissioned research, lesson-learning and documentation for this purpose at focus country level and produced well-designed publications (see Annex A). Focus country project managers came to Geneva to contribute to joint meetings and briefed the core group and ECHO Technical Advisors. In December 2011, the Ethiopia start-up coordinator advocated on behalf of NGOs for changes to the Emergency Response Fund (ERF), and to raise awareness of NHRPII with UN agencies, donors and NGOs in Washington and New York. The visit was followed by a letter about the ERF from the HINGO network to OCHA in January 2012.

In December 2012, donors were invited to a briefing by project managers on Humanitarian Reform and the Transformative Agenda at the EU delegation in Geneva. An international symposium funded by AusAid brought NNGO participants in NHRPII to Geneva in 2013. There they shared experience about coordination and advocacy before taking part in ICVA's annual conference, in some cases leading working group discussions.

> *I can say that the visit to Geneva helped me to understand the Humanitarian Reform project because the symposium was a platform for exchanging and sharing experience from project beneficiary countries on their coordination mechanisms, and on their capacity to influence decisions at national and international level. This was a rich and constructive experience. (Côte d'Ivoire)*

> *[NHRPII] has taken time to listen to the concerns of local NGOs who usually don't have a voice in terms of influencing the humanitarian sector, especially in terms of grand scale strategy and terms of partnerships. It has given these organisations the confidence to advocate for their rights and to create better partnerships. I personally enjoyed having the opportunity to meet humanitarian actors from other countries. (Zimbabwe)*

It is difficult to measure and attribute the effects of advocacy and policy work, particularly in the short-term. Nonetheless, the contribution to global messaging by NHRPII is evident. Global outputs include a Humanitarian Reform glossary, first developed in Pakistan and translated into Urdu, French and Somali; changes to the IASC's global guidelines on distribution of the ERF; a note to government donors and guidance for NGOs on the Transformative Agenda, issued jointly with InterAction and the Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response. ICVA's draft guide to humanitarian coordination, published in May 2013, references NHRPI (though not NHRPII).

Less evident is a global campaign strategy. The concept note placed responsibility for global policy on ICVA's then Executive Director and emphasised the use of ICVA's new website. Draft terms of reference for the core group first included (March 2012) then appear to have dropped (April 2012) a global policy role for members. A global role did not feature in members' contracts with DRC and, with the exception of CAFOD, there are few up to date references to NHRPII and its work on core group member websites.[18]

---

21 January 2011

[18] Links below correct at 19 July 2013:

ACTED http://www.acted.org/en/ngo-and-humanitarian-reform-project-ii-nhrp-ii-start
ActionAid Zimbabwe http://www.actionaid.org/zimbabwe/2012/08/zimbabwe-commemorates-world-humanitarian-day

However, CAFOD made use of NHRPII products to inform long-term policy work on funding for national NGOs. It involved NGOs from Pakistan and Côte d'Ivoire in its research after meeting NNGO representatives in Geneva in 2013 and included information on Humanitarian Reform. ACTED and CAFOD presented ACTED's research on Libya, conducted during the start-up phase, to DFID in London and OCHA in Geneva. Core group members recognised the project's achievements but thought there was more that could be done.

> *NHRPII didn't develop a global advocacy platform just a series of reports …*
> *Much more could be done. (Host)*

> *There weren't asks necessarily of the core group in terms of moving their own*
> *agencies forward or doing international policy work through their own*
> *governments. (Host)*

Websites were developed by focus country managers in Côte d'Ivoire and Somalia. In Somalia, *www.hrs.info* carried basic information about NHRPII in plain English until the project ended. In Côte d'Ivoire, the *Humanitaire et Développement* site went online at the end of NHRPII, coinciding with the start-up of the new NNGO network. This site remains online and, at the time of writing, carries basic information about network members, job advertisements and global information from ICVA and IRIN.[19]

Much of ICVA's own website, including learning from NHRPII focus countries, lies behind a members-only pay wall. The main ICVA site was under redesign in 2012-13 and this led to difficulties in accessing background documents and to some lack of project visibility.

> *People didn't know so much about what ICVA does at global level. When*
> *[counterpart] tried to access the ICVA website, they couldn't. (Project manager)*

> *We have a very strong link to InterAction but not to ICVA … Through the project*
> *we started get the ICVA newsletters but I couldn't access any of the links*
> *because it's for members only. (Pakistan)*

> *I am very glad I worked on this project… People are not aware of what's been*
> *done. The whole NHRPII project is not known … Projects like this bring out a lot*
> *of information. [It] needs to be visible. (Host)*

ICVA is entitled to maintain members-only access to its own documentation, and website problems were an unfortunate coincidence. The use of open access pages, similar to those used by the Global Humanitarian Platform, and/or negotiation with core group members with web capacity might have been a way forward.

ICVA now has a second office in New York and plans to establish regional hubs in Asia, East Africa, West Africa and MENA. This will enable it to make visible in the longer term project outputs developed during NHRPII.

CAFOD http://www.cafod.org.uk/Policy-and-Research/Emergencies-and-conflict/The-humanitarian-system
[19] http://humanitaireetdeveloppement.org/

2.3 Collaboration and partnerships

Identification of key stakeholders in most focus countries took place before the deployment of project managers through reports that mapped humanitarian structures in place, for example, in Côte d'Ivoire and Zimbabwe. Project managers conducted numerous meetings, formal and informal, with national and international NGOs, networks, UN agencies clusters and government organisations.

In Ethiopia and Zimbabwe, the project was already known because of NHRPI. In Zimbabwe, NHRPII was introduced to key stakeholders by ActionAid's country director and the new project manager focused on linking NHRPII with key officers and agencies. He first established contact with the UN Policy Advisor for Transition and Recovery, the National Association of NGOs (NANGO), the WASH Cluster and the UN Heads of Agencies.[20] In Ethiopia, the start-up phase coordinator began by meeting agencies involved in NHRPI. As project manager in Pakistan, she participated in or led 24 meetings, all but two with external partners, in her first three weeks in post.[21]

Partnerships of different kinds were the subject of country studies that examined strategic, operational and financial collaboration between humanitarian organisations. Such studies included perceptions of partnership between different stakeholders in Côte d'Ivoire, NGO partnership in the distribution of pooled funds in Zimbabwe, and barriers to partnership between national NGOs and INGOs in Somalia.

The strengthening of partnerships between NGOs in Côte d'Ivoire, Somalia and Zimbabwe was valued.

> *The project strengthened and consolidated collaborative links between local NGOs and national, even international, networks. (Côte d'Ivoire)*

> *The project, especially the coordination training improved the transparency, information sharing and reducing [duplication] in the work of NGOs. (Somalia)*

> *Our participation in the project has given us the confidence to advocate for better partnership terms with our donors. We are also making more concerted efforts to partner with other local NGOs to increase our leverage and complement each other's efforts in fundraising and project implementation. (Zimbabwe)*

In Zimbabwe, OCHA, clusters and NGOs became closer as a result of joint regional meetings. OCHA in Zimbabwe had no regional offices, hence meetings organised by NHRPII brought it closer to local NGOs.

> *We are largely Harare-based so arranging these workshops with NGOs in the provinces has been a good opportunity for outreach … on Humanitarian Reform and transition to recovery and development. (Zimbabwe)*

> *We now have a contact person at OCHA whom we speak to regularly on coordination issues and also receiving updates … We are now attending cluster meetings on a regular basis. (Zimbabwe)*

---

[20] Project report, NHRPII, Zimbabwe, 11 May 2012, 8 June 2012
[21] Project report, NHRPII, Pakistan, 30 May 2012

> *This exposure has enabled us to penetrate information that we were not getting and starting June 2013, we will be implementing a project funded by WFP for the first time … (Zimbabwe)*

In Pakistan, the value of partnership in regional clusters was recognised.

> *The other area where the partnership increased and some of this was due to the project – our interaction with clusters at provincial level which wasn't something that we were particularly good at. The team realised the added value of attending those. (Pakistan)*

In Côte d'Ivoire and Zimbabwe, some informants questioned the project's focus on humanitarian rather than development partnership. The issues covered in humanitarian capacity building included personnel standards (People In Aid) impact and accountability (HAP and ECB) which were relevant too in development programmes. The longer-term context for learning about Humanitarian Reform and related topics needed to be made explicit.

> *Emphasis was totally on humanitarian NGOs which demotivated us a little towards the end. (Côte d'Ivoire)*

> *The project was too short term and it could have helped in seeing the transition from humanitarian to development in the country. (Zimbabwe)*

The majority, however, were enthusiastic about the project's role with national NGOs whose relationship with INGOs and the UN had not been perceived as one of equality during the emergency in Côte d'Ivoire in 2010-2011. Some informants saw these relationships changing.

> *The review of the partnership process in Côte d'Ivoire during the humanitarian response was to me the most useful output because it's rare … so this I think to me was the big benefit of the project. (Côte d'Ivoire)*

National NGOs in Côte d'Ivoire and Zimbabwe d'Ivoire felt that the project had helped enhance their role and status with UN, government and with INGOs.

> *A more important position is starting to be given to national NGOs, more attention by humanitarian coordination (OCHA) for example. (Côte d'Ivoire)*

> *The Humanitarian Reform project gave our organisation credibility with government structures … certain government ministries now trust us and are able to work with us. (Côte d'Ivoire)*

> *The "Big brother" mentality that has been the order of the day especially in partnerships involving local and international NGOs was always referred to and discussed and seemingly there are cases now where such situations are dying down … There are noticeable changes in the mindset especially by INGOs on the role and capacities on local NGOs. (Zimbabwe)*

2.4 Impact and sustainability

It was too soon for informants to see evidence of impact on humanitarian assistance programmes. As informants noted, the project and its resources were small by comparison with those of humanitarian response programmes in focus countries.

NHRPII succeeded, however, in acting as a catalyst on key issues at national level, complementing, contributing to or triggering capacity-building or advocacy by others, for example, INGOs and the Somalia NGO Forum in Nairobi, HINGO and HAP members in Ethiopia, national NGOs and HAP in Côte d'Ivoire, NHN and CARE in Pakistan.

In addition, it was highly effective in raising awareness of their role among national NGOs, frequently omitted, sidelined or excluded from coordination mechanisms or seen as the junior in implementing partnerships.

> *If we believe that good coordination can make that difference then I think it's on the right road. There are so many good local and national NGOs out there who are being empowered to attend these meetings and feel they have a right to be at them and speak at them. (Pakistan)*

NHRPII helped link national NGOs with other agencies at country, regional or global level. If failing occasionally to make explicit its role in linking relief and development, the project strengthened representation in transition mechanisms and preparedness in post-disaster scenarios. At global level, it influenced global coordination structures through its work on accountability, advocacy and access to humanitarian funds.

The majority of informants wanted to see the project continue. They had two concerns. Some believed that even if the field phase had run a full 16 months, NHRPII was too short to achieve change.

> *The first … year should be the time to understand the scenario. It is the second year that you actually implement, and it is the third year that you ensure sustainability … (Somalia)*
>
> *The end of the Humanitarian Reform project came just at the moment when the NGOs' organisation was being set up. (Côte d'Ivoire)*
>
> *... because a reform is a change and all change is a source of conflict so what was needed was to put in place the basics of a good change management strategy for a period of three years ... (Côte d'Ivoire)*
>
> *My personal opinion is that while Zimbabwe situation has greatly improved, it was still very necessary to continue with this project for at least another two years. This was really going to strengthen our institutions and learn more in managing different Humanitarian Reform processes. (Zimbabwe)*

In Côte d'Ivoire where the project had started last, a joint letter to ACF, ECHO and ICVA requested an extension.

While donor contract length was outside NHRPII's control, exit strategy was not. In Côte d'Ivoire, OCHA aimed to continue support for national NGOs. The project manager left a

handover document, together with project and training materials. Some national NGOs had requested training on advocacy, which OCHA subsequently provided.[22]

> *The project helped make us think again about the role of national NGOs, and how better to support them. OCHA is committed to continuing, to the extent possible, to follow this up after the end of the project, and in particular to support the training needs of national NGOs. (Côte d'Ivoire)*

In Zimbabwe, OCHA was positive about NHRPII from the start and had expressed interest in supporting activities after the project ended: 'OCHA … feel that there is a strong need to continue with the Humanitarian Reform agenda i.e. beyond the 16 month period for sustainability.'[23] However, exit strategy was not shared with all stakeholders.

> *We found out through third parties that the project was over and haven't seen any end of project follow-up … (Zimbabwe)*

NHRPII provided NGOs and networks with additional resources and expertise. Publications on humanitarian structures captured lessons from focus countries. It is too soon to say whether the impact of this project includes a leading role for national NGOs in international humanitarian response. However, as a result partly of NHRPII and its predecessor, it is hard to think about international coordination, funding and leadership structures without simultaneously thinking about the role and status of national NGOs within them.

---

[22] Communication with Liliane Bitong, 04.07.13

[23] Project report, NHRPII, Zimbabwe, 13 April 2012

3. Conclusions

3.1 Project design

NHRPII was somewhat hampered by its architecture, the delay between start-up phase and substantive project in most countries, and by work plans which under-estimated the significance of relationship-building. Consideration of these issues and of human resource factors by planners would have strengthened partnership between NHRPII, host agencies and INGO networks in some countries.

Project manager workloads were high, in part owing to the scale and context of the project. The shortened time frame and multiple reporting lines added to challenges in the field and in Geneva. However, activities were relevant and project staff in focus countries and Geneva seen as doing difficult jobs well. NHRPII succeeded in a) enhancing capacity among national NGOs and b) contributing to the creation of an environment in which NGOs, particularly national NGOs, received greater recognition in systems of humanitarian response leadership, funding and policy.

3.2 Capacity-building

Capacity-building was delivered in locally appropriate languages, by recognised national and international providers and, where possible, outside capital cities. Training and workshops on leadership, aid sector standards, web technology, advocacy and international humanitarian funding and 'architecture' were well received and contributed to preparedness in countries transitioning from humanitarian response to development. Capacity-building and providers in Côte d'Ivoire, Pakistan, Somalia and Zimbabwe were highly regarded.

The opportunity to share lessons at national level, at multi-country leadership training in Nairobi and the multi-country symposium in Geneva was welcomed by national NGOs. INGO informants in Pakistan appreciated tailored learning for staff in advocacy and representational roles.

Given the primacy and responsibility of national actors in humanitarian response, (demonstrated by the government of Ethiopia in its refusal to approve NHRPII), understanding of national context and national humanitarian structures might also have been of value for international NGOs, reflecting the principle of equality in partnership.[24] Such understanding would also help clearly counter the notion that there is only one 'humanitarian architecture', that of international actors.

---

[24] NGO Code of Conduct: Principle 6; Sphere Core Standard 2; Principles of Partnership, A Statement of Commitment http://www.globalhumanitarianplatform.org/pop.html#pop

In the eyes of some informants, the absence of formal follow-up limited the value of capacity-building as a tool for change. However, within its short time frame and despite limited human resources, NHRPII was able to demonstrate the demand for capacity-building, particularly from national NGOs, and how this could be met. Capacity-building was not a cure-all: enhanced knowledge alone could not address barriers to leadership and representation by national NGOs. Without capacity-building, however, it is difficult to see how the project could have advanced its other activities.

3.3   Strengthening coordination mechanisms

Work to strengthen NGO coordination mechanisms was easier when networks knew the earlier NHRPI project, where they had been appropriately consulted and involved before the start of NHRPII and/or where NHRPII brought additional resources.

In INGO networks, project managers made links with individual agencies and groups of agencies with an interest in capacity-building or advocacy. It was most successful, however, in building and supporting national NGO networks. At its best, NHRPII was a catalyst. It helped national NGOs in one country start a new network, strengthened or extended the scope of work or geographic reach in others, and encouraged NGOs to take up or make better use of their roles in Humanitarian Country Teams, national and regional clusters, and funding boards.

Work by project managers to support NGO secretariats strengthened them in the short term and enabled other activities to take place or start during the lifetime of the project. Such support demonstrated what networks could achieve. However, unless a national staff counterpart was in post or an exit strategy in place, a gap re-opened when NHRPII ended.

While NHRPII's capacity-building was popular - and arguably the easier task for project managers - it is notable that most comments on length and sustainability of NHRPII referred to its role in strengthening coordination mechanisms. This work was recognised as entailing change that would take years rather than months, the case with many of the inter-agency networks whose approaches NHRPII presented in capacity-building, including HAP, Sphere, People In Aid and the clusters: Humanitarian Reform itself addresses chronic not short-term problems and NHRPI had originally been three years long.

3.4   Informing and advancing global policy discussions

The difference between NHRPII and the INGO networks advocating for better Humanitarian Reform in focus countries was ICVA's global role. ICVA's role could have been strengthened by an explicit strategy and by greater involvement of its global partners in NHRPII. Two made opportunities to use project outputs and contacts in advocacy or policy research but these were not part of a concerted strategy by the global partners.

Though websites were set up in two focus countries, technical problems and a pay wall made it difficult for key partners to access project outputs and information on the main ICVA website. This reduced the overall project's visibility globally and at national level.

However, NHRPII informed and influenced issues of concern to NGOs, notably the ERF guidelines, and developed briefings on the Transformative Agenda for NGO and government stakeholders. NHRPII involved its focus country project managers and national NGOs in policy discussion. It sent a project manager to New York and brought NNGO leaders to Geneva. The latter provided an opportunity for national NGO leaders, seldom heard in global forums and clusters, to participate in international policy discussions and speak for themselves.

3.5   Collaboration and partnerships

Where NHRPII's work resulted in opportunities for additional collaboration between NGOs and others, it was easy for informants to describe resulting change. NHRPII helped national NGOs to forge stronger links with one another, with OCHA, with national government and / or UN agencies in all focus countries through leadership training, learning exchange and support for networking activities.

While it was important to demonstrate the practical outcomes of partnerships in terms of effectiveness and efficiency, the partnership pillar of Humanitarian Reform also encompasses the principle of equality. Partnership as a value was appreciated by national NGOs in countries where relationships between national and international agencies were not strong or where approaches to partnership had been perceived as top-down.

3.6   Impact and sustainability

It was too soon to see the impact of NHRPII on large-scale operations in focus countries where humanitarian response operations were ongoing. Nevertheless, the role of NHRPII as a catalyst and advocate was clearer and the project left most informants wanting more.

The investment which NHRPII represented began to pay off even during the project's short lifetime. NHRPII contributed to greater awareness of NNGO rights, roles and status in HCT meetings, funding forums, and operational partnerships. Evidence includes outreach or follow-up on capacity-building by OCHA in some focus countries, relationships with governments, and amendments to ERF procedures. The cascading of training and the leveraging of financial resources from major INGOs and the CAP are likely to contribute to further change.

Exit strategy, part of relationship-building and accountability to partners, needed to be more proactive in some focus countries. However, by raising the collective profile of NGOs, particularly national NGOs, within government and international humanitarian systems, NHRPII helped to ensure their visibility. For all the challenges of this project, the legacy of NHRPII is Humanitarian Reform processes from which it is difficult to imagine NGOs, national NGOs in particular, being excluded.

Annex A – NHRPII publications and websites

Publications

Anon., (2012), Humanitarian Coordination in Somalia, NHRPII and Somalia NGO Consortium

Anon., (2012), Status, Perceptions and the Future: NGOs and Humanitarian Reform in Zimbabwe, NHRPII

Anon., Local & International Partnership In Somalia, ICVA Quarterly Update, December 2012

Kudzai Chatiza and Obrian Nyamucherera, (2013), Transition from Humanitarian to Recovery and Development Coordination Mechanisms in Zimbabwe, NHRPII

Gamuchirai Chituri, (2013), NGO Participation in Pooled Funds Advisory Boards in Zimbabwe: Overview and Recommendations, NHRPII

Paul Currion, Kerren Hedlund, Manisha Thomas, (2013), NGO Coordination Guide Version 1.0, ICVA

Kelsey Hoppe, (2013), Humanitarian Architecture & NGO Engagement in Pakistan, NHRPII

Kelsey Hoppe, (2013), An Example of Decentralised Coordination in Pakistan: the National Humanitarian Network, NHRPII

Kelsey Hoppe, (2013), NGOs, Humanitarian Reform and the Transformative Agenda in South Sudan (draft)

ICVA, (2012), The Emergency Response Funds Global Guidelines: A Guide to the Recent Changes, NHRPII

ICVA, InterAction, SCHR, (2012), The IASC Transformative Agenda: Operational Implications for NGOs

ICVA, InterAction, SCHR, (2012), The IASC Transformative Agenda: Information Note for NGOs

Ellie Kemp, (2013), NGO Voice in the Humanitarian Response in Somalia: Challenges and Ways Forward

Clément Lorvão, (2013), Diagnostic de la Perception des Pratiques de Partenariats entre Opérateurs Humanitaires dans le contexte de Crise Post-Crise Ivoirien

NHRPII, (2013), Glossary of the NHRP II, NHRPII

NHRPII, (2012), NHRP II note to Governments on the Transformative Agenda, NHRPII

Remy Reymann, (2012), The Humanitarian Reform in the Libyan Crisis - Case study, NHRPII

Isabelle Roubeix, (2011), Humanitarian Reform in Ivory Coast, NHRPII

Steffen Schwarz, (2012), Untitled background document on the Transformative Agenda, NHRPII Somalia

Yuri Tsitrinbaum, (2012), Aid Partnerships: A Vehicle to Strengthen NGOs in Somalia? NHRPII

Websites

Links correct at 19 July 2013

ICVA https://icvanetwork.org/doc00005403.html

NHRPII Côte d'Ivoire, Humanitaire et Développement, http://humanitaireetdeveloppement.org/

Now offline

NHRPII Somalia, Humanitarian Reform Somalia, http://hrs.info

Annex B   Sample questions

Your name:

Your job title:

Your organisation:

1. Which activities organised or supported by the Humanitarian Reform Project (NHRPII) have you been involved in? Please explain.

2. Have any other organisations helped you to understand Humanitarian Reform?

    i) Yes / no
    ii) Please explain.

3. What impact do you think this project has had?

    a. *On your own work*

        i) Negative / nil / positive
        ii) Please explain

    b. *On strategy in your organisation*

        i) Negative / nil / positive
        ii) Please explain

    c. *On practice in your organisation*

        i) Negative / nil / positive
        ii) Please explain

    d. *On the implementation of humanitarian projects in your country*

        i) Negative / nil / positive
        ii) Please explain

4. Have you or your agency made any changes as a result of your involvement In the project?

> i) Yes / no
> ii) Please explain.

5. What impact do you think the project activities have made on NGO partnership in your country?

> a. *Project impact on partnership with other NGOs/networks*

> i) Negative / nil / positive

> ii) Please explain

> b. *Project impact on partnership with UN bodies*
> i) Negative / nil / positive

> ii) Please explain

> c. *Project impact on partnership with others (for example, other coordinating forums, clusters, government)*
> i) Negative / nil / positive

> ii) Please explain

6. What do you think the Humanitarian Reform project has done best? Please explain.

7. Is there anything the Humanitarian Reform project could have done better? Please explain.

8. Are there any other comments you would like to make about the Humanitarian Reform project?

Annex C   Informants

Name	Agency	Focus
Thomas Loreaux	ACF	Côte d'Ivoire
Liliane Bitong	ACF/NHRPII	Côte d'Ivoire
Evelyne Adom	Afrique Secours et Assistance	Côte d'Ivoire
Adama Kpayérigué Sekongo	Animation Rurale de Korhogo	Côte d'Ivoire
Ernest Atte	Association de Soutien à l'Autopromotion Sanitaire Urbaine	Côte d'Ivoire
Ahua René Koffi	Caritas	Côte d'Ivoire
Yvan Hildebrand	ECHO	Côte d'Ivoire
Albert Siaba Seu	IDE-Afrique	Côte d'Ivoire
Clément Lorvão	Independent consultant, NHRPII	Côte d'Ivoire
Pascale Blanchetière	Médecins du Monde	Côte d'Ivoire
Marcellin Tchako	ONG Espoir Tiers Monde	Côte d'Ivoire
Somian Daniel Say	ONG Femmes de Salem, Internationale	Côte d'Ivoire
Guy Zamian Obra	ONG Femmes Elites	Côte d'Ivoire
Epse Coulibaly Irad Gbazalé	ONG Femmes en Action	Côte d'Ivoire
Alexis Kango	ONG Limpia	Côte d'Ivoire
Noel Galo Bi Djangone	ONG ODAFEM	Côte d'Ivoire
Gianluca Ferrera	PAM/WFP	Côte d'Ivoire
Salima Mokrani	UNOCHA	Côte d'Ivoire
Jerome Ouraga Wanyou	West African Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP)	Côte d'Ivoire
Pauline Chetcuti	ACF	Côte d'Ivoire / Global
Anne Street	CAFOD	Ethiopia
Joe Read	CAFOD / ACTED / NHRPII	Ethiopia / Pakistan
Mikkel Jensen	Danish Refugee Council	Global
Katharina Samara-Wickrama	ICVA	Global
Randa Hassan	UNOCHA	Global
Andrew Buchanan	ACTED	Pakistan

Mette Hartmeyer	ACTED / NHRPII	Pakistan
Waleed Rauf	CARE	Pakistan
Áine Fay	Concern	Pakistan
Ai Morita	CWS Pakistan/Afghanistan / NHRPII training partner	Pakistan
Rabia Sabri	CWS Pakistan/Afghanistan / NHRPII training partner	Pakistan
Sana Khan Amin	Independent consultant NHRPII	Pakistan
Claire Whiting	Pakistan Humanitarian Forum	Pakistan
Ben Emmens	The Conscious Project / NHRPII Consultant	Pakistan
Luca Pupulin	ACTED	Pakistan / Global
Hussein Jama Ismail	ADO	Somalia
Celestin Nkundabemera	American Friends Services Committee	Somalia
Sally Mullei	CARE	Somalia
Steffen Schwarz	Danish Refugee Council/NHRPII	Somalia
Nefisa Yusuf Mohamed	Nagaad Network	Somalia
Qurat Sadozai	Norwegian Refugee Council	Somalia
Ben Foot	Save the Children	Somalia
Abdikadir Abubakar Hassan	Somali Humanitarian Operational Consortium	Somalia
Tanja Schümer-Cross	Somalia NGO Consortium	Somalia
Gemma Sanmartin	UNOCHA	Somalia
Nimo Jirdeh	WASDA / NHRPII consultant	Somalia
Kathrine Starup	Danish Refugee Council	Somalia / Global
Joram Chikwanya	ActionAid	Zimbabwe
Edward Makoni	Caritas Masvingo	Zimbabwe
Blazio Manobo	Caritas Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe
Rt. Rev. Stanslous Chatikobo	Christian Care	Zimbabwe
Ephraim Murendo	Lower Guruve Development Association	Zimbabwe
Mvuselelo Huni	Organisation of Rural Associations for Progress (ORAP)	Zimbabwe
Paul Thomas	UNOCHA	Zimbabwe

Annex D – Sources and references

This list is indicative only. See also Annex A, NHRPII publications and websites

Correspondence from CHAD to ActionAid, Department for International Development, 4 August 2010

Joram Chikwanya, 18 August 2012, Consensus Building on the need to build the capacity of NANGO for Humanitarian Coordination

Nigel Clarke, Training managers for emergencies: time to get serious? *Humanitarian Exchange Magazine*, Issue 33, March 2006

Andy Featherstone, (2012), *Building a Better Response: Gaps and Good Practice in Training for Humanitarian Reform,* OCHA and USAID/OFDA

Andy Featherstone, (2010), *Fit for the Future? Strengthening the leadership pillar of Humanitarian Reform,* NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project

ICVA, Report on the National NGO Symposium, 28 February 2013

Core Group Discussion, ECHO Proposal on NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Friday, 8 April 2011, 12:00, Meeting Note by ICVA

Draft as of 5 April 2011, ToRs for the Core Strategic Group of the NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project Phase II

Draft core group decisions and action points November 2011, NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project Phase II Meeting of Core Group, 21st November 2011, Decisions and Action points

Sue Lautze, Angela Raven-Roberts and Teshome Erkineh, Humanitarian Governance in Ethiopia, *Humanitarian Exchange Magazine*, HPN Issue 43, June 2009

Clément Lorvão, (2013), Diagnostic de la Perception des Pratiques de Partenariats entre Opérateurs Humanitaires dans le contexte de Crise Post-Crise Ivoirien

NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project Phase II, Meeting of Core Group - 2 March 2012 , Minutes.

NGOs and Humanitarian Reform project (NHRP): the second phase, Concept Note for ECHO 21 January 2011

NHRPII, April 2013, NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project Phase II, Draft Synthesis Report

People In Aid, (2003) People In Aid Code, http://www.peopleinaid.org/code/online.aspx

Anne Street, Humanitarian partnerships: what do they really mean? *Humanitarian Exchange Magazine*, HPN Issue 50, April 2011

Links below correct at 19 July 2013:

ACTED http://www.acted.org/en/ngo-and-humanitarian-reform-project-ii-nhrp-ii-start
ActionAid Zimbabwe http://www.actionaid.org/zimbabwe/2012/08/zimbabwe-commemorates-world-humanitarian-day
CAFOD http://www.cafod.org.uk/Policy-and-Research/Emergencies-and-conflict/The-humanitarian-system

Annex E – Terms of Reference

**Call for Proposals
External Evaluation of the
NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project Phase II Terms of Reference1, February
2013**

Background
In late 2010, a consortium of five INGOs2 joined ICVA to build on the advocacy and
research findings of the earlier NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project (NHRP)3 with
second phase of the project funded by ECHO. This evaluation is limited to the second
phase of the NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project (NHRP II).

The original NHRP ran from 2008 to 2010 and aimed to increase "the effectiveness of
humanitarian response by strengthening the effective engagement of international,
national and local NGOs in humanitarian reform." Early on, NGOs recognised that the
humanitarian reform mechanisms were perceived as UN---centric, and that NGOs
(international and national) and other stakeholders have an essential role in enabling the
humanitarian reform. Moreover, a lack of ownership hindered the effective engagement
of national and local NGOs –as well as some INGOs. The NHRP had began working
with NGOs to strengthen their engagement in the reform mechanisms when project
funding was withdrawn in 2010. Acknowledging the continued need for focus on NGO
engagement and leadership in the humanitarian response, in September 2011 ECHO
began funding the NHRP II in five newly selected focus countries to develop
contextualised priorities and work plans to promote NGO participation in the
Humanitarian Reform and Transformative Agenda.

Consortium set-up
The project Core Group (CG) is made up of representatives from the NHRP II
consortium members and includes: the International Council of Voluntary Agencies
(ICVA) coordinating the project from Geneva, the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) as the
ECHO contract holder and project host for Somalia in Kenya, ACTED hosting in
Pakistan and facilitating a humanitarian architecture study in South Sudan, Action Aid
hosting in Zimbabwe and Action Contre la Faim (ACF) hosting in Côte d'Ivoire. CAFOD
continue to be a member of the CG after their hosting arrangement in Ethiopia failed to
secure government permission. In each focus country, a Country Programme Manager
is responsible for implementing the NHRP II activities. The CG advises and supports the
global project coordinator and the Country Programme Managers.

NHRP II objective and activities
The Principal Objective of the project is: "Improved humanitarian response through
better NGO coordination and engagement with (international and national) humanitarian
coordination". The Specific Objective of the project is:

"To enhance NGO (national and international) representation, participation and
leadership in humanitarian reform and other coordination forums for improved
performance"

In order to ensure that project work was relevant to NGOs, the wider humanitarian community and promoted improved coordination, Country Programme Managers developed context specific work plans in consultation with the existing NGO fora or NGO advisory groups in each country. As a result, the primary focus of the NHRP has been engaging national NGOs in the humanitarian reform systems

During the development process, it became clear that the indicators and activities in the original logical framework needed revising. The overall revised work plan for the project is annexed.

Overall objective of this evaluation:
To evaluate results against the objectives set out in the ECHO funded NHRP II project document based on the agreed indicators and give recommendations for future activities to strengthen NGO engagement and leadership in the humanitarian reform and transformative agenda.

Scope
To fulfil these objectives the evaluation should cover, but not be limited to, the following issues:

Project Relevance
Do the activities described in the national work plans meet the requirements of the over all work plan?
Were the project activities undertaken, the relevant and appropriate ones to meet the overall objective?
During the course of the project, were the needed and relevant adjustments made to the project to reflect the any changes needed to enable the project to meet its objectives?

Collaboration and partnerships
How has NHRP II worked with key partners/stakeholders practically and strategically?
How do identified stakeholders, value the project interventions?

Impact and sustainability
Evaluate the project achievements against the four locally developed national work plans.
Describe any additional, unintended or indirect results or outcomes, as a result of awareness raising within the humanitarian community.
What has been the impact of the NHRP II work in the context of understanding and implementing aspects of the humanitarian reform and Transformative Agenda in the focus countries?
With the resources available, what could/should NHRP II have done more or differently in taking the humanitarian reform Transformative Agenda forward?
What has been the impact of NHRPII's work in improving the quality of NGO engagement and partnership with each other and with the UN bodies?
Make recommendations on project activities could be initiated, sustained and built on to further strengthen the role of NGOs in the humanitarian reform and Transformative Agenda.

Time Frame
The evaluation should commence in April 2013.
1st meeting between the project coordinator and the consultant – 15 April 2013--03---22

Submission of 1st draft -20 May 2013
Meeting with CG on 1st draft - 21 May 2013
Deadline for comments to consultant – 28 May 2013
Deadline for final report incorporating comments received – 7 June 2013

Methodology
The evaluator will conduct a desk review of project materials and interviews with key informants. Documents to be reviewed include the concept note, project proposals (start--up and full) and modified project document as well as the base line studies, guidance notes and studies from each country.

The project coordinator and CG will provide the evaluator with a list of key informants to be interviewed by Skype or telephone. At a minimum this will include:

NHRP II project staff
Consultants
Core Group members
Country Directors of hosting agencies
International and National NGO partners
Training participants

A more detailed list will be provided at the beginning of the evaluation.

Outputs
The consultant will present their findings in a final report consisting of no more than 20 pages (excluding annexes). The report will include:
An executive summary
Report including: methodology, findings, lessons learned, conclusion and recommendations
Annexes including: TOR, documents reviewed, list of people interviewed etc. The report will be shared in the first instance with the Core Group, ECHO and the NHRP II team.
The Executive Summary will be made publicly available on the ICVA website and CG members' website (as relevant) (subject to the agreement of the Core Group).

Budget
This consultancy has a budget of 10,000 CHF.

Experience required
The consultant will demonstrate the following qualifications and experience:
8 years relevant experience
Knowledge of the humanitarian sector, specifically the humanitarian reform processes
Experience in project evaluation
Proven ability to interview a variety of stakeholders
Organisation skills
Flexibility to arrange interviews and meetings
Excellent English writing skills

Proposals should include the following:
Proposed structure of how the evaluation will be conducted over the period of 15 April to 7 June 2013;
An indication of how the final report will be structured;

CV(s); including a description of past experience in conducting evaluations. Proposals should be submitted by 9 April 2013 to : Vacancy@icvanetwork.org

.