Ladies and Gentlemen, Distinguished Guests, Colleagues.

I am delighted to be here this morning. It’s truly an honor to be asked to provide these opening remarks.

I first became involved in the Core Humanitarian Standard two years ago when I participated in one of the preparatory workshops in London. There was a tremendous amount of debate and passion in the room that day, particularly over the question of whether to include “neutrality” as one of the humanitarian principles to be highlighted in the Standard. Dozens of people worked together to find the exact words that would respect the humanitarian imperative in a manner that would also remain true to their own institutional beliefs and approaches.

I would like to say thanks to those dedicated colleagues who spent days, weeks and months crafting the language of the Standard. They have produced a tool that every day galvanizes more support and recognition worldwide. Indeed, during the World Humanitarian Summit, more than 120 commitments were made to adopt the Core Humanitarian Standard. These pledges came from across the globe from very diverse organizations: the Afghan Independent Human Rights Committee, the All India Disaster Mitigation Institute, the Association of Municipalities of Mali, and the Youth Peer Education Networks of Nepal, Somaliland, and Thailand, to name just a few.

Today’s learning event comes a little under six months since the World Humanitarian Summit and I would like to say a few words about what I learned from being part of that event. You may remember three years ago when Pope Francis went to Lampedusa in Italy to witness first-hand the plight of refugees and migrants. There, he condemned what he called "the globalization of indifference." These are words which cannot simply be ignored. And yet that was exactly what was happening around the world in the face of injustice, suffering and the relentless increase in humanitarian needs.

The World Humanitarian Summit sought to combat that indifference. It sought to remind world leaders, members of civil society, the private sector, all of us what it really means to have to live – survive – while waiting for a war to end or to rebuild after a flood, earthquake or hurricane. To ensure that children continue to be educated. To face a new life, maybe, without a job, a farm, a business or even a future. The Summit sought to place communities and people affected by crisis at the center of humanitarian action. In this sense, it shared the same objectives as the Core Humanitarian Standard.

Was the Summit a success? That may depend on your definition of success. Personally, I believe the thousands of commitments made at the Summit demonstrate an unwavering and sincere shared desire to see profound changes in the humanitarian system and to do better by the 130 million people requiring assistance in crisis-affected areas. Furthermore, the Summit commitments pointed to several key policy shifts, which I believe are worth highlighting here today.

First, there was a resounding call for international humanitarian actors to “reinforce and not replace local and national actors”. The message was clear: international humanitarians need to systematically ask themselves how they can add value to what people and communities are already doing to ensure resilience and self-reliance in humanitarian contexts.
We, the humanitarian community, also have some other tough questions to ask ourselves: Are we doing all we can to enable local populations to respond to their own needs? Are we sometimes—perhaps unwittingly—creating a culture of dependence on international assistance when local solutions may be more appropriate?

We urgently need to change the way we do business. There needs to be a transition to more nationally-led responses involving greater participation by local actors. We need to allocate far greater financial resources to local and national responders. This is one of the commitments of the Grand Bargain. But we also need to invest in capacity-building so that national actors, including governments, are better equipped to coordinate and respond to emergencies in a more efficient and timely manner.

We need to move from standardization to contextualization when it comes to coordination architecture. We shouldn’t activate an internationally-led response as a default reaction to a crisis. We should first require a mapping of existing capacities and gaps. We should build on what is in place already. We need to reflect on whether the current local, national and global coordination architecture actually meets the collaboration needs of national and local actors. And if it doesn’t, we need to be ready to change, adapt and show flexibility. We don’t want local responders to simply turn up as passive participants at internationally-led coordination meetings conducted in a language they may not master. Local actors need to be part of the decision-making. They need to have a real voice.

At the same time, we have to remember that every context is different. And as both the Summit and the Core Humanitarian Standard remind us, all humanitarian action—whether by international, national or local actors, must be first and foremost guided by the humanitarian principles.

A second clear message from the Summit is that if we want to meet needs and to be accountable, we have to learn to listen. We have to hear what individuals and communities have to say about their lives, their customs, and put into practice the ideas they have to contribute to humanitarian responses. In the Grand Bargain, this is known as the Participation Revolution. Revolution. Now that’s quite a word. And why not? If it takes a revolution, then let’s have a revolution. But I can’t help myself asking why we need to have a revolution to achieve something that should by now stand at front and center of all of our humanitarian work: listening to the local populations.

In 1999, I worked for a now defunct NGO called Media Action International. It was set up by a handful of former journalists like myself who advocated that people living in crisis areas had a right to information. Shortly after NATO expelled Serb forces from Pristina, UN envoy Sergio de Mello led a meeting with Stefan de Mistura who was a Special Advisor to UNHCR in Kosovo. In a matter of moments, they had agreed that one of the first orders of business of the UN in post-conflict Kosovo would be to set up a Serb and Albanian language common service platform to regularly update the local population on the humanitarian situation and to seek their feedback. And that it would be the job of my tiny NGO to make it happen, within days. These two visionary leaders knew nearly twenty years ago that crisis-affected populations not only have the need to be informed — they have the right- and that communicating with communities was critical to effective humanitarian action.

This is still far from being a standard way of operating in every humanitarian context. And yet it is only when we listen and really engage with people that we can effectively respond to their
needs, aspirations and desires in a manner which restores dignity and is respectful of their choices.

And this takes me to the third message I took home from Istanbul. In 2013 following the devastation of Typhoon Haiyan, I walked through flooded coastal villages stretching from Tacloban to Guiuan speaking to Filipinos about their needs. I dutifully asked sectoral question after sectoral question: did they need food, did they need water, did they need shelter? At the end, I asked the only open-ended question on the survey form, which was: what are your priority needs? Their answer: cash.

They didn’t ask for tents for shelter or even food. They wanted to replace – as quickly as possible - their lost incomes so they could repair their boats and nets. The message I heard from the villagers was blunt: they wanted to be economically empowered and to get back to work. They wanted to get back to normal.

The World Bank recently produced a report for the IASC which states: “Cash sheds light on the strengths and challenges of the current humanitarian system and can be a compelling entry point for systemic change. Multi-purpose cash, in particular, can challenge traditional sectoral responses.”

While it is clear that in-kind humanitarian relief will also continue to be used, providing cash wherever feasible as the default modality could help bring about the radical change – the revolution - that many are calling for. Cash is not the destination but it is definitely part of the journey towards more accountable humanitarian assistance. After all, what can be closer to the true meaning of accountability than making sure people can make their own decisions about how best to meet their needs? We know that things will have to be done differently in the future even if we don’t yet have all the answers. But one thing is sure: we cannot let our current structures and systems hold us back from evolving and achieving the change so strongly desired by so many people.

My hope is that the World Humanitarian Summit will be remembered as a turning point. In Istanbul, I had the opportunity to listen closely to the interventions of many of the participants, including world leaders. One was especially inspirational: President Higgins of Ireland and these words in particular:

"For too long, empty pledges and fine words have died in our mouths- now is the time to turn promises into action for this generation."

This event describes the Core Humanitarian Standard as a "disruptive standard" but perhaps a better term would be a "visionary standard." I believe that systematic implementation of the Core Humanitarian Standard can play a critical role in achieving the vision articulated at the Summit and thus turn promises into action for this generation.

One of the terms frequently used at the World Humanitarian Summit was the “humanitarian eco-system.” Civil society groups, faith-based organizations, and municipal authorities- these are just some of the diverse actors engaged in the aid world.

It has become abundantly evident that we cannot accomplish all that we need to do without working together but it is also clear that as more groups and more diverse actors get involved in humanitarian work we will need to find ways to guarantee the quality and accountability of the assistance being provided.

I believe the Core Humanitarian Standard can increasingly become the common thread that binds us all together. Already we see concrete action in the field. In Somalia, this year’s
Humanitarian Response Plan calls for joint training and annual action planning sessions to operationalize the Core Humanitarian Standard. In the Democratic Republic of Congo, one of the four objectives of the national strategic plan is to implement the Core Humanitarian Standard.

But we need to pick up the pace. More awareness raising and capacity-building is required, not only with NGOs and the UN system but also with national governments and local actors, including the private sector.

Let’s be ambitious, let’s have a revolution. After all, a goal is but a dream with a deadline. So let’s set ourselves a goal and a deadline. Within the next two years, every one of the 25 or so humanitarian response plans produced annually will include operationalization of the Core Humanitarian Standard.

Let’s ask country teams to monitor and report on progress. Let’s hold ourselves to account for really using this Standard to drive home the meaningful change we heard about in Istanbul. And let’s do it together- UN, NGO, civil society, private sector- so that we finally achieve what we all desire: people at the center of humanitarian response.
A disruptive standard?

Rethinking humanitarian response with the Core Humanitarian Standard
Welcome

JUDITH GREENWOOD
Executive Director, CHS Alliance
Development of quality instruments
The Starting Point

“Without agreed, understandable and applied standards, we will not be able to respond as a system, but rather as separate and largely autonomous agencies and organizations. We will not be able to add value, maximize impact and minimize duplication”

Valerie Amos, Opening of the Joint Standards Initiative (JSI) Conference, Copenhagen, November 2013

And later joined by Groupe URD
Is the CHS content all new?

The CHS builds on:

- HAP Standard
- People in Aid Code
- Sphere Core standards
- The code of conduct for the Int. RC / RC movement
- The IASC commitments on AAP
- The OECD DAC criteria for evaluation development and humanitarian assistance
- The Good Humanitarian Donorship
The Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS)

- Based on humanitarian principles
- Nine Commitments and corresponding criteria for organisations to assess and improve the quality and accountability of the assistance they provide.
- Made up of a set of key actions on one hand, and organisational responsibilities on the other for each commitment.
- Developed by CHS Alliance, Groupe URD and the Sphere project, in collaboration with the sector.
CHS – A “whole of organisation approach”

**Strategic objectives**
- Communities receive assistance appropriate to their needs (1)
- Communities have access to assistance at the right time (2)
- Communities are not negatively affected and are more prepared, resilient and less at risk (3)

**Organisational approach**
- Rights based approach (4)
- Do no harm (3)
- Participation and communication (4)

**Systems and processes**
- Complaints response mechanism (5)
- Assistance coordinated and complimentary (6)
- Organisational learning (7)

**Organisational resources**
- Staff and volunteers are competent and well managed (8)
- Efficient and effective and ethical management of resources (9)
Communities vulnerable to risk and affected by disaster, conflict or poverty influence and access quality assistance and can hold organisations accountable.
Using slido during the learning event

- Improve and innovate
- Allow more people to engage
- Enrich our strategy development
- Prioritise, rate
- Link to social media
Using polls

WIFI:
Login: CHS
Password: 2016

Join at slido.com #chslearning
Asking questions

Login: CHS
Password: 2016
Download learning event documents

- 01 Detailed programme learning event
- Learning-Event-1 page programme.pdf
Sharing on social media

#chslearning
Keynote speech

Loretta Hieber Girardet
Chief, Inter-Cluster Coordination Section, Programme Support Branch, OCHA Geneva
Panel discussion

- **Loretta Hieber Girardet**
  Chief, Inter-Cluster Coordination Section, Programme Support Branch, OCHA Geneva

- **Qassem Al Saad, chairman**
  Chairman, Naba’a, developmental action without borders

- **Richard Cobb**
  Senior Humanitarian Evidence, Effectiveness & Accountability Advisor, Save the Children,

- **Christine Knudsen**
  Director, The Sphere Project

**Facilitation: Maxine Clayton**
Regional Representative, East Africa, CHS Alliance

Join with #chslearning at slido.com
### Where is my workshop?

#### Morning: 10.30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop 1</th>
<th>Workshop 2</th>
<th>Workshop 3</th>
<th>Workshop 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the CHS work for both national and international actors?</strong></td>
<td><strong>The role of the CHS in coordination and the cluster system.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The CHS Verification Scheme, a credible commitment to quality?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Learning by asking the right questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main room</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 14</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 13</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rooms 7-8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Afternoon: 13.30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop 5</th>
<th>Workshop 6</th>
<th>Workshop 7</th>
<th>Workshop 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor staff management, poor quality.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Closing the feedback loop.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Harmonised standards, harmonised donor compliance requirements</strong></td>
<td><strong>Development, disaster preparedness and the CHS.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room 14</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 13</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main room</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 7-8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Join with #chslearning at slido.com
A disruptive standard?
Rethinking humanitarian response with the Core Humanitarian Standard
Proposals for action

MOTERATED BY MAXINE CLAYTON
CHS Alliance regional representative for East Africa
Keynote speech

ELHADJ AS SY
Secretary General, IFRC
Conclusion

JUDITH GREENWOOD
Executive Director, CHS Alliance
Thank you for your active participation!

Join with #chslearning

#chslearning
Workshop 1

Does the CHS work for both national and international actors?
In pairs:

• Share your name and organisation
• Outline why you chose this workshop and what your expectations are
Workshop #1 timings
10:30 – 12:15

10:30am
• Welcome and introduction, 10 mins
• 3 x Presentations, 45 mins
• Q&A on Presentations, 15 mins

11:40am
• “Proposals for change” – vote for preferred proposal, 5 mins
• In groups: Discuss / reframe the selected “Proposal for change” 20 mins
• Present revised change proposals and select, 10 mins
Does the CHS work for both national and international actors?

- Is the existence of an international standard such as the CHS an opportunity for national actors to demonstrate that, when judged with the same yardstick, they have areas of competitive advantage over international actors?

- Or on the contrary, is it, together with potential requirements for certification, another barrier to accessing funds directly?

- **What will it take to move this agenda forward** and allow - among other things - more equal access to funding for national actors?
Http://slido.com

Question:
How would you describe the organisation that you represent?

• Local / national actor
• International actor
• International actor and local/national actor
• Other
Question:
Should national/local actors adopt the CHS?

- **Yes** – and it should be an expectation of any international actor with whom they work
- **Yes** – but it is the decision of the national/local actor whether they do
- **Maybe** – but only if they are provided appropriate support, particularly by international actors
- **Maybe** – if the national/local actor believes there is a clear value-add to their work
- **No**
Presentations

• **Reza Chowdhury** - managing COAST working for coastal poor in Bangladesh.

• **Shveta Shah** - Disaster and Emergencies Preparedness Programme (DEPP) Portfolio Manager, START Network.

• **Anne Street** - Head of Humanitarian Policy at CAFOD
The CHS: is it appropriate for both international and national actors?

Why and Why Not

Rezaul Karim Chowdhury

www.coastbd.net  www.near.ngo
Interesting Indeed ???
But I need to tell you about COAST involvement

- 6 years in HAP governance
- Certified two times
- Involved in CHS development as a technical committee member
Interesting Indeed ???
But I need to tell you about COAST involvement

- In Bangladesh facilitated inclusive process of translation and roll out.
- Two year long process of translation, validation and launch,
- Aiming to increase awareness and to motivate uptake.
- But, experience are different, observation in Cyclone Roanu (May 2016, Bangladesh) relief and rehabilitation work
Why COAST have internalized it

Self-motivation and for

- Mutual accountability
- Respect from all level
- Front line and public monitoring
- Community and front line take responsibility
- Low level of risk
- People centered, staff managed
- Visible Outcomes

Reward and recognition are secondary
Experiences on cyclone Roanu (May 2016) relief rehabilitation work

After "survival food package" distribution, we started talking with community, especially with women, elderly people, children and population living in remote area, basically with two major objectives

- To make the activities need based
- To avoid duplication of resources.
Experiences on cyclone Roanu (May 2016) relief rehabilitation work

We found that, involved with water sanitation (e.g., cleaned water supply though machines, renovation of tub wells, increase surface water preservation through pond reaccavation, desalinization of pond, dress and book supply to the children, created cube surrounding tub wells to facilitate women to use those, reconstruct high raised toilets).
Experiences on cyclone Roanu (May 2016)
relief rehabilitation work

- **local to national level advocacy** (e.g., four rally in local and district level to demand immediate embankment constructions to protect people from monsoon tidal surge in each fortnight, organized parliamentary caucus in parliament with Member of Parliaments and Ministers during budget session, organize multi stakeholder consultation in grass root to promote public participatory monitoring during embankment construction.)
Experiences on cyclone Roanu (May 2016) INGO vs NNGO perspective

- Ironically we hardly see any INGO and local / NGO has involved in such crucial humanitarian service delivery like water and sanitation, mostly of them overwhelmed with “cash distribution” and no one involved with humanitarian advocacy. Our analysis of WHY in this regard.

- INGOs head quarter might does not have any CHS multiplication (roll out) plan for their country offices,

- Little of agency wise system on continuous and consistent “trial, error and strive for excellence” on CHS,
Experiences on cyclone Roanu (May 2016) relief rehabilitation work

- Little on anything for partners in this regard, little of competition, mostly repetition of “sub-contracting approaches rather than partnership approach” mostly overwhelmed with humanitarian service delivery.

- Little of no pressure or no review on CHS and reward from core donors like UKAID, ECHO, SIDA, NORAD and DANIDA.

- Little of investment in demand side (ie, humanitarian victims and local and national NGOs are demanding Accountability / CHS) creation from front line / grass root.
It is not the question of appropriateness it is the question on operationalization of principles on our existence

- **WHY:** we exist for poor / humanitarian victims, so there is a question of mutual accountability put them in place of decision making power.

- **WHAT:** ultimate aim is to create environment that the state and the community will take responsibility themselves.
Commitment, investment and roll out process to front line with trial and error process.

Competition policy among the partners based on internalization.

Core donor provide funding based on assessment of CHS roll out and

Investment in respect of creating demand side of CHS.
Changes I propose

- Annual reporting of membership in CHS on roll out of CHS
- Collection and dissemination of good practices and know how
- Separate focal person in INGO headquarter and separate allocation for CHS roll out
- Assessment by Core Donor on CHS roll out prior to funding
START NETWORK

SHVETA SHAH
Disaster and Emergencies Preparedness Programme (DEPP)
Portfolio Manager, START Network.
Who is the Network?

An international network of 42 humanitarian NGOs from across five continents working together and leading for change in humanitarian aid.
What does the Network do?

We are working to enable a humanitarian system that is **diverse, decentralised** and **collaborative**

We do this by working in 4 main areas:

- **START FUND**
- **START ENGAGE**
- **START LABS**
- **COLLABORATIVE RESPONSES**
Reflections on CHS - environment

www.startnetwork.org
Reflections on CHS - network

• **Decentralised nature of the Network:** some members already apply the CHS, and want the Network to focus on operational collaborative action.

• **Approach:** Investing in experimenting, innovating, and learning-by-doing.

• **Power analysis:** Addressing humanitarian financing, decision-making, capacities, planning and action.

• ‘**Hearts and minds’ vs compliance:** Take-up is organically done by our collaborative initiatives.
Reflections on CHS – DEPP

Through Start Engage we are collaboratively developing new approaches to capacity strengthening in disaster response.

- 13 DEPP Projects
- 44 Partners
- 11 Countries

[Map showing countries such as Jordan, Pakistan, Bangladesh, DRC, Ethiopia, South Sudan, Mozambique, Kenya, Myanmar, Philippines]
Reflections on CHS – in action
Reflections on CHS in action - power

- **Shifting the Power** as part of preparedness capacity development?

- Vision: A better balanced system where local actors take their place alongside international NGOs. A shift of power towards locally owned and led response.

- 5 countries | 50 Local & National NGOs | 6 INGOs | £5mil

- National committees with own pots of money to develop capacity development plans and actions.

- Frameworks | Piloting | Research | Advocacy

- **Mindset** - Power analysis the whole journey
Reflections on CHS in action - power

• SHAPE framework & assessment
• Mapped against CHS where possible
• Loved by INGOs and donors – what about everyone else?
• Only as an entry point – at busy times we revert to old ways of working so use tool to challenge, not constrain.
• if something is missing don’t re-create. Use what is out there like CHS and friends who are using it = peer to peer exchange.

www.startnetwork.org
Reflections on CHS in action - inclusion

- **Age and Disability Capacity Programme** ‘no one left behind’ are we walking the talk?

- Mainstreaming approach – does it work?

- Organisational change | Inclusion standards | M&E tools | Advocacy | Multi-donor funding

- Tactically influencing others in Start Network – whole DEPP portfolio and Start Fund

- Shared Humanity - WHS recognition of Inclusion Charter
Reflections on CHS in action - inclusion

• 8 / 9 Key Inclusion Standards align with CHS
  They ask: What does an age and disability inclusive implementation of CHS look like? What would it take to achieve that?

1. Are recognised – they are visible in surveys – disaggregated data.

2. Have access to the assistance they need – their specific needs are assessed.

3. Are not negatively affected - not put at risk from further exclusion and stigma – e.g. being mindful of risks of abuse from exclusive practices
Reflections on CHS in action - inclusion

4. Know their rights and entitlements

5. Have access to complaints mechanisms – have equal access to information, appropriate communication

6. Receive and participate in co-ordinated assistance – inclusion in all sectors – and linkages between mainstream & specialist

7. Can expect improved assistance from learning and review – including voices in evaluation – to improve protection and access

8. Received assistance from competent staff and equal opportunities for employment and volunteering – about training staff on issues and access to employment

www.startnetwork.org
Propositions

Prove it works and shout about it!

1. Generate evidence

2. Share good practices, failures and learnings.

www.startnetwork.org
CAFOD and the Charter4Change

Anne Street
Head of Humanitarian Policy
CHS QUALITY CRITERION:
HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE
STRENGTHENS LOCAL CAPACITIES
AND AVOIDS NEGATIVE EFFECTS

Charter4Change and the Localisation of Humanitarian Aid
Anne Street CHS Learning Event Nov 2016
There are 29 signatories to the Charter and it is endorsed by over 150 southern NGOs and NGO networks.
Provide robust organisational support and capacity building

**Support**
Provide robust organisational support and capacity building

**Promote**
Promote the role of local actors to media and public

**Equality**
Address subcontracting ensuring local and national actors participate in decision-making as equals

**Direct Funding**
Commit to passing 20% humanitarian funding to NNGOs

**Partnership**
Reaffirm principles of partnership

**Transparency**
Publish amount/percentage of funding passed to NNGOs

**Recruitment**
Consider and prevent negative impact of recruiting NNGO staff during emergencies

**Advocacy**
Emphasise the importance of national actors
Is the system changing? 
Are actors changing? 
Is CHS making a difference?

Strong calls for more effective localisation in World Humanitarian Summit consultations.

Some real commitments made in Istanbul: 
Grand Bargain: 25% funding to NNGOs by 2020

Establishment and funding of NEAR Network

Changes within UN agencies and approaches

Growing recognition of CHS across the sector
1. C4C and CHS should make common cause to support the delivery of a more people-centred and locally appropriate response
Presentations: Q&A

*Points of clarification – short please!*

*“Stand-out” points from what you heard*
Proposals for Change

- What problem, opportunity it addresses
- How it will do so
- Expected benefit, impact, added value
- Who will need to be involved
Proposals for Change

Discuss / reframe the selected change proposal – looking for a SMART proposition
Workshop 2

The role of the CHS in coordination and the cluster system.
IASC

ASTRID DE VALON
IASC AAP and PSEA task team coordinator
Accountability to Affected Population: 3 aspects

Taking Account

- Giving affected people influence over decision making and ensuring the response is adjusted accordingly

Being Held to Account

- Giving communities the opportunity to assess and if appropriate sanction your actions.

Giving Account

- Transparently and effectively sharing information with communities
At Regional level

- Dropbox
- Hotlines
- Sms
- Focus Groups
- Regular visits

Cluster leads for the region

Consolidation of feedback per themes

Accountability to Affected Population Working Group

Individual Agencies

At Country level

National Cluster leads

National Inter Cluster Coordination Mechanism

Consolidation of feedback per themes

Accountability to Affected Population Coordinator

15 days
Example  “Accountability together” Automated web-based Integrated Complaint Referral Mechanism in Kenya

“Quality service and accountability from government and non-government service providers is your right”
### How does the CHS support strengthening our collective accountability

- Global Cluster Coordinators agreed upon the CHS in terms of its practicality in providing a framework, which NGOs and many partners are familiar with, in helping to operationalise the IASC core commitments on AAP.

- All organisations submitting projects to Humanitarian Response Plans must demonstrate they are working to Sphere standards and quality criteria of the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS).

- Clusters develop work plans based on CHS and deliver assistance according to Sphere.

- Only organisations applying CHS and Sphere to be eligible for CERF funding.

- Humanitarian Country Teams' biannual review according to CHS quality criteria and Sphere standards.

To do this, IASC needs to:

- Change TOR for Humanitarian Coordinators and cluster lead agencies (include direct responsibility for integrating CHS & Sphere standards)
Commitment 6: focussing on coordination and complementarity

- Commitment 6 includes key actions that are essential to strengthening collective accountability such as:
  - Collaboration and sharing of resources and equipment
  - Joint assessment, trainings and evaluation to ensure a coherent approach
  - Ensure local actors participation to coordination meeting is facilitated (language, location)

Recognise that impact is only possible through collaborative working and mutual accountability.
Tools to support clusters and inter cluster

- Fiches developed by OCHA, the task team and the Global Protection Cluster
- Aimed at Cluster and intercluster coordination groups
- Suggesting key actions related to Accountability, Communication, PSEA, Protection, Protection Mainstreaming throughout the Humanitarian Program Cycle
- Based on the CHS, the IASC CAAP, the IASC Guidance on Protection and AAP, the MoS on PSEA, the GPC guidance on Protection mainstreaming and other lessons learned.
- Fiches will be disseminated to the global clusters, along with 2 annexes:
  - Questions and Answers
  - Global Protection Cluster checklist derived from the IASC Guidance on Protection and AAP
• Uphold key standards such as the Core Humanitarian Standards and the Minimum Operating Standards on PSEA and ensure they are complemented with technical standards such as the Sphere standards.
• Roll out the Best Practice Guide to Establish Inter-Agency Community-Based Complaint Mechanisms (CBCM) and accompanying Standard Operating Procedures.
• Commit to adapt the standards and related operational frameworks to the local context after consultations with local stakeholders and communities.
Proposal for change

In 2015, Global Cluster Coordinators have agreed upon the CHS in terms of its practicality in providing a framework to operationalise the IASC core commitments on AAP.

- Ensure to use the CHS to collectively improve our accountability to affected population.
- Use the CHS to facilitate access and participation of national actors and diaspora organizations to coordination mechanisms in order to collectively advance AAP.
GPC Protection Mainstreaming Task Team

Gergey Pasztor
Technical advisor for protection mainstreaming, IRC
Overview

1. Protection Mainstreaming and the CHS
   - Guidance
   - Tools

2. Challenges & Pitfalls

3. Successes & Positives
Protection Mainstreaming & the CHS

PM Guidance & Principles

> Meaningful Access (CHS 1 & 2)
> Safety & Dignity (CHS 3)
> Accountability (CHS 4 & 5)
> Participation (CHS 3 & 4)
Protection Mainstreaming & the CHS

PM Toolkit

> Combination of guidance and self-assessment Tools
> Targeting: Implementing agencies, clusters, humanitarian coordination structure, and donors.
> Links to the CHS self-assessment tools
Challenges & Pitfalls

> Crowded Field

> Protection as a sector VS Protection as a cross-cutting issue

> Lack of a clear incentive structure (ethical, normative, or functional)

> One-time VS periodic assessments
Successes & Positives

> Committed Donors (OFDA, Sida, ECHO, Dfid)

> Committed humanitarian community that keeps this high on the agenda (see IASC Policy on Protection)

> A global & field structure that can support mainstreaming as part of its core tasks (e.g. Regional Trainers, Protection Clusters, Humanitarian Coordination Mechanisms – OCHA)
Open Questions

> The field structure has been instrumental in promoting Protection Mainstreaming. How can the CHS use existing field structures to promote the CHS?

> How will CHS deal with the crowded field?
Suggestion: A “CHS-Ready” label?

Ready for the Core Humanitarian STANDARD

Compatible with the Core Humanitarian STANDARD
UNICEF

PHILIP TAMMINGA, OFDA project, UNICEF
Using the CHS for Improving Cluster Performance & Accountability
Using the CHS for Improving Cluster Performance & Accountability

Reflections from the OFDA-UNICEF Cluster AAP Project

Philip Tamminga – Global Cluster AAP Advisor, UNICEF

CHS Learning Event
4 November 2016
So what is accountability to affected people?

It’s really about our responsibilities to people in three areas.
And it’s about relationships based on trust and respect that support local capacities and resilience...

It’s about generating results that meet their needs and priorities....

It’s about respecting and enabling them to exercise their rights...

RELATIONSHIPS
In other words, when we put people at the centre...

They are more likely to be satisfied with aid efforts...and we are more likely to meet our commitments to them....
And that’s exactly what the CHS does...

The nine CHS commitments focus on **results, rights and relationships with affected people**.
The cluster system was meant to help us generate more predictable results for affected people.

But look who is at the centre of the system... It’s not affected people!
So, this is the flower we are trying to grow....

---And too much of our efforts go into supporting this kind of flower instead of supporting affected people.
Cluster core “6+1” functions are supposed to help the system work better.

But it’s still mainly about the system...
It looks like AAP was an after-thought, and not the central function of clusters.

So it’s easy to see why many clusters don’t see AAP as a priority…
What is worse...when you add on all the different tools, guidelines, policies and other “system” requirements we produce....

...It’s easy to see why many cluster coordinators see AAP as part of the jungle and not central to our work...
Wouldn’t it be better to put people at the centre?

This flower certainly looks more healthy!
If we did, we would more likely generate meaningful **results** for people, support them to exercise their **rights**, and respect and prioritise local capacities and strengthen resilience.

*In other words, a happy, healthy flower*
And if cluster and coordination mechanisms work together towards this, the more likely we are to collectively improve the quality, coverage, effectiveness and accountability of responses.
So what do clusters need to do to help this flower take root in our system?
CHANGE WE AIM TO SEE

Use the CHS as the reference for:

**Cluster capacity building**
- Cluster coordinators and partners are trained and have practical tools to use the CHS to improve collective quality, effectiveness and accountability

**HRP’s and cluster strategies**
- Specific quality and accountability objectives will help orient us to the type of coordination we want
- Linking accountability to quality, coverage, effectiveness can help us with a more holistic approach to meeting people’s needs and priorities

**Cluster performance management**
- Better use of feedback and other data will give us a better understanding of how well we are meeting affected people’s needs and priorities
- Collective indicators against the CHS will help us measure and benchmark our progress
- More systematic joint field monitoring and LISTENING to people will help us fulfill cluster’s risk management and quality assurance role

**Resource mobilisation**
- Clusters could prioritise allocation of resources based on peoples’ needs and priorities
- The CHS can be a criteria access to funding from donors, pooled funds, etc.
- The CHS could also help prioritise allocating resources to build partners’s capacity
How to get there...

Get back to basics
• The role of coordination for improved results, rights and relationships, not “feeding the system”

Practical
• Develop simple, practical tools and “how to” instructions to show integrating AAP is possible and we are often doing it already

Realistic
• Start with small steps and priorities and build from there

Learn as we go
• Make mistakes, experiment, and scale-up when ready
Workshop 3

The CHS Verification Scheme, a credible commitment to quality?
PLAN International Germany

FABIAN BÖCKLER
Team Leader Disaster Risk Management, Programme Department
Independent Benchmarking
A third party quality assurance
Presentation Outline

1. Why we chose Benchmarking
2. The process (different steps, workload and resources)
3. Challenges as a member of a federated organisational structure
4. Obtained results (expected and unexpected)
5. Moving forward
6. Proposals for change
Why we chose Benchmarking
Why we chose Benchmarking
A third party quality assurance

• to show our commitment to the Core Humanitarian Standard
• to establish Plan Germany’s starting point in this process and define the baseline of Plan Germany’s DRM team’s performance against each of the 9 commitments
• to have an external, unbiased and independent view on our work
• practical reasons: to source out a part of the work to an external party
• organizational reasons: a period of quick growth, significant number of new staff and experiencing new ways of working
• advocacy reasons: an opportune time to influence
The Process
Different steps, workload and resources
The Process

Different steps of the benchmarking exercise

- The benchmarking exercise included **3 parts**: the self-assessment (HQAI-version), a HQ Audit (2 days) and a Field Audit (5 days)
- **Tanzania** was chosen by the auditor as Project Site (based on security, access, volume of projects as criteria)
- Focus on assessing the Plan Germany’s **Disaster Risk Management Unit**
- The self-assessment tool was filled by **one team member** - with one country chosen as sample
- Information was gathered from **different sources** from Plan International
- The initial draft was shared with the DRM team to **reach consensus** on the scores
- Other departments were not directly involved
- The final self-assessment document was shared with the auditor prior to her HQ visit
The Process

Workload and Resources

• I would describe the process as **intense**

• **23** work days as **total time spent** on conducting the self-assessment (one third of one team member’s time during 3 months)

• Given more time we could have:
  - conducted interviews with staff
  - included other departments
  - held collaborative sessions for each commitment
Challenges
as a member of a federated organizational structure
Challenges

as a member of a federated organizational structure

- The standard CHS model is structured in a way that suits an organisational model consisting of an international HQ and partner field offices.
- It was a challenge to **navigate the role of the Plan Germany** in CHS compliance in Plan’s **federated** structure.
- It was a challenge to isolate the influence or attributed contribution of Plan Germany to the Field Office performance in some areas of the assessment.
Obtained Results

Expected and unexpected
Obtained results

Expected and unexpected

It was expected that the benchmarking would allow Plan Germany to:

- Identify the **existing gaps** that the team must work on
- Identify **existing strengths** that the team can play towards and build upon
- Differentiate between **institutional levels** on which strengths and gaps can be identified and addressed
- Create a plan for improvement and allowing **measurement of progress** and achievements
- Participating DRM team members gained a **better understanding** of each commitment
Overall, Plan International Germany works in line with the CHS requirements

Main strengths:
• our community engagement and strong values/policies on child protection
• we work on a needs-based approach, engaging communities and being accessible to them
• strongly involved in coordination processes, sharing information and learning with others
• committed to transparency and due diligence
• learning organisation, involved into capacity building inside and outside the organisation

Areas for improvement:
• some gaps between our principles and commitments and actual achievements
• clearer systems and control mechanisms at some levels needed
• a need to better support, systematize and disseminate monitoring, evaluation and learning mechanisms
• strong HR policies, but they might not be systematically applied and implemented

Obtained Results
Overall organisational performance
Obtained results
Self Assessment Results compared to HQAI external auditor results

• The HQAI auditor explained the scoring scale during the HQ audit. It became clear that this was not exactly the same as our scoring scale and so it was accepted that the scores of the two reports would not be entirely comparable

• Nevertheless, in general our scores and findings were in line with the HQAI auditor’s and the trend of the scores were similar

• We intentionally marked ourselves more severely on the indicators where we felt Plan Germany had the greatest scope for influence

• The auditor’s assessment had the added depth of the field visit and beneficiary interviews which weren’t included in the Plan Germany self-assessment
Obtained results
Self Assessment Results compared to HQAI external auditor results

CHS Plan Germany Assessment Results

Commitment 1  Commitment 2  Commitment 3  Commitment 4  Commitment 5  Commitment 6  Commitment 7  Commitment 8  Commitment 9

Self Assessment  HQAI
Moving forward
How we plan to use the outcomes
Moving forward

How we plan to use the outcomes

- Plan Germany is one of the first entities to embark on this CHS compliance process within the federation. Our results and learnings, regarding both the findings and the process itself, will be shared with Plan International.

- Plan Germany will use these results and the lessons learned from this process to advise and provide input to Plan International on the global next steps, the urgent areas for improvement, and to highlight areas within the organisation where capacities need to be further developed.

- Plan International will be conducting a CHS self-assessment, using Plan Germany’s benchmarking and Plan UK’s self-assessment as baseline for this organizational-wide exercise.

- Plan International will set-up a complimentary system, including an overall improvement plan to which Plan Germany’s improvement plan will contribute.
Proposals for Change
Proposals for change

• **Reviewing structure of self-assessment tool for variety of organization types:** for example, make it more user friendly and to make it more adaptable for federation structures.
  
  → The tool has the potential to be used to disaggregate the results according to the levels of the organisation, which would further allow an organisation to have a targeted improvement plan.

• **Proactive awareness raising and advocacy for using CHS:** providing incentives for organisations to apply the CHS both on the supply and demand side. For example, advocate for the application of the Core Humanitarian Standards in the European Refugee Response (e.g. in countries that are hosting large numbers of refugees).
THANK YOU!
Lutheran World Federation

PETRA FEIL
Global QAA & PMER Coordinator
LWF Experience: CHS Self-Assessment Process

Dr. Petra Feil
Global QAA & PMER Coordinator
LWF Geneva
Planning the LWF CHS Self-Assessment Process

1: Consultation
- 1 day workshop for all Geneva staff
- Introductory webinar for all Country Programs

2: Documentation
- Development of global CHS SA plan 2016/2017
- Preparation of LWF CHS Self-Assessment Toolkit (adaptation of CHS SA toolkit and translations)

3: Testing & exchange
- Testing and verification of SA process in 2 countries
- On-going cross-country learning and exchange, including webinars and face-to-face meetings
## LWF CHS Self-Assessment Process Outline 2016-2017

### 2016: 8 Country Programs (CPs) & Geneva to start SA

- Myanmar (completed)
- Nepal (completed)
- Colombia (on-going)
- Uganda (on-going)
- Chad (planning phase)
- Mauritania (planning phase)
- CAR (started, put on hold)
- South Sudan *(on hold)*

- Geneva (nearly complete)

### 2017: More CPs to start process & Global Report

- SA processes started in 2016 are finalized
- 8 more CPs to start SA process in 2017
- Consolidated Global SA Report submitted by Dec 2017
Why such an extensive SA process?

• To respond to the ‘newness’ of CHS by:
  - building awareness & capacity across LWF World Service
  - developing a new global baseline for LWF against the CHS

• To embrace the intrinsic differences between SA and Audit approaches by:
  - aiming as high as we can, rather than doing ‘just enough’ to pass
  - promoting an participatory empowerment and learning approach — not choosing just the ‘usual suspects’ but intentionally involving CPs perceived as weaker/less well-resourced
  - developing a process that is continuous, not one-off…
  - strengthening cross-country/peer learning, less focused on HQ
Let’s hear from LWF Nepal…

https://lwf-worldservice.webex.com/lwf-worldservice/ldr.php?RCID=6a3b8ffa85c10a5ccafde3738deb4a46
Next Steps for LWF

• **We will have a solid baseline for CHS alignment across LWF by end of 2017**
• **But now need to develop plan for 2018 and beyond…**
• **Key considerations will be:**
  - **Meaningfulness** – i.e. how to best build on progress and processes in 2016/2017… How to mainstream SA? Going for certification?
  - **Capacity** – i.e. how often can each Country Program realistically conduct a SA? And the implementing the improvement plan in between?
  - **Cost** – i.e. perceived value of validation method vs actual cost?
    Support and lobbying for changes in budgeting
Learning and Recommendations

The Self Assessment process:
• increases CHS awareness – with staff, partners and communities

• provides a unique internal ‘space’ for reflection & learning on Q&A

• moves forward more easily at country level with internal peer accompaniment (i.e. country-to-country, or Geneva-to-country program)
Learning and Recommendations

The Self Assessment process
• tends to result in focus on improvements rather than strengths

Recommendation 1: CHS Alliance and its members should consider how the SA process can be enhanced to capture and build on strengths as strongly as it addresses weaknesses/improvements
• supports good data collection but more data analysis capacity needed

Recommendation 2: CHS Alliance and its members should consider how the SA process (incl. toolkit) can be improved to strengthen data analysis, especially of qualitative feedback from communities
Thank you!

• **Feel free to contact us:**
  Dr Petra Feil: petra.feil@lutheranworld.org
  Ruth Foley: ruth.foley@lutheranworld.org
INTERACT WITH #chslearning ON

INTERACT WITH #chslearning ON
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Learning by asking the right questions
CERAH

Edith Favoreu
Deputy Director, CERAH
Learning by asking the right questions, Learning with the CHS
Learning…

- Who we are
- Our connections with the CHS
- How we use the CHS
WHAT DOES CERAH STAND FOR?

Mission
CERAH enhances the capacity of individual and institutional humanitarian actors to devise and bring relevant, adapted and timely responses to the plight of populations affected by armed conflict, disasters or social exclusion.

Objective 1: Postgraduate education
Strengthen the competencies of professionals active in the humanitarian sector through an internationally recognized education and training offer focused on humanitarian organisations’ current and future challenges.

Objective 2: Research
Undertake research critically assessing humanitarian concepts, policies and practices in order to improve humanitarian responses.

Objective 3: Critical debate
Stimulate debate and reflection on selected humanitarian issues to further critical and innovative thinking.

Develop critical thinking and analysis to improve the quality of humanitarian response.
Joint centre, inter-faculties

Partnership with Humanitarian Organisations

Post-graduate: Middle managers

Professionalisation of the Humanitarian sector

9 diplomas: MAS-DAS-CAS

More than 15 Thematic Seminars

Accredited programme (European credits transfer system ECTS)

Modularity - flexibility

Pluri and-or Interdisciplinary

Conceptual, Theoretical and Practical

Descriptive, Analytic, Comparative and Prospective

Interactive and Highly participatory

Transmissive, Reflexive, Collaborative and Constructive

Problem solving

Knowledge transfer into working situation
CERAH

Values and guiding principles

- Ensuring effectiveness and promote quality
- All activities undertaken by CERAH, whether in the realm of training, research or debate, are evidence-based, results-oriented and ultimately geared towards improving the humanitarian situation on the ground.
- CERAH thus has a duty to apply the highest quality standards to its activities and to ensure as much as possible that their impact is measurable and positive, while avoiding harm.
- Quality is central to the CERAH’s mission to improve the quality of humanitarian responses.
People centered Humanitarian action

Quality accountability Effectiveness

Individual
organisational
Program. Project activity level

Process Behaviour

Professionalisation

Competences Recognition

Connecting…
4 dimensions

- For our own *quality process*
- In our *program content*
- For the *learning process*
- *Dissemination process*
For our own quality process

As part of the Humanitarian System

Commitment 7: (...) organisations learn from experience and reflection

Commitment 8: (...) competent and well-managed staff

Commitment 9. (...) organisations assisting them are managing resources effectively, efficiently and ethically.
In our **program content**

- *Quality as a key stake and a transversal issue*=
  Quality management

- Different **components** of quality and accountability (specific courses on Do No Harm, participation and community engagement, etc.)

- **Presentation of** the CHS, Guidance notes, Sphere standards, Compas quality,
For the *learning process*

- Reflexive analysis
- Critical analysis
- Contextualisation
- Critiques and recommendations
- Implementation
For the **learning process**

- **Reflexive analysis**
  
  **Linking the CHS and our role as managers**
  
  - Did you manage to fulfill the commitment X in your previous experience? Why? What were your major challenges?
  
  - Do you consider that you have the capacities (individual- organisational) to fulfill the commitment X? Why/ Why not? Which knowledge, skills, soft skills you would like to strengthen?
Critical analysis

What are the challenges, issues, problems?

...In terms of

- process
- content
- use of concepts, terminology,
- approaches
- contextualisation
For the *learning process*

- **Contextualisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT DOES IT MEAN....</th>
<th>Different or similar Why?</th>
<th>What does it mean for us, as manager in our own organisational and regional context?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application in conflict situations and other types of disaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application regarding different crisis phases (relief, recovery, development)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application regarding different approaches: humanitarian/development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICS

- **Process:**
  Minimal engagement of affected communities in the development of standards

- **Content:**
  - **Humanitarian action** = humanitarian assistance
  - Protection « left behind»
  - **Contextualisation but** no distinction regarding the types of crises, crisis phases, ....
  Commitment 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
DESIRABLE CONNECTIONS

For example: CHS and Humanitarian Qualification Framework
Framework: CHS related to Level 5-6-7-8 of the HQF

**HQM can benefit from CHS:**
- Do no Harm
- Participatory approach
- Feedbacks and complaints mechanisms
- Capitalisation of experience

**CHS can benefit from HQM:**
- Autonomy and responsibility in the decisional process as an individual
Implementation

• CAS Designing strategies and projects for humanitarian action
  • Geneva: Analytical grid
  • Blended learning: Plan of Action design and implementation in their working situation
Dissemination

• Our students, Managers
• Implementation in their own practice
• Professional dissemination: Dialogue with their:
  • Team members
  • Colleagues
  • Managers
Thank you!

www.cerahgeneve.ch
The Quality COMPAS, developed by Groupe URD, was launched in 2004.

This quality assurance method was organised around a quality reference framework, the COMPAS Rose, made of 12 quality criteria.
In 2014, Groupe URD was invited to participate in the development of the CHS ...
Background: from the Quality COMPAS to the CHS-COMPAS

... and decided to integrate the Quality COMPAS reference framework into the CHS.
Background: from the Quality COMPAS to the CHS-COMPAS

The COMPAS Rose got transformed into the CHS reference framework.
The CHS-COMPAS: the COMPAS method adapted to the CHS

The CHS-COMPAS is composed of two main parts:

• a series of **key questions, warning and tips**, derived from the CHS criteria and key actions, for each stage of the **project cycle** to ensure the quality of the programmes.

• a **framework to guide the evaluation** of programmes, based on a series of indicators derived from the 9 CHS criteria.
The CHS-COMPAS Dashboard

These two components of the COMPAS method are organized in the CHS-COMPAS Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logic of the intervention</th>
<th>Information to collect (M&amp;E)</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Quality criteria, CHS commitments</th>
<th>Key actions</th>
<th>Phase 1 of the PCM</th>
<th>Phase 2 of the PCM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Gap between planned and achieved</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.1.</td>
<td>▶ Key question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td>Comparison between planned and necessary</td>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>Tips</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tips or warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.1.</td>
<td>▶ Key question</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation

Implementation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality criteria</th>
<th>Key actions</th>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Programme design</th>
<th>Design of the monitoring system</th>
<th>Implementation and monitoring</th>
<th>Programme closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Draw on lessons learnt and prior experience when designing programmes.</td>
<td>Collect lessons learnt from experience of providing aid in this context.</td>
<td>Ensure you integrate the lessons learnt from other projects or the experience of other organisations into your project design (...)</td>
<td>Make sure you integrate lessons learnt from previous monitoring mechanisms (type of indicators, data collection mechanisms, etc.) and context specificities (access to information, national database, etc.)</td>
<td>Implement the lessons learnt from experience of providing aid in this context.</td>
<td>Previous monitoring mechanisms.</td>
<td>Previous monitoring mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Learn, innovate and implement changes on the basis of monitoring and evaluation, and feedback and complaints.</td>
<td>▶ How are you going to learn lessons from this programme (e.g. self-evaluation, group feedback and discussion, external evaluation, etc.)?</td>
<td>In case of innovation, make sure the appropriate monitoring and learning mechanisms are in place.</td>
<td>▶ What changes have to be made to the programme, based on the results of learning?</td>
<td>▶ What are the main lessons learnt from this experience and any particular innovation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Share learning and innovation internally, with communities and people affected by crisis, and with other stakeholders.</td>
<td>▶ Make sure to set aside a specific time and budget for learning and piloting innovation.</td>
<td>Make sure you share learning and decisions about changes to the right people and organisations.</td>
<td>▶ How do you disseminate the lessons learnt from your programme and the innovations?</td>
<td>▶ How do you disseminate the lessons learnt from your programme and the innovations?</td>
<td>▶ How do you disseminate the lessons learnt from your programme and the innovations?</td>
<td>▶ How do you disseminate the lessons learnt from your programme and the innovations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentinel indicators</td>
<td>Logic of the intervention</td>
<td>Information to be collected</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Quality criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Repeat of mistakes made in other programmes or typical mistakes of the sector are registered. * Programme team, partners and/or population display signs of dissatisfaction (weariness, despondency) or distrust as a result of failure to rectify mistakes or of mistakes continually being repeated. * Repeated losses in energy, time and money to rectify mistakes are registered several times.</td>
<td>Technical and methodological foundations of the programme (guidelines, techniques recognised within the sector, assumptions, local experience, etc.)</td>
<td>Up-to-date techniques that have been validated by experts in the sector</td>
<td>Gap between proposed techniques/methodology and current expertise within the sector</td>
<td>7. Communities and people affected by crisis can expect delivery of improved assistance as organisations learn from experience and reflection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned process for improving the programme and learning from this experience (system for recording programme information, monitoring and evaluating methods, etc.)</td>
<td>Recurring problems regularly pointed out by stakeholders</td>
<td>Problems persist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes introduced or lessons learnt</td>
<td>Improvements made to the programme and lessons learnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to use the Dashboard?

• The Dashboard is, first of all, a tool to make explicit a coherent, structured and comprehensive approach to Quality management in complex and turbulent situations.

• When finalised, key questions, warning and tips will be organised by phase of the PCM and published in a booklet to support the implementation of the CHS at project level.

• This booklet will include an evaluation part which will remain organised by criterion and proposed as a support to programme’s evaluation.
Proposal for change n°1:

- Collectively finalize and disseminate the CHS - COMPAS as a way to support the implementation of the CHS at field level through key questions at each stage of the project cycle and a guide to evaluate programmes’ quality and accountability.

A working group would comment the draft 0 and the method would then be made available to all CHS-Alliance members.
Proposal for action n°2:

• Pilot the use of Sigmah as a concrete and practical way to implement the CHS within an organization. Groupe URD is seeking organisations willing to take part in a pilot to implement the CHS with the use of Sigmah.

• The learning will be shared within the CHS-Alliance and the solution (open source software+ documentation) will later on, be made available for all interested organisations.
A learning approach to the Core Humanitarian STANDARD

Atish Gonsalves
@atishgonsalves @AcademyHum

CONNECT | SHARE | PREPARE
Our mission is to enable people around the world to prepare for and respond to crises in their own countries
Where we work:
Learning vision:

Supporting the needs of individuals, organizations and communities by facilitating access to learning resources, platforms and tools that can enable locally relevant capacity-sharing and mutual learning.
What are our learning principles?

**Be collaborative**
Building partnerships with academia, training providers, humanitarian organisations and non-traditional organisations is a core part of our theory of change.

**Design with the user**
The development of both Academy Centres and learning resources is undertaken in close collaboration with learners and feedback is continuously integrated to improve our offer.

**Be needs driven**
We will stay relevant as a learning institution by keeping abreast of needs and trends in learning across the humanitarian sector.

**Understand the Ecosystem**
Through partnerships and regional Academy Centres, we will strive to work with a strong understanding of the sector, country and local community that we operate in.

**Be innovative**
We will push for new thinking, methodologies and tools to make learning more engaging and accessible.

**Build for sustainability**
We will work to make the activities and the activities of our partners as sustainable as possible, for example by supporting learning and development providers to develop sustainable financial models.

**Reuse and improve**
We will always build on existing knowledge and expertise wherever it exists. This is especially relevant as we develop learning materials, which we will do by aggregating first and creating last.

**Use open source and open licences**
Our objective is to make learning more accessible, and we will therefore always strive to make learning materials and resources openly available.

**Design for scale**
Our objective is to democratise access to learning. Through regional Academy Centres and the global digital platform, all developed products are designed to be taken to scale.
Who are we trying to reach through learning?

**TARGET GROUP: LOCAL RESPONDERS**
- access and use training materials available online and offline
- receive accreditation for their expertise

**TARGET GROUP: HUMANITARIAN ORGANISATIONS**
- use content and framework to identify and fill capacity gaps
- implement international quality standards for their learning and accreditation programmes

**TARGET GROUP: LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROVIDERS**
- provide training and skill building that conforms to international quality standards and have adopted more sustainable business models
Who needs the learning?

**Humanitarian Co-ordinators**
Support humanitarian co-ordinators with their highly pressured roles

**Senior**
Support and train humanitarian leaders in order to better equip them to make key decisions when disasters strike

**Mid**
Support and train managers to lead their teams in disaster and emergency response on the frontline

**Entry Level**
Support and train operational staff to work seamlessly when a crisis hits

**Community Responders**
Support and train community members to be ready to mobilise
How can we truly democratize access?

**Provide Content**

**Knowledge**
- Produce insights on best practices from peer-reviews, evaluations and research

**Learning**
- Map existing learning resources
- Contextualise existing resources
- Develop new content for key knowledge gaps
- Develop new content for key underserved audiences

**Enable Access to Learning**

- Launch a global digital platform
- Establish worldwide communities of practice
- Provide learning opportunities in the 10 Academy Centres
- Partner with L&D providers to provide learning opportunities

**Recognise Skills and Experience**

- Create a framework of international humanitarian skills for accreditation
- Develop a quality assurance system for organisational learning

**Support Organisations**

- Support learning and development providers in developing their business models and sustainability
- Support humanitarian organisations in identifying their skills and capacity gaps
How do we create learning that is scalable yet engaging?

Learning pathways can include **self-paced learning** content, **social engagement** with experts and other learners and localised **in-person training opportunities**

**Level 1 - Democratizing Access**
- Open & self-guided learning
- Communities of Learning

**Level 2 – Structured & Supported Learning**
- Guided learning pathways
- Peer feedback & coaching

**Level 3 – Localised & In-Person Learning**
- Local learning experiences
- Certification pathways
Where is the CHS needed?

Learning Tools
- Learning Design and Facilitation
- Coaching and Mentoring

Working in a Humanitarian response
- Humanitarian Essentials for Humanitarian professionals
- Humanitarian Essentials for Volunteers

Managing Operations and Teams
- Management Essentials
- Project Management
- Financial Management
e.g. Essentials Pathway for Humanitarian Professionals

**Audience**
For entry level or early career humanitarian professionals

**Aim**
Develop the necessary knowledge and skills to work effectively and responsibly in humanitarian contexts

**How is it delivered?**
Initially 15 hours self-directed online learning and an accompanying facilitation guide

### 7 Themes
- Humanitarian principles/standards
- Humanitarian context
- The International Legal Framework
- Age, gender, diversity
- Safety and security
- Communicating in times of crisis
- Maintaining Personal wellbeing
How do we recognise learning?

Self-Assessed Badges - Badges for completion of learning pathways and programmes

ISO-standard compliant “micro-certifications” that align with the Core Humanitarian Competency Framework (CHCF):

• Off-the-shelf – PMD pro, FMD pro
• Bespoke certifications – PHAP credentialing
  • Understanding the humanitarian ecosystem
  • Applying humanitarian principles in practice
  • Legal frameworks for humanitarian action

(Led by the Collaboration Centre for Recognition of Learning - Humanitarian Passport Initiative)
Is digital learning possible in our context?

• How is learning accessed - Online, Blended or In-Person?

• How do we contextualise global learning effectively?

• How do we capture local learning?

• Can digital learning break barriers or does it become a barrier?
Aggregate first, build last

Co-develop with partners
Can we simulate real life through learning?

- Trainers use simulation exercises for “serious games”
- Organising simulation exercises is resource heavy – need actors, props, scheduling
- Can we make simulations more scalable?
Perhaps through gamified learning?
Proposal 1 – Collaborate on content

Share learning content across the sector

Co-develop and invest in new content by bringing together:

- Subject matter experts
- Instructional designers
- Instructional technologists
- Translators
Proposal 2 - Collaborate on democratizing learning

Co-develop and invest in sustainable & scalable, localised learning experiences by creating/bringing together:

- Local & global learning content
- Engagement opportunities – webinars, training events, coaching & mentoring
- Local trainers, facilitators & coaches
- Academia
Proposal 3 - Collaborate on recognition

Co-develop and invest in new badges and certification programmes by developing the:

- Required learning
- Body of knowledge
- Self-assessment
- Certification
Thank you
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Poor staff management, poor quality
THE CONSCIOUS PROJECT

Ben Emmens
Director
BRAC

SAYEDA TAHYA HOSSAIN
Chief People Officer
Values Driven Leadership in BRAC for greater organisational success
Introduction of BRAC

BRAC is the world’s largest development organization based in Bangladesh, dedicated to empowering people living in poverty.

BRAC has around 110,000 employees and operate across 10 countries, touching the lives of 1 in every 55 people.

BRAC’s strategic partners are DFID and DFAT
BRAC Values at a Glance

**Integrity**
- Honesty
- Reliability
- Trustworthy
- Accountability

**Innovation**
- Creative
- Courage
- Adaptability

**Effectiveness**
- Creative impacts
- Problem solving
- Result Driven

**Inclusiveness**
- Equality
- Rational
- Think “One BRAC”
Proposal for change:

Each organisation has its own value, which relate very much to the CHS. We have to find a way to integrate these values into the organisation’s people management and ensure they are reflected in staff behaviour.
Traits to become a successful people manager / leader

**BRAC Values**

- **Integrity**
- **Innovation**
- **Inclusiveness**
- **Effectiveness**

**Living BRAC Values through behaviours**

- **Integrity**
  - Evaluate staff honestly
  - Gives honest feedback & encourage others to give opinion
  - Accountable for all actions

- **Innovation**
  - Gives creative and acceptable solution
  - Has courage to delegate authority/ownership
  - Ready to accept change

- **Inclusiveness**
  - Equal treatment
  - Acceptance of new ideas
  - Includes everyone for greater success

- **Effectiveness**
  - Timely and right actions
  - Takes ownership of the results
  - Target oriented & develops team

**Successful People Manager**
Value engagement for greater performance

• Value parameters in the performance management system
  • Year end assessment reflects on how values has been demonstrated by staffs which is linked with reward and recognition

• Investigation team and committee in place to identify breach of values like sexual harassment, financial fraud, code of conduct etc.

• Appointed Ombudsperson to ensure neutrality of decision

• Annual Values Award Event
  • Rigorous process to identify staffs who demonstrated values and can be noted as an value idol
  • From initial screening this prestigious award is given to a handful amount of staffs based on different assessment processes

• Values training, workshops and awareness programmes on a regular basis.
Innovation
A well proven value in BRAC to adopt the changes that took place for last 43 years. This is playing a vital role in today's change for sustainability thus impacts greatly to the Leadership of the organisation
Changing Paradigm in Development sector in Bangladesh and BRAC’s strategy

- Bangladesh is transforming into middle-income generating country
- Level of ultra poor people are minimum in Bangladesh
- As a result, donner funds and grants are getting reduced

- BRAC’s strategy for next 5 years
  - transforming to predominantly a social enterprise model to get future sustainability
  - Empowering people in the society to become financially independent (women, Youth etc.)
  - Increase influence through knowledge and evidence-driven advocacy and strategic partnership
  - Internally Develop management and business thinking capacity
How BRAC HR is Addressing the Paradigm shift

• Reinvented BRAC brand value in job market through doing **customized job evaluation** (mixture of business sector and development sector), aligning it with current market and **attracting** people from business background

• Introduced different competency based **customized assessment tools** to determine the right people in the right place

• Established the **Leadership Academy** to design the required leadership competencies and also meet the requirement of capacity development based on the competencies

• Introduced **objective based** and **value driven** performance management system aligned with social enterprise model

• Introduced **woman Leadership development initiative** based on required competencies.
An accountable approach to People Management

Catherine Skehan
Accountability and participation advisor, CAFOD
Poor staff management - poor quality .......?

..if it is an objective in terms of programming can it be ignored without consequences at organisational level

Why should take accountability seriously when I don’t see it reflected internally?
It is about creating the right environment to enable people to flourish through:

• Engagement
• Participation
• Transparency
• Accountability
• Performance
• Voice

If we can create this internally, then it becomes second nature in the way we deliver our programmes.
People Management and Accountability working together...

Accountability is integral to CAFOD’s Visions, Missions.
Voice and Communication
We encourage and support healthy, robust dialogue.
We take the opportunity to share stories, ideas and information across CAFOD.
We communicate clearly and respectfully, mindful of the impact of our communication on others.
We listen and are open to other people’s views.

Our Experience at Work
We share responsibility for making CAFOD a great place to work.
We recognise and celebrate our achievements.
We treat people with dignity and respect.
We take responsibility for our well-being and that of our colleagues.

Our Vision and Values
Together we aim to:
Do the right thing
Do it in the right way
Communicate and celebrate what we do

Personal Responsibility and Accountability
We take personal responsibility for our performance and behaviour.
We welcome constructive feedback to improve and develop our work.
We learn from what goes well and what doesn’t go well.
We work to the best of our ability to achieve CAFOD’s objectives.

Leading and Managing
We seek ways to constantly develop our skills and behaviours.
We take responsibility for motivating, challenging and supporting those we lead and manage.
We actively role model positive behaviours in line with our values.

CAFOD
Just one world
"Accountability is integral to CAFOD's vision, mission and values. It supports people and communities to influence decisions affecting their lives."
CAFOD Certification

• Strengthened the sense of integration

• Engaged people from across different groups in CAFOD

• Question about the how the external evaluators tested the level of integration – still felt a bit siloed and “HRy”

• More importantly has prompted an on-going dialogue within the organisation about how we can continue to strengthen the integration of our external focus and our internal people management
Proposal and Call to Action

- Embedding the principles of quality and accountability:
  - At leadership level in role modelling
  - At organisational level in our structures, policies and practices
  - Technically in the core skills of all our people
  - And individually in behaviours and ways of working
Humanitarian Competency Model

Mahmoud Almadhoun PhD
Human Resources & Operations Director, Islamic Relief Germany
Outline

- Methodology & Best Practice of Competency Modeling adopted by IRD

- Integration of the humanitarian competency model of Islamic Relief into the main HR processes along the “employee life-cycle“

- Outcomes & Challenges of Using the Humanitarian Competency Model
Best Practice of Competency Modeling

- To develop the competency model of Islamic Relief Deutschland (IRD), we followed the best practice recommended by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) on competency modeling, which occurred in three phases:

  - **Phase 1: Model Development:**
    - Literature Review,
    - Benchlearning/good practices of other organizations
  
  - **Phase 2: Content Validation:** to check the accuracy, relevance, and importance of the competency model content
  
  - **Phase 3: Criterion Validation:** to integrate the model elements into the main HR processes along the employee life cycle.

  **Phase 1: Model Development**
  - General literature review
  - Benchlearning / good practices of other humanitarian organisations such as CBHA, UN, CAFOD
  - Key documents of IRD such as mission statement and organizational values
  - Input from over 40 individuals during 4 workshops conducted with employees & management, volunteers, and program people from our field offices in Africa, Asia, and Middle East Regions and also from our international office in the UK

  **Phase 2: Content Validation**
  - Competency-based HR tools such as: Competency-based recruitment and selection, onboarding, competency assessment and development as part of the performance management system, and exit interview

  **Phase 3: Criterion Validation**
**Structure of IRD Humanitarian Competency Model**

### Core Values Islamic Relief Germany

- **Values Based on Faith**
- **Humanitarian Values**
- **Values of Human Togetherness**

The board, the management and all employees of Islamic Relief Deutschland will always uphold these values.

### Five Fields of Competence

- **A. Involvement based on values and firm conviction.**
- **B. Professionalism in humanitarian and development work.**
- **C. Acting effectively in teams, co-operations and networks.**
- **D. Personal attitudes, self-responsibility and initiative.**
- **E. Leading, encouraging and challenging employees and teams.**

### Humanitarian Competence Areas

Currently 5 x 4 competence areas

### Competence Characteristics / Behavioral Anchors

Behaviors Required
Integration of the model into the main HR processes along the “employee life-cycle“

1- Planning & Preparedness
Competencies required must be identified in the Job Description

2- Recruiting & Selection
Competency-based job advertisement
Competency-Based Interview Questions

3- Onboarding /Probationary-Period Competency Assessment made by the line manager by the end of the probationary period using a scale of 1 (below expectations/requirements) to 3 (exceed expectations/Requirements). This helps to create development plans for the new staff.

4- Managing Performance/ Objectives based performance review: by setting the yearly objectives, line managers focus on the competencies identified in the JD and set objectives which demonstrate the use of and development of these competencies.

5- Personal Professional Development/ Competency-assessment form for HR Development: The employee and the line manager will separately conduct their assessments using a scale of 1 to 3. Both parties should focus on 3-4 competencies, which they consider particularly important in the future development of the employee. They then meet for dialogue and summarize their views and conclusions for next year. In general, no more than 1-2 concrete development recommendations should be obtained.

6- De-briefing/Exit/ Exit-Interview form is also connected to the competency model. IRD asks the leaving employee to give rating on a scale of 1 to 3 to assess the extent to which IRD has effectively used the competency model.

The practical use of competencies in IRD according to the CHSF of Start Network
Outcomes of Using the Competency Model

Feedback from one of our Country Program Managers:

• Using the Core Humanitarian Competency Framework (CHCF) has provided a new understanding on how to improve country office operations by selecting the right people.

• Job descriptions have been redesigned based on the framework. Staff set objective plans based on the framework and made efforts to hold monthly meetings with employees to review progress against the objectives.

• Employees are now more committed to their job descriptions and are aware of the elements they are evaluated against.

• Employees actively participate in developing their objective plan and set goals to achieve higher levels of competencies and skills.

• The self-assessment tool was crucial to see where they stand today and where they aim to reach.
- Challenges faced when using the competency model/framework by some country offices

1. The usefulness of the framework is beyond using the tools themselves, it is in shifting the mind-set of how the organisation selects people and what competencies the organisation aims to acquire through the right recruitment, setting a capacity building plan and in giving employees direction.

2. It is crucial that competent HR practitioners who are well versed in the competencies are assigned in field/country offices in order to promote the effective implementation of the model/framework.

3. Senior management buy-in is also crucial to ensure the process is completed successfully.
Our approach to use the competency model in order to meet the CHSAlliance Standard

- Considering the results of the CHSAlliance Review of the CHCF/Start Network (2016)
- Applying **Self-Assessment option** of the CHSAlliance verification scheme to assess the degree to which we comply with CHS
- IRD Strengths & Areas for Improvement considering the policies & procedures, practices, and results
Proposal for change:

Add the "development" element to the CHS standard to help better identifying and developing the relevant competencies"
Thank You
OXFAM INTERNATIONAL

René Bujard
HR Director, Research & Development, Europe, Middle East and Africa, Global Upstream and External Innovation teams
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Closing the feedback loop.

Join with #chslearning

#chslearning
In pairs

- Share your name and organisation
- One word on why you chose this workshop
Workshop #6
Timings 13.30 – 15.15

• Welcome and introduction, 10 mins
• 2 x Presentations, video and responder, 45 mins
• Q&A on Presentations, 10 mins

• “Proposals for change”, 20 mins
• Present revised change proposals and select, 20 mins
The CREATE project

Roslyn Hees
Senior Advisor, Transparency International
THE CREATE PROJECT

Collective Resolution to Enhance Accountability And Transparency in Emergencies

CHS Learning Event
November 4, 2016

Roslyn Hees
Senior Advisor
Transparency International
The CREATE Project

- Identify corruption risks and mitigation measures in complex humanitarian contexts
- Recommend strategies to humanitarian actors to address risks and enhance integrity in challenging environments
- Four case studies: Afghanistan, Guinea (Ebola response), Lebanon (Syrian refugees), Southern Somalia
- Qualitative field research and advocacy
- Partnership with Humanitarian Outcomes and Groupe URD
Findings from first two case studies

Guinea and Somalia: Differences and Similarities

• Contexts:  --Endemic corruption and weak public institutions
  --Absent, ineffectual or unenforced rule of law
  --Ongoing conflict and limited state control in Somalia
• Strategic importance:  --Guinea: fear of global Ebola pandemic
  --Somalia: part of counter-terrorism campaign
• Nature of the response:  --Sudden onset epidemic
  ➢ massive rapid scale-up
  --Protracted emergency over decades
  ➢ aid fatigue
People’s perceptions of humanitarian aid

- Remote management and poor communication with local population increases enabling environments for corruption

• Somalia:
  - IDPs consider corruption as the top impediment to receiving humanitarian aid
  - Resentment of budgets and staff concentrated in Nairobi: differentials in security, salaries and living conditions

• Guinea:
  - Perception of “Ebola Business” – crisis created by government and international agencies to make money and keep the epidemic confined to Africa
  - Ebola funds channeled through new and costly UN organization: UNMEER (in Accra), bypassing existing public health institutions
Difficult access to affected populations

Security constraints for different reasons

- Guinea: community stigmatization of Ebola victims created fear and hostility towards aid workers
- Somalia: ongoing conflict and presence of armed groups with whom aid agencies have to negotiate for access (‘security fees’)

Poor communication with communities

- Guinea: Initially inadequate information about nature, risks and treatment of Ebola; not communicating through traditional leaders
- Somalia: lack of information for beneficiaries about aid entitlements facilitates resource diversion
Targeting of beneficiaries and provision of aid

• **Guinea**: fear and stigmatization of Ebola victims
  ➢ Greatly reduced competition for registration and treatment

• Low marketability of Ebola goods; reduced temptation of diversion
  ➢ Diversion of vehicles, equipment, fuel still a high risk

• **Somalia**: high competition for aid resources
  ➢ Biased targeting of geographical or clan areas

• Local ‘gate-keepers’ control aid distribution
  ➢ Creation of ‘ghost beneficiaries’, informal ‘taxing’ of aid entitlements
Finance and logistics

• **Guinea:** High pressure to disburse funds rapidly and endemic public corruption
  - Funds routed through UN agencies and INGOs, bypassing government and local NGOs
  - Over-investment in infrastructure rather than communications and logistics

• **Somalia:** State weakness creates dependency on local implementing partners, contractors and traditional clan structures
  - Multiple layers of subcontracting increase risks of corruption
  - Many risks of conflict of interest between clans and contractors
Human Resources

• **Guinea:** Rapid scale-up of staff and dangerous working conditions
  ➢ High turnover of expatriate experts unfamiliar with local culture
  ➢ Massive local recruitment and payment of ‘Ebola bonuses’; local ‘brain-drain’ to international agencies and competition for subsequently reduced posts

• **Somalia:** Pressure to recruit from dominant clans
  ➢ Local staff subject to community pressures for collusion and aid diversion
  ➢ Separation of duties and committee decision-making remedies less effective
  ➢ Highly dangerous to dismiss staff for corruption
Emerging common recommendations

Governments:
✓ Invest in capacity for coordination of humanitarian interventions within public administration, among central and local authorities, and between government and international aid agencies

Donors:
✓ Put corruption risks on strategic humanitarian agenda and promote more inter-agency dialogue on corruption risks
✓ Examine carefully whether their own policies on sanctions for reported corruption cases may discourage transparent reporting
Humanitarian aid agencies (UN, INGOs, NNGOs)

- Acknowledge seriousness of corruption risks in challenging environments and regularly discuss in inter-agency meetings
- Senior agency leadership set the ‘tone at the top’ for open discussion of corruption risks within their own agency and actively encourage staff to report irregularities
- Integrate corruption risk analysis in risk management processes and develop relevant monitoring tools and mitigation measures
Emerging common recommendations (cont)

Humanitarian aid agencies (UN, INGOs, NNGOs)

☑ Invest in greater staff skills in understanding local culture and power structures as well as in communicating effectively with affected communities

☑ Ensure that field staff and local partners are fully familiar with agency anti-corruption policies and procedures through wider publicity, discussion forums and training

☑ Engage donors in dialogue on incentives to report corruption cases transparently and their reputational impact
Listen Learn Act

ERIK JOHNSON
Head of Humanitarian Response, Dan Church Aid
LISTEN, LEARN, ACT

“Enhanced Response Capacity through Evidence-based Quality and Accountability Standards and Innovative Inclusion of Affected Populations”

Strengthening our ability to listen to, use and respond to feedback from communities.

Funded by European Union Humanitarian Aid
What is the Listen Learn Act project?
Example questions and results

**Q2. Did the service happen at a time and place that was convenient for you?**

- Yes: 92%
- No: 8%

*From Lebanon LLA pilot survey*
Example questions and results

**Question 6**
To what extent do you feel your views are taken into account in decisions made about the support you receive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost every time</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every time</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 2.4  Benchmark: 2.2

From Nepal LLA pilot survey

---

Save the Children  
Ground Truth Solutions  
DCA actations
What has been achieved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Round 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>October-November</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>October-November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What have we learned?

• **Accountability gaps** – passive feedback is not enough. We must *actively* listen.
• **Relevance** – there are often trust gaps.
• **Action** – we often fail to ‘close the loop.’
• **Motivation** – it’s about creating new set of incentives for staffs and managers
• **Evidence** – but keep it simple, visual
What have we learning about living up to CHS?

Snapshot of performance against CHS commitments 1-5 in Nepal earthquake response
Challenges

• **Organisational Buy-in.** Orgs often buy-in to CHS at HQ level, but front-line workers get a different set of incentives about what’s most important (hint: it often has something to do with funding...)

• **Integration.** Integrating Ground Truth Methodology with agency’s own accountability frameworks in a sustainable way is doable, but requires investment.

• **Difficult contexts, different incentives.** The methodology *does* work in difficult contexts, but requires creativity. But accountability still fighting to be as important as ‘results.’
Potential Implications for CHS

• **Listen, Learn, Act project** has found that Ground Truth Methodology allows communities to routinely feedback on agency performance against selected CHS commitments (1-5)

• The key features of the GT Methodology (**Regular surveys, actively soliciting, analysis, closing loop**) do help review of changes over time and spark action and improve performance

• **Collective accountability performance** across one or more humanitarian responses is possible, and valuable, to provide a meta-analysis across a response
A call to action

• Communities should have greater scope to measure agency performance against the CHS commitments

• Assessment across and between different responses would provide an important yardstick for humanitarian effectiveness
The Truth Truck

Victoria Murtagh
Humanitarian Programme Advisor
Ground Truth

NICK VAN PRAAG
Presentations: Q&A

Points of clarification – short please!

“Stand-out” points from what you heard
Proposals for Change

• What problem, opportunity it addresses
• How it will do so
• Expected benefit, impact, added value
• Who will need to be involved
Proposals for Change

Discuss / reframe the selected change proposal – looking for a SMART proposition
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Harmonised standards, harmonised donor compliance requirements?
LESS PAPER MORE AID

MELISSA PITOTTI
Head of Policy, ICVA
The Story of
Less Paper, More Aid

ICVA Head of Policy
Melissa Pitotti
4 November 2016
THE HUMANITARIAN SYSTEM MUST MOVE AWAY FROM A CENTRALIZED, COMMAND AND CONTROL, ONE-SYSTEM-FITS-ALL APPROACH TO AN ECOSYSTEM OF DIVERSE ACTORS, WHERE FRONTLINE RESPONDERS RECEIVE ADEQUATE & TIMELY RESOURCES.

#GRANDBARGAIN
DONOR CONDITIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE

The IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team
LESS PAPER
MORE AID

Reducing the burden of donor conditions to improve the efficiency of humanitarian action.
Finding 1: Volume
Note: Higher volume of reporting requested by UN
Finding 2: Complexity
Finding 3: Duplication

Dilbert

I STARTED A TASK FORCE TO ELIMINATE REDUNDANCIES IN OUR INTERNAL PROCESSES.

REALLY? I'M DOING THE SAME THING.
Finding 4: Inadequate Feedback
Finding 5: Risk
3 Proposed Frameworks for Change

- Reporting
- Partner Capacity Assessments
- Audit
The Grand Bargain Workstreams

- Transparency
- Frontline Responders
- Cash
- Reduced Management Costs
- Needs Assessments
- Participation Revolution
- Multi-Year Funding
- Less earmarks
- Simplified/Harmonized Reporting
- Humanitarian-Development Nexus
Looking Forward

1. Design a good process

2. Invest time/ resources to 2018

3. Connect the dots
GPPI

Julia Steets
Director, Global Public Policy Institute
The CHS : a donor perspective

ANDY WHEATLEY

DFID Humanitarian Adviser: Accountability and Monitoring
Q1 Are we clear what we actually want from the CHS

- Cohesion of the vision?
- Divergence of requirements?

“What if we don’t change at all ... and something magical just happens?”
Q2  What do harmonised standards actually look like?

- What will this mean for individual agencies – and is there the appetite to adjust and change?

- How evidence change ... and that this is joined up?
Q3 Is the problem a lack of harmonisation?

Is there really ....

• A Desire to Change ?

• Awareness?

• Is it more about multiple timeframes?

• Sufficient evidence/data ?
Q4 Is change a linear process ... and what road blocks exist?

• What is the block to existing common mechanisms being taken up – eg indicator register

• What is being done in concrete terms in agencies to adjust systems and processes – more light needs to be shed on the nuts and bolts of change

• Similarly – apparently ‘clusters are on board ‘… what does that mean specifically
Q5 Is there clarity of ask of Donors ....

- Change to proposals?

- Change to reporting frequency / content?

- What do you need to put in place to bring about this clarity?

“I want you to find a bold and innovative way to do everything exactly the same way it’s been done for 25 years.”
Q6 Are you prepared for what you wish for?

• What happens to those who are not CHS compliant …

• Are you prepared for a more meaningful monitoring process

• Are you prepared for disruption and change to systems?
DFID Performance Effectiveness Tracker

- An enhanced monitoring process. Better tracking of qualitative delivery.
- Reflecting CHS indicators
- A set of 18 core metrics, and a further 10 additional voluntary/ context specific indicators (quality).
  - Speed x 4
  - Quality x 12
  - Cost x 2
Clearly state your vision

• In concrete terms – what will be different?
• How?
• Why is this better?
Getting past ‘So what?’

- Need to evidence change being made and why matters
- Demonstrate what this will change – why will the outcome be better, why should donors bother to invest time and effort in change
- Need to be clear that this is not the latest fad.
- Be explicit what you want and how
- Sell process widely
- Be prepared for a long game
- Speak with one voice
- Touch multiple parts of the organisation
Workshop 8

Development, disaster preparedness and the CHS.
CHS - Relevance for Multimandated Actors

Uwe Korus, CARE International
CHS-Alliance Learning Event,
Case - Peru: PERSISTENCE PAYS
Breaking the silence during 2007 EQ response

The Challenge: during the EQ response in 2007, rural marginalized (Afro-Peruvian, Quechua) communities were largely neglected / excluded. CARE’s Response:

- Convene broad alliance to break the silence & ‘ignorance’ (GVSS)
- Develop alternatives (safe & secure adobe house, financing) - go public
- Pilot with support from private sector financing (2008)
- Evidence based advocacy

SUCCESSES:

- national safe & secure housing policy (2008)
- inclusive national housing programme (2009)
- Operational guidelines & full implementation (2010)
- Enrol leaders: Presidential candidates (2011)
Case – Niger: Snakes and Ladders
Clever links between humanitarian & development

The Challenge: providing relevant support to each HH at different points in time during recurrent crisis & peak disasters due to climatic shocks, bad governance and insecurity. CARE’s Response:

- Community Based Adaptation Approach: participatory vulnerability analysis during & off crisis + Robust feedback & complaints mechanisms
- Humanitarian & development activities under one framework + contingency
- Early warning: piloting locally, going national

SUCCESSES:

- Reduced vulnerability scores
- Savings established as top CBA strategy
- VSLA established as lead change accelerator (social, economic, early warning, DRM)
Case – Vanuatu: gender responsive DRR holding the pieces together when a Cat 5 hits

The Challenge: Preparedness actions did not prevent physical damage and degradation of social support structures

CARE’s Response:
- **Empowered leadership:** CDCCC drives preparedness, manages DRR assets, leads damage & vulnerability assessments with robust SADD
- **Vertical linkages:** public investment and support for CDCCC actions
- **Gender Equality:** gender balanced CDCCC, Social Analysis & Action (GBV)

SUCCESSES (CDCCC led vs no-CDCCC villages):
- **Consistent preparedness** (80% vs 5% of recommended actions)
- **Efficient response** (85% vs 20% of recommended actions) incl. vulnerable groups
- **Less damage** on productive assets and household items
- **Faster and more equal recovery**
- **Significant public leadership by women, less emotional trauma**
Hypothesis: Humanitarian and development strategies are linked through a Continguum Not a Continuum therefore CHS commitments apply across and overlap with other frameworks.
Case - West Bank & Gaza
Putting the pieces together

The Challenge: Partners & affected population call on CARE to stop hand-outs and give them a voice – or leave! (2012)

CARE’s Response:

- **Empowerment & Gender Equality** as central approaches
- **Contiguum NOT continuum**: simultaneous humanitarian, recovery & development initiatives
- **Coordinate and complement**: cross-over teams, new & old partners
- **Use humanitarian actions wisely** - examples:
  - medical clinics as SAA hubs against GBV;
  - Witnessing of impact of demolition orders on basic services
  - From food to cash: cash vouchers, cash transfers, VSLA
ADH study (Bonn/Brussels, Oct 2016): Cost-Benefit analysis of disaster risk reduction

The challenge: between 1991 and 2010 spending ratio for DRR vs Recovery + Response is 1:7 while some (infamous) estimates stipulate that savings through investment in DRR can reach 7:1.

Method: 117 case studies from 1996-2015, over 30 countries.

Findings: C/B ration for DRR interventions is ...

... higher in countries with low HDI

... higher for non-structural than for structural DRR interventions

... same for preparedness and prevention

... more sustainable (DRR lifetime) if supported by investment in long-lasting, large scale measures
CHS for Multimandated Organisations – Overlapping Frameworks in CARE’s Approach

By addressing the underlying causes of poverty through using the CARE Approach in all of our programs and actions:

- Strengthening gender equality and women’s voice
- Promoting inclusive governance
- Increasing resilience

And playing the following roles:

- Humanitarian action and saving lives
- Promoting lasting change and innovative solutions
- Multiplying impact

CARE and our partners will support 150 million people from the most vulnerable and excluded communities to overcome poverty and social injustice by 2020.
Proposal

• Change development paradigm: development & humanitarian strategies under one framework
• Link CHS commitments especially with inclusive governance and social & economic empowerment approaches incl. gender equality
• Crossover teams and partnerships
ALERT PROJECT

ANDREW COLLODEL
Alert project manager, HelpAge International
Why preparedness matters
The ALERT Platform and the CHS
Why preparedness matters

• Preparedness takes place during the development phase and pays huge dividends during the humanitarian response

• Preparedness is done during the quiet period when we have the time and less stress to make our plans

• Preparedness should be linked directly to our development and resilience work

• Scenario Based Response Plans should be linked to the resilience and preparedness work we do at community level
Why preparedness matters

• Being prepared means we can respond faster and more effectively
• Nepal Example +13 days – are you kidding!
Why preparedness matters

• Most agencies require their country offices to maintain a level of preparedness

• Basically preparedness is a long “task” or “to do” list

• Biggest challenge is keeping track of your preparedness status and then maintaining a consistent level of preparedness

• In the Nepal example a lack of preparedness cost us at least 7 days – it’s simply not good enough
Preparedness tracker

• ALERT is designed to support and track preparedness

• WHY not incorporate CHS preparedness tasks?

• In collaboration with the CHS Alliance and START members we developed CHS preparedness tasks that are directly linked to the NINE CHS standards (see your hand-out)

• Please feel free to comment on the hand-out provided and return it to us
CHS preparedness tasks

ALERT supports the CHS process BUT only for preparedness

The documentation is stored centrally and can be quality checked and shared with other country offices

Tasks are valid for a predetermined period and then MUST be reviewed

Traceable, recorded and tractable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHS Standard</th>
<th>Number of tasks related to this standard</th>
<th>Number of supporting documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 (plus 2 are part of ALERT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Integrating CHS into preparedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions assigned to me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DUE ON 30/06/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity mapping, including that of government and civil society has been conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget: $100  Type: CHS  Department: CHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DUE ON 29/09/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procure extra storage capacity for both paper and electronic documentation and perform a back up to be stored in off-site locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget: $100  Type: Mandated  Department: Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DUE ON 15/07/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import, customs clearing and taxes exemption procedures identified and documented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget: $0  Type: Custom  Department: Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DUE ON 30/07/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put in place a staff information system with contact details of staff, their installed dependent and next-of-kin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget: $70  Type: Mandated  Department: HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DUE ON 01/10/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans exist to scale up staff in a way that doesn’t undermine the capacity of other humanitarian actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget: $0  Type: CHS  Department: CHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VALID UNTIL 15/10/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Safety and Security Procedures in place (RED data, Communication Tree, others).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget: $200  Type: Mandated  Department: Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHS task completed with supporting documents attached
Measuring preparedness against CHS

My Tasks

1. A red level indicator needs to be updated today. Spatial extent of flooding
2. A CHS preparedness action needs to be completed today. Develop a surge capacity and staff scale up plan that does not undermine the capacity of...
3. An unassigned minimum preparedness action needs to be completed today. MOUs with Emergency Partners Signed.
Comparing preparedness between agencies

Comparing agencies against a common standard

Note the difference between Minimum Preparedness and CHS
CHS in preparedness

• Contributes to CHS compliance

• Quality Control checks through uploaded documents

• Demonstrates capacity gaps in the country office

• Tasks are delegated, tracked, renewed and documentation uploads supported

• Improves accountability, transparency and tasks are traceable

• Objective measure of preparedness (between countries and even agencies)
Proposition for change

• Emergency Preparedness becomes a priority part of everyday life in the country office

• This means that in our country offices we are consistent in:
  • Maintaining an appropriate level of preparedness
  • Developing our preparedness plans in consultation with a sample of “at risk” communities
  • Working collaboratively with all other humanitarian responders
  • Monitoring hazards and being aware of our changing context
  • React to early warning
  • Responding immediately, effectively and in collaboration with affected populations
THANK YOU

www.alertpreparedness.org
TO ACCESS THE PROTOTYPE:

WEBLINK: prototype.alertpreparedness.org
USERNAME: alert
PASSWORD: Alert999
CWS Asia

SHAMA MALL
Deputy Director for Development & Capacity enhancement