



**ALNAP**

Active Learning Network for  
Accountability and Performance  
in Humanitarian Action

# ALNAP 24<sup>th</sup> Biannual Meeting



# Meeting report

## Day 1, Tuesday 2nd December 2009

### Opening remarks: Eleanor Monbiot *World Vision, ALNAP Chair*

Eleanor Monbiot welcomed the participants and new members, especially a Chinese delegation, noting that they had been involved in the Sichuan earthquake recovery effort.

The goal of this Biannual was to move towards developing awareness about impact assessment (IA) while recognizing its limits.

It was encouraging to note that the expanded report of the previous Biannual had been well used by a number of organisations.

### Welcome address: Ambassador Busso von Alvensleben, *Commissioner for Global Issues, German Federal Foreign Office*

The Ambassador referred to the increasing volume of international aid as well as the scale and amount of humanitarian disasters. Of this increase in aid, the EU provides more than 50% with Germany being one of the biggest donors within the EU. Germany plans to spend €120 million via transfers to implementing partners. Furthermore substantial funds for relief and aid from BMZ will be raised.

On the one hand, as such a large spender, Germany wants to make sure that the money it provides is used in an efficient manner and in line with German policy. On the other hand, it is important to recipient nations that there is a clearly understood definition of what humanitarian aid is, and that it is not politicized. In this context

Germany has, together with the European Commission, produced a document called *A European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid*, showing that Germany is dedicated to humanitarian principles.

The key issues would always be how to organise and deliver humanitarian aid in conflict situations. He referred to the special challenge of complex emergencies such as Darfur, Sudan, and Somalia, drawing a link between how humanitarian aid is perceived and the security of aid workers in the field. The UN has a key role in this context.

The German Federal Foreign Ministry strives for working in accordance with IHL, in general, and the Humanitarian Principles in particular. Therefore, donors have a high responsibility to be accountable and transparent, so that aid is "delivered as efficiently and cost effectively as possible". Additionally he stressed the need to work towards capacity building of local organisations and especially local implementing partners of international NGOs. Finally, it is important that those involved in humanitarian action (HA) do not forget that all of the tools and processes they use must "serve first and foremost the beneficiaries." With these realities in mind, he looked forward to the participants' recommendations.

### Discussion Starter 1: What are the challenges and potential benefits of IA in the Humanitarian sector?

John Mitchell,  
*Director, ALNAP*

Click [here](#) for John Mitchell's presentation

John Mitchell drew attention to the [background paper](#), which had been prepared as a framework for the day. The paper has 3 parts: a short background on driving forces of IA, a description of six key areas, and conclusions.

He then presented a brief summary of the changes, which have occurred in the humanitarian sector, and the challenges they present to impact assessment:

Humanitarian Aid (HA) has undergone a fundamental transformation, shifting from the provision of aid in humanitarian crises to a multi-dimensional process that addresses "complex emergencies".

Humanitarian aid is no longer about simply saving life. Therefore, measuring impact is not clear, and thus the need to develop codes of best practice arose.

What this essentially boils down to is "setting goals and measuring achievements". John Mitchell gives the disclaimer that he is not sure if this is actually successful, but it does, however, give legitimacy to humanitarian actors.

Occurring at the same time as the shift in types of humanitarian disasters provided for, the scale of HA has increased dramatically in past 20 years.

This presents challenges in understanding what works and what doesn't, what progress has been made, and what are the challenges we face.

John Mitchell proposed answers to these questions as they relate to 6 key areas:

### 1. Defining impact assessment

- It is seen as a linear results chain, but the real world is a complex place.
- Impacts can be both positive and negative.
- Lack of clarity about definition and purpose of HA intervention.
- Impact assessment is more complicated in HA than in development.
- Development world should spend more time planning than HA.

### 2. Diverse stakeholders and interest

- The word stakeholder has changed since the creation of Red Cross.
- Population growth transformed the world.
- Balancing different needs is tricky.
- Tension between balancing accountability and learning from impact assessment.

### 3. Indicators, baselines and data

- Choose own indicators based on individuals and programs.
- Difficulty of moving from outputs to outcomes.
- Gives the example of taking a horse to water: indicators focus on water delivery and not the outcome of the water being drunk.
- Data is unreliable, unavailable or of poor quality; it focuses on process and outputs but not outcome.

### 4. Methodologies

- There are a wealth of tools and techniques for measuring impact.
- Qualitative versus quantitative.
- Jodi Nelson (IRC) has developed methods.
- Debate over qualitative/quantitative has been going on for over a century.
- Quantitative data is what and where; qualitative data is why and how.
- "Humanitarians are pragmatists."

### 5. Collective interpretation and analysis

#### 6. Capacities and incentives (institutional challenges)

- Lack of capacities to carry out effective evaluations.
- Unclear ToR.
- Non-defined.
- Institutional incentives can override humanitarian ones; too few incentives to conduct good impact incentives

### Conclusions

Little progress has been made. How do we do this realistically and sensibly? The answers to these questions, and how to overcome these challenges, rest in the hands of this conference's participants.

**Discussion starter 2:  
Current thinking about  
impact assessment, with  
particular reference to the  
development sector:  
Elliot Stern, *Professor of  
Evaluation Research,  
Lancaster University***

Click [here](#) for Elliot Stern's presentation.

Elliot Stern stressed the importance of impact assessment and its dependence on circumstances, resulting from the problem of attribution and resulting in the need for a pluralism of methods. He acknowledged that so far he had mostly been working in the development sector.

He argued that the process and outcome of assessment should be connected, since otherwise it would be difficult to understand how the evaluated outcome came about. He acknowledged, however, that this rarely occurred. Another shortcoming is the failure to include all those involved in humanitarian assistance. Everyone agrees that direct beneficiaries are supposed to be involved (although this doesn't happen), but other people affected indirectly would like to be involved but are excluded.

Furthermore impact assessment is done in a short-term time frame, and is rarely followed up with long-term development. This is exacerbated by the fact that there are different definitions and understandings of what IA actually is. For example, IA is defined in the development sector as long term effects produced by development initiatives. In the humanitarian sector, however, there is a trend towards using experimental theories and approaches. By referring to the "nothing works school" he tried to explain the emergence of this preference for experimental methods while acknowledging that some aspects of such methods are still valid. Therefore, it is hard to say that there is one single best method. Rather, all approaches have to be seen as important

'arms' for IA. The solution is to adjust a mix of methods for each specific situation.

On why attribution matters, Elliot Stern suggested that the key point is understanding "if it could have happened differently". He argued that comparative methods are more cross-case focused whereas theory-based methods are more useful within in-depth single-case studies. Thus he said that the "main conclusion of people in the field is that we need both". Furthermore there are philosophical issues around evidence being regarded as truth, instead of being willing to constantly reassess what we know it and then challenge it.

Despite the methodological dispute, he also recalled three types of considerations that are generally when using IA. These are:

- The political agendas of actors (institutional policies, occupational policies and careerism, reduced public spending)
- Technical issues determining what is possible (administrative obstacles to maintain IA, risk of contamination, statistical power "the small N" and the ability to generalise findings)
- Ethical considerations

This led the speaker to point to the cleavage between practical risks and logical difficulties. For example "we always say that context matters, but it is remarkable how little effort is spent to do research on it".

Concluding with the importance of comparisons, he referred to the plurality of approaches by saying that there are true elements in every method, and therefore, none of them should be ignored or followed exclusively; scholars such as Duflo acknowledge this. Finally, he criticized that IA is to some extent conducted on the project level, less so on the programming and strategy-level and nearly non-existent on the policy-level.

## **Reaction by James Darcy, *Director of Humanitarian Programmes, ODI***

### **1. What do we mean by impact assessment?**

There appears to be a consensus that we can agree on objectives, which leads to agreement on how we conduct a needs assessment. We can agree on what we want to avoid. We agree that we want to protect the health and physical well being of individuals. Yet it is difficult to say where the threat to the physical wellbeing is coming from. How we assess starting conditions is, therefore, of extreme importance. Impact analysis is inextricable from needs analysis.

### **2. How do we frame a problem?**

It is quite easy to misrepresent the problem. For example, in Lesotho the government claimed that 40 million people were at risk of starvation. So we put loads of resources into Lesotho, and then 40 million people did not die. So, either we were successful or the diagnosis was wrong. It was indeed wrong. This happens all the time.

The danger is that we miss the REAL problems. We can all have impact if we narrow our line of attack enough. But the problem is more difficult than that. It is about access and coverage. That is, we can only measure impact where we can physically be there. If we don't have projects there, we cannot measure impact.

For example, we can look at therapeutic feeding. Therapeutic feeding has saved lots of children. So was it successful? Not exactly. The 15% that received it recovered, and therefore the impact was successful. But the overall coverage was way too low. More specifically, there was an 85% deficit of coverage. So one of the questions is how to scope the problem; or, in other words, how to take into consideration the actual measure of the problem and adequately respond to it.

### **3. Where might this lead us?**

This is about understanding the causal factors. Policy determines outcomes, but policy can also have a detrimental effect

on people's lives: for example, the importance of advocacy, which had a huge effect in Zimbabwe.

Our focus should be on reducing known risk factors, or combinations of factors that tend to lead to certain outcomes and eliminating those factors. If we look at Oxfam's water and sanitation program in an IDP camp we can see that it was done in a standard way. Yet they found that incidence of diarrheal diseases was not going down. This forced them to look at what was wrong with their initial analysis. It turns out that the problem was occurring at the household level. Specifically, the jerry cans were the cause of contamination. So Oxfam gave chlorine tablets to the households and then the disease level reduced dramatically. This created incentive alignment whereby Oxfam had the incentives to ask the right questions. Stated differently, high mortality rates forced them to find the reason.

## **Reaction by Nick York, *Deputy Director and Head of Evaluation, DFID and chair of NONIE***

Humanitarian spending is funded by taxpayers, so one of the drivers for impact assessment is to reassure taxpayers that their money is being well spent: this creates the need for evaluations.

The scaling up of aid requires the ammunition for doing so. This is a major driver. The need to discuss cost effectiveness is also a driver. The current situation is that the majority of evaluations have very little to do with impact assessment.

The people that benefit from impact assessment are the international community as a whole, as this is a global public good. So the actual evaluators don't benefit from it. We must find a way to build systems whereby public goods can be provided more often because they are undersupplied.

We must look at the demand side of impact assessment.

The need to build an intelligent demand from developing country governments for impact assessment is very important. Until now, Impact Assessment has been driven by the people that want to do it and the methods that they have. That is to say, it has not been policy driven. Yet the impact of policy is very important. We need to make impact assessments relevant and productive. If impact assessment is just a tool to reinforce the methods that we already have, it is useless.

## Questions & open discussion

Questions were raised about the effect of different parties' interests in IA; the implicit interplay of humanitarian and development evaluations; the objectives of IA, and whether what we measure implies what we care about; and the need to look at impact assessments from perspectives other than those of 'northern' agencies.

Comments made included:

- impact assessment should also consider what would have happened without the intervention. It should also consider means and results; give equal attention to positive and negative impact; and balance immediate and longer term needs.
- Donors drive the definition of impact assessment, so the question should be about how donors define agenda and impact.
- Needs assessment cannot be divorced from impact assessment, without fear of looking at contextual and political factors.

## Panel responses:

**Elliot Stern:** It is quite well accepted in many fields that evaluation should begin with a stakeholder analysis, in order to address all concerns. One of the difficulties in this sector is not evaluation, but monitoring: there is more monitoring than evaluation. I think you need to decide to what you want to evaluate in terms of timescale. The focus is too much on short-term impacts and not on sustainability.

We should be looking at negative and positive knock-on effects of intervention. At the moment, too much focus is on positive impact. What is the motivation for impact assessment? It is either cutting or improving. There has been a consistent attempt by policy makers to put emphasis on long-term problems but then give 3 year contracts to look at outcomes and therefore have short-term evaluations. Therefore there is a tension and a time-lag.

**Nick York:** The first stage of the process is indeed stakeholder analysis, which gives the real insights. Impact assessment in humanitarian disasters is easy and obvious, but perhaps more impact assessment is needed in the development field.

We have to move away from donor driven initiatives to country driven initiatives. This requires government training and capacity building for civil society. Evaluator preferences also determine agendas, but we need to move the debate in favour of developing country interests.

**James Darcy:** There are indeed both implicit and explicit objectives of Impact assessment, and the interests of stakeholders are diverse as well. The implicit ones are political: what stakeholders can vary with the context: in North Korea, the goal of food aid was to stop starvation, but it was also political to stop a regime from collapsing. If the real or primary reason was not humanitarian we might not be urged to do a complete impact assessment.

## Sharing ideas and experiences around impact assessment: When, why and how is IA currently done in participants' organisations? How could it be improved?

The meeting divided into 'buzz groups', each of which was asked to identify two key questions for the afternoon workshops addressing the subject of how IA can be strengthened in the humanitarian sector. From the questions proposed, eight were selected for discussion in workshop groups,

although in the event only seven groups were formed.

### **Workshop Group 1: How do we pragmatically involve beneficiaries in Impact Assessment?**

There was disagreement on whether or not the problem can be discussed on a pragmatic level since so many fundamental aspects need to be considered. Much of the discussion was about fundamental topics rather than about pragmatic solutions. There was consensus on the fact that collaborative assessments usually do not work because of rivalry amongst NGOs.

There was also disagreement between donor and NGO representatives on how the current dilemma between having a proposal ready quickly and the requirement of conducting a thorough needs assessment could be solved. The donor representatives said they would react to requests from NGOs, whilst NGOs felt that donors did not really demand it.

The key recommendations of this group were:

1. Collectively work to strengthen compliance mechanisms for standards (participation) including peer-reviews.
2. Improve how we communicate with local actors
3. Require a shift towards participation
4. Increase focus on local capacity building for disaster management, especially with regards to needs assessment and IA.

### **Workshop Group 2: Is IA beyond the scope of single humanitarian actors? How can we promote more collective approaches?**

This group had a consensus on the belief that humanitarian actors need to move away from their focus on impact, and move towards the outcomes of intervention. Both

impact and outcomes, however, are the result of multiple actors and not just one agency. Yet coordinating the interests, needs and actions of all actors remains a large challenge. Homogenising indicators is a first step in effectively allowing for inter-agency cooperation. Looking at the outcomes of individual clusters is another way of facilitating joint cooperation.

The key recommendations of this group were:

1. At an agency level, focus on outcomes, rather than impacts - but move towards harmonising indicators.
2. ALNAP should engage with reformed clusters and the IASC to encourage the development and implementation of impact indicators.

### **Workshop Group 3: How can we adapt existing incentive structures to improve demand for IA?**

In comparing the incentives and accountabilities of the private sector with the humanitarian sector, the group determined that improving the demand for impact assessment is impossible without a restructuring of the entire sector. While it was agreed that there are a number of incentives for undertaking Impact assessments, including purposes of learning, accountability, fundraising, informing the public and the media, a number of disincentives also exist. These include the complexity of terminology, seemingly excessive public scrutiny, lack of capacity, lack of learning cultures, timing inconsistencies and general lack of demand for IA—especially long-term IA. The group then turned to the existence of perverse incentives, or reasons for conducting IA that are not in line with the goal or purpose of humanitarian intervention. These realities leave much room for improvement. Therefore, the group determined that in the next four years, there would be a number of ideal developments, including: identification of simple and easy methodologies that have

been successfully tried and tested; more institutional support of the undertaking of IA; willingness and capacity to address the concerns of diverse stakeholders; increased links between development and humanitarian assistance; and for humanitarian agencies to be less risk averse.

The key recommendations of this group were:

1. More stakeholder analysis to clarify the need for and use of impact assessments.
2. To clarify concepts related to impact assessment and develop a menu of appropriate and feasible methodologies for doing impact assessments.
3. ALNAP could facilitate a community of practice around IA.

#### **Workshop Group 4: How can we address the different requirements of different stakeholders in IA?**

In attempting to answer this question, the group determined that it was, indeed, impossible to address all of the different requirements of different stakeholders in impact assessment. This is because there are simply too many stakeholders with varying requirements and motives. Ultimately, different stakeholders have different goals and requirements for impact assessment and, furthermore, these goals and requirements can differ for the different individuals that comprise a single stakeholder group. Therefore, instead of working towards satisfying the IA needs of all stakeholders, the humanitarian assistance community should simply be honest and open about whom they are conducting IAs for, and what purpose they are serving.

The key recommendations of this group were:

1. Whilst there may be many potential stakeholders in Impact assessment, not all those stakeholders' information needs are best met by impact assessment. So, we must

2. To be clear and transparent about who the target groups are for the impact assessment exercise.
3. To justify the focus, and provide risk analysis for stakeholder groups not included.
4. During static points of programme design and implementation, creatively explore other solutions to meet the information needs of other stakeholders. This is very difficult to do in reality, and is in contradiction to how it is done now, which is post-hoc.

#### **Workshop group 5: How do we reconcile the complexity of humanitarian crises with simple workable approaches to IA?**

The group agreed that there was no one blueprint for this, but it is important to be clear about aims and objectives and keep in mind the long-term goals. Staff should be encouraged to keep impact logs, in other words write down stories which can serve as illustrations. Impact is only as good as project design, so a good project design is essential. This is linked to a longer term approach and to sustainability. A better structure is needed for impact assessment and it must allow for comparison between one crisis and another - for example being based on the DAC criteria. Agencies need to overcome their natural fear of risk, to set precise and carefully chosen indicators.

The recommendations of this group were not recorded.

#### **Working Group 6: How do we address issues of longer-term impact, e.g. in protracted crises?**

The group decided that the question should properly read: How do we assess issues of longer-term impact, e.g. in protracted crises? Ultimately, the question was re-formulated into: How does the tediousness of protracted crises add to impact assessment need? What is "normal" impact assessment, what is added in protracted crises?



After defining what a protracted crisis is, the group discussed what they knew already as a whole. This included, but was not limited to, the concept of do no harm, the need to avoid dependency cycles, that one should be aware of footprints, and that implementing agencies should stick to their core competencies. The group then pointed out that by definition, impact assessment should mean that the root causes of the problem should be affected through humanitarian action. When addressing the question of where we want to be in 4 years, group members stated that they would like to see more staying power, and increased information sharing with both traditional actors and new actors such as the military. They also wanted to see lessons learned fed back into policy creation, among other goals. To achieve these goals, participants stated that there should be an increased emphasis on local capacity building, contracting longer-term field staff members, and change in artificial funding cycles. These suggestions and others were summed up in a set of general recommendations which can be found at the end of this section of the report.

The key recommendations of this group were:

1. To create incentives (policy) and capacity (practice) to consider longer-term impacts of humanitarian assistance, including understanding of context and gaps
2. For operational agencies to keep their experienced staff and local partners.
3. For donors and governments to provide continuity of financing for developing capacity and easing transition between funding cycles
4. To promote fundamental changes to aid architecture leading to improved accountability to peers and beneficiaries (human-rights based approaches)

## Workshop Group 7: How can we integrate Impact Assessment

### into broader information strategies?

After the group discussed at length their personal experiences with IA, there was consensus on a number of points. These were that beneficiaries should be referred to as affected people, and they should be involved in impact assessment and impact evaluation; that IA should be linked to needs assessment, monitoring, and evaluation; that no one of these elements should be preferred over the other (although in reality not all stages of PCM are equally funded); and that the understanding of IA in general is dependent upon context, time constraints, funds, and the capacity of staff to carryout IA. There was also disagreement about whether IA should be sector specific or more broad reaching, and the role of indicators and other tools, including whether or not they should be sector specific.

The key recommendations of this group were:

1. Impact Assessment should be linked into Needs Assessment.
2. Beneficiaries should be more intensely utilized in the IA process.

## Plenary Session and Panel Discussion

The group leaders presented their conclusions and recommendations.

**Nan Buzzard, *American Red Cross***, chairing the panel discussion, stated that indicators are helpful but also add to the exhaustion of the humanitarian sector. She then posed the question to the panel: "Do we understand the scope of vulnerability? What is left out of impact assessments?"

### Panel comments

**Lori Bell, *FAO***: Beneficiary involvement, if used at all, is only included in needs assessment but not in monitoring and evaluation. It is also absent when setting priorities in the case of funding shortages. Therefore, it is of utmost importance to include beneficiaries throughout the entire project cycle.

It makes sense to do impact assessment collectively. It is expensive and therefore becomes difficult for individual organizations to justify doing it alone. Peer review also adds to the transparency of the entire humanitarian response and to an open discussion.

A generic evaluation may be difficult, so sector specific impact assessment may be more applicable.

We didn't talk very much about qualitative versus quantitative data. There is a lot of push for IA to be quantitative and statistics driven. People often conduct qualitative interviews and then present them as quantitative results.

**Tim Robertson, DFID:** There is a need for fundamental change in the architecture of the humanitarian system, as these debates are outdated. There are a couple of issues around the recommendations presented so far. The key issue with IA is to identify who is going to use them, how they are going to use them and what part of the information they will actually use. It is important to work with the people who want the impact assessment to be done, and do so all throughout the process. Linking IA to decision-making process is fundamental.

There should also be discussion about putting IA in the context of political economy. These are part of the wider aspects of IA that need to be incorporated into our thinking.

**François Grünewald, Groupe URD:** How we strategically engage in IA is as important as for what we use it.

How do we define impact? Most say when the rock hits the water. But the rock may or may not cause ripples. Others look at it like a footprint that is static up until the point where it is washed away by a wave. So definition at this stage is important, but there may be more than one definition.

We need a multi-cultural, multi-gender, multi-sectoral approach. That means we have to act collectively. But one tool for everything doesn't always work. Sometimes we need an individual evaluation, other times we need collective evaluations. In Chad, 90% of the agencies may be working in camps, and therefore it would make

sense to use collective IA. Yet it makes less sense for others who are working outside of the camps. IA is only effective if it is linked to policymaking and process assessment: the question is as it always has been, "did you make a difference?"

**Elliot Stern, Lancaster University:** It is important to look at who these impact assessments are for, and what they are used for. If you look at a textbook of management and implementation strategy and do a check through the index you'll find all the words that were used here today. Because that's essentially all we talked about. We have to diversify our discussions. Who are IAs done for? Some things are important to professionals, others to donors and others to beneficiaries. The whole question of involving stakeholders is whose criteria we use.

Be cautious about words that take on different meaning, for example "incentives" in principal agent theory essentially translates into "how can I make you do what I want?"

Very often as an evaluator I am concerned with the unit of analysis. What scale of impact do we hope to have? People assume that we can have an impact on the situation. If you are dealing with civil war or things related to the international political economy, then when you expect certain results you are actually dooming yourselves to fail. We have to recognise our limits, and that sometimes we cannot have an impact at all.

## Reactions from the floor

There should be a clear distinction between armed conflict and natural disaster.

We should focus on outcomes, but we should go further in identifying the core outcomes of concern. We are not always the main instruments of change.

A coherent outcome of learning is also important. We should use existing frameworks (e.g. HAP, Sphere, Compas) rather than inventing new tools.

## Panel responses

**François Grünewald** disagreed about distinguishing between conflict and natural disaster, saying that many questions are generic and can be applied to both. Simplicity in a complex world won't work.

**Elliot Stern:** The assumption about learning in an impact assessment is that you do it from bits and pieces and through reviews. So you have to set up a framework that allows you to synthesize all the bits and pieces. You learn a little from one evaluation but you learn a lot from periodic cross evaluations. Many initiatives are context specific. So don't put a heavy framework on organizations, but rather, just mainstream their reviews.

**Lori Bell:** This effectiveness in measurement is outside of the time window. You need impact assessments 3-5 years down the line, but this is difficult to justify to funders.

## Update from ALNAP Secretariat

Ben Ramalingam announced that the follow-up work on this topic will include do 4 case studies, and members were asked to suggest topics for further research. The work on the humanitarian performance project will include an attempt to look at collective assessments, and there will also be consideration of cooperation with 'development initiatives', 3IE, and potentially other actors.

## Closure of day 1

Eleanor Monbiot reminded participants that the subject discussed today can be very technical. What we need is a realistic vision of how to deal with these subjects over the next few years. Can evidence be equated with truth, or is it tool of analysis? We should be looking at our context and make sure we ask the right questions.

We have looked at when IA is appropriate and when it can help achieve these goals. We also have to keep challenging ourselves with our methodologies. Finally, our challenge is to continue learning and to apply that learning. We

need to learn to learn. Evaluations and assessments are a means to an end, tools that can allow for learning.

Eleanor thanked Margie Buchanan-Smith for facilitating the group sessions; Nan Buzard for chairing the panel; the panellists from both morning and afternoons; the workshop facilitators; the note takers; the ALNAP Secretariat; all the participants; and especially the German Federal Foreign Ministry and Ambassador von Alvensleben who opened the meeting and would be hosting the following dinner.

## Day 2 Wednesday 3rd December 2008

### Opening by ALNAP Chair & Secretariat

Eleanor Monbiot welcomed new members of ALNAP: Action Against Hunger (AAH), Disasters Emergency Committee (DEC), Humanitarian Futures Programme (HFP), Instituto de Estudios sobre Conflictos y Acción Humanitaria (IECAH) and L'Office Africain pour le Développement et la Coopération (OFADEC).

Ben Ramalingam (ALNAP Secretariat) reviewed the first day. He recalled the intention to follow up on the findings and ideas for IA from this biannual with a study forming a chapter in the 8<sup>th</sup> *Review of Humanitarian Action*.

### State of the System Report, Review of Humanitarian Action (RHA) and Humanitarian Performance Project (HPP): John Mitchell, Ben Ramalingam, and John Borton

For presentation click [here](#)

For briefing note on HPP click [here](#)

For State of the system ToR click [here](#)

For proposal from Humanitarian Outcomes click [here](#)

For interest group proposal click [here](#)

John Mitchell reminded members that various strands of ALNAP work have been working towards assessing system-wide performance: some of the components of the RHA; facilitation of the TEC; and the HPP proposal. He summarised what had been learned from each of these, and also from the 23rd Biannual Meeting in Madrid.

Ben Ramalingam went on to outline a three track approach by which this process is to be carried forward: "fast track" - a pilot state of the system report; "medium track"

- more learning about beneficiary surveys and IA to feed into further state of the system reports; and "slow track" - continued work on developing performance indicators.

The groups at each table in the room discussed the presentation and reacted as follows:

1. How do we identify or define performance? Who is going to define performance?
2. These proposals are very ambitious. How can it be ensured that the lessons from track one feed into track two?
3. Will these proposals require additional funding from ALNAP members? It is important to avoid duplicating other work.
4. It is important to ensure that peer groups are as heterogeneous as possible: incorporating affected countries should be of primary importance.
5. Other standards/indicators exist, such as Multiple Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN): are these incorporated into the new initiative? We need to have an overall aim against which to measure performance. Should beneficiary opinions be fast tracked?
6. What is being measured? What performance benchmarks are to be measured against?
7. In looking at impact assessment, and talking about Beneficiary surveys, there is a danger of leaving out non-intended beneficiaries from the surveys. So this group recommended a change of language. Could ALNAP engage more systematically with the UN clusters on performance management systems? What sort of commitment is the minimum from members? A lot of needs assessment has impact related data. Therefore it could be used as a synthesis for other evaluations.

8. One group was confused about linkages and impact assessments. Impact assessment was beyond the scope of single agencies, so how does it relate to these proposals? The group would like to see ToR for this exercise, and a concrete example from one country or sector of what ALNAP wants to do.

### Presenter responses:

**John Mitchell:** what we are suggesting is to define performance through the OECD/DAC criteria. There are different ways to define it, but we have chosen these because they are well known and have been used before.

ALNAP has the funds to cover this without additional funding; indeed, it will cost slightly less than the RHA, partly because there is no need to spend time collecting primary data. The commitment required from members to do is respond to in the poll, and for some full members to participate in an advisory panel. The ToR and, in due course, the consultants' inception report, will be posted on the website.

The Secretariat accepts that this project is ambitious, but believes it is achievable. Nonetheless, they will follow the suggestion to keep it simple.

**Ben Ramalingam:** There will be a chapter in next year's RHA on performance criteria.

We agree with the need for linkages. The Secretariat will be playing a facilitation role with all of these initiatives, with a strong focus on communication. ALNAP serves as a platform to bring all this information together but as a synthesis of other work, not a duplication.

ALNAP members will be engaged in some of the "medium track" elements. The intention is not to overload the membership: it is possible to take part in single elements of this project.

**John Borton:** Participation in affected countries will be encouraged. By looking at one country or example, we can develop a country level understanding. Interest groups are not defined and can go in many directions.

Clusters are very important, and ALNAP will actively engage with them in their use of indicators, and also take note of MOPAN.

### DARA's Humanitarian Response Index (HRI) report 2008, Silvia Hidalgo and Philip Tamminga, DARA

Click [here](#) for presentation. For the complete report go to [www.hri.daraint.org](http://www.hri.daraint.org)

Silvia Hidalgo and Philip Tamminga presented the second version of HRI. The principles of good humanitarian donorship (GHD) are used as background to a) attempt to interpret donor behaviour; b) counterbalance donors' lack of guidance; and c) understand the role of incentives for good donor performance. The HRI is not intended to confront donors, but to offer an analysis of strengths and weaknesses in order to support donors in their efforts to be good donors.

The objectives of HRI are to measure the quality and effectiveness of donors' humanitarian assistance; to contribute to greater transparency and accountability; and, primarily, to contribute to an informed debate and to support improvements in humanitarian assistance.

The methodology of collecting and analysing information and scoring the results of each donor were explained and some of the results displayed. Whilst results may be unpalatable for some donors, DARA believes that it contributes to an informed debate, and that the value added for the donors themselves with the HRI is a possibility to compare themselves with others.

The conclusions of the study were:

1. Wealthy countries must provide aid in an impartial manner instead of according to political, economic or security agendas.
2. Wealthy countries could do more to improve the quality and use of needs assessments. There are serious gaps in the use of needs assessments so that the right kind

- of aid reaches those who need it most, when they need it.
3. Wealthy countries need to invest in building the capacity of the humanitarian system to respond to future crises, especially in prevention strategies at the local level.
  4. Wealthy countries can better support local capacities and link relief efforts to recovery and longer-term development strategies for lasting impact.

DARA's perception is that the GHD principles are not adhered to on a large scale and that something more precise is needed. Thus, they recommend a revision of GHD and they plan to do in-depth interviews on that subject for further confirmation of their assumption.

### Questions from the floor and response from speakers

Ivan Scott, *Oxfam*: How can the Gulf States be factored into this?

Margie Buchanan-Smith, *independent consultant*: The GHD is still relevant: there is a need to focus more on advocacy.

Mathias Rickli, *SDC*: The Humanitarian department at SDC believe that the data is not well researched, due to insufficient consultation with the donors themselves, and may be out of date.

Philip Tamminga: A mechanism to include the Gulf States is being sought. It is accepted that data sources can be improved, but it is not always possible to obtain the best data.

### Claude Hilfiker, *OCHA* and Andrea Binder, *GPPI*: an M & E Framework for the Gender Standby Capacity (GenCap) Project

Click [here](#) for presentation

Global Public Policy Institute which is an independent non-profit think tank that focuses on good governance. GenCap is a

collaboration between the Inter-agency Standing Committee (IASC) and the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC). It is a pool of gender advisers ready for deployment to Humanitarian Coordinators' offices, and seeks to build capacity of humanitarian actors at the country level to mainstream gender equality programming, including prevention and response to gender-based violence, in all sectors of humanitarian response. It also seeks to ensure that humanitarian action takes into consideration the different needs and capabilities of women, girls, boys and men equally. The presentation looked at measurement and monitoring of the project's impact.

### Rudolf Vandenboogaard, *CAFOD consultant*: Rapid Reaction Fund, DFID, findings of the Final Programme Evaluation in DRC

Click [here](#) for presentation

The Rapid Reaction Fund (RRF), implemented and funded by DFID, was designed as a fast track programme in the DRC before the recent outbreak of violence. The presentation focused on why it was successful in building up local partnerships.

The implementation of humanitarian action through local structures (here those of Caritas) was the core of the approach. With this approach they could take advantage of empowerment of local institutions, use local knowledge and capacities, adapt to local conditions and context, and reduce costs.

A critical point was that RRF dealt mainly with newly displaced persons. However, procedural shortcomings led to some uncertainty as to who was in this category.

The needs assessment was well-timed and well-implemented, but sometimes not specific enough. However, the shift in the time-frame of one month between the emerging of the demands, needs assessment, and delivery created the

assumption that the performance of the local teams could have been improved.

The specific lessons learned, in regard to the use of local structures, were the well-integrated approach of humanitarian assistance tradition, the straightforward relation with networks and locals, and the efficient use of community resources. By nature, this approach facilitated the maximisation of ownership while at the same time the minimisation of programme expenditures.

## Discussion

François Grünewald, *Groupe URD*, mentioned similar research by Groupe URD for a paper on GHD and needs assessment had produced different results.

Margie Buchanan-Smith, *independent consultant*, asked about the scope of this approach, and if it is to be used conceptually.

Rudolf Vandenboogaard agreed that, despite a great deal of experiences with the actors involved, the contextual analysis is still lacking. This could be a starting point for involving further local organisations, and CAFOD should move on to the rehabilitation phase.

## Lori Bell, *FAO*: Methodological issues related to evaluating the impact of food security and livelihood interventions in emergencies

Click [here](#) for presentation

What has been the experience so far in impact evaluation? First, all FAO Impact Assessments have been done in the context of larger evaluations such as country evaluations. There are 2 normative frameworks: beneficiary assessment, and monitoring policy impacts.

There are difficulties in collecting data, especially as it often comes indirectly, through partner organisations, and because of the time lag between intervention and evaluation. FAO tries to emphasise

qualitative methodologies, although there is not always time to adequately analyse this.

An evaluation carried out in Sudan between 2004 and 2008 on community animal health intervention was cited as an example. It particularly revealed high turnover of workers trained in the situation, and the lack of a standard model for community health programming.

## Questions from the floor and response from speaker

Jock Baker, *Care International*, referred to an evaluation in Myanmar which had followed the FAO model, and wondered what effect this type of work is having on other projects.

Ian Christoplos, *Independent*: If the objective is to look at sustainability, it would be interesting to look beyond animal sector actors. In Eritrea, they shut down all animal trainers because they “wanted to be modern”. However, without these workers, animals are still getting taken care of one way or another. This would be worth looking into.

Lori Bell broadly agreed, adding that there is a debate comparable to that in the development field about hospitals versus mobile clinics: what needs to be determined is whether there should be the same distinction in the animal sector. But the capacity of both government and the private sector to develop these tools needs to be studied.

## Monica Blagescu, *HAP*: Strengthening accountability and quality management

A brief update on membership and certification:

There are currently 33 HAP members, of which 6 are Associate members (including Danida, Sida, DFID and People In Aid) and 27 Full members. The first round of certification was completed in 2007 and the second in 2008.

Latest learning and next steps in terms of evaluating the effect of the work

HAP has conducted a beneficiary-based consultation to ascertain if humanitarian beneficiaries feel safer as a result of NGO and UN efforts to prevent sexual exploitation and abuse by aid workers. Monica Blagescu outlined the major points from the report on this process, *To Complain or Not to Complain: Still the Question*, which is available on the [HAP website](#).

A Follow-Up study to the Beneficiary Based Consultation using the same methodology will take place in the spring of 2010. In parallel to this, HAP are now commissioning a series of studies, including one looking at the effect of complaints handling in agencies where such effective and safe mechanisms have been established. Also, HAP and Save the Children are currently developing a proposal for a consultation process on setting up a stronger support and monitoring function on prevention, investigation and response to sexual exploitation and abuse cases.

HAP are also hoping to engage others who have a shared interest in their research agenda on Mortality/morbidity/dignity indices in relation to increased accountability and on costs/benefits for agencies and aid workers from improving humanitarian accountability and quality management.

The Standard revision process

The review process for the HAP 2007 Standard on Humanitarian Accountability and Quality Management has now started. It will consider the following key areas:

- Impact of the HAP 2007 Standard on the lives of disaster survivors
- Experience with the HAP 2007 Standard to date
- Changes needed in the content of the HAP 2007 Standard
- New directions for the Standard, such as an expansion of certification options beyond the humanitarian emergency domain, inter-operability with other

relevant standards, particularly the Sphere "Common Standards" and the People in Aid Code, and the need for additional benchmarks,

Members were invited to contribute to this process.

### Questions from the floor and response from speaker

**Christian Boehm, Danish Refugee Council:** The process for obtaining certification was not easy, but DRC now sees the benefit: relationships with beneficiaries have improved, but it is still difficult to make a complaint.

**Scott Green, OCHA,** asked for more detail of the certification process.

**Monica Blagescu** replied that HAP accepts that certification and compliance are difficult, but believes it to be useful for all stakeholders in the long term.

### Alison Joyner, Sphere: revision of the Sphere handbook.

The process of research has not been initiated yet as funding is still being sought, but it is hoped to start work May.

The demand for the handbook is still very high, and the goal of the upcoming revision process is to keep Sphere a living document by incorporating changes that have taken place since 2003, and also making it simpler and more coherent.

Sphere is also developing training material demonstrating the relation with HAP, People in Aid, ALNAP and other initiatives, and this is expected to go in print in 2009. It is also important to work with, not in competition with, other materials such as the Quality Compass. Other organisations including HAP and INEE will be contributing to the revision process.

### Questions from the floor and response from speaker

**Gunilla Kuperus, MSF-Holland,** raised concern about the number of initiatives that have been emerging recently and the



additional workload burden they impose on agencies.

**Oddhild Günther, NRC**, applauded the involvement of INEE was included and suggested linking with the Camp Management Toolkit.

**Alison Joyner** acknowledged that there are many initiatives but that there are efforts to combine and reduce them, too. Other tools are complementary to Sphere, but it would not be helpful to keep on using the existing handbook as it becomes more outdated.

## Discussion of possible themes for 25<sup>th</sup> Biannual

**Ben Ramalingam, ALNAP Secretariat**, outlined suggested themes for the next Biannual: national capacities, climate change, and civil military-relations. He asked Members to complete a voting form during lunch, but added that the decision would also take into account views expressed in the member poll in summer 2008 and, if the Meeting is held in a developing country, the views of actors in the region.

## Full Members discussion on ALNAP and diversity

**Eleanor Monbiot** explained that some Members have been concerned about inadequate attention being paid to the diversity within the membership, for example in taking account of work in languages other than English. Members were asked to discuss in small groups and come up with suggestions to respond to these concerns. After a time of discussion, points were made as follows.

**Sean Lowrie, Humanitarian Futures Programme**, recommended Secretariat staff and advisory group memberships should include those able to read literature from different cultural backgrounds.

**François Grünwald, Groupe URD**, thanked the secretariat for putting this point on the agenda. He mentioned the trilingual literature review which had been carried out for the ALNAP Global Study in 2003.

**Mathias Rickli, SDC**, asked for a common definition on the more concrete task of evaluation and assessment for ALNAP.

**Pascal Desbiens, CIDA**, proposed more involvement of actors from developing regions, if necessary by use of teleconferences etc.

**Jock Baker, CARE International**, suggested a synthesis of important terms in various languages.

**Ian Christoplos, Independent**: A major strength of ALNAP lies in informal dialogue. The dialogue should be widened to include regions such as southern Europe not currently represented.

**Eva von Oelreich, SCHR**, proposed to establish relations with international Masters/PhD courses on the topic, especially from developing countries. This would help to multiply knowledge and make use of academic capacities, and provide access to sources of knowledge from different cultural backgrounds

**Jonathan Potter, People In Aid**: ALNAP's position could be strengthened if the voice of southern organisations were better heard, even though they may not be able to be full members. ALNAP should get connected to other regional networks.

## ALNAP updates

### Network to network learning project

**Jonathan Potter, People In Aid**: This project arose from the awareness of economic obstacles to 'southern' participation in international meetings, including ALNAP Biannuals. Members were invited to read the proposal which has been drawn up in collaboration with representatives of some 'southern' networks.

**Ben Ramalingam, ALNAP Secretariat**: The first phase seeks funding for exchanges, i.e. bringing 'southern' actors to meetings and learning opportunities in the 'north'. In Phase two, it is hoped to strengthen the capacity of regional networks through better learning and accountability.

## Discussion

Mamadou Ndiaye, *OFADEC*, thanked those who had been working on this. He added that it is a two-way process: capacity building needs to take place in the 'south', but also in the 'north'.

Manisha Thomas, *ICVA*, expressed support and reminded participants that this would need financial commitment.

Ian Christoplos: Money needs to be provided to the 'southern' networks to run programs themselves, not programmes being run from the 'north'.

Ben Ramalingam confirmed that this is the goal of the longer-term process.

Eleanor Monbiot summed up by saying that this project is leading by example, and in partnership with other networks. She mentioned that there is currently no link to networks in Latin America, which is why a Biannual in that region is being considered.

## RTE Guide

Claude Hilfiker, *OCHA*, explained that this was an update on Real Time Evaluation (RTE), and particularly the RTE pilot initiative by the IASC and ALNAP. An interest group has been meeting for the last two years, and new members are invited. A draft guide has been piloted in various locations.

Ben Ramalingam noted that there was an ongoing discussion of what RTEs actually are, what is the right way to perform them, and what distinguishes them from other evaluations. This is the background before which the design of a guide was approved by the steering committee in December 2007. The guide, revised following the pilots, will be published electronically in 2009.

## Discussion

Jock Baker, *CARE international*, commended the guide, having piloted it in Myanmar.

François Grünewald, *Groupe URD*, felt that the feedback section needed expanding.

## 8<sup>th</sup> review of humanitarian action

Ben Ramalingam: The RHA will be published in April 2009. An update about this project will be circulated in the coming weeks to clear up any confusion that might have followed the morning's discussion.

The first study will bring together research on performance issues with the findings of the HPP.

Chapter 2 will be a study on IA and will use literature and organizational reviews, interviews, and discussion summaries from this Biannual. Interested Members were invited to put themselves forward for the advisory group.

A third study on innovations in humanitarian sector will examine the nature and role that innovations play in improving field based humanitarian practices. This will lead to a new series of innovation case studies as well as an innovation exchange mechanism.

## Discussion

John Borton suggested use of the term "outcome of impact" rather than IA.

Monica Blagescu: There is little data on how accountability has improved over time.

Ben Ramalingam: It was useful to avoid defining impact on Day 1, but we cannot avoid it altogether.

Eleanor Monbiot: For the first time, the RHA and the Biannual are being linked by a common theme.

## ALNAP Governance

John Mitchell stressed that there has been a considerable expansion of the Full Membership, so it is necessary to clarify questions concerning the structure, membership types, and roles of Members, Steering Committee and Secretariat. Consequently, a comprehensive document covering these areas has been written, and once approved by the steering committee will be circulated to Members and posted on the website.

## Website Design:

**Ben Ramalingam** explained that the site is being redesigned as a dynamic tool. Members are being asked to vote on line between 3 draft designs.

## Lessons papers

**Ben Ramalingam** recapped on the papers which have been written and those in progress. He invited contributions to these papers, specifically in regard to scientific diversification based on cultural and language background, as previously discussed. In that context, participants were reminded that following a DFID initiative to translate the Responding to earthquakes paper into Chinese, a high-level Chinese had attended part of this meeting.

## Discussion

**François Grünewald** stressed that papers should have a practical value and therefore be short and compact.

**Jock Baker, CARE International**, proposed future papers on disaster risk reduction (DRR) and the environmental impact of humanitarian crises.

**Ian Christoplos**, felt that there is already a lot of information on DRR available and that ALNAP has no specific advantage in producing another paper on the topic. He suggested a paper focussing on one region such as Central America or South East Asia to discuss the comparative advantage of bringing in international actors against relying completely on local capacities.

**Eva von Oelreich, SCHR**, proposed a paper on local communities and participation: existing material is lengthy so a shorter paper would be useful.

## Closing remarks Eleanor Monbiot, World Vision, ALNAP Chair

The comments and conclusions on the state of the system work have been noted and will be passed on to the consultants.

The dates and location of the next Biannual Meeting have not been finalised, but would be announced as soon as possible.

Thanks were expressed to the Federal Foreign Ministry for hosting the meeting.

## List of participants

**Michael Ahrens** German Federal Foreign Ministry *vn05-3@auswaertiges-amt.de*

**Margaret Arnold** ProVention Consortium *margaret.arnold@ifrc.org*

**Jurij Aston** German Federal Foreign Ministry

**Jock Baker** CARE International *baker@careinternational.org*

**Matt Bannerman** ECB Project *matt.bannerman@hotmail.co.uk*

**Herbert Beck** German Federal Foreign Ministry *pr-1-io@genf.auswaertiges-amt.de*

**Sally Begbie** Global Hand *sallybegbie@globalhand.org*

**Lori Bell** FAO *Lori.Bell@fao.org*

**Ramsey Ben-Achour** GPPI (meeting recorder) *ramseybenachour@gmail.com*

**Marie-Therese Benner** Malteser International *mariet.benner@malteser-international.org*

**Andrea Binder** Global Public Policy Institute *abinder@gppi.net*

**Monica Blagescu** HAP International *mblagescu@hapinternational.org*

**Hai Bo** China Nation Center of Poverty Alleviation and Development

**Christian Boehm** Danish Refugee Council *Christian.Boehm@drc.dk*

**Vera Bohle** GICHD *v.bohle@gichd.org*

**Thomas Bonschab** GTZ *Thomas.Bonschab@gtz.de*

**John Borton** Independent *johnborton@ntlworld.com*

**Sybille Braune** Deutsches Rotes Kreuz *braunes@drk.de*

**Margie Buchanan-Smith** Independent *Margiebsmith@aol.com*

**Diana Burghardt** Bochum University (meeting recorder) *d\_burghardt@hotmail.com*

**Nan Buzard** American Red Cross *BuzardN@usa.redcross.org*

**Huang Chengwei** International Poverty Reduction Center in China

**Ian Christoplos** Independent *ian@glemdev.com*

**Richard Cobb** Merlin *richard.cobb@merlin.org.uk*

**Claudia Conrad** KEK-CDC Consultants *conrad@kek.ch*

**Rosalinda Crescini-Tablang** Humanitarian Response & Development Network *saykedelik@yahoo.com*

**Jeff Crisp** UNHCR *CRISP@unhcr.org*

**James Darcy** ODI *j.darcy@odi.org.uk*

**Pascal Desbiens** CIDA *Pascal.Desbiens@international.gc.ca*

**Annie Devonport** DEC *adevonport@dec.org.uk*

**Harry Donsbach** World Vision *harry\_donsbach@wvi.org*

**Frank Dörner** MSF-Germany *frank.doerner@berlin.msf.org*

**Wolf-Dieter Eberwein** VOICE *eberwein.voice@yahoo.fr*

**Sabine Eckart** Medico International *eckart@medico.de*

**Lars Elle Danida** *larell@um.dk*

**Christoph Ernesti** CARE Deutschland *ernesti@care.de*

**Lecia Feszczak** Ärzte der Welt *lecia.feszczak@aerztederwelt.org*

**Martin Fisher** IFRC *martinjohn.fisher@ifrc.org*

**Bart Fonteyne** ICRC *bfonteyne.gva@icrc.org*

**Mitsuaki Furukawa** JICA *furukawa.mitsuaki@jica.go.jp*

**Jesús García Luengos** IECAH *jesus.luengos@iecah.org*

**Paz García Montes** AECID *Paz.Garcia@aecid.es*

**Josse Gillijns** IFRC *Josse.Gillijns@ifrc.org*

**Laura González Garcés** Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Cooperation  
*laura.gonzalez@maec.es*

**Claire Goudsmit** CAFOD  
*cgoudsmit@cafod.org.uk*

**Scott Green** OCHA *green10@un.org*

**François Grünewald** Groupe URD  
*fgrunewald@urd.org*

**Oddhild Günther** Norwegian Refugee Council  
*oddhild.gunther@nrc.no*

**Colin Hadkiss** ALNAP Secretariat  
*c.hadkiss@alnap.org*

**Hana Haller Crowe** Save the Children  
*HCrowe@savechildren.org*

**Chris Hartmann** Terre des Hommes  
*c.hartmann@tdh.de*

**Christopher Hepp** Independent  
*christopherhepp@yahoo.de*

**Silvia Hidalgo** DARA *shidalgo@daraint.org*

**Claude Hilfiker** OCHA *hilfiker@un.org*

**Peter Hirsch** Bochum University (meeting recorder)  
*peter.m.hirsch@googlemail.com*

**Charles-Antoine Hofmann** British Red Cross  
*cahofmann@redcross.org.uk*

**Anne Holmes** Irish Aid *Anne.Holmes@dfa.ie*

**Claire Hutchings** Oxfam  
*CHutchings@Oxfam.org.uk*

**Eva Jakobsen Broegaard** Danida  
*evabro@um.dk*

**Li Jian** GTZ *Jian.Li@gtz.de*

**Alison Joyner** SPHERE  
*Alison.Joyner@ifrc.org*

**Joanna Katarzyna** ECHO  
*Joanna-Katarzyna.CZAPLICKA-CABEZAS@ec.europa.eu*

**Martina Klement** German Federal Foreign Ministry  
*vn05-93-n@auswaertiges-amt.de*

**Gunilla Kuperus** MSF-Holland  
*gunilla.kuperus@amsterdam.msf.org*

**Bernd Leber** Consultant  
*proMig\_Consult@web.de*

**Miriam Lenz** German Federal Foreign Ministry  
*vn05-2@auswaertiges-amt.de*

**Mario Lima** LINGOs *mario@lingos.org*

**Sean Lowrie** Humanitarian Futures Programme  
*info@seanlowrie.com*

**Rainer Lucht** Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe  
*r.lucht@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.de*

**Anne-Claire Luzot** WFP  
*AnneClaire.Luzot@wfp.org*

**Hans Peter Melby** NORAD  
*hans.melby@norad.no*

**Eva Meyer** German Federal Foreign Ministry  
*vn05-referendar@zentrale.auswaertiges-amt.de*

**John Mitchell** ALNAP Secretariat  
*j.mitchell@alnap.org*

**Eleanor Monbiot** World Vision  
*eleanor\_monbiot@wvi.org*

**Ursula Müller** German Federal Foreign Ministry  
*vn05-rl@auswaertiges-amt.de*

**Jamie Munn** HAP International  
*jmun@hapinternational.org*

**Aninia Nadig** SPHERE *aninia.nadig@ifrc.org*

**Christiane Nagel** Bochum University (meeting recorder)  
*nagel.christiane@yahoo.de*

**Mamadou Ndiaye** OFADEC  
*mndiaye@ofadec.org*

**Ben Nicholson** Tearfund  
*Ben.Nicholson@tearfund.org*

**Franziska Orphal** ALNAP Secretariat  
*f.orphal@alnap.org*

**Ralf Otto** Channel Research  
*otto@channelresearch.com*

**Melissa Peters** German Federal Foreign Ministry

**Riccardo Polastro** DARA  
*rpolastro@daraint.org*

**Jonathan Potter** People In Aid  
*Jonathan@peopleinaid.org*

**Megan Price** RedR *megan.price@redr.org*

**Karen Proudlock** ALNAP Secretariat  
*k.proudlock@alnap.org*

**Ben Ramalingam** ALNAP Secretariat  
*b.ramalingam@alnap.org*

**Florian Reissinger** Interpreter to Chinese Delegation

**Inge Remmert-Fontes** AGEF  
[i\\_remmert\\_fontes@gmx.de](mailto:i_remmert_fontes@gmx.de)

**Francisco Rey Marcos** IECAH  
[francisco.rey@iecah.org](mailto:francisco.rey@iecah.org)

**Mathias Rickli** SDC  
[mathias.rickli@deza.admin.ch](mailto:mathias.rickli@deza.admin.ch)

**Sylvie Robert** Independent  
[sylvierobertconsulting@yahoo.fr](mailto:sylvierobertconsulting@yahoo.fr)

**Tim Robertson** DFID  
[t-robertson@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:t-robertson@dfid.gov.uk)

**Hubertus Rüffer** Deutsche Welthungerhilfe  
[hubertus.rueffer@welthungerhilfe.de](mailto:hubertus.rueffer@welthungerhilfe.de)

**Peter Runge** VENRO [p.runge@venro.org](mailto:p.runge@venro.org)

**Catherine Russ** RedR  
[Catherine.Russ@redr.org](mailto:Catherine.Russ@redr.org)

**David Sanderson** CENDEP  
[dsanderson@brookes.ac.uk](mailto:dsanderson@brookes.ac.uk)

**Kevin Savage** World Vision  
[kevin\\_savage@wvi.org](mailto:kevin_savage@wvi.org)

**Ivan Scott** Oxfam GB [IScott@oxfam.org.uk](mailto:IScott@oxfam.org.uk)

**Kim Scriven** ALNAP Secretariat  
[k.scriven@alnap.org](mailto:k.scriven@alnap.org)

**Guy Sharrock** CRS [GSharroc@crs.org](mailto:GSharroc@crs.org)

**Sigrid Sommer** German Federal Foreign Ministry  
[Sigrid.Sommer@diplo.de](mailto:Sigrid.Sommer@diplo.de)

**Harriet Spanos** USAID/OFDA  
[spanosh@state.gov](mailto:spanosh@state.gov)

**Birgit Spiewok** Johanniter Auslandshilfe  
[birgit.spiewok@juh.de](mailto:birgit.spiewok@juh.de)

**Julia Steets** GPPI [jsteets@gppi.net](mailto:jsteets@gppi.net)

**Elliott Stern** Lancaster University  
[e.stern@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:e.stern@lancaster.ac.uk)

**Philip Tamminga** DARA  
[ptamminga@daraint.org](mailto:ptamminga@daraint.org)

**Manisha Thomas** ICVA [manisha@icva.ch](mailto:manisha@icva.ch)

**Mariska van Beijnum** Clingendael Institute  
[mbeijnum@clingendael.nl](mailto:mbeijnum@clingendael.nl)

**Antje van Roeden** ICRC  
[avanroeden.gva@icrc.org](mailto:avanroeden.gva@icrc.org)

**Rudolf Vandenboogaard** CAFOD

**Mathew Varghese** UNICEF  
[mvarghese@unicef.org](mailto:mvarghese@unicef.org)

**Busso von Alvensleben** German Federal Foreign Ministry  
[vn-b-2@auswaertiges-amt.de](mailto:vn-b-2@auswaertiges-amt.de)

**Eva von Oelreich** SCHR [schr@ifrc.org](mailto:schr@ifrc.org)

**Jane Waite** British Red Cross  
[JWaite@redcross.org.uk](mailto:JWaite@redcross.org.uk)

**Guiliang Wang** Chinese State Council

**Lioba Weingärtner** Consultant  
[Lioba.Weingaertner@t-online.de](mailto:Lioba.Weingaertner@t-online.de)

**He Xiaojun** Chinese State Council

**Hou Yongjian** Chinese State Council

**Nick York** DFID [N-York@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:N-York@dfid.gov.uk)

**Dawit Zawde** Africa Humanitarian Action  
[dawitz@africahumanitarian.org](mailto:dawitz@africahumanitarian.org)

**Nevio Zagaria** WHO [zagarian@who.int](mailto:zagarian@who.int)

**Michaela Zintl** German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation & Development  
[Michaela.Zintl@bmz.bund.de](mailto:Michaela.Zintl@bmz.bund.de)