



# ALNAP 14th Biannual Meeting



**16–17 October 2003** Hosted in Boston by the Feinsein International Famine Center,  
Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy, Tufts University.

# Meeting Report

## Day 1

### Welcome and Introductions

**Chair** Anita Menghetti, U.S. Agency for International Development/Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance, and Dave Hastings, Executive Associate Dean, Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy, (Dr Irwin H. Rosenberg, Dean, did not attend, apologies received)

### Humanitarian Protection: Its Nature and Programmatic Content

James Darcy, Research Fellow, Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute, London (Did not attend, apologies received)

### Putting the Individual at the Centre of Humanitarian Protection

*Dr. Hugo Slim, Chief Scholar, Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue*

**Rediscovery of the individual civilian** Although the 1991 U.N. General Assembly Resolution 46182 did not mention protection, the resolution did discuss humanitarian action.

#### Rise of the protection agenda

- 1992 Agenda for Peace.
- Use of Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter for humanitarian intervention.
- Explicit U.N. Security Council statements on civilian suffering and international peace and security.

#### Emerging outlines of policy and practice

- In 1980s humanitarian community did “relief,” not protection. In 1990s, the idea of “protection” expanded to include human suffering and policies to address it. The humanitarian community began to use and enforce the international legal frameworks.
- Emphasis on three civilian groups: internally displaced persons (IDPs), women, and children.

Although the protection of civilians has become well recognized, there are still five main ideologies that reject the importance of the civilian identity.

- Totalized enmity.
- Blurred identity.
- Human passions/desire for revenge.

- Strategic choice – bigger effect with less force.
- Part of war – difficult in war not to impact civilians.

#### Discussion

- How is the war on terrorism affecting protection of the civilian?
- Two more ideologies that reject the importance of the civilian identity:
  - The end justifies the means.
  - Major powers must follow different rules.
- Importance of respect, not paternalism, in protection.
- Perception of the humanitarian community and increased attacks on the community.
- Is humanitarianism being co-opted by politics?
- Depending on the perception of threat, states and other actors are more or less likely to reject the importance of protection of the civilian.
- Both social protection and humanitarian protection have the same goals but they follow different approaches.

### Link between Protection and Assistance

*Paul Bonard, International Committee of the Red Cross*

Protection and assistance must be closely linked because assistance cannot be properly provided without considering protection and can create protection risks. For example, food assistance can cause displacement to dangerous areas.

Assistance allows organizations to collect information on protection without exposing the population to security risks.

#### Requirements for protection activities

- Constant presence for close monitoring.
- Negotiation skills.
- Knowledge of protection norms and legal framework.
- Confidential data management – requires specific knowledge.
- Need to protect the source of information collection.
- Human resources – need expatriate staff.

#### Requirements for assistance activities

- Advanced technical knowledge.
- Transversal and integrative approach for different kinds of assistance.
- Data collection techniques.
- Coordination.
- Capacity to mobilize large resources.
- Aptitude for short/medium/long term operations.

#### Discussion

- Importance of working with the local community.
- Possibility of de-linking assistance and protection.
- Prioritization of needs.

## Protection in Practice and Humanitarian Assistance: Where are we now?

*Diane Paul, Senior Advisor on Human Rights, The Cuny Center*

Remarks based on the *Aide Mémoire* and a joint survey by the Cuny Center, Brookings Institution, School of Advanced International Studies at The Johns Hopkins University, and OCHA on IDP protection. The IDP protection survey visited nine countries and will be published in January 2004.

### Current situation

- Increased acceptance that everyone can participate in protection activities.
- Increased awareness that governments and armed groups must be held accountable.

### Obstacles

- Generally, international protection is not undertaken systematically, or is even overlooked entirely.
- No single agenda for the U.N. on protection. Instead, individual agencies develop their own agendas.
- U.N. is often silent about human rights violations.
- Disconnect between U.N. field offices and U.N. headquarters.
- UNHCR focuses more on capacity building than protection.
- Opaque monitoring and reporting mechanisms.
- Impunity due to little prosecution of cases.

### Recommendations

- Create a protection strategy advisory unit for each complex emergency, ideally funded and based in OCHA.
- U.N. or ICRC should take the lead.
- Further develop concept of preventive protection.

### Discussion

- The *Aide Mémoire* should be a flexible document, open to change.
- U.N. protection working group in Liberia is a good example of coordination.
- Need to hold Security Council accountable for non-compliance with resolutions.

## Protection: Who needs it? From whom? How? Considerations from field experience

*Mary B. Anderson, President, Collaborative for Development Action Inc.*

The three most important dilemmas in the linkage between assistance and protection are:

- Unintended negative consequences.
- Conflicting strategies and goals for protection.
- Multiple approaches to protection.

Example of peace-building strategies from the Peace Practice Group:

	More people strategies	Key people strategies
Culture of peace (individual)		
Peace is a matter of creating institutions (system)		

The rows show two ways that people believe peace is created – changing individuals or changing systems – and the columns are the strategies that organizations choose in order to create peace.

The most effective programs had linkages between all four levels of the matrix.

### Challenges for successful protection activities

- Need methods to scale up impact of individual protection strategies to reach the entire community.
- Need to link the legal and functional approaches.
- Need to hold people accountable for violations.
- Need to link international capacity with local capacity.

### Discussion

- Formal human rights machinery is ineffective.
- Need to choose strategy based on the capabilities of the organization rather than the organizational theory of change.
- Importance of supporting local strategies.
- Importance of examining previous attempts to solve the same issues.
- Example of the landmine campaign on increasing impact.



## Summary from Chair

*John Mitchell*

The original goal of the ALNAP protection study was to develop a performance framework to evaluate protection elements in humanitarian programs. Given the lack of consensus around what protection is, ALNAP has now focused on developing a tool to assist managers in deciding whether or not to undertake protection activities in the field and how to best to do it.

It seems uncertain whether a working consensus exists on the fundamental concepts of protection. Perhaps ALNAP should develop the practical and conceptual side of protection and work with other agencies and groups doing similar work before going on to develop a performance framework?

## Breakout groups

**Group 1** What are the scope of humanitarian protection and the role of non-mandated agencies and the donor agencies of governments?

### Development of debate on humanitarian protection

- Debate on humanitarian protection began when humanitarian agencies started critiquing UNHCR for its failure to protect refugees in Bosnia-Herzegovina.
- Now, there is more collaboration, but it is still unclear who does what.

### Donor roles

- Must be careful not to put partners in danger.
- Donors can find commonality with their development colleagues working with protection.

Both the mandated and non-mandated agencies share the same goal, but only mandated agencies are accountable.

A focus on capacity building may be dangerous for protection activities.

States have the principal responsibility for protection and should be included in this discussion.

Is protection by military forces humanitarian protection?

Suggested an annual examination on protection issues hosted by ALNAP or another agency.

**Group 2** How is protection operationalised?

The group began by discussing definitions of protection and realized there was no common definition.

Shared lessons from activities in the Philippines, Thailand, India, Colombia, and South Pacific.

### Lessons learned

- Communities that are already organized can protect themselves better.
- Coping mechanisms always exist.
- The importance of comprehensive situational analysis.
- Need good contact within the local communities and with parties in conflict and donors.
- Still need to mainstream gender issues.
- Information and the source of information: should coordinate, cooperate, and be adaptive.
- Protection is a continuous activity that requires continuing analysis and flexibility.

**Group 3** How can humanitarian protection be evaluated?

The group discussed the challenges posed by evaluation of humanitarian protection.

### Debates on methodology

- Evaluation needs to take into account that protection is longer term than assistance.
- Difficulty of measuring impact:
- May be attributable to external factors.
- How to measure what does not happen?
- When to evaluate programs – after or during?
- Should evaluation be a sector wide approach, programme specific?
- How to measure the impact on beneficiaries?

### Recommendations

- Clarify methodology.
- Explore which indicators to use further and perhaps look at other sectors for indicators.
- ALNAP could gather best practices.
- Need to use appropriate people for the evaluations.

## Summary of Breakout Groups

*Dr. Peter Walker, Director, Feinstein International Famine Center*

### Four recommendations

- **Be careful** not to let funding concerns define protection activities.
- **Get smart.** Gather knowledge from the community, local officials, and international actors.
- **Get structure.** Decide what your agency can do and can not do. Decide what you can get others to do.
- **Do not give up.** Remember why you are involved.



## Day 2

# ALNAP Activity Updates

### Secretariat News

*John Mitchell, ALNAP Secretariat*

ALNAP is in good shape. ALNAP's finances are healthy, and there is renewed energy in the network. There continue to be close, open relations among the members, conducive to learning.

### Financial Update

*Sera Orzel, ALNAP Secretariat*

Previously, ALNAP had a £9,250 overspend (Budget 2002–2003), but donations from IFRC, ICRC, CARE, and FAO have gone a long way to address this, raising £5,613.

Of the present budget, ALNAP has confirmed 39.84% of funds have been received with another 57.16% of funds pledged. This equates to 97.05% of funds (including 0.05% income from other sources) secured.

ALNAP will present a new budget for 2004–2005 at the end of the year.

### ALNAP Training Modules

*Sera Orzel, ALNAP Secretariat*

In 2001, ALNAP members requested the development of training modules to improve managerial skills.

#### Three Modules

- **Module 1** Introduction to Evaluation of Humanitarian Action.

- **Module 2** Evaluation of Humanitarian Action: the Evaluator's Role.
- **Module 3** Managing and Facilitating Evaluations of Humanitarian Action.

The modules were updated in 2003 by Sarah Swords and are available at [www.alnap.org](http://www.alnap.org) at no cost. The modules now include:

- More details on evaluation criteria and its importance.
- Links between evaluation and monitoring.
- How to strengthen organizational learning to aid acceptance and use of evaluation findings.
- Evaluation of protection.
- The refined ALNAP Quality Proforma.

#### Discussion

- We can put materials on CDs if members agree.
- Make links to other evaluation materials.
- CARE institutionalised Module 1 but found Module 3 too elementary.
- UNICEF offered to put ALNAP modules on their CD of monitoring and evaluation materials.
- Possible collaboration with World Bank suggested by MFA Norway.

### ALNAP Website and Evaluative Reports Database

*John Lakeman, ALNAP Secretariat*

#### New additions to [www.alnap.org](http://www.alnap.org)

- 5 Global Study monographs.
- Revised Training Modules.
- Key Message Sheets.
- Annual Review 2002.
- Ability to purchase publications online.

#### Future development of [www.alnap.org](http://www.alnap.org)

- Overhaul and redesign of website.
- Overhaul Evaluative Reports Database and transfer to ODI web space.
- Develop notice board for members.
- Develop subscription form for visitors.

Numbers of visitors to [www.alnap.org](http://www.alnap.org) is increasing.

Evaluative Reports Database (ERD), the last nine months:

- Significant interest in 74 individual records from ERD, 917 requests received.
- Significant interest in 14 individual records from "Useful Resources," 535 requests received.

#### Training Modules

- Third most popular page on the site.
- 4,440 viewings since May 2002:

**Module 1** 1,482 viewings.

**Module 2** 891 viewings.

**Module 3** 855 viewings.

Key document downloads since May 2003:

- Annual Review Key Messages: 350.
- After Action Review Key Messages: 261.
- Iraq Evaluation Lessons: 246.
- Liberia Evaluation Lessons: 191.
- Annual Review 2001: 138.
- Annual Review 2002: 124.

#### Discussion

- Should promote more links to and from the ALNAP site.

## Follow-up to Annual Review 2003

*Tony Beck*

127 evaluation reports were assessed against 12 areas in the Quality Proforma (QP).

Conducted follow-up visits to agencies: WFP, Oxfam UK, UNICEF, Tearfund, DEC, MSF-H, UNHCR, ECHO, IFRC, and DANIDA.

#### Results

- Almost all agencies thought the visit was worthwhile.
- In many cases, visits confirmed issues of which Evaluation Officers were already aware.
- There was strong commitment to improve evaluation performance.
- Assessment against the QP has established a baseline against which agencies can measure progress.

#### Findings on the Annual Review

- Annual Review needs to be more user-oriented.
- ALNAP needs to do more marketing in relation to the Annual Review.
- The QP sets high standards for the evaluation of humanitarian action.

#### Findings on standards

- Almost all respondents agreed that there should be an attempt to develop sector wide standards, facilitated by ALNAP.
- Many agencies already have standards in place.

#### Main recommendations

- Follow up visits should be considered for 2004 for select agencies.
- ALNAP Steering Committee should discuss publishing individual agency QP results.

#### Main recommendations on the Annual Review

- The Annual Review needs to be better marketed.
- The 2004 Annual Review Meta-Evaluation section should include a strong focus on good practice.

#### Main recommendations on evaluation standards

- ALNAP should establish a small working committee to set out a framework for the process of developing evaluation standards.
- An upcoming Biannual should include a focus on follow-up to evaluation findings and recommendations.

#### Discussion

- Difference between purposeful exclusion of some QP criteria and accidental omission.
- Joint evaluations lead to better quality.
- Need to review the QP.
- Need to examine impact of the evaluation but requires more resources.
- Need for a more active process and more feedback.

## Annual Review 2004

*Ian Christoplos; Fernande Faulkner and Brian Foster; Faulkner & Associates*

The Annual Review 2004 will focus on field level learning especially what encourages/discourages learning in the field and the need to see field learning as part of the solution.

For the Annual Review 2004, Faulkner & Associates plan to include the following:

- Analysis of the whole system.
- The group as the unit of analysis.
- Examine variety of learning methods.
- Importance of technology.
- Model a participative learning process.
- Website on Groove collaborative network.



**Timeline** Faulkner & Associates will work with ALNAP at the LSO Meeting in London on 3 December, and then conduct more detailed data gathering and approximately 30 telephone interviews.

## Guidance Booklet on How to Evaluate Humanitarian Action

*Tony Beck*

**Objective** To provide practical support in using and applying the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria in the evaluation of humanitarian action (EHA).

### Method

- Use a reference group as a guide.
- Survey of 25 ALNAP full members.
- Review of good practice within EHA and in the general evaluation field.
- Building on previous work by Hallam (1998), Borton/OECD/DAC (1999) and ETC (UK) (2001).

### Issues

- Reference group divided as to amount of conceptual information to be included.
- Main area of division was attention to be paid to debate on lesson learning vs. accountability.
- Attempted to find a balance between divergent views.
- In the past EHA has been largely accountability focused, but it is moving to lesson learning.
- Can use of the DAC criteria support both lesson learning and accountability?
- Whether the DAC criteria could be used to examine more effectively social process.
- Utilization is intended as a cross-cutting theme of the Booklet but is the focus clear enough?

### Format: Section 3

- Definition and its explanation.
- Issues to consider in use of the criteria, including areas that can be problematic.
- Key messages.
- Good practice examples.

### DAC criteria covered

- Effectiveness.
- Impact.
- Efficiency.
- Coverage.
- Relevance/appropriateness.
- Connectedness.
- Coherence.

### Outstanding issues

- Are the definitions clear enough?
- Is the format user friendly?

- Is there anything missing (e.g. focus on primary stakeholder participation)?
- Will the booklet be used?

### Next steps

- Piloting of Guidance Booklet with 2–3 agency evaluations over 6–9 months.
- Workshop pre- and post-piloting with agency and evaluators.

### Volunteers to pilot the booklet

- DANIDA.
- Groupe URD.
- MFA Netherlands.

## Guidance Booklet on Humanitarian Protection – Next Steps

*Kathrine Starup, Danish Refugee Council*

### Key questions

- How does the emphasis on protection add value to the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) compared with more traditional needs-based programmes?
- What will be the operational implications of applying the principles of humanitarian protection?
- Within the humanitarian protection framework, what are the roles, responsibilities, and comparative advantages of DRC?

### Piloting of the guidance booklet

- Testing the Booklet in four very different conflict or post-conflict settings.
- Testing the usefulness and relevance of the Booklet as guidance in analysing, designing, and programming for humanitarian protection.
- Case studies of relevance to other organisations.

### Programmatic challenges

- Trivialising the concept of protection.
- Making protection superior to any other kind of humanitarian intervention.
- How to ensure inter-agency complementarity and cooperation around shared protection goals?

### Organisational challenges

- Traditional legal training on the relevant international instruments is required prior to applying the analytical framework.
- The analytical framework presupposes that the legal expertise is in place in order to be able to apply the principles of humanitarian protection.

# Working Groups Update

## Global Study on Consultation and Participation

*Andre Griekspoor, World Health Organization*

### Achievements

- Three literature reviews in three languages.
- Case Studies – Sri Lanka, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Afghanistan, Angola, and Colombia.
- Draft practitioners' handbook.
- Created first outline of overview book.

A look at field participation showed little evidence of participation.

Oxfam will host phase 2 of the study on strengthening participation.

Need comments and volunteers to pilot draft practitioners' handbook.

## The Use of Sample Surveys in Humanitarian Programmes

*Jeff Crisp, U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)*

On October 15, 2003, the ALNAP Strategy Committee endorsed a proposal from UNHCR to establish an ALNAP Working Group on the use of sample surveys in humanitarian programmes.

The plan for the study is modest and is still open for comment.

The Working Group will use an expert on the subject at UNHCR.

Members are asked to supply information on any similar studies.

Full members voted to approve UNHCR's proposal to be a working group activity.

## The Learning Support Office (LSO)

*John Borton*

The objective of a LSO is to make a positive impact on the quality of emergency response through the promotion and facilitation of three-way learning activities at the field-level.

LSO Malawi operated from September 2002 through March 2003 as an ALNAP Interest Group Activity and was evaluated by Reto Zehnder.

The LSO Malawi was funded by DFID, OFDA, SIDA, WVI, and CAFOD.

### Accomplishments

- Established LSO Resource Centre.
- Conducted three regional workshops.
- Organized and managed 11 one-day training sessions.
- Provided support to other actors.

### Conclusions

- LSO mandate needs to be limited, feasible, widely accepted and have strong backing by agency headquarters.
- Agencies willing to act as learning organizations should be identified before deployment
- Need to undertake comprehensive strategic planning process before full deployment – ideally between Project Director and Steering Group.
- Need to ensure diversification of client groups to prevent being “absorbed” by any one group.
- Need to ensure that LSO is still present in post-peak phase.
- Avoid straying into activities outside learning.

LSO Workshop will be held 4–5 November in London, in order to define a strategy for an appropriate next phase in field level learning activities of the ALNAP Working Group.





# ALNAP Full Members Information Exchange

## Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response (SCHR) Peer Review

*Joel McClellan, SCHR*

Organizations wrote memos regarding what each organization was doing about sexual exploitation and abuse.

In May 2003, the report was distributed to the Steering Committee, and in July 2003, three SCHR member agencies – Oxfam, Save the Children, and the ICRC – piloted the peer review process.

In January 2004, the team will meet at Oxfam to decide upon future actions.

## World Vision Learning Network

*Richard Rumsey, World Vision*

Difficulty of identifying where knowledge is and where it should be because of a multitude of partners and other actors.

### **Six principles for success**

- The desire for learning must be organic.
- Collaborate.
- Make learning easy.
- Recognize and augment existing 'business' practices.
- Reporting is essential to knowledge transfer and accountability.
- Sharing knowledge.

### **Four elements of learning**

- Expert group learning.
- Knowledge management.
- Organizational learning.
- Learning implementation and communications.

### **Discussion**

- What other organizations could do this?
- Required budget?
- Incentive for learning necessary.

## Good Donorship Initiative

*Marco Ferrari, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation*

Study of humanitarian donations found that most countries have more than one organizational unit for humanitarian donations, leading to difficulties in coordination.

International meeting on good humanitarian donorship held in Sweden June 16th–17th, 2003.

Papers from the meeting are available on the Sida web page:

- Principles and Practices of Good Humanitarian Donorship.
- Protection and Assistance.
- Meeting Conclusions.
- Implementation Plan for Good Humanitarian Donorship.

Burundi is the pilot country for the 2004 U.N. Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP) chaired by the United Kingdom, and DRC is the pilot country for the 2005 CAP chaired by Belgium and the U.S.

Sudan is a possible pilot country.

### **Discussion**

- Donor funding structures are also being examined.
- Transparency, accountability? - Papers are available on Relief Web.
- Need to involve agencies not connected with the CAP.

## Framework for a Common Approach on Assistance to IDPs

*Niels Dabelstein, DANIDA*

Donors need to agree on a new way of doing joint work/joint assessments, and there should be a synthesis of the evaluations. These evaluations should work towards a rights-based approach.

UNHCR focuses on displacement as an issue instead of IDPs.

Focusing on IDPs has become politically popular recently.

Need to decide which donors will be responsible for which countries, and donors will be involved in this.

Need to remember that IDPs are not the only vulnerable groups.

## Issues arising from Iraq crisis

*Antonio Donini, Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University*

New qualitative threshold in the politicization of humanitarian aid:

- Trend or aberration?
- Shrinking of humanitarian space because of politicization.

Humanitarianism as a tool of the super-powers?

Issues of human rights and humanitarian action:

- Need to focus on linkages.
- Need to think strategically and make coalitions of rights minded groups.

Humanitarian activities cannot be judged by cost-effectiveness.

Political and economic motivations for humanitarian assistance.

Need to return to principles of neutrality and impartiality.

Choice between cooperation with governments and irrelevance for NGOs.

Humanitarians have always had to work in morally difficult situations.

Increased attacks on humanitarians due to identification with governments.

Increased commercialization and militarization of humanitarian assistance.

Opportunity to link humanitarianism to issues of justice, poverty, etc.

Actions in one location affect perceptions of humanitarians in another location.

How to establish trust with the local community?

**Discussion:** What are possible roles for ALNAP?

- Coordinating initiatives.
- Provide a database for reports on Iraq.
- Possibly dangerous for ALNAP to become involved in security concerns.
- Examine effects of security concerns on performance.
- Examine the paradigm shift (Iraq/Afghanistan) and look at activities of Provincial Reconstruction Teams.
- Bring together agencies conducting similar evaluations.

## Closing Issues

Next biannual meetings will be in June 2004 and December 2004.



# Appendix 1

## Meeting agenda

### ALNAP 14th Biannual Meeting

Hosted by the Feinstein International Famine Center, Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy, Tufts University, 16–17 October 2003

#### Day 1 Agenda

Jaharis Building, 150 Harrison Avenue, Boston

**08.30–09.00** Registration and coffee

**09.00–09.30** Welcome and Introductions. *Chair: Anita Menghetti, USAID/OFDA, and Dr Bea Rogers, Dean of Academic Affairs, Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy*

**09.30–10.05** Humanitarian Protection: its Nature and Programmatic Content: *James Darcy, Research Fellow, Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute, London*

**10.05–10.40** Putting the Individual at the Centre of Humanitarian Protection: *Dr Hugo Slim, Chief Scholar, Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, Geneva*

**10.40–11.15** The Link Between Protection and Assistance: *Paul Bonard, Deputy Head of Protection Division, ICRC.*

**11.15–11.45** Coffee break

**11.45–12.20** Protection in Practice and Humanitarian Assistance: Where are we now? *Diane Paul, Senior Advisor on Human Rights, The Cuny Center, Washington*

**12.20–12.55** Protection: Who needs it? From whom? How? Considerations from field experience: *Mary B. Anderson, President, Collaborative for Development Action Inc.*

**12.55–13.15** Summary from Chair

**13.15–14.30** Lunch

**14.30–16.00** Breakout groups (*including coffee break*):

*Group 1* What is the scope of humanitarian protection and the role of non-mandated agencies and the donor agencies of governments?

*Group 2* How has humanitarian protection been operationalised? What works well?

*Group 3* How can humanitarian protection be evaluated?

**16.00–17.15** Feedback and plenary

**17.15–17.30** Summary by *Dr. Peter Walker, Director, Feinstein International Famine Center.*

*Invitation to dinner*

*At 19.00 you are cordially invited to attend the ALNAP Dinner at the Doubletree Hotel, 821 Washington Street, Boston.*

#### Day 2 Agenda

Sackler Center, 145, Harrison Avenue, Boston

**08.45–09.15** Coffee

**09.15–09.30** Introduction (*Chair: Anita Menghetti, USAID/OFDA*)

**09.30–11.00** ALNAP Activity Updates:

Secretariat News: *John Mitchell, ALNAP Secretariat*

Financial Update: *Sera Orzel, ALNAP Secretariat*

ALNAP Training Modules: *Sera Orzel, ALNAP Secretariat*

ALNAP Website and Evaluative Reports Database: *John Lakeman, ALNAP Secretariat*

Follow-up to Annual Review 2003: *Tony Beck*

Annual Review 2004: *Ian Christoplos; Fernande Faulkner and Brian Foster, Faulkner & Associates*

Guidance Booklet on How to Evaluate Humanitarian Action: *Tony Beck*

Guidance Booklet on Humanitarian Protection - next steps: *Kathrine Starup, Danish Refugee Council*

**11.00–11.30** Coffee break

**11.30–12.00** Working Groups Update :

Global Study on Consultation and Participation: *Andre Griekspoor, WHO*

The Use of Sample Surveys in Humanitarian Programmes: *Jeff Crisp, UNICEF*

The Learning Support Office: *John Borton*

**12.00–13.00** ALNAP Full Members Information Exchange :

SCHR Peer Review: *Joel McClellan, SCHR*

World Vision Learning Network: *Richard Rumsey, World Vision*

Good Donorship Initiative: *Marco Ferrari SDC*

**13.00–14.15** Lunch

**14.15–15.30** Issues arising from Iraq crisis. *Antonio Donini, Visiting Senior Fellow, Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University, Providence*

**15.30–16.00** Coffee break

**16.00–17.00** Membership Networking and Informal Discussions

**17.00–17.15** Summary and closure

# Appendix 2

## Meeting participants

### ALNAP 14th Biannual Meeting Participants List

**Kate Alley** UNICEF *ktalley@unicef.org*

**Mary Anderson** Collaborative for Development Action Inc *mba@cdainc.com*

**Jock Baker** CARE USA *jbaker@care.org*

**Tony Beck** Independent *tonybeck@shaw.ca*

**Mihir Bhatt** DML, India *dmi@icenet.net*

**Paul Bonard** ICRC *pbonard@icrc.org*

**Andrew Bonwick** OXFAM *abonwick@oxfam.org.uk*

**John Borton** John Borton Consulting *johnborton@btinternet.com*

**Nan Buzard** SPHERE *buzard@ifrc.org*

**Matthew Carter** CAFOD/CARITAS *mcarter@cafod.org.uk*

**Peter Cavendish** ECHO *peter.cavendish@cec.eu.int*

**Richard Cewers** Sida *richard.cewers@sida.se*

**Ian Christoplos** Independent *christop@bahnhof.se*

**Rosalind Clarke** DFID/CHAD Ops *Rosalind-Clarke@dfid.gov.uk*

**Jeff Crisp** UNHCR *crisp@unhcr.ch*

**Niels Dabelstein** DANIDA *niedab@um.dk*

**Stefan Dahlgren** Sida *stefan.dahlgren@sida.se*

**Nicki Dahrendorf** UNICEF *ndahrendorf@unicef.org*

**Steve Darvill** AusAid *Steve\_Darvill@ausaid.gov.au*

**Rupen Das** WorldVision Ca/Int *rupen\_das@worldvision.ca*

**Zenaida Delica** ADPC *zdelica@adpc.net*

**Antonio Donini** Brown University *Antonio\_Donini@brown.edu*

**Luis Enrique Eguren** Independent *quique@nodo50.org*

**Sigurd Endresen** MFA Norway *se@mfa.no*

**Fernande Faulkner** Eriksen, Faulkner, Foster *Faulkner@eriksenfaulknerfoster.com*

**Marco Ferrari** SDC *Marco.Ferrari@deza.admin.ch*

**Brian Foster** Eriksen, Faulkner, Foster *foster@eriksenfaulknerfoster.com*

**Susanne Frueh** OCHA *frueh@un.org*

**Peter Giesen** MSF-H *Peter\_GIESEN@msf.org*

**André Griekspoor** WHO *griekspoor@who.ch*

**Robyn Groves** OCHA *groves@un.org*

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

**Colin Hadkiss** ALNAP *c.hadkiss@odi.org.uk*

**Maurice Herson** Oxfam GB *mherson@oxfam.org.uk*

**Vishaka Hidellage** ITDG *NilanthiG@itdg.slt.lk*

**Karen Jacobsen** Tufts University *karen.jacobsen@tufts.edu*

**Christoph Jakob** SDC *christoph.jakob@deza.admin.ch*

**Ted Kliest** MFA Netherlands *tj.kliest@minbuza.nl*

**John Lakeman** ALNAP *j.lakeman@odi.org.uk*

**Joel McClellan** SCHR *schr@ifrc.org*

**Anita Menghetti** USAID/OFDA *amenghetti@usaid.gov*

**Noria Mezlef** HAP International *nmezlef@hapinternational.org*

**Larry Minear** Tufts University *larry.minear@tufts.edu*

**John Mitchell** ALNAP *j.mitchell@odi.org.uk*

**Geeta Narayan** UNICEF *gnarayan@unicef.org*

**Nora Niland** Tufts University *nora.niland@tufts.edu*

**Phil O'Keefe** ETCUK Ltd *phil@etcuk.org*

**Sera Orzel** ALNAP *s.orzel@odi.org.uk*

**Pierrette Parriaux** OXFAM America *pparriaux@oxfamamerica.org*

**Diane Paul** Independent *dipaul@citlink.net*

**Francisco Rey** IECAH *francisco.rey@eresmas.net*

**Richard Rumsey** World Vision UK *richard.rumsey@worldvision.org.uk*

**Ed Schenkenberg** ICVA *ed.schenkenberg@icva.ch*

**Ian Shaw** University of York *ifs2@york.ac.uk*

**Lewis Sida** SCF UK *L.Sida@SCFUK.org.uk*

**Romain Sirois** WFP *romain.sirois@wfp.org*

**Hugo Slim** Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue *slim@hdcentre.org*

**Geir Moe Sørensen** MFA Norway *geir.moe.sorensen@mfa.no*

**Kathrine Starup** Danish Refugee Council *Kathrine.Starup@dr.dk*

**Antje van Roeden** ICRC *avanroeden@icrc.org*

**Mathew Varghese** IFRC *Mathew.varghese@ifrc.org*

**Peter Walker** Tufts University *peter.walker@tufts.edu*

**Sarah Wikenczy** IRC *sarahw@theirc.org*

**Gelila Wudeneh** AHA *aha@telecom.net.et*