INTER-AGENCY
REAL TIME EVALUATION (IA RTE)
OF EMERGENCY HUMANITARIAN
OPERATIONS

PROCEDURES & METHODOLOGIES

Developed by the IA RTE Steering Group

Revised Oct 6 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS

ALNAP	Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance
CAP	Consolidated Appeals Process
CLA	Cluster Lead Agencies
ECB-Project	The Emergency Capacity Building Project
EoI	Expression of Interest
ERC	Emergency Relief Coordinator
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization
HC	Humanitarian Coordinator
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
IA RTE IG	Inter-agency Real Time Evaluation Interest Group
IA RTE MG	Inter-agency Real Time Evaluation Management Group
IA RTE AG	Inter-agency Real Time Evaluation Advisory Group
IA RTE SG	Inter-agency Real Time Evaluation Steering Group
IA RTE	Inter-agency Real Time Evaluation
IASC	Inter-agency Standing Committee
IASC WG	Inter-agency Standing Committee Working Group
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IRC	International Rescue Committee
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
OCHA EGS	OCHA Evaluation and Guidance Section (PDSB)
OCHA PDSB	OCHA Policy Development and Studies Branch
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OSOCC	On-Site Operations Coordination Centre
ROP	Recommended Operating Procedure
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
UN	United Nations
UNDAC	United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination system
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
WFP	United Nations World Food Programme
WHO	United Nations World Health Programme

Background, Definition and Purpose

1. Following the decision by the IASC Working Group (IASC WG) to move beyond the pilot phase for inter-agency RTE to regular implementation, it requested that an OCHA-led Inter-agency Real Time Evaluation Interest Group (OCHA IA RTE IG), develops a set of operating procedures for RTE.

2. The guidelines include; criteria for the triggering of an IA-RTE; a clear purpose statement for IA-RTEs; and a standard Terms of Reference and clearly described, commonly accepted assessment methodologies. The procedures and methodologies apply in both natural disaster situations and in complex emergency situations which occur in a single national context, but do not apply in the case of disasters involving cross-border operations.

3. IA RTEs are 'Inter-Agency (IA)' in that the RTEs are instigated, managed and used by a variety of international organizations. The term 'Real-Time (RT)' refers to the early implementation stages of a humanitarian emergency operation, to the rapid feedback of IA RTE findings at the field level, and to the possibility of an iterative, multi-phased approach depending on the scale of the disaster. The IASC WG agreed that RTE exercises should aim to be relevant, useful and empowering for the Humanitarian Country Teams.

4. 'Evaluation' (E), as applied in the term IA RTE, describes a participatory review process. IA RTEs differ from other humanitarian evaluations regarding speed, coverage, methods, and outputs. RTEs complement regular evaluations, and peer-reviews. They are primarily concerned with learning at the national level, and not accountability at the global level, although there may be relevant recommendations at the global level.

5. As they are not regular full-fledged evaluations and are carried out during the initial stages stages of an operational response, IA RTEs will generally not be able to provide comprehensive coverage of issues based on standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria.

Roles, Responsibilities and Management Arrangements

6. The Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) as the chair of the IASC, and the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) of the country in which the IA RTE is carried out are the overall owners of the IA RTE process and deliverables. The ERC delegates authority to the IA RTE Steering Group, composed of IASC members (UN, NGO's, IOM, Red Cross) and ALNAP, to trigger and manage IA RTEs following agreed concepts and procedures. The Steering Group also develop methodological approaches and refinements, and provides substantive leadership, advice and strategic support and guidance to IA RTEs. The OCHA Focal Point chairs the Steering Group, drives the overall IA RTE agenda forward in full consultation with the Steering Group and presents results to the IASC periodically as requested by its members.

7. For each RTE, a Management Group is set up to manage the evaluation, including financial resource mobilization, team recruitment, team briefing, reviewing the inception report, and the draft and final report, as well as the management response plan. An in country Advisory Group can also be formed to serve as the main link between the IA RTE consultant team, the

ad-hoc Management Group and key stakeholder groups involved in the response and / or impacted by the disaster.

Triggering IA RTEs

8. A sudden onset emergency can be considered to trigger an IA RTE automatically if the Flash Appeal requests more than $50 million, and more than 1 million individuals are affected. In the case of natural disasters, the Steering Group informs the ERC that an IA RTE has been automatically triggered, and requests the ERC to advise the RC/HC and to request their support and the engagement of the whole HCT. In case of complex emergencies, the Steering Group will request the ERC to review with the IASC principals whether an IA RTE should be undertaken.

9. IA RTEs can also be requested by the IASC WG, the Emergency Relief Co-ordinator (ERC), the RC/HC or the majority of HCT members. In these, the context is considered to see if the coordination and management setting is 'time and place specific', and if there are opportunities for relevant real-time learning, which will feed into HCT decision-making as well as appeal documents, strategies and common response plans. Funding, through the Flash Appeal or contributions, and commitment from members of the Steering Group must also be secured.

Conducting and Managing IA RTEs

10. Once the IA RTE has been launched, a preparatory planning mission (7-10 days) is conducted to brief the HCT about objectives and processes of an IA RTE, and to identify in close collaboration with the HCT key issues of concern, scope and key questions for the IA RTE based on the IA RTE Assessment Framework. A Call for an Expression of Interest is posted on ALNAP and ReliefWeb, and then the consultant team is selected through a transparent and fair decision-making process by the ad-hoc Management Group.

11. The Management Group oversee that the IA RTE is carried out according to the standard methods and approaches set out in this document., and in accordance with established good practice for independent evaluation; and ensures that in-country debriefings validate the initial findings, facts and recommendations relevant for the operational response at country-level (if already formulated).

12. The evaluation team consultants will provide real-time feedback through a series of in-country workshops. The workshops will present key findings, conclusions and recommendations. A major objective of the feedback workshops will be to support country team learning and to help initiate follow up and needed corrective actions. During real time feedback, stakeholders jointly review and prioritize key findings and recommendations and define the basis of an action plan which includes the identification of timeframes and responsible organizations. By the end of the feedback workshops, the core elements of an agreed forward-looking action plan should already be in place.

13. At the global level, the evaluation team debriefs on IA RTE results at the regular IASC meetings in New York and/or Geneva, and the IASC Working Group may upon specific request also receive a debriefing.

Standard Timelines, Funding Arrangements and Information Disclosure

14. The target of completing the IA RTE in less than 90 days is shorter than that for past IA RTEs, but considered realistic based on the following critical assumptions: the core focus of the IA RTE is limited to the focus displayed in the Standard Terms of Reference and the IA RTE ; evaluators are deployed from a standby roster, using pre-arranged and expedited procedures; the evaluation is largely self-sufficient and unobtrusive; and that approaches and outputs are light and agile compared to regular evaluations.

15. In the case of an automatic trigger, the costs for the IA RTE (125.000-150.00 US Dollar) should ideally be included as a project into the Flash Appeal. As this is not always the case, OCHA has also set up an 'inter-agency evaluation and review' account in order to share costs among interested donors, organizations and agencies for future and specific IA RTEs.

16. The IA RTE Steering Group is committed to making information about IA RTEs available to the public and considers public access to information a key component of effective participation of all stakeholders in the evaluation process. The Management Group is committed to release the Terms of Reference, the Expression of Interest, the Inception Report (if applicable) as well as the debriefing presentations, the draft report and comments matrixes (if applicable), as well as the final report on its IA RTE website, unless certain sensitive information relative to political or other contexts needs to remain confidential. If documents will not be shared, it will be also announced on the IA RTE website of OneResponse. Final evaluations reports will be published on ReliefWeb, ALNAP, OchaOnline and on OneResponse.

General Methodological Approach and the IA RTE Framework

17. The applied methods for IA RTE shall be light and participatory, and IA RTEs will be conducted by teams comprised of independent consultants. The evaluation will be carried out through analyses of various sources of information including desk reviews; field visits; interviews with key stakeholders (affected population, UN, / I/NGOs, donors, governments) and through cross-validation of data. Evaluation teams will serve as 'facilitators', encouraging and assisting field personnel, both individually and collectively, to look critically at their operations and find creative solutions to problems.

18. The IA RTE Framework intends to provide the evaluators and the HCT with guidance on the most critical questions and issues to be evaluated. After having been deployed to the field, evaluators should try to first assess the outputs and outcomes of the humanitarian response at the level of the affected population (bottom-up approach), especially by answering one of the main questions of the Framework – "what were the main operational results, and their positive and negative outcomes for the affected population?" Deductive analysis should then guide evaluators to the other relevant dimensions and issues outlined in the Framework.

19. During the 74th IASC Working Group Meeting, between 13-15 July 2009, the IASC Working Group (IASC WG) agreed to move beyond the pilot phase for inter-agency RTE to regular implementation. In this regard, it requested that an OCHA-led Inter-agency Real Time Evaluation Interest Group (OCHA IA RTE IG), using the learning from the pilot phase, develops a **set of operating procedures for RTE**, including:

    a. Criteria for the triggering of an IA-RTE
    b. A clear purpose statement for IA-RTEs
    c. A standard Terms of Reference and clearly described, commonly accepted assessment methodologies

20. The IASC WG agreed that RTE exercises should aim to be relevant, useful and empowering for the Humanitarian Country Teams. The IASC WG also agreed, however, that **the HCT should not have veto power** over the decision to undertake an inter-agency real time evaluation when conditions warrant.

21. Following this mandate, OCHA requested an independent consultant to develop an IA RTE Concepts and Management Discussion Paper, which outlined options for procedures and methodologies for future IA RTEs. On this basis the OCHA IA RTE IG split up in a Working Group on procedures and a Working Group on methodologies and met in September, November, February and May of 2009 to develop an initial set of procedures and methodologies for IA RTEs. Subsequent meetings held in 2010 and 2011 further reviewed progress and revised procedures in line with lessons learned. A permanent IA RTE Steering Group has been established, under the mandate of the IA WG, to guide IA-RTE work.

22. The present document is intended for use by all stakeholders involved in implementing and using IA RTEs. It lays out the roles, responsibilities for different stakeholders, and recommends procedures and methodologies for triggering, conducting and managing IA RTEs.

23. The procedures and methodologies contained herewith will apply in both natural disaster situations and in complex emergency situations which occur in a single national context. The procedures and methodologies contained herein do not apply in the case of disasters involving cross-border operations.

24. The IA RTE Steering Group has decided that the present manual should be reviewed on a regular basis, in order to adapt dynamically to new contexts and to better integrate on going learning.

1 IA RTE CORE DEFINITIONS AND PURPOSE

Definition

25.   In recent years, efforts have been increasingly directed towards improving humanitarian response through inter-agency real-time evaluations (IA-RTEs).

26.   IA RTEs are 'Inter-Agency (IA)' in that the RTEs are instigated, managed and used by a variety of international organizations. These are represented at a global level in the IA RTE Steering Group and for a specific IA RTE, through the IA RTE Management Group, the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) and the in-country IA RTE Advisory Group, when established.

27.   The term 'Real-Time (RT)' refers to the early implementation stages of a humanitarian emergency operation, to the rapid feedback of IA RTE findings at the field level, and to the possibility of an iterative, multi-phased approach depending on the scale and duration of the disaster. A one-phase approach of an IA RTE would be carried out within the two first month and consists of remote monitoring and the IA RTE mission, whereas a multi-phase approach would include a follow up second IA RTE mission (with a different focus corresponding to real time needs at a later stage in the response).

28.   'Evaluation' (E), as applied in the term IA RTE, describes a participatory review process. IA RTEs differ from other humanitarian evaluations regarding speed, coverage, methods, and outputs.

29.   IA RTEs are hence typified by their: shared management and methodological oversight through global and national level inter-agency reference and management groups, celerity of mobilization, feedback and follow-up, light, agile approaches, restricted scope[1], and participatory methods.[2]

Purpose

30.   An IA RTE can be defined as a rapid participatory assessment conducted during the early stages of a humanitarian operation which almost simultaneously feeds back its findings for immediate use by the broader humanitarian community at the field level.

31.   IA RTEs are intended to support learning in emergency operations in a single country context with field-level 'inter-agency coordination and management" at the core, especially in the context of sudden-onset disasters, or protracted crises undergoing a phase of rapid

---

[1] With respect to the standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, IA-RTEs tend to focus on relevance, efficiency (in particular timeliness of response) and effectiveness (with a particular stress on coordination) of the initial response with less emphasis on impact and sustainability due to the very early stage at which the IA RTE is conducted.

[2] Definition offered by John Telford in 11th October Concepts Discussion and Management paper.

deterioration or escalating violence. Ideally, IA RTEs seek to identify gaps, access constraints and potential threats to "humanitarian space", assess the relevance, quality and timeliness of the response, unlock inter-stakeholder coordination/ collaboration problems or operational bottlenecks, propose appropriate strategic re-orientation and provide real time learning to the field on same. The principle aim is to identify strengths and weaknesses of the response and to seek the views of affected populations.

32. The primary end users of IA RTEs are in-country agencies and staff engaged in the humanitarian response, especially those involved in inter-agency coordination and management. Secondary users include management outside the country of operation, especially at headquarters levels, as the IA RTEs are also seen to strengthen the humanitarian reform. Thirdly, recurring lessons should emerge for a global humanitarian audience (i.e. IASC WG) especially when a critical mass of IA RTEs has been achieved.

33. As a light early-stage assessment, IA RTEs do not seek to build lengthy narratives or to provide a detailed accounting of programmatic results on either a sectoral or country level. IA RTEs are a forward looking instrument. Insofar as they are designed to provide rapid feedback to the HC and the HCT, they do not replace routine monitoring processes which are required to support global-level accountability objectives. In this same context, IA RTEs are not organized around the standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria

34. IA RTEs complement both regular humanitarian evaluations, and peer-reviews. They are primarily concerned with supporting learning at the national level. Whereas providing accountability at the global level is not seen as a major objective, IA RTEs may nevertheless provide useful analysis and recommendations in the context of global level policy discussions or for application in future humanitarian operations (i.e. lessons learned).

Coverage of standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria within the IA RTE

35. As they are not traditional evaluations and are carried out during the initial stages of an operational response, IA RTEs will generally not be able to provide comprehensive coverage of issues based on standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria.

36. In general, IA RTEs will apply standard evaluation criteria in a manner which is consistent with the overall purpose of IA RTEs which is the provision of rapid feedback on inter-agency coordination and management arrangements including the views of affected populations.

37. The IA RTE evaluation framework (pg 27-32) provides detailed questions which all IA RTEs should ideally seek to address. The table below highlights how the IA RTE assessment framework addresses recognized OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, however, this will vary depending on the context in which the RTE is conducted.

OECD-DAC Evaluation Criteria	Extent of Coverage in the IA RTE framework	Comments
Relevance/ appropriateness	Medium	Includes issues related to the adequacy of the response from the perspective of affected populations; IA RTEs also examine whether response strategies are aligned to local needs.
Connectedness	Low -Medium	Framework includes coverage of whether the response has been planned in close collaboration with national strategies including pre-existing co-ordination structures. Coverage on connectedness may be higher in the case of IA RTEs looking at transitional situations.
Coherence	High	As a joint evaluation mechanism focused on inter-agency co-ordination issues, the framework extensively covers common strategies and encourages learning based on a holistic view of the humanitarian response.
Coverage	Medium	The framework includes feedback as to whether the needs of all segments of the affected population have been properly assessed and included within response plans and strategies. Major coverage gaps are assessed.
Efficiency	Not included	During early stages of a major operation, the data required for such an analysis will not be available.
Effectiveness	Medium	When conducted during the early stages of the response IA RTEs will not be able to assess whether the overall response is achieving its purpose. The framework however does address questions of timeliness, which is implicit within the criterion of effectiveness. The Framework also addresses issues related to the effectiveness of co-ordination arrangements.
Impact	Not included	As a rapid feedback mechanism focused on short-term issues, IA RTE s will as a general rule not be able to assess the wider effects of humanitarian intervention on different segments of the affected population.

2   RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES FOR IA RTEs

The chapter outlines the main procedures for triggering and managing IA RTEs. It starts with a description of the roles and responsibilities for stakeholders involved in an IA RTE. Thereafter, it presents criteria for triggering IA RTEs. The chapter also sets out the procedures for conducting and managing IA RTEs.

Roles, Responsibilities & Management Arrangements

This section spells out the main roles, responsibilities and general management arrangements for the main stakeholders in an IA RTE process. These are the ERC, the HC, the IA RTE Steering Group, the OCHA IA RTE Focal Point, the ad-hoc Management Group and an optional in-country Advisory Group.

2.1.1 ERC & HC

38. The Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) as the chair of the IASC, and the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) of the country in which the IA RTE is carried out are the overall owners of the IA RTE process and deliverables.

39. The ERC and the HC bear the overall responsibility that a triggered IA RTE is carried out. They have a primary interest in the findings, conclusions and follow up to the IA RTE recommendations including actions from the Cluster Lead Agencies (CLA) and partners of the HCT.

40. RTEs are a tool for strengthening humanitarian reform. CLAs and the HCT should be closely involved in IA RTEs and assist in their timely activation and follow up.

41. The Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) delegates authority to the IA RTE Steering Group to trigger and manage IA RTEs following the concepts and procedures contained in this document.

2.1.2 Steering Group

42. *The Steering Group provides policy and strategic support to IA RTE efforts. Specific Terms of Reference for the Steering Group include:*

- Proposes and initiates IA RTEs based on 'Desirable IA RTE Trigger Criteria' (t*riggering by re*quest) [*see section 2.2*]
- Continuously monitors the humanitarian situation globally, identifying crisis as they develop to identify humanitarian response situations that may meet the IA-RTE criteria.

- Develops guidance on methodological approaches and refinements for IA-RTEs.
- Provides human resources for an ad-hoc Management Group if the IA RTE is of interest to the agency/ organization of the Steering Group member.
- Provides evaluators and/ or in-country support to the IA RTE, if it is of interest to the agency/organization of the Steering Group member.
- Provides financial contributions to the IA RTE, if it is of interest to the agency/organization of the Steering Group member
- Informs the ERC that the criteria for the automatic trigger of an IA RTE have been met.
- Informs via the OCHA Focal Point the ERC and the HC on the results of the IA RTE.

43. *Recommended Operating Procedures for the Steering Group:*

- The Steering Group will meet at least two times a year to discuss and synthesize lessons learned and identify areas for further methodological strengthening as needed.
- Steering Group meetings can be convened, organized and chaired by any member of the Steering Group. If there is no initiative on behalf of a member of the Steering Group, then Steering Group meetings will be organized, convened, and chaired by the OCHA Focal Point.
- The Steering Group takes decisions on a quorum of two-thirds of its members and after a general debate has taken place.
- Membership to the Steering Group is voluntary and open to representatives of evaluation functions from IASC members (UN, NGO's, IOM, Red Cross) and ALNAP.[3]
- To avoid potential perceptions of conflicts of interest, individuals who are either members of the Steering Group or who regularly contribute to the work of the Steering Group shall not be allowed to conduct IA RTEs.

2.1.3 OCHA Focal Point

44. *OCHA EGS appoints a Focal Point whose main Terms of Reference are to*:

- Chair the Steering Group and the ad-hoc Management Group, if need be and this task cannot be fulfilled by other members of the Steering Group
- Organize and facilitate the work of the Steering Group, the ad-hoc Management Group and oversee possible working groups.
- Drive the overall IA RTE agenda forward in full consultation with the Steering Group and present results to the IASC periodically as requested by its members.
- Review IA RTE proposals along the established criteria list for launching IA RTEs
- In case, the IA RTE will be triggered, put out a call to the Steering Group for volunteers to serve on the ad-hoc Management Group

---

[3]   Role of Member States: The IA RTE Support Group recognizes the valuable inputs which Member States can provide. As appropriate Member States may be consulted on draft Terms of Reference and participate in IA RTEs through in country advisory groups. On a case-by-case basis, select representatives from the evaluation function of member states may participate on ad hoc management groups.

- Ensure adequate consultation has taken place between the HC and the HCT members in country, in order to gauge the overall level of support for the exercise, even if IA RTE moves forward despite objections.
- Initiate remote monitoring support at the onset of a sudden onset / natural disaster response operation; especially send out standard inventory of documents for remote monitoring data analysis
- Ensure oversight of the IA RTE evaluation processes
- Be the main point of contact for inquiries with regard to IA RTEs
- Serve as mediator between the Steering Group, the ad-hoc Management Group, the Advisory Group and the consultant team if needed
- Inform the ERC on the results of process and outcomes of the IA RTE

2.1.4. Management Group (ad-hoc)

45.   *The Management Group provides inputs and guidance for an IA-RTE and serves as a conduit for consultation and information sharing for internal communications within IA-RTE member agencies. The Evaluation Manager[4] serves as chair of the Ad-Hoc Management Group.*

Recommended Operating Procedures for the Ad-Hoc Management Group:

- An ad-hoc Management Group will be established for each IA RTE
- The ad-hoc Management Group will be established on a voluntary basis by members of the Steering Group, with participation being initially solicited by the OCHA Focal Point, targeting key agencies involved in the response. The Group members will them agree on who will be the lead agency and Evaluation Manager. This will be determined on a voluntary basis according to members' comparative advantage and capacity.
- During the first meeting of the members of the ad-hoc Management Group, members will jointly discuss and define the specific governance arrangements for best achieving the objectives of the specific IA-RTE at hand, preferably (but not necessarily) in the form of a brief Management Group ToR. At minimum, this ToR should specify procedures for taking decisions (including for handling areas of disagreement among members). In addition, it should articulate specific roles and responsibilities of individual team members. It should outline the frequency at which Management Group meetings will be held to address key actions and decisions to be taken throughout the evaluation.

The ToRs for the Ad-Hoc Management Group are to:

- Provide input throughout the entire evaluation (including financial resource mobilization, team recruitment, team briefing, reviewing the inception report, and the draft and final report, as well as the management response plan) at key junctures and in consultation with Steering Group members.

---

[4] As noted above, the OCHA Focal Point has so far also acted as Evaluation Manager, but this role can also be assumed by other agencies.

- Solicit in-country support and remote monitoring data from their respective agencies (e.g., logistics, administration, advocacy, and so on) as needed.
- Monitor and assesses the quality of the evaluation and its process at all phases of the RTE, from consultant recruitment to data collection and analysis and presentation;
- If needed, recommends the establishment of an optional in-country Advisory Group (or the use of pre-existing groups like cluster-diagnostic groups etc.)
- Provide inputs and guidance for an IA-RTE and serves as a conduit for consultation and information sharing for internal communications within IA-RTE member agencies.

2.1.5. The Evaluation Manager

46. *The Evaluation Manager serves as chair of the Management Group, and his/her ToR are to:*

- Carry out planning and scoping missions with the objective to familiarizing stakeholders with the processes and aims of an IA RTE, as well as to refine the evaluation scope, focus and key issues, possibly with other members of the Management Group
- Undertake adequate communication with external consultant(s) in order to ensure the timeliness, quality and independence of the IA RTE
- Provide guidance and institutional support to the external consultant(s), especially on issues of methodology, but also including other areas as necessary (e.g. navigating the inter-agency system, optimizing independence, and so on)
- Facilitate the consultants access to key stakeholders and specific information or expertise needed to perform the assessment (including data monitored remotely by members of the Management Group)
- Facilitate the consultation and comments process on the draft report by the HC, HCT, the Advisory Group, the Steering Group, and all people interviewed
- Foster optimal engagement by the HCT on initial findings prior to dissemination, by requesting the ERC to instruct the HC to convene a mandatory in-country briefing or debriefing focused in country-level decision-making to be undertaken
- Provide quality control including provision of critical feedback to consultants on draft reports, including recommendations and presentations (also in-country), ensure ToR questions are addressed coherently and in a manner free from internal contradictions, and that conclusions and recommendations are clear.
- Approve the final IA RTE report and shares the report with Steering Group members
- Send the final report to the ERC. Advises the ERC to request from the HC to follow up on recommendations through a recommendation workshop/or a management response plan FP
- Set up a communication strategy and manages "communications" both with internal stakeholders (e.g. handling agencies' objectives to the IA RTE) and external stakeholders (e.g. journalists, donors)

2.1.6 In-country Advisory Group (recommendedl)

The Terms of Reference and Recommended Operating Procedures described below are optional guidelines and applicable only if a need for this specific group has been expressed by the HCT, or has been strongly recommended by the ad-hoc Management Group.

47.   *Terms of Reference for the in-country Advisory Group*[5]:

- Together with the HCT in the affected country the Advisory Group will serve as the main link between the IA RTE consultant team, the ad-hoc Management Group and key stakeholder groups involved in the response and / or impacted by the disaster. It will serve in an advisory capacity only, without having decision-making authority.
- The Advisory Group will provide advice and support to the IA RTE consultant team (hereafter consultant team) so they emerge at the end of the evaluative process with practical and useful guidance for in-country stakeholders – despite time and other constraints.
- The Advisory Group will help to promote ownership of respective stakeholder groups of the IA RTE process and subsequent use of the report (and related deliverables).

48.   Specific areas of engagement for the in-country Advisory Group in the IA RTE include:

- Provides appropriate advice and support to the IA RTE consultant team to help them in prioritizing issues and collecting the necessary supporting data to put together a comprehensive and credible evidence base to be used in analysis and development of recommendations.
- Reviews and provides appropriate and timely feedback on draft documents related to the IA-RTE (i.e. ToR, Inception Report, drafts of the final report) although, as the RTE is independent, comments will not necessarily be taken on board by the Management Group or consultant(s).
- Consolidating comments on drafts if appropriate.
- Facilitates the engagement of key stakeholder groups in consultations around draft documents to ensure that their perspectives are adequately represented and that there is broad ownership of the results (i.e. recommendations should 'resonate' with targeted stakeholder groups).
- Facilitates processes associated with development of action plans by stakeholders to follow up on recommendations, including monitoring of implementation of recommendations (either by the in-country Advisory Group or another body).
- Assists with developing and implementing a communication strategy in support of RTE processes, which should include providing appropriate feedback to communities directly affected by the disaster.
- Advises the HC/ HCT to establish a management response, in order to address the recommendations originating from the IA RTE report. Ensures that the management response is communicated to the HCT and the Steering Group.

49.   *Membership in the in-country Advisory Group*:

---

[5]   The text is an adapted draft terms of reference (courtesy of Jock Baker) developed for the RTE advisory group for the IA RTE Cyclone Nargis response. The ToR is taken from the ALNAP Guide Pilot Version of Real-time evaluations of humanitarian action and has been amended.

Membership of the in-country Advisory Group is based on a 'mapping' of key stakeholder groups that have been directly involved in the disaster / sudden onset. These comprise UN agencies, iternational NGOs, local NGOs, key donors to the response, and the Government. The OCHA HoO will assist in the mapping exercise and chair and convene the in-country Advisory Group, if no other member of the in-country Advisory Group volunteers.

Criteria Lists for Triggering IA RTEs

IA RTEs can be triggered in one of the following two ways, i.e. either *automatically* when essential criteria are met, or by *request*, when desirable criteria are met. The criteria for triggering IA RTEs automatically and the criteria for triggering RTEs at request are outlined below.

2.2.1 Essential IA RTE Trigger Criteria (which trigger IA RTEs automatically)

50. The emergency is a sudden-onset disaster, or protracted crisis undergoing rapid deterioration, or a major epidemic involving many actors.

51. The emergency triggers an IA RTE automatically if the following two criteria are fulfilled[6]:

    a. The Flash Appeal or Consolidated Appeals Process identifies that more than 1 million individuals are affected.

    b. The Flash Appeal requests an amount of more than US$ 50 million.

2.2.2 Desirable IA RTE Trigger Criteria (which trigger IA RTEs by request)

All of the following criteria have to be fulfilled, in order to trigger an IA RTE at request.

52. A specific request has been made by: the IASC WG, the Emergency Relief Co-ordinator (ERC), the RC/HC or the majority of HCT members.

53. The inter-agency coordination and management to be examined are 'time and place specific': covering a specific period - e.g. from the beginning of the triggering event(s) to the time of the evaluation - and a clearly defined geographic area (or areas).

54. There are important opportunities for relevant real-time learning, which will feed into the revision of HCT decision-making, as well as appeal documents, strategies and common response plans.

55. Members of the Steering Group have agreed to:
    a. act as a lead agency, or co-manager for the IA RTE;
    b. to make resources available from their own budget; and

---

[6]   Until stand-by arrangements for consultants are in place, the IA RTE will be triggered according to these two conditions, but their realization remains dependent on available financial and human resources capacity.

c. to support the inclusion of a budget into a Flash Appeal or a CAP

Procedures for Triggering IA RTEs

This section describes step by step the procedures to trigger IA RTEs 'automatically' based on the essential criteria, or at request based on the desirable criteria.

2.3.1 Automatic Trigger Procedure

56. Immediately after a sudden-onset emergency has taken place, the OCHA Focal Point takes the initiative to review the sudden onset disaster against the established essential criteria.

57. If the sudden-onset fulfills the essential criteria or is expected to fulfill the essential criteria (based on the magnitude of the disaster) the OCHA Focal Point will inform the Steering Group that the essential criteria to trigger the IA RTE are met and will therefore be launched.

58. In the case of natural disasters, the Steering Group informs the ERC that an IA RTE has been automatically triggered, and requests the ERC to advise the RC/HC and to request their support and the engagement of the whole HCT.

59. In case of complex emergencies, the Steering Group will request the ERC to review with the IASC principals whether an IA RTE should be undertaken.

60. The OCHA Focal Point will include a provision in the Flash Appeal for an IA RTE in the range between 125.000-150.000 US Dollars.

61. The OCHA Focal Point will convene the Steering Group to establish an ad-hoc Management Group.

62. Members of the ad-hoc Management Group will support the planning of practical arrangements, such as: management, administrative and logistical arrangements; in-country support and set up of an optional Advisory Group, the support to be provided by ad-hoc Management Group; international travel; in-country transportation; consultant remuneration and hiring; interpretation arrangements; provision of communications and office support, etc.

63. The time between the triggering of the IA RTE (inclusion into the Flash Appeal) and the deployment of the evaluation team in the field, shall ideally take place within two months, but no later than three months. Wherever possible an inception mission will be undertaken to ensure adequate preparation and national stakeholder buy-in to the process.

2.3.2 Triggering an IA RTE in the case of a specific request

64. OCHA Focal Point receives the proposal to conduct an IA RTE (i.e. from the IASC-WG, RC/HC, or the majority of HCT members).

65. OCHA Focal Point reviews the proposal against the IA RTE desirable trigger criteria, including the availability of a capacity to conduct an IA RTE (e.g. funds and management

time). OCHA Focal Point also gauges the interest of key stakeholders (includingSteering Group) to launch and manage IA RTE.

66. Results of the desirable criteria-review and any background information posted on the IA RTE website (e.g. how it does or does not meet the criteria).

67. Within one week Steering Group should :

a. Review the proposal and results of the criteria-review
b. Vote, by ticking one of three options – agree; disagree; or abstain. In case of disagreement, Steering Group members need to carefully explain their decision in writing and "make a case/ solid argument" of their decision. A non response within a one week (5 working days) is taken as an abstention.
c. Answer whether the agency would tentatively be willing to:
    i. Join (or lead) the IA RTE ad-hoc Management Group
    ii. Host the IA RTE in-country
    iii.   Provide other support – evaluators, funding, etc.

68. OCHA Focal Point to review responses (and follow-up bi-laterally if there is a need for additional clarity or background).

69. OCHA Focal Point to count positive or negative responses on a two-third majority basis and to publish the results whether the IA RTE will be triggered on the IA RTE web page, including the actual decision by each members of the Steering Group.

70. An option is that the Steering Group recommendation to proceed with an IA RTE be referred to the ERC (or IASC), especially for sensitive cases or if strong opposition to the Steering Group decision exists. The ERC (or IASC) would reply within a set time limit, saying 'yes' or 'no'.

71. If the decision is negative, end the process and inform all accordingly in a standard email and on the web.

72. If the decision is positive, organize the IA RTE as set out in paragraph 58-62.

Procedures & Conditions for Conducting and Managing IA RTEs

The following sections lay out the conditions which are necessary before an IA RTE can take place, as well as the recommended procedures for conducting and managing IA RTEs.

2.4.1 Necessary Conditions pre-IA RTE

73. Create and maintain a list of Steering Group members and identify focal points (principals and alternates) for each member organization at the beginning of each year. Disseminate the list amongst members and post in the IA-RTE website.

74. Establish an appropriate stand-by mechanism for consultants / consultant teams (identification of pre-approved evaluation experts)

75. Ensure sufficient funding through pre-agreed financing channels / funding mechanisms.

76. Establish practical arrangements (establish standby rosters, agree conditions of, and call for Steering Group member staff availability for the roster, develop management and methodological toolboxes, Management Group ToR template, remote monitoring document request list, and so on).

77. Publicize the above - conduct an information campaign re the new IA RTE system (by circulars, Reliefweb posting, etc. by the Steering Group, IASC, HC's, etc.).[7]

2.4.2 Conducting the IA RTE

78. The Evaluation Manager, with possible participation of other Management Group members, will carry out a preparatory planning mission (7 days) to the country with the objective to brief the HCT about objectives and processes of an IA RTE, identify in close collaboration with the HCT and other key stakeholders key issues of concern, scope and key questions for the IA RTE based on the IA RTE Assessment Framework (see below)

79. Based on the preparatory planning mission, suggest parameters for the IA RTE, including temporal and geographical boundaries and make any necessary adaptations to the standard TOR, as feasible and while attempting to keep these modifications to a minimum;

80. The Evaluation Manager will share draft ToR with HCT and Management Group and request comments within 5 working days, and then will review and include comments as appropriate and finalize ToR.

81. To recruit the evaluation team, the FP will:
    a. publish a Call for an Expression of Interest on ALNAP and ReliefWeb (as long as an appropriate stand-by consultant mechanism is not in place); and participating Agencies' websites
    b. shortlist eligible candidates and select the consultant / consultant team through a transparent and fair decision-making process vetted by the ad-hoc Management Group
    c. contract consultants

---

[7] To be carried out after the approval of these recommended operating procedures.

82. Provide the evaluation team with key background documents, based on a standard inventory developed by the OCHA Focal Point, in order for the consultant team to start the desk review process as early as possible;

83. The Evaluation Manager will brief the consultant team (if needed – hold a face to face meeting with the consultant team), in order to define the objectives of the evaluation, obtain common understanding on the ToR, discuss expectations and possible limitations, roles and responsibilities;

84. Oversee that the IA RTE is carried out according to the standard methods and approaches set out in this document., and in accordance with established good practice for independent evaluation;

85. Attend initial presentations of findings made by the consultant team to key actors (in- country through workshop & presentation) and ensure that the presentation draws out specific items for action by management so as to improve the response moving forward;

86. Oversee that in-country debriefings validate the initial findings, facts and recommendations relevant for the operational response at country-level (if already formulated). Oversee that the consultant team holds its in-country debriefings in front of the local IASC, CLA, HC, local NGO's and Government and all people interviewed, as well as all interested stakeholders. Ensure that consultants produce a powerpoint presentation and aide memoire for the debriefing. After the debriefing, presentations should ideally be available in English and in the local language of the affected population and be posted on the IA RTE website.

87. Commence communication of the lessons & recommendations (in-country), in collaboration with the consultant team;

88. After two weeks of the debrief in-country, the consultants should present the Management Group with the draft report. After a one day quality check[8], the Management Group will send the draft to the HC (requesting to circulate the report within the HCT, the Advisory Group, all people interviewed, and the Steering Group).

89. Consolidated comments and feedback on the draft report should be sent by the HC to the Management Group within a maximum of 10 days. The Management Group will forward comments immediately upon reception to the consultant team, and will be share with other member of the Group.

90. The consultant team will be given a maximum of seven working days to incorporate or reject comments as appropriate and provide the Management Group with the final report.

91. Management Group reviews the final report and approves it within seven days.

---

[8] If the quality check reveals that the team leader needs to revise the draft, it will be revised again before it is shared.

92. Management Group in collaboration with the OCHA Focal Point sends final report to the ERC, who will disseminate the final report to the HCT, and within OCHA, and published on relevant public and agency websites.

93. The ERC to follow up with the HC after to establish progress against agreed action plan within 3 months.

2.4.3 Standard Timelines

94. The following timeline, which is shorter than that for past IA RTEs, is based on the critical assumptions that::

95. The core focus of the IA RTE is limited to the focus displayed in the Standard Terms of Reference and the IA RTE Framework [*see section 3.2 & Annex 1*]. Necessary IA RTE triggering procedures are agreed and in place. Sufficient standby mechanisms and capacity exist for rapid mobilization, especially of the team. Evaluators are deployed from a standby roster, using pre-arranged and expedited   procedures: e.g. 1-2 independent external; 1-2 national. The evaluation is largely self-sufficient and unobtrusive, drawing upon in-country (HCT)   emergency resources and staff-time to an absolute minimum (except for support provided willingly by Steering Group member agencies/ organizations).

96. Approaches and outputs are light and agile compared to regular evaluations.

Action/event	Targeted Deadline
Emergency event(s)	Day 0
TRIGGERING AND REMOTE MONITORING PHASE	
Automatic Triggering of IA RTE or Request	+3
Inclusion of the IA RTE into the initial Flash Appeal (if automatically triggered)	+2 (5)
Remote Monitoring from HQ & Data Collection (via OTF, GCL Meetings, Virtual OSOCC, Sitreps)	Since beginning
Drafting of DRAFT Terms of Reference (based on standard IA RTE ToR template & Drafting of Expression of Interest)	+3 (8)
Publication of EoI on Relief Web & ALNAP (note: until we have a an appropriate stand-by roster in place)	+1 (9)
PREPARATORY EVALUATION MANAGEMENT MISSION	Done
Scoping mission by the evaluation management to identify key questions and issues, as well as to explain processes.	+10 (19)
MISSION ON THE INITIAL RESPONSE	Target dates

Hiring of Consultant – Contract signed	+5 (24)
Handover of remotely monitored data to the consultants. Consultants start the Desk Review.	+1 (25)
Mobilization of Consultant & one day face-to-face Mission Briefings in GVA /or NY (or via phone) between consultants and the ad-hoc Management Group	+1 (26)
Field visits: Mission to the country – interview and visit period	+20 (46)
FIRST DRAFT: Analysis of findings and drafting of draft IA RTE report, including recommendations. Draft is shared with HCT and IA RTE Management Group for comments.	+10 (56)
IN-COUNTRY WORKSHOPS: Workshops in country to validate findings and recommendations, as well as to discuss next steps and outline timelines and action for a management response to the recommendations	**+7 (63)**
END OF MISSION: Debriefings in country to HCT (including government counterparts).	**+2 (65)**
FINAL DRAFT: Production of Final Report, including summary of proceedings/outcome of workshop discussion and agreed next steps.	**+7 (72)**
Final Check & Approval by ad-hoc Management Group of Final Report. OCHA Focal Points prepares email to ERC, who will send out the Final Report and share it with the HCT, IA RTE Steering Group and OCHA	**+5 (77)**
Debriefing in GVA and / or New York	+4 (81)
TOTAL WORKING DAYS	81 days
Dissemination of Final Report	Within 5 days
Dissemination of Action Plan (or MRM) for implementation of recommendations at the country level	Within 45 days

INSERT ROWS AND DEADLINES FOR MANAGEMENT RESPONSE AND DISSEMINATION OF REPORT AND MR. DISSEMNITATION

2.4.4 Funding Arrangements

97. **Flash Appeal**: In cases in which an IA RTE is triggered automatically, the costs should be included as a project into the Flash Appeal. Based on the past experience of previous IA RTEs, the OCHA IA RTE Focal Point will include a funding request for an IA RTE in the order of 125.000-150.00 US Dollar. The exact amount will depend on the complexity of the emergency and the logistical capacity of the HCT to support the IA RTE.

98. **Cost Sharing**: The TOR will include a detailed estimate of the IA-RTE budget. OCHA has set up an 'inter-agency evaluation and review' account. and can receive funds as Special Designated Contributions (SDC). Donors, organizations and agencies will therefore be invited to transfer funding to this account as costs will be shared to the extent possible for upcoming IA RTEs.

99. Organizations providing funds will be consulted in the preparation of TORs and are invited to participate in country level advisory groups.

100. Organizations providing funds to the IA RTE, will be mentioned on the cover of the report. In addition, a short narrative explaining the use of the funds for inter-agency evaluations would be included in the Annex of OCHA's Annual Report on Special Designated Contributions.

2.4.5 Generic IA RTE Budget

101. Below is a generic budget for an IA RTE, based on an evaluation team of one international team-leader, one international team member and two national team members.

GENERIC IA RTE BUDGET			
Item	**Days**	**Unit cost**	**Total**
1. PREPARATION PHASE (BRIEFINGS AND DESK REVIEW)			
1.1 Desk Review			
Fees Team Leader (TL)	4	600	2'400
Fees International Team Member ™	4	400	1'600
1.2 Briefing in Geneva			
Fees TL	1	600	600
Fees International TM 1	1	400	400
Airplane ticket European city to Geneva (2 persons)	2	500	1'000

DSA Geneva (man/days)	2	420	840
Sub Total 1			**6'840**
2. FIRST RTE MISSION AND FIELD			
2.1 Main Capital			
Fees TL	8	600	4'800
Fees National TM1	8	200	1'600
Fees National TM2	7	200	1'400
Airplane tickets Europe-Country XYZ (2 persons)	2	5000	10'000
DSA: 8 days *	8	100	800
2.2 Regions			
Fees TL	15	600	9000
Fees International TM 1	15	400	6000
Fees National TM1	15	200	3000
Fees National TM2	14	200	2800
DSA: 15 days*4	60	150	9000
Sub Total 2			**48'400**
3. STAHOLDER WORKSHOPS, DEBRIEFINGS AND WRITE-UP FINAL REPORT			
3.1 Draft Report			
Fees TL	10	600	6'000
Fees International TM 1	10	400	4'000
3.2 Workshop Main capital and Regions			
Fees TL	10	600	6'000
Fees International TM 1	10	400	4'000
Airplane ticket Europe- Country XYZ (2 persons)	2	5000	10'000
DSA: 7 days * 1 TL + 1 TM (man/days)	20	150	3'000
3.3 Final Report			
Fees TL	4	600	2'400
Fees International TM 1	3	400	1'200
3.4 Defriefings in Geneva and NY			
Fees TL	6	600	3'600
Fees International TM 1	1	400	400
Airplane ticket European city -Geneva (2 persons)	2	500	1'000
Airplane ticket European city - NY (1 person)	1	1000	1'000
DSA Geneva 2 persons * 1 day (man/days)	2	420	840
DSA NY 1 person * 6 days (man/ days)	3	420	1'260

Sub Total 3			**44'700**
4. MISCELLANEOUS			
Insurance (Man/days)	28	100	2800
Insurance (Man/days)	60	150	9000
Audit report			1120
Sub total 4			**12'920**
Total direct cost (1+2+3+4)			**112'860**
Administration costs, backstopping, QA and logistics support (10% of direct cost)			**11'286**
Contingency (5% of direct cost)			**5'643**
Grand total US Dollar			**129'789**

2.4.6 Information Disclosure Policy

102. The IA RTE Steering Group is committed to making information about IA RTEs available to the public. The Steering Group considers public access to information a key component of effective participation of all stakeholders in the evaluation process.

103. The IA RTE Information Disclosure Policy (hereinafter referred to as the "Policy") is intended to ensure that information concerning IA RTEs is available to all stakeholders and the public, except for limited information that is deemed confidential as set out in this Policy.

104. Consequently, the Management Group is committed to release the Terms of Reference, the Expression of Interest, the Inception Report (if applicable) as well as the debriefing presentations, the draft report as well as the final report on its IA RTE website.

105. As a general rule, the policy is that unless there are good reasons to treat information confidentially, it will be disclosed, i.e. shared and published on the IA RTE or appropriate (in-country) website, after the Management Group (ad-hoc) has carried out a quality check of the documents.

106. This Policy recognizes that humanitarian disasters pose particular challenges in terms of UN & NGO's Country Offices relations with Governments and other stakeholders. The fundamental principle that applies to information disclosure in these situations, or in communities with heightened levels of political, social and cultural tensions, is transparency. However, the Steering Group recognizes that in certain situations, sensitive information relative to the political or other contexts will remain confidential. It will be up to the Management Group to decide if information will not be publicly shared. If documents will not be shared, it will be also announced on the IA RTE website of OneResponse (http://oneresponse.info/Coordination/IARTE/Pages/IARTE.aspx).

107. Final evaluations reports will be published on ReliefWeb (http://www.reliefweb.int/),on ALNAP (http://www.alnap.org/) OchaOnline (http://www.unocha.org/) on OneResponse (http://oneresponse.info/Coordination/IARTE/Pages/IARTE.aspx), and on participating agencies websites.

2.4.7 Delivery of real-time feedback and follow up at country level

108. The evaluation team consultants will provide feedback and at a series of in-country workshops through a series of in-country workshops. All key stakeholders within the HCT should be represented during these workshops. As appropriate, workshops may be held at both the sub-national and national levels. The team will also provide real-time feedback at appropriate times during the evaluation mission.

109. The workshops will present key findings, conclusions and recommendations. A major objective of the feedback workshops will be to support country team learning and to help initiate follow up and needed corrective actions. During real time feedback, stakeholders jointly review and prioritize key findings and recommendations and define the basis of an action plan which includes the identification of timeframes and responsible organizations. By the end of the feedback workshops, the core elements of an agreed forward-looking action plan (Management Response) should already be in place.

110. The HC, in consultation with the HCT and with the support of OCHA, oversees implementation of the action plan. The HC updates the ERC, the IASC Emergency Directors and the IA RTE Steering Group on the implementation of follow up plans after three months. Members of the Steering Group may undertake subsequent visits to review and report back on the status of follow up.

2..4.8 Delivery of real-time feedback and follow up at global level

111. The evaluation team debriefs on IA RTE results at the regular IASC meetings in New York and/or Geneva. The IASC Working Group may upon specific request also receive a debriefing on the results of IA RTEs. A synthesis of IA-RTE reports will be prepared periodically to capture common findings, conclusions and recommendations to inform system-wide actions.

3.1 General Methodological Approach

112. The applied methods for IA RTE shall be light and participatory. The evaluations will be conducted by teams comprising independent consultants.

113. The evaluation will be carried out through analyses of various sources of information including desk reviews; field visits; interviews with key stakeholders (affected population, UN, / I/NGOs, donors, governments) and through cross-   validation of data. In situations where there is time to conduct a planning mission, the planning missions will help identify stakeholders to be interviewed. While maintaining independence, the evaluation will seek the views of all parties, especially the affected population.

114. Evaluation teams will serve as 'facilitators', encouraging and assisting field personnel, both individually and collectively, to look critically at their operations and find creative solutions to problems.

115. Methods may include in addition a combination of the following: Facilitated discussions and group consultations (as a balance to time-consuming individual interviews); Establishing chronological timelines of key steps and decisions; Key stakeholder/informant interviews; Review of key documents; Sample site visits; review and monitoring data.

3.2 The IA RTE Framework

Purpose and Assumptions

116. The IA RTE Framework intends to provide the evaluators and the HCT with guidance on the most critical questions and issues to be evaluated. Ideally, the IA RTE Framework should be shared with all relevant stakeholders.

117. It is expected that evaluators use the Framework as main reference tool for their assessment. After having been deployed to the field, evaluators should try to first assess the outputs and outcomes of the humanitarian response at the level of the affected population (bottom-up approach), especially by answering one of the main questions of the Framework – "what were the main operational results, and their positive and negative outcomes for the affected population?" Deductive analysis should then guide evaluators to the other relevant dimensions and issues outlined in the Framework.

118. The IA RTE Framework is a model that attempts to portray crucial characteristics of an 'ideal humanitarian response'. It was developed to serve as a basis and starting point for natural disasters and rapid external evaluation. Moreover, the Framework serves a communication tool between all stakeholders and can therefore be slightly adapted to local issues and relevant opportunities for learning.

119.   The 'IA RTE Framework' as Diagram

blue: main overarching question
yellow : potential areas for remote monitoring
red text: framework additions to be used for complex emergencies

IA RTE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK			
Dimensions	**Characteristics of an Ideal Operation**	**Key Questions**	**Indicators & Data Sources** (Timelines daily during the first 2-3 weeks, then weekly and later monthly tbd)
I. SITUATION /CONTEXT, NEEDS **Context,** **Needs** **Who are actors (complex emergencies)**	• All segments of the affected population are assisted in a timely and equitable manner and in line with their needs. There are no significant coverage gaps.	• **Is the ongoing humanitarian response producing positive benefits for all segments of the affected population? What gaps need to be addressed?** • How do different segments of the affected population view their situation and the overall adequacy of the humanitarian response to date? • What were the most important facts and figures characterizing the humanitarian situation? • Have coordinated assessments of the needs of all parts of the populations, men and boys, women and girls and vulnerable groups been undertaken? • To what extent are these assessments being used to guide the delivery of	• **Number of Dead, Wounded, Sick, (morbidity, and mortality data)** • **Degree of destruction, number of homeless / IDP** • **National Politicians and Institutions** • **International system / context** • **Affected / Assisted population views** • **Security incidents** **Factors affecting humanitarian access** *Sitreps, Press releases, tbc*

IA RTE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK			
Dimensions	**Characteristics of an Ideal Operation**	**Key Questions**	**Indicators & Data Sources** (Timelines daily during the first 2-3 weeks, then weekly and later monthly tbd)
		assistance? (WFP suggestion)	
		• What were the main (security or other) events which hampered the response?	
		• What are most severe and widespread risks being faced by the population?	
II. PLANNING & RESOURCES **Strategic and Operational Planning**	• Coordinated needs assessment and discussions with all actors have resulted in a timely and adequate common humanitarian strategic action.	• Have relevant, inclusive and appropriate strategic and response plans been developed? • Are priority needs and gaps being identified and adequately addressed? • To what extent do duplications of effort exist? • Are duplications successfully being avoided through co-ordinated needs assessments and effective information sharing?	• **Common strategies established** • **Coherent operation plans (general and by Cluster) established** • **Appeal Processes timely organized and launched** • **Financing (pledges and flows)** • **Human resources: staff deployment** • **Timelines of production of plans** • **Timelines of pledges and funding** • **Timelines of staff deployment**
Resource Mobilization	• Co-ordinated appeals are raised and funded in a timely manner. • Is there appropriate humanitarian engagement with all parties?	• Were the appeals issued in a timely way and responded to? • Was the continuity of funding and staffing warranted all the time or were there significant	• **Consistency of efforts to engage with all parties to the conflict**

IA RTE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK			
Dimensions	**Characteristics of an Ideal Operation**	**Key Questions**	**Indicators & Data Sources** (Timelines daily during the first 2-3 weeks, then weekly and later monthly tbd)
		gaps?	*Flash Appeals and revisions (communications by CAP section), FTS, Sitreps, Briefing papers, Staffing Tables, OTF protocols, Key messages for the USG and SG*
III. COORDINATION **Coordination System Activated (OSOCC / Cluster Approach)**	• Effective coordination structures are quickly put in place and are performing well.	• Has an inclusive and well-managed coordination system been established early on? • In complex emergencies, have coordination arrangements taken into account the role of the government in conflict? • Is the cluster system operating effectively? • When were the main coordination bodies activated (by whom?) and connected? • Were roles & responsibilities, well defined and clear? • What key decisions have affected the response? • Have important actors been excluded from the co-ordination arrangements?	• **Activation timeline of Coordination hubs (HQ and Field, link with peacekeeping missions, OCHA, Clusters, US, national etc.)** • **Key decisions inventory and timeline (including key stakeholders)** • **Gaps: dates of identification and addressing of critical bottlenecks and gaps (infrastructures, procedures, security)** • **Date and main features of the coordination arrangements with member states, military and National counterparts** • **IM network's "operationality"** • **Timeline of key advocacy**
Access	• Core humanitarian principles are adequately adhered to in the response.		

IA RTE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK			
Dimensions	**Characteristics of an Ideal Operation**	**Key Questions**	**Indicators & Data Sources** (Timelines daily during the first 2-3 weeks, then weekly and later monthly tbd)
Information Management and Public Information **M&E** **Cross- cutting issues (gender, environment, HIV/AIDS)**	• The humanitarian response is underpinned by effective information management practices. • Monitoring and reporting systems can track and report on results. • Cross cutting issues are addressed and adequately incorporated into all aspects of the response.	• What are constraints on access, and how are these being addressed? • Are security arrangements conducive to humanitarian operations and access? • Was the coordination system supported by an efficient communication and information management system? (information flow within the field, between field and HQs) • Were public messages clear, timely and accurate and proactive? • Is IM used to inform programming • Which systems have been put into place to monitor, report and evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the overall response? • Is the monitoring of sufficient quality to enable future assessment of outcomes?	**actions and messages** • **Negotiation protocols for access and security** • **CIMCOORD arrangements** • **Inventory of IM systems and their main functions** • **Key messages by main humanitarian actors** • **Quality and availability of expertise** • **Availability of (sex-age etc.) disaggregated) data** *Sitreps and protocols from various coordination bodies (incl.UNDAC, OSOCC, OCHA, press releases, IM protocols and ToR,* • **Framework for Gender Indicators (also for each cluster): "IASC Gender Handbook in Humanitarian Action"** • **Number of women and men trained on gender issues** • **Number of GenCaps deployed** • **Framework for HIV/AIDS Indicators IASC Guidelines**

IA RTE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK			
Dimensions	**Characteristics of an Ideal Operation**	**Key Questions**	**Indicators & Data Sources** (Timelines daily during the first 2-3 weeks, then weekly and later monthly tbd)
Ownership and Connectedness	• The humanitarian response has been planned and is carried out in close collaboration with pre-existing response structures (such as the Government / military and civil protection) • In complex emergencies, are appropriate coordination arrangements in place? • The humanitarian response helps build the capacities of national governments	• Have the cross cutting issues be dealt with adequately in all aspects of the response and in all clusters/ sectors? • Has statistical evidence been gathered (e.g. disaggregated by sex and age?) • Have standards been developed and did they provide guidance and methodologies for integrating Cross Cutting Issues (XCI) into Clusters / Sector NAs and PDNAs? • Are these being tracked throughout the disaster and is appropriate action taken quickly to effectively reverse negative trends? • Have advisors for the various cross-cutting themes been deployed in a timely way?	for HiV/Aids interventions in emergency settings • **Guidelines on MHPSS in Emergency Settings, IASC (2007)** • **Flash Environmental Assessment Tool (FEAT)** • **Integrating environment in Post-Conflict Needs Assessments, Humanitarian action and the Environment: Essential Guidance for Humanitarian Actors** • **Emergency Waste Management Guidelines** • **Application of pre-existing response plan in the current emergency response** • **Participation of local capacities in relevant coordination mechanisms (clusters, common needs assessment etc.)** • **Participation of local civil society organization in**

IA RTE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK			
Dimensions	**Characteristics of an Ideal Operation**	**Key Questions**	**Indicators & Data Sources** (Timelines daily during the first 2-3 weeks, then weekly and later monthly tbd)
Coordinated Strategy for Security & Access		• Have local capacities been involved, used and strengthened and have partnerships with civil society organizations been built-up? • Were activities planned in support to pre-existing plans, structures and capacities? • Was an inclusive common strategy for security and access developed? • Have key stakeholders identified in a timely manner possible limitations for access to beneficiaries and assessed the security for staff and advocated for access? • Have Access and Security issues been addressed in the response plan of each Cluster by the Cluster Lead? • Has sufficient funding been provided for appropriate security risk management strategies? • Have factors affecting access	coordination mechanisms • **Establishment of national NGO consortia to be included into response plans?** • **Key messages by ERC** • **Speeches by HC** *Meeting minutes from Cluster/ Sector meetings* *Meeting minutes between HC and local authorities* *Public Information Campaign documents* *Cluster Response Plans* *Daily Situation Reports*

IA RTE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK			
Dimensions	**Characteristics of an Ideal Operation**	**Key Questions**	**Indicators & Data Sources** (Timelines daily during the first 2-3 weeks, then weekly and later monthly tbd)
		been monitored, and reported, and used in planning the response?	
IV. RESPONSE <u>**(and preparedness)**</u> **Quality and Timeliness of Response**	All segments of the affected population are assisted in a timely and equitable manner and in line with their needs. There are no significant coverage gaps.	• **How do different segments of the affected population view their situation and the overall adequacy of the humanitarian response to date?** • **Have critical gaps and issues been identified and addressed in a timely way system-wide and by each Cluster?**	• **Coverage of beneficiary needs** • **Mapping and analysis of operational bottlenecks** • **Tracing of main features of operational response (who did deliver what, where and when?)** *Field visits to affected areas Cluster Situation Reports OCHA Situation Reports Comparison between outcome of needs assessment (UNDAC needs assessment, common needs assessment & PDNAS) and Cluster Response Plans / revised Flash Appeal / CAP etc. SPHERE and other standards*
Common Agreement on and Compliance to Standards	• Common standards (appropriate to national context) have been developed in an inclusive manner within the coordination system (globally and for each cluster).	• **Have appropriate common standards been developed within the coordination systems (globally and for each Cluster) and reached?** • **Was the standard setting inclusive (participation of national, local authorities)?**	

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Terms of Reference Template

The Terms of Reference are intended to be drafted for an IA RTE in a specific country. The document will be given the consultant team.

Reading advise
- [Text in brackets clarifies the content of the section]
- [*Text in grey italics has to be adopted to the context of the specific IA RTE*]

INTER-AGENCY REAL-TIME EVALUATION (IA RTE) OF THE HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE TO [*DISASTER XYZ in COUNTRY XYZ*]
Terms of Reference

[*Version: Date*]

1. INTRODUCTION & RATIONALE

[Purpose of IA RTEs and explanation of the criteria that have triggered this IA RTE]

IA RTEs are an initiative of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC). An IA RTE can be defined as an evaluation carried out at the early implementation stages of a humanitarian operation which simultaneously feeds back findings for immediate use by the broader humanitarian community, particularly at the field level. An IA RTE is primarily intended for sudden-onset disasters, or protracted crises undergoing a phase of rapid deterioration or escalating violence. These evaluations differ from other forms of humanitarian evaluation in their speed, coverage, methods, and outputs. IA RTEs are typified by their shared management and methodological oversight through global and national level inter-agency support, management groups [*and in-country Advisory Groups*]; speed of mobilization, feedback and follow-up; light, agile approaches; restricted scope; and participatory methods. Ideally, IA RTEs seek to unlock inter-agency coordination problems or operational bottlenecks and provide real-time learning in field settings.

The IASC IA RTE Steering Group[9] has agreed to carry out an IA RTE in [*country XYC*] since the humanitarian emergency meets the selection criteria identified by the IASC as possible triggers. [*Explain whether the IA RTE was triggered by Essential or Desirable Criteria*]

2. BACKGROUND TO THE CURRENT CRISIS

---

[9]   Members in the IASC IA RTE SG are: UNICEF, UNDP, INGOs (Care, Oxfam for ECB/SCHR), IFRC, FAO, WFP, OCHA, ALNAP.

[Offers a background to the crisis, including the main events and the main humanitarian response to date by the various actors. Does not consist of more than 10 lines maximum!]

3. OBJECTIVES AND USE

[What is the reason and objectives for undertaking this evaluation? It seeks to outline the parameters to be used]

The IA RTE team will be deployed during the initial response phase and ideally evaluators will arrive no later in country than two months after the disaster.

The IA RTE will aim to provide snapshots of current situations, including real-time feedback and learning to the HCT: (local IASC, Cluster, NGO's, national Government, national NGO's involved in the humanitarian response). The main objective of the IA RTE is to assess the initial response and provide real time feedback and input into on-going decision making in the field. This will enable the adoption of corrective actions as needed.

The evaluation will in this way support the ongoing operational planning of the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT), which will be the most immediate user of the feedback and recommendations.

4. METHODOLOGY

[Explains the methodology and defines if the approach is one phase approach or a multi phased approach.]

The applied methods for IA RTE shall be light and participatory. The evaluations will be conducted by teams comprising independent consultants. The evaluation will be carried out through analyses of various sources of information including desk reviews; field visits; interviews with key stakeholders (affected population, UN, / I/NGOs, donors, governments) and through cross-validation of data. While maintaining independence, the evaluation will seek the views of all parties, especially the affected population. Evaluation teams will serve as 'facilitators', encouraging and assisting field personnel, both individually and collectively, to look critically at their operations and find creative solutions to problems.

[*Explain if the IA RTE is a one-phase approach or a multi-phase approach*: A one-phase approach of an IA RTE would be carried out within the two first month and consist of remote monitoring and the IA RTE mission, whereas a multi phase approach would include a follow up IA RTE mission (with a different focus corresponding to real time needs at a later stage in the response).]

In order to best prepare the consultants / consultant team for the upcoming evaluation, members of the IA RTE Steering Group remotely monitored the response and gathered relevant information since the onset of the emergency. Data has been gathered along the main questions set out in the IA RTE Framework (see below) and consist of: e.g. Situation Reports, Needs Assessment Reports, Key Messages, timelines of key decisions, timelines of cluster activation, timelines of the funding status, exit surveys, and main contact lists of key humanitarian

stakeholders. The data will be handed over confidentially to the consultant team to carry out a desk review well in advance of the field mission.

5. FOCUS & 'IA RTE FRAMEWORK'

[Outlines the evaluation criteria that will be applied, describes the key issues to be evaluated and questions to be asked]

Main Focus

The evaluation will first identify the extent to which the overall response achieved or did not achieve key objectives including addressing in a timely and meaningful way the needs of all segments of the affected population. Deductive analysis will then guide the evaluators to the other elements and dimension (as displayed in the IA RTE Framework below) on which the evaluation should specifically focus. In general, the IA RTE will focus in large part on the effectiveness and efficiency of the coordination and management systems, addressing critical issues related to both the provision of relief and to the transition to recovery.

IA RTE Framework, including Key Issues & Key Questions

The IA RTE Framework is a model that intends to display crucial characteristics of an 'ideal humanitarian response'. It was developed to be applied for natural disasters and rapid external evaluation. Moreover, the Framework serves a communication tool between all stakeholders and can therefore be slightly adapted to local issues and relevant opportunities for learning. The IA RTE Framework intends to provide the evaluators and the HCT with guidance on the most critical questions and issues to be evaluated. Ideally, the IA RTE Framework should be shared with all relevant stakeholders. It is expected that evaluators use the Framework as main reference tool for their assessment.

To reiterate, evaluators should try to first focus on the outputs and outcomes of the humanitarian response at the level of the affected population, especially by answering one of the main questions of the Framework – "**How adequate was the response as a whole, and what operational results as well as positive and negative outcomes for the affected population did it produce?**". Deductive analysis should then guide the evaluators to the other relevant dimensions as outlined below in the Framework.

Please find below the IA RTE Framework as Table

[INCLUDE HERE THE IA RTE FRAMEWORK AS TABLE: *For reasons of duplication, the IA RTE Framework has not been attached in this section of the document again, but can be found in Chapter 3.2. However, Terms of References for an actual IA RTE shall always be published together with the IA RTE Framework*]

Evaluators must try to focus on the key questions in the Framework. Additional follow up and more specific questions are listed below – according to the dimensions of the Framework.

Specific issues and questions to be explored might include the following, broken down by overall response area:

Response covering the needs

Overarching questions:
Is the ongoing humanitarian response producing positive benefits for all segments of the disaster-affected population? What gaps need to be addressed?
- ***Have appropriate common standards been developed within the coordination systems (globally and for each Cluster) and to what degree have these been adhered to?***

Specific questions:
- How timely and successful is the humanitarian response in delivering against stated objectives/indicators (as per cluster work plans at the global and the country level, individual agencies' articulated benchmarks)?
- To what extent have critical gaps been identified and addressed in a timely way, both inter- and intra-cluster?
- How effectively have cross-cutting issues been addressed in the cluster response?
- How adequately have the psychosocial effects of the disaster been addressed in addition to the provision of life-saving interventions?
- What critical factors (e.g., security events, infrastructure, procedures, access, enabling environment, etc.) help explain why the response was or was not delivered in an adequate and timely manner?
- How effectively are humanitarian space, access and security being assessed, with a view to identifying and addressing bottlenecks and gaps?
- How effectively were the risks at delivery (e.g. sexual exploitation and abuse, gender-based violence) identified and addressed?
- What is the humanitarian system's level of commitment and compliance to standards (such as SPHERE, INEE, some subset of the Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action, HAP 2007 Standard in Humanitarian Accountability and Quality Management, Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief, guidance on civil-military relations and protected humanitarian space, etc.)?

Strategic and operational planning and resource mobilization

Overarching question:
- ***Have relevant, inclusive and appropriate strategic and response plans been developed in a timely way and based on a common needs assessment?***

Specific questions:
- How effective has the overall inter-agency planning and management process been?
- How timely, relevant and coherently inter-linked have the various appeals, strategies and operation plans (e.g., the Flash Appeal, PDNA, RF and the National Recovery Plan) been?
- To what extent have these been based on an inclusive and coordinated needs assessment and analysis that reflects the views of various international and national stakeholders, including government, civil society organizations and various segments of the affected population (including socially excluded groups and groups and individuals vulnerable to human rights violations due to discrimination and stigma)? (How quickly and adequately have these appeals been responded to? How adequate is the continuity of funding and staffing?)
- How adequately are recovery considerations incorporated into assessments, planning and provision of relief interventions?

- How adequately has the political dimension of the country's context been considered in assessments, planning and provision of relief and transition to recovery efforts?
- How sufficient have funding flows been, both in quantity and timeliness, so as to allow humanitarian actors to respond effectively to both humanitarian and time-critical early recovery needs?
- To what extent are the basic tenets of disaster risk reduction (DRR) being incorporated into planning and efforts in order to reduce further vulnerability?[10]
- To what extent did Clusters take humanitarian principles into account?

Coordination and Connectedness

Overarching questions:
- *Has an inclusive and well-managed coordination system been established early on, including national actors, the military and all other relevant stakeholders?*
- *Were activities planned in support to pre-existing response plans, structures and capacities?*
- *Was the coordination system supported by an efficient communication and information management system (e.g., enhancing information flow within the field, between field and HQs)?*
- *What systems have been put into place to monitor, report and evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the overall response? How adequate are these for measuring progress against objectives?*
- *How adequately have cross-cutting issues be dealt with in all aspects of the response and in all clusters/ sectors?*
- *Was an inclusive common strategy for security and access developed?*

Specific questions:
- To what extent does the coordination system support relief and recovery alike?
- In what ways, if any, has the cluster approach led to a more strategic response in terms of predictable leadership, partnership, cohesiveness and accountability?
- How effective has inter-cluster coordination been (with specific focus on cross cutting issues, Protection and Early Recovery)?
- How effectively has the humanitarian community coordinated the response with the Government and the [*international military forces*]?
- Has an effective integrated accountability framework been put in place? How well functioning and robust is it?
- In what ways, if any, has the government's leadership capacity been strengthen as it has the primary responsibility to respond to its people's needs?
- In what ways, if any, have national and local capacities been capitalized on and strengthened (e.g., in needs assessments?)
- How effectively have partnerships with civil society organizations and the affected communities themselves been built-up in order to maximize local ownership, and thereby enhance effectiveness, accountability and sustainability?

Context and Needs

---

[10] These might include the following principles, among others: (1) ensuring that all projects are designed with a multi-hazard approach and do not pose new threats or increase the existing ones; (2) ensuring a 'build back safer' approach addressing underlying causes of risk and is informed by national and local assessments of risk; (3) promoting community participation (especially women and children) in all stages (from assessment, implementation to evaluation); (4) building on existing capacity of government, civil society and people; and (5) embracing partnership to ensure the effective use of resources at national and sub-national level.

Overarching question:
- *What segments of the affected population could and could not be assisted, and why?*

Specific questions:
- Has a common needs assessment and analysis been carried out?
- What proportions of the affected population could be assisted? Who was excluded, and what were the key barriers to full access?
- How effectively have key bottlenecks and gaps in humanitarian space, access and security been assessed and addressed?
- How adequate and timely were situation timelines and statistical evidence on contextual factors (such as situation of the population - casualties, wounded, sick, degree of infrastructure destruction) to the needs of operational decision making?
- Has analysis of different needs, vulnerabilities and capacities and response design included a vision of the variant effects on men and women, girls and boys, and vulnerable groups? Has the disaggregated data (by age and gender) been available to inform the analysis?
- To what extent has the needs of all segments of the population, men and boys, women and girls and vulnerable groups been assessed and the differential needs of specific subpopulations been addressed?
- How far has the humanitarian response been tailored to meet national and local needs and ensure ownership at these levels by, and accountability to, affected populations? How far has the response been tailored to the divergent needs, vulnerabilities and capacities of girls and boys, women and men, young and old, and socially excluded groups?
- Has information about the humanitarian response been communicated in a manner that is widely accessible to the people of the [*country XYZ*]?

6. STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

The evaluation team will engage with staff from UN agencies, international NGOs, national NGOs, national stakeholders, government and donor organizations, as well as military actors. The team will acknowledge the significant workload already borne by in country staff and endeavor to ensure that any staff resource allocations to the evaluations are minimized and that the IA RTE is carried out with a 'light footprint'.

Interagency technical and policy support will be provided through the IA RTE Steering Group. It will be expected that the evaluation team will be as much as possible self-sufficient on the ground!

The team will report its findings to all members of the HCT (Clusters, IASC locally) and their international and local counterparts (including Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, IOM, local NGO's, government etc.) in [country xyz], prior to leaving the region. Presentations in Geneva and/ or New York will follow within two weeks of the consultants' return from the field mission.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The IA RTE will be overseen by the IASC IA RTE Steering Group. Day-to-day management of the evaluation will be led by a smaller Management Group (MG) which will be established on a voluntary basis and be made up of members of the IASC IA RTE Steering Group interested to contribute their time and efforts. The MG will be chaired by [*agency xyz*] and includes the following members [xyz, xyz . . .].

MG members will be expected to:

- Manage the entire evaluation process (including financial resource mobilization, team recruitment, reviewing the inception report, participate in the survey design, reviewing draft reports) for the particular phase;
- Offer in-country support during critical phases of the evaluation and travel [*to the country xyz*] as needed;
- Monitor and assess the quality of all outputs on the evaluation;
- Provide guidance and institutional support to the external consultant(s), especially on issues of methodology;
- Approves the final IA RTE report;
- Represent the participating Agencies in discussion with the consultant(s) conducting the IA RTE;
- Represent the participating Agencies of the evaluation in dealings with the UN Country Team, Donor representatives and NGO communities.
- Keep the IA RTE Steering Group advised on key developments throughout the evaluation

The evaluation team selected for the IA RTE will report to the MG.

All evaluation products will first be submitted to the Management Group and will then be shared with the wider IA RTE Steering Group.

8. DURATION OF EVALUATION AND TENTATIVE TIMEPLAN

Action/event	Targeted Deadline
Emergency event(s)	
TRIGGERING AND REMOTE MONITORING PHASE	
Automatic Triggering of IA RTE or Request	+3
Inclusion of the IA RTE into the initial Flash Appeal (if automatically triggered)	+2 (5)
Remote Monitoring from HQ & Data Collection (via OTF, GCL Meetings, Virtual OSOCC, Sitreps)	Since beginning
Drafting of DRAFT Terms of Reference (based on standard IA RTE ToR template & Drafting of Expression of Interest)	+3 (8)
Publication of EoI on Relief Web & ALNAP (note: until we have a an appropriate stand-by roster in place)	+1 (9)
PREPARATORY EVALUATION MANAGEMENT MISSION	**Done**
Scoping mission by the evaluation management team to identify key questions and issues, as well as to explain processes.	+10 (19)
MISSION ON THE INITIAL RESPONSE	**Target dates**
Contract signed	+5 (24)

Handover of remotely monitored data to the consultants. Consultants start the Desk Review.	+1 (25)
Mobilization of Consultant & one day face-to-face Mission Briefings in GVA /or NY (or via phone) between consultants and the ad-hoc Management Group	+1 (26)
Field visits: Mission to the country – interview and visit period	+20 (46)
Workshop preparation	+3 (49)
IN-COUNTRY WORKSHOPS: Workshops in country to validate findings and recommendations, as well as to discuss next steps and outline timelines and action for a management response to the recommendations	**+7 (56)**
END OF MISSION: Debriefings in country to HCT (including government counterparts).	**+2 (58)**
FINAL DRAFT: Production of Final Report, including summary of proceedings/outcome of workshop discussion and agreed next steps.	**+7 (65)**
Final Check & Approval by ad-hoc Management Group of Final Report. OCHA Focal Points prepares email to ERC, who will send out the Final Report and share it with the HCT, IA RTE Steering Group and OCHA	**+5 (70)**
Debriefing in GVA and / or New York	**+4 (74)**
TOTAL WORKING DAYS	**74 days**

9. EVALUATION TEAM: Competency and Expertise Requirements

The evaluation will employ the services of a consultant company / research institute which will probably consists of a team of 2 international and 2 national consultants. Consultant teams must be gender and age balanced! Consultant team will embody the following collective experiences:

- Proven senior-level experience and ability to provide strategic recommendations to key stakeholders;
- Good knowledge of strategic and operational management of humanitarian operations, preferably in [*country xyz*]; the ability to bring on board national consultants(s) from [*country xyz*] would be an asset;
- Good knowledge of humanitarian system and its reforms, including of UN agencies, IFRC, NGOs, and local government disaster response structures and systems;
- Demonstrated experience in conducting evaluations of humanitarian programmes and the capacity to work collaboratively with multiple stakeholders and on a team;
- Strong experience in key sectors and/or in cross-cutting issues;
- Strong analytical skills and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions and to prepare well-written reports in a timely manner;
- Strong workshop facilitation skills;
- Excellent writing and presentation skills in English and French; and
- Immediate availability for the period indicated.
- Evaluation teams should be gender and age balanced

11. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AND DELIVERABLES

- A **series of presentations of findings** to HCT in [*country xyz*], New York and/ or Geneva;

- A **final report** containing analytical elements related to the issues specified in this set of ToR. The report shall contain a short executive summary of no more than 2,000 words and a main text of no more than 10,000 words, both inclusive of clear and concise recommendations. Annexes should include a list of all individuals interviewed, a bibliography, a description of method(s) employed, a summary of survey results (if applicable), and any other relevant materials. The report will be submitted two weeks after the completion of the mission; and

The evaluation team will also be expected to contribute to conceptualizing the survey instrument forming the second phase of the IA RTE.

Draft reports will be submitted within two weeks of the consultants' return from the field mission, upon which the HCT and IA RTE Management Group, will be afforded 7 days to comment. The document will subsequently be disseminated to a wider audience for comment.

The evaluation team is solely responsible for the final products. While maintaining independence, the team will adhere to professional standards and language, particularly that which may relate to the protection of staff and operations. Direct consultations with affected populations will be a formal requirement of the evaluation unless security conditions are overriding. Additionally, agencies at the country level and the IA RTE Steering Group will be consulted prior to the dissemination of any products emanating from the evaluation.

All analytical results and products arising from this evaluation will be owned by the IASC RTE Steering Group. The team leader and/or members will not be allowed without prior authorization in writing to present any of the analytical results as his or her own work or to make use of the evaluation results for private publication purposes.

Compliance with the ALNAP quality pro forma is expected and the evaluation report will be judged in this regard. All external evaluation reports will also be submitted to ALNAP for inclusion in the regular meta-evaluation process that rates the quality of evaluation reports.