

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

The relationship between the creation of humanitarian space and the flow of assistance to war-affected populations is the basis of OLS and hence the main focus of this review. Therefore the team will not be expected to undertake a detailed analysis of the impact of OLS programmes, but rather to review the effectiveness of its modis operandi in meeting the needs of war-affected civilians.

Mandate, Principles and Structure

Mandate and Principles:

What are the factors which have contributed to, or impeded, OLS in the fulfilment of its mandate to provide humanitarian assistance to all in need in a neutral, impartial and transparent manner?

Is there a consensus among the following groups regarding OLS's mandate and principles and their translation into operational procedures and modalities?

- Government/SPLM/SSIM
- International NGOs
- Affected populations
- Donors
- Local NGOs and other community groups

How has OLS benefitted from or been restricted by adherence to its mandate and basic principles. Are neutrality and impartiality the most appropriate approaches to working in such situations?

To what extent have OLS and the parties to the conflict respected agreements entered into? How have the modalities of negotiated agreements contributed to the success of the OLS operation? What has been the contribution of the UN Special Envoy?

Is OLS making the best use of all possible channels to increase access to populations in need?

(End p 4)

Within its existing mandate, is OLS doing enough to ensure that humanitarian assistance reaches its intended beneficiaries? What strategies has OLS developed to address breaches of humanitarian agreements and ground rules relating to OLS?

What could have been done to increase the effectiveness of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, international humanitarian law and specific resolutions for the protection of

war-affected and displaced populations?

What have been the biggest constraints to ensuring accountability to beneficiary communities? How might these constraints be overcome?

Structures:

Has the UN's coordination role been defined with sufficient clarity to be accepted and understood by the parties to the conflict, the UN agencies and NGOs?

How has the establishment of DHA and the role of the UN Special Envoy affected coordination and leadership in OLS?

Has the UN provided effective leadership and coordination of OLS through the UNCERO/OLS Coordinator-Nairobi management link?

Has the UN coordinated effectively with NGOs in programme policy-making and implementation?

Have the various coordination mechanisms (letters of understanding, meetings, workshops, field staff) been effectively used for programme implementation and to ensure adherence to the OLS principles?

How could coordination be strengthened/reinforced?

How has OLS been hindered and/or facilitated by: inter UN agency staffing and structures?; by NGO policies and reporting requirements?

Has the mechanism of the consolidated inter-agency appeal proved adequate as a resource mobilisation tool for OLS?

(End p 5)

Have donor funding procedures served effectively in responding to OLS programme requirements?

Has the donor community shown a coordinated and effective policy in support of the OLS mandate and fundamental principles?

Has OLS been accountable and transparent in relation to donors?

Programme Strategy:

The team with focus on a cross-section of OLS sectoral activities including both conventional relief as well as interventions with a longer-term focus. Within the sectors

of household food security, health, education and water, the team will ask whether OLS agencies have succeeded in defining common objectives and achieving them through programmes that most effectively meet the needs of the Sudanese people. Particular attention should be given to the role that these programmes have played in promoting the survival and development of children.

Identifying Needs:

Have assessment/monitoring systems contributed to a consensus on the extent and prioritisation of sectoral and geographical needs?

Does OLS have an information collection system adequate to its programme planning needs?

Coordination Structures and Mechanisms:

Have the structures and mechanisms created been effective in promoting coordination in programme planning and implementation as well as in making the best use of agencies' comparative advantages? How have these structures responded to rapidly changing field conditions?

Implementation:

Has OLS managed to provide levels of assistance, proportioned to need, to war-affected civilians irrespective of their location? To what degree has this
(End p 6)

contributed to responding to the total identified needs of all war-affected civilians in the country?

How has OLS responded to the survival needs of accessible populations?

Has OLS achieved a strategic balance of food and non-food assistance with the aim of promoting self-reliance?

What has been achieved in protecting livelihoods and promoting self-sufficiency?

Has OLS sufficiently emphasized capacity building and sustainability in programme planning and implementation?

Gender:

How have OLS programmes reflected the primary role of women in the maintenance and restoration of family and community life?

Deliver of Assistance: Strategies and Cost-Effectiveness:

At the outset of OLS, the strategy for the delivery of assistance to serve war- affected civilians was established. With respect to logistics, cost-effectiveness and the practicalities of ensuring neutrality in a conflict, the cross-border operations serve SPLM areas and in-country operations serve GOS locations. In the intervening years, rail and river corridors opened, permitting cross-line deliveries to take place from within the country, while access to GOS areas by cross-border operations also became an accepted option. At the same time, safe and effective road access has declined, forcing continued reliance on expensive but secure air transport services.

Have these changes influenced the original rationale of delivery based on cost-effectiveness and logistical practicality?

Has OLS done everything possible to reduce operational costs by taking advantage of opportunities for new delivery modalities and access routes?

Have the overall operational and overhead costs been reasonable in relation to
(End p 7)

the actual delivery of assistance? How might OLS achieve greater cost efficiency? Do the existing conditions permit the greater use of in-country logistic bases?

Food Aid/Food Security:

Special focus is given to the area of food aid and food security for two main reasons: food aid represents the most significant area of OLS expenditure; OLS has adopted a strategy that seeks to promote household food security through a comprehensive analysis of both available and potential sources of food. Many of the questions that follow apply to other sectors as well as that of food aid/food security.

- I. Are there clear policies and objectives for the promotion of nutritional well-being and food security?
 - To what extent have food aid and the various household food security interventions (seeds and tools, livestock, fishing) improved the nutritional status, household food security and economic well-being of target groups?
 - How can the criteria developed for the identification of food aid beneficiaries be improved?
- II. Has OLS been able to identify needs for food aid?

- Have the methodologies used each year by OLS and by the joint FAO/WFP crop assessment and food supply missions achieved a clear understanding of the level to which populations have access to food sources and resources?
 - To what extent can standardised monitoring and assessment methodologies be applied by OLS throughout Sudan?
- III. Has OLS been able to translate information gathered into appropriate decisions/strategies?
- How has the information gathering in assessments been used in decision-making on the allocation and timing of food aid and other inputs?
 - Has OLS established effective fora that have allowed all agencies working in the area of food aid and food security to come together with the information required to make coherent and consistent decisions?
 - Has OLS/WFP explored alternative uses of food aid, such as food for work, market support, monetization, production support, rather than direct food relief? What more might be done in this area? To what extent has food aid assisted beneficiaries toward self-sufficiency? What have been the constraints in using food aid to promote self-sufficiency?
 - Is there evidence to suggest that food aid acted as a disincentive to production or interfered with traditional community level self-help mechanisms?
- (End p 8)
- IV. Has OLS been able to deliver food in a timely and appropriate manner once potential beneficiary populations have been identified? What have been the main constraints?
- With regard to the concern of the donor community over the diversion of food aid, has OLS done enough to ensure that food aid reaches its intended beneficiaries?

Capacity Building and Empowerment:

How has OLS ensured that humanitarian assistance enhances local capacities, empowers

local populations and provides sustainable initiatives?

What have the parties to the conflict done to permit the establishment and functioning of effective and accountable humanitarian counterparts to OLS?

Has OLS done all it could to promote/support these counterparts?

Have counterparts provided adequate service/support to OLS agencies?
(End p 9)

Has the support provided by OLS agencies been appropriate to the capacity building needs of local organisations and community groups?

What is being done to promote beneficiary participation in planning and implementation of relief and rehabilitation activities?

What impact has this had on programme quality?
(Page 10)