

Humanitarian Accountability Partnership - International

"making humanitarian action accountable to beneficiaries"

HAP Nairobi Accountably and Quality Management Workshop

3rd to 4th July 2006

Summary of Feedback / Evaluation Comments

Total Number of participants: 41

Number of Feedback / evaluation comments Received: 37

No	Comments (Positive & Negative); Advice; Concerns	HAPI Response
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Takes minimum standard accountability to a new level (beyond Sphere) ▪ Potential to change the existing power balance from HQ decision making to the beneficiary 	Totally agree
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7 standards really cover a broad and essential set of issues within the humanitarian field 	Glad we are getting there.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wanted to learn more about HAP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Expectations fully met and very satisfied ○ Feel this is an excellent initiative 	Thank you
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ HAP provides a forum and a framework for what we all feel is a long overdue priority in the humanitarian sector 	Good
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased understanding as to how to be accountable to beneficiaries 	It was our goal
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggestion for workshops: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Perhaps colour code handouts to make it easier to find the right document for each activity ▪ All in all it was great. 	I agree with this suggestion - thanks
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are so many good practices & tools available already that we can make use of 	An yet people are always asking for more!
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compelling and rich beneficiary insights which make this initiative all the more credible. ▪ Participation in action not just theory 	Exactly
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None – no complaint 	Great
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Made aware of all humanitarian standards that exist & resources 	It was what we wanted to convey.
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Warning: non certified agencies may suffer decrease in funding. This may cause "joining for the wrong motives" 	At the end of the day whatever the motive, validation will ensure improved quality assurance.
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To do better: There was a need to learn and understand the humanitarian standards of the UN agencies 	We will endeavour to do so
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We are pleased that officially beneficiaries are getting a voice 	Us too.
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ HAPI is an indicator that humanitarian community is committed to change for the positive and be more accountable – encouraging! 	I hope so.
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Keen reading material simple 	Will try to
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More practical and tangible 	Good
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will HAP encourage competition between agencies (negative impact) 	Actually. I think it will more encourage prioritisation of quality and accountability.
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The process and consultation around standards is good. 	Thank you.
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For improvement: workshop to be more focused. Was the purpose training? Developing indicators? Time too short to do all. 	You are right of course. I had wanted to have both as I wanted to ensure those that invested their

Humanitarian Accountability Partnership - International

"making humanitarian action accountable to beneficiaries"

		time also took away something new.
20	▪ Compliment: Efficient! Efficient! In time management	Thanks.
21	▪ Warning: of pre accreditation is not preceded by training the self evaluations are not comparable.	Good point – we will discuss this further.
22	▪ I now appreciate more the need for strong program management monitoring and evaluation systems	Good
23	▪ Don't make it too difficult	Absolutely agree
24	▪ We now understand HAP and can feedback to our teams	I am glad.
25	▪ Advice: Stay focused on not being an agency. ▪ Could do the audit by only talking to the agency, not beneficiaries?	Thanks – good point. We think it needs both but need to be carefully how this is approached.
26	▪ Certification may raise expectations on part of donors. Small organisations who don't qualify or get extra funding after certification will be de-motivated.	Though the reverse may happen.
27	▪ Warning: HAP could become so big you will need numbers of verifiers in the future.	Sure – we don't want to get big so planning how to cover the work is essential
28	▪ Warning: Standards and verification very bureaucratic. About documentation - measures agencies ability to document – doesn't measure how beneficiaries influence programs for example	I agree – inevitably verification does require a level of documentation – the key is to imbed in existing material.
29	▪ Strength: Diversity of participants in terms of organisations and geographical coverage ▪ Experience and skills of facilitators	Thanks – glad this worked
30	▪ To take home: The standards themselves – especially the standard from my working group - 5	Good ownership!
31	▪ Watch out: for agencies that will want to frustrate HAP	Thanks for the warning
32	▪ We are HAP	Keep smiling then.
33	▪ Learnt what HAP is about	Good
34	▪ Learning the value of accountability to organisations	OK
35	▪ HAP will be as good as the organisations that support it.	Very good point
36	▪ We have been motivated to drive towards perfection	Don't give up.
37	▪ We will take back with us: ○ More importance given to downwards accountability ○ Improved complaints mechanisms ▪ More importance given to beneficiaries consent	Then a lot was achieved.

Many thanks for all your feedback. We will use the advice shared to redraft and improve the agenda and content of the workshop in Nairobi.

Sheryl Haw
Standards Development Manager
HAP International

Date: 14th July 2006