

After Action Review of the HAP Roving Team deployment to Haiti



15/10/2010

HAP International

After Action Review of the HAP Roving Team Deployment to Haiti

21 July – 22 October, 2009

Dr Jamie Munn, HAP International

10 December 2010



HAP International is a partnership of humanitarian agencies dedicated to building a system of self-regulation based upon quality management and accountability principles, with a specific commitment to making humanitarian action accountable to its intended beneficiaries. In addition to providing capacity building support to members and other agencies enrolled in the certification scheme, contributing to research on the cost effectiveness of quality management of humanitarian action, and establishing a system of quality management certification, HAP International seeks to demonstrate to the “humanitarian system” more widely the potential for improving humanitarian outcomes through quality management and quality assurance.

Abbreviations

AAR	After Action Review
ACTED	Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development
ALWG	Accountability and Learning Working Group
CRM	Complaints and Response Mechanism
CD	Country Director
DFID	Department for International Development, UK
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
DRSS	Disaster Response Support Service project
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Office
GSA	Guided Self-Assessment
HAP	Humanitarian Accountability Partnership International
HAP team	HAP Roving Team
HAF	Humanitarian Accountability Framework
IDP	Internally Displace Persons
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
ICCO	Interchurch Organisation for Development Co operations
JCRM	Joint Complaints and Response Mechanism
LL	Lessons Learnt
LWR	Lutheran World Relief
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluations
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NCA	Norwegian Church Aid
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance
PSEA	Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
PSG	Quality and Accountability Working Group (Peer Support Group)
SC	Save the Children
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
WVI	World Vision International

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank RedR/Bioforce Haiti for hosting the HAP Team deployment for six months and the AAR facilitator.

We owe thanks to all the participants for their willingness to speak openly and frankly of their experiences.

The HAP team was hosted by RedR/Bioforce as part of the Disaster Response Support Service (DRSS) project. Activities in Haiti were supported financially by ACT Alliance/DanChurchAid (via a grant from Danida), Tearfund, World Vision, and ECHO.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	3
Acknowledgements	4
Summary of Achievements	6
What did we set out to do?	8
What have we learned?	11
Outcomes & unexpected results	17

Summary of Achievements

Phase One, February 2010:

- Worked to support the ACT Alliance staff in Haiti on their efforts to strengthen the humanitarian accountability and quality in their programming, to assess the current issues and support needs for a longer term deployment and contribute to the work of the other quality and accountability initiatives in Haiti.
- Conducted trainings on quality and accountability, HAP and Sphere.
- Provided technical advice.
- Conducted two field visits.
- Met with key stakeholders in the humanitarian response, including HAP members and other NGOs, Sphere ToT trained trainers, quality and accountability initiatives, support services, the Haitian Government and UN agencies.

Phase Two, March – September 2010:

- 15 Workshops with 11 HAP members and 28 non-HAP members (international and national NGOs), a total of 260 staff. These have included: an introduction to HAP and accountability for practitioners and management; benchmark specific training on information sharing and participation; approaches for rapid-assessment of practice at project level with site visit.
- The rapid-assessments as part of training programmes was particularly successful in helping participants to realize existing gaps between their understanding of current practice, and the realities on the ground from the perspective of beneficiaries. The training covered the regions of Port-au-Prince, Leogane and Jacmel.
- Together with ACTED, the HAP team developed a Camp Committee Assessment Tool, which was used in Ti Savanne camp, a camp managed by ACTED.
- IOM and HAP worked to further test and refine the Camp Committee Assessment Tool in three camps. The tool will be shared widely within Haiti, so that agencies working in camps (either providing services or as the camp manager) can map and analyse the existing committees in order to make a more informed decision about how they want to work with these committees and the wider camp population.
- Working with the Lutheran World Foundation (LWF), Save the Children and World Vision, the HAP team supported, advised and assisted in the development of a Joint Complaints and Response Mechanism (JCRM) to be piloted by these three agencies. This included facilitating a series of meetings, providing technical expertise, offering

feedback on tools, and supporting with the drafting of complaints handling procedures.

- With interested agencies, an Accountability Learning Working Group (ALWG) was established to provide a forum for international and national agencies to share examples of good practice, tools and learning on accountability.
- The HAP team supported the Haiti PSEA coordinator engaged by OCHA, and participating in the Steering Committee on PSEA.
- HAP facilitated a session as part of training for agency focal points on PSEA,
- To help build capacity that will remain in Haiti after September, Réseau National de Droits Humaines (RNDDH) seconded a member of staff to HAP for 7 weeks. It is hoped that this staff member will be in a position to continue to deliver trainings on accountability after the HAP team deployment, and to maintain the call for accountability in the emergency and relief efforts in Haiti.
- The HAP team worked with photographer and video documentary filmmaker, Robin Moore, to capture the life of camp residents in Ti Savanne, where HAP had conducted their first camp committee assessment. The work resulted in a photo series and video documentary, yet to be finalised.
- Follow up on training to review impact and support agencies with capitalising on internal knowledge developed as a result of the training.
- Support agencies in rolling out a Joint CRM and share the learning from this process widely, in order to raise awareness on the importance and feasibility of joint CRMs.
- Continue regular meetings of the ALWG, and build ownership of participating agencies so that this continues after the end of the HAP deployment.
- Work with the Sphere resource people in Haiti, to identify and deliver joint support activities.
- Document learning from the deployment, including examples of good practice

- **Background**

The New Emergencies Policy (NEP) established a commitment by HAP member organisations to make a special collective effort to apply the *HAP Principles of Accountability* at the outset of all new humanitarian emergencies.¹ Given the magnitude of this emergency, there are many opportunities and challenges to ensuring a high quality and accountable response. In collaboration with other initiatives, and to support members in implementing the New Emergencies Policy, the HAP Secretariat worked to ensure that quality and accountability (Q&A) are given due focus in the Haiti response. The ToR, building on work of the initial team (Phase One), set out a longer-term deployment (6 Months) to be established to support HAP members, national NGOs, members’ partners and other interested agencies to improve understanding and strengthen humanitarian accountability and quality programming.

The ToR laid out three specific goals (details can be found on the [HAP in Haiti](#) page). HAP members responding in Haiti during the HAP deployment were: ACT Alliance, ACTED, CAFOD, CARE, Christian Aid, Concern Worldwide, DanChurchAid, Lutheran World Federation, Medair, MERCY Malaysia, Merlin, Muslim Aid, Norwegian Church Aid, Norwegian Refugee Council; Oxfam GB, PMU Interlife, Save the Children UK, Tearfund, and World Vision.

Other initiatives supporting Q&A in the Haiti response in different means included: the Sphere Project, People In Aid, ALNAP, Collaborative Learning Projects (Listening Project and Do No Harm), Transparency International, ICVA and InterAction, RedR and Bioforce, Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities (CDAC), Keeping Children Safe.

What did we set out to do?

The overall aim of the deployment was to improve understanding and strengthen practice of humanitarian accountability and quality management as part of the current humanitarian response in Haiti.

In order to achieve this aim the HAP Team divided their activities to meet three key objectives:

<p>Objective 1: To identify and deliver appropriate support and learning activities with interested agencies in order to strengthen their understanding of, and ability to apply, established quality and accountability tools.</p>	<p>Objective 2: To collaborate with relevant stakeholders and advocate for quality and accountability of the wider humanitarian response, including through raising awareness of existing approaches to Q&A and highlighting strengths and gaps observed to date.</p>	<p>Objective 3: To document and share good practice and learning in order to build on the pool of resources available for senior managers and practitioners in Haiti and globally, and for use as part of wider discussions on the ‘state of quality and accountability as part of current humanitarian response.</p>
--	--	--

¹ Principles of Accountability are available at <http://www.hapinternational.org/projects/standard/development/principles-of-accountability.aspx>

Objective 1: The HAP team used the HAP 2007 Standard as a core tool, and will promote understanding and awareness of the Sphere standards as a routine part of their work². They will work closely with the Sphere resource team members to ensure that interoperability between the two tools is highlighted and made accessible.

Agency interest and the specific support activities will be agreed through discussions with HAP member focal people and senior managers, partner agency representatives and representatives of other interested agencies in Haiti. While the HAP team will devote some of its time to supporting HAP members and their partners, HAP is committed to working broadly with non-member agencies as well. It is anticipated that a combination of inter-agency and agency specific activities will be conducted as part of this. Support activities may include:

- a. Guided assessment and implementation: Support agencies to assess and improve their current response through the lens of accountability and quality using the HAP Standard, and in collaboration with Sphere resource workers where appropriate, with a view to identify means of strengthening practice. Agencies may choose to initially focus on one or two benchmarks, in order to focus efforts to achieve clear and measurable results.

Guided assessment and implementation includes working with, and building the capacity of, designated agency staff so that they may continue to play a role in driving improvements in practice. It normally involves consultations, trainings, and project site visits to speak with affected-communities / project beneficiaries. It is envisaged that the HAP Team will continue to work with agencies throughout the deployment to document the impact of improved compliance with the HAP Standard (See Objective 3).

- b. Technical advice: Provide advice to humanitarian agency staff at a range of levels, including at a senior level to ensure leadership in activities, regarding integration of humanitarian accountability into the design, development and delivery of programs, in measuring performance against the HAP Standard, and in strengthening accountability when working with partners.
- c. Briefings and training as relevant: on quality programming, accountability and other specific issues as identified by agencies (for example complaints handling or information dissemination etc), plus support in action planning and implementation. These briefings and trainings may be conducted jointly or with input from Sphere resource staff, and may be conducted for single or small groups of related agencies, or as part of general and open accountability trainings and events.
- d. On the job coaching: As negotiated with agencies, to assist staff at different levels and with responsibilities to design and implement accountability action plans and overcoming obstacles to complying with the HAP Standard. Emphasis will be placed on identifying and supporting focal people within participating agencies who are in a position to continue the work.
- e. Provide support to agencies on protection and response to sexual exploitation and abuse. Such support includes, but is not limited to, participating on an inter-agency platform concerned with prevention and response to sexual exploitation and abuse, providing tailored advice to agencies, conducting trainings on developing agency specific and / or inter-agency complaints mechanisms and trainings on conducting investigations and advocating for inter-agency complaints mechanisms where

² The HAP 2007 Standard in Humanitarian Accountability and Quality Management can be downloaded [here](#).

appropriate. (Technical support and advice to the deployment team on this issue will be provided by the Complaints Handling Unit of HAP as required).

- f. Other specific projects undertaken with agencies as identified during early consultations.

The number of agencies the team can work with in this way is limited. Selection of agencies will be based upon, for example, demonstrated commitment to take forward work on accountability. Activities may be conducted with individual agencies, or depending on interest, in conjunction with other agencies. Brief bi-lateral MoUs between HAP and each agency will be used to clarify expectations and commitments.

Emphasis will also be given to identifying ways in which support can be provided to national actors (in particular national NGOs).

Objective 2: Activities are likely to include:

- a. Advocate for an increase in quality and accountability of the wider humanitarian response through a variety of means as appropriate, and including engagement with a variety of key actors such as donors, UN bodies and the cluster system, national and international non-member NGOs, affected communities, local/central government authorities³, and other key players and stakeholders.
- b. Conduct information and learning events on accountability where relevant and strategic.
- c. Based on information gathered from field visits undertaken as part of agency support activities share perspectives of affected populations regarding their experience of the humanitarian response and ideas for improvements.
- d. Ensure that protection from sexual exploitation and abuse issues are placed and remain on the agenda of key respondents to the earthquake and work towards the establishment of an appropriate and effective means of response.
- e. Where possible and appropriate work collaboratively with other initiatives working towards improved accountability in the Haiti response. This includes, but is not restricted to: the Sphere Project, People In Aid, RedR/BioForce, Transparency International, Communication with Disaster-Affected Communities (CDAC), Keeping Children Safe (KCS) and InterAction/ICVA (as part of the NGO Coordination Support Office) to maximise resources and promote quality and accountability through a coherent approach.
- f. In collaboration with relevant actors, and in particular, the Sphere resource workers, support the establishment of a locally based Accountability and Learning Working Group, and provide technical expertise on accountability to the group.

Objective 3: Activities will include:

- a. Document and disseminate key learning related to quality and accountability as part of the Haiti response, including beneficiary perceptions on Q&A as part of the emergency response and key recommendations for the humanitarian community regarding the strengthening of Q&A.

³ Such as the Department of Civil Protection. This may either be in collaboration with other Q&A initiatives responding in Haiti, or through supporting the work of a HAP Member, with the aim to enable positive dialogue with NGOs on key standards related to quality and accountability and their use.

- b. Document and disseminate case studies, good practice and tools (in collaboration with HAP members) related to accountability for wider sharing within Haiti and the wider humanitarian community globally.
- c. Collect evidence on and document the impact of the application of the HAP Standard – with focus on the agencies who have received direct support from the HAP Team under Objective 1.
- d. Manage the translation of key HAP documents, tools and learning into French and Creole.
- e. Provide regular updates on activities for the HAP website ([HAP in Haiti](#)), newsletter and secretariat (monthly), feed into OneResponse and ALNAP portals, and a summary report at the end of the deployment.

Within the first month of the deployment, the team will draft a detailed workplan, outlining specific activities and indicators that will lead to the achievement of the broad aims of the deployment. This workplan will be submitted to HAP's Programme and Membership Services Coordinator for approval, and will be reported against in detail on a monthly basis. Summary versions of these reports will be posted on the HAP website. The workplan will be reviewed and updated as appropriate through the deployment.

What did we actually do?

(Excerpt from the final report produced by the HAP deployment team)

This deployment was established as a part of an overall quality and accountability presence that incorporated the expertise of both HAP and The Sphere Project, and was hosted by the joint initiative of RedR UK and Bioforce, DRSS. The team worked to seek improvement in how the international community shared information and involved the disaster-affected communities in the response, and supported the establishment of well-functioning complaint mechanisms to hold agencies and individuals accountable for their actions. Achievements of the six-month deployment included the design and implementation of impact-oriented training for national and international agencies, the development of a widely applicable tool to assess the role of camp committees, initiation of a joint complaints mechanism, and establishment of a forum to exchange knowledge and joint initiatives. The team worked closely with HAP members, non-affiliated agencies, the UN, national NGOs and national and international media.

What have we learned?

The After Action Review (AAR) focused on the activities of the HAP deployment, associated activities of participating agencies and covered, from the agencies perspective, the overall positioning of humanitarian accountability in the earthquake response. Further activities in response to the AAR will include:

- This report, summarising the activities and learning from the deployment
- A review of the methodology used during deployments as a result from the suggestions and recommendations from AAR participants.
- Development and sharing of case studies
- Debriefing of HAP members, Head Office via the focal persons.
- A planned post-deployment follow-up is scheduled to take place in the first quarter of 2011; following on from this AAR the follow-up visit is to understand activities

undertaken by agencies as a result of their engagement with the HAP team, to help us understand the longer impact from a HAP deployment.

In order to summarise the strengths of the HAP engagement and activities, agency representatives were asked during the AAR to address a number of questions. Of particular interest for this section of the report were two questions that provide insight into the guidance provided by the HAP team.

For each of the following questions, agency staff members were given the opportunity to examine and share their experiences and provide consolidated feedback. A summary of their answers are recorded below.

Question 1: Based on your experience what are the 2-3 key lessons learnt from your interaction with the HAP team? This can relate to either experience from working with the HAP team, or with particular aspects / benchmarks of the HAP Standard / the current situation in Haiti.

The professionalism and knowledge of the HAP team during agencies' engagement was seen as considerably important, helpful and reassuring, particularly for junior international staff and all national staff. The approach taken (workshops, one-on-one agency interaction, advise and support on JCRMs, Camp Committee Assessments) was highlighted as providing agency staff not only the opportunity to develop and improve upon their current accountability performance but to also built capacity with national staff on areas accountability. Some agencies noted that the team were readily available to answer questions and provide follow-up from the camp assessment process.

Methods employed during the workshops and the availability of case studies and tools in Creole and French shared on the HAP website along with first time introductory training on the HAP Standard and its benchmarks provided agency staff with the necessary guidance on how to deepen their understanding and the organisations' accountability practices.

The opportunity to share experiences with agencies through the ALWG was highlighted as a key aspect of the deployment. It is important to note that a number of agencies' representatives are concerned that the working group will collapse without one agency taking the lead for it to continue.

The HAP team and the rapid camp assessment exercises (including the camp visits) allowed for gaps in current practices and new methods of information sharing to be identified, revising current tools, and opening new avenues for accountability.

Question 2: Did anything get in the way of the interaction and learning being the best it could be?

A majority of agencies felt that in the beginning of the HAP deployment they were not prepared to fully engage and participate in HAP workshops or sent the wrong members of staff (hence little long-term impact). On reflection a number of these agencies stated the ownership of the lack of full engagement came down to their lack of preparation for engaging with the HAP team.

Some agency staff expressed the concern that, partly due to the amount of work and the size of the HAP team, too much time was devoted in the later half of the deployment to working with IOM on the development of the Camp Committee Assessment Tool and support was not readily available to member agencies.

From the participating agencies' perspective

Some of the points raised by agencies on their experience with the HAP team also included:

- Support on developing tools to review practice and plan for future activities related to accountability.
- Able to discuss with HAP team and gain support on more sensitive internal issues, including the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse.
- Gain understanding of what certain benchmarks within the HAP Standard means; in particular what it means to meet benchmarks on information sharing, participation and complaints handling.
- Support with developing an action plan and with participation of other stakeholders.

The After Action Review interviews examined the learning in three main areas: an agency-specific examination of what was learnt, a sectoral assessment of the impact (both immediate and anticipated) of working with the HAP team, and moving forward with accountability and quality structures in the post-HAP deployment period. It is fair to say that over all three areas, interviewees provided examples of where accountability was practiced whilst also recognised areas in need of improvement.

After working with the HAP team, agency staff recognised some *agency-specific* key lessons and accountability areas needing improvement:

- A need for stronger cultural awareness, especially in the provision of goods (NFIs).
- Allow for continual review of community members' needs assessment to better address the changing "must haves" of beneficiaries throughout the phases of the response (keeping in mind the longevity of the response).
- More emphasis to be placed on assessing and building the capacity of local NGO partners to implement projects.
- Needs assessment are important and agencies can use activities that put them in contact with affected-people to seek feedback on agency.
- When working through partners, the means of assessing the implementing partner could be strengthened, as well as the performance being appraised during the length of the agreement.
- The need to provide capacity building for implementing partners to enable them to better respond to the peculiarities of the relief / emergency context especially when related to issues of protection and complaints handling. This is acutely important as the majority of local NGOs have been training in providing for the development needs of the population.
- Agencies must not forget that there are often un-highlighted opportunities to work with the affected population, in particular many of the IDPs are highly skilled and can be used as volunteers (many agencies are involved in case for work programmes).
- Opportunities sometimes present themselves, allowing agencies to use other means of seeking input, for example giving greater emphasis on observation.
- Some commonly used terms, such as 'participation', have not been clearly defined by agencies. As a result, staff have different understandings of what is expected by senior managements (for example is talking to beneficiaries sufficient or ideally does the agency want staff to aim for more meaningful engagement).

- Identified gaps in staff awareness of internal policies and systems. While these may be known by senior managers they have not always been passed ‘down the line’.

There was overall agreement that the HAP team provided important guidance for agencies in strengthening accountability and quality of programming, particularly in areas of information sharing and helping agencies develop more realistic analyses of their expectations and responses in meeting the changing contextual arrangements within an urban setting.

Two further suggestions were brought up by agencies’ representatives for the HAP team to include in future deployments:

- Develop and share more case studies and tools (including other inter-active methodologies) prior to the deployment (i.e. having these on hand from the case studies bank) that can build staff capacity to assess their commitments, resources and human resources in the delivery of quality programmes.
- Focus on developing a training of trainers (ToT) for local staff (national and international) to provide for capacity building on accountability within agencies as well as free time for the small HAP team to expand the scope of their influence and free time to other responsibilities and work commitments beyond the immediate workshops and trainings.
- The ongoing challenge of maintaining a balance between agencies’ requirements to share information (who we are? what we do?) and responding to the “needs of the population”.

During the interviews, participants were asked three further questions to help the facilitator and the HAP team gain a better understanding of where the HAP deployment could have been better. Some answers to each of these questions are provided in the table below.

<i>Question 3: Thinking back over your involvement with the HAP team what other types of support or alternative activities would have been useful?</i>
Agencies felt the HAP team was restricted in time given the tasks and the size of the response. There was a clear demand for even more in-depth capacity building and workshops directly on developing humanitarian accountability frameworks and action plans.
Collecting data from affected populations and agency staff, as part of the camp visits, utilise more games and role playing exercises.
Engagement with senior country management to gain their “buy-in” and commitment should be increased.
Engagement with more national staff by utilising a system of ToT, which would build more local capacity and assist agencies in leaving behind knowledge of accountability with their national staff and partners.

Question 4: Interviewees to be encouraged to openly discuss their perceptions of accountability in Haiti from the start of the disaster response and think about where they are now.

- a) *What accountability processes have been put in place?*
- b) *What might get in the way of achieving accountability targets?*
- c) *How can a follow-up visit from HAP assist in meeting the challenges?*

Extremely useful in aiding the management of current emergency work.

All agencies remarked that with a better institutional knowledge of the HAP 2007 Standard they could prioritise accountability to beneficiaries and justify their actions throughout the management structure (if given the support of Country Directors or immediate line managers).

Agencies expressed the usefulness of the HAP Standard for management and programme site activities in planning their communication tools at camp and community locations, particular reference was made to benchmarks 2, 3 and 5 by the majority of interviewees.

National staff from a number of agencies, interviewed during the AAR, indicated their appreciation of the various workshops offered to them by the HAP team and how they have continued to think about accountability as a component of their daily activities.

One agency noted that staff attitudes towards complaints handling and programme quality had been tightened as a result of working with the HAP Standard and the HAP team during the beginning phase of the deployment.

Immediate and anticipated impacts

Focusing on the impacts of the HAP deployment, agencies were asked to divide their responses into two key areas, immediate impacts at the organisational and programme levels, and impacts they anticipate to implement or see as a result of working with the HAP team.

Immediate Impacts

Workshops were seen as an effective training / refresher for national staff – allowing a review of practice and enabled staff to respond to the crisis in a more accountability manner.

Being able to identify key issues of (possible) concern when working with the population

Provided case studies and tools on various options with respect to sharing information with intended beneficiaries

Staff gained a sense of satisfaction with being able to gauge their accountability practices – particularly international staff were motivated as they felt their good practice was being acknowledged during the Rapid Assessment Exercises undertaken with the HAP team.

Identification of gaps and prioritisation of areas for improvement with participation of staff during the Rapid Assessment Exercises

A shared understanding of HAP across the country offices on par with head office – gained understanding at both management and programme level, and staff are now aware of their own agency’s commitment (or in some cases, lack thereof) to HAP.

Opened up a space for accountability to beneficiaries.

Anticipated Impacts

Resources, time, and staff training on humanitarian accountability issues to be in future Terms of Reference, budgets, and donor funding proposals. This will need senior management commitment.

Improvement in the quality of programming

Inter-agency shared learning and a pooling of accountability and quality management resources as long as the ALWG continues without the presence of the HAP team

Improvement in staff capacity on accountability and the HAP Standard

Shift in M&E and learning approaches (including modes of operating, types of questions to be included in M&E activities and tools) taking into account the HAP Standard. More participatory and qualitative aspect will be strengthened.

Formalisation of complaints and response mechanisms, achieving the requirements of benchmark 5 of the HAP Standard

Improvement to beneficiary participation, and integration of information sharing and complaints handling into management system.

Will seek greater engagement with accountability focal person at country level.

Constraints of time, budgets for capacity building and limited senior management support

Increased peer to peer learning particularly on humanitarian accountability frameworks, information sharing and complaints through the ALWG.

Impact of the HAP deployment on the agency

In order to understand future plans and provide a clear view of the impact of the HAP team, key informants were asked to provide answers to one final question. This final question sought to gain specific examples of the impact of the HAP team on agencies as they develop their future programmes.

Question 5: What specific issues emerged during your engagement with the HAP team at programme and country-office levels?

Perhaps as a result of the successful funding appeals for the Haiti response, agencies have decided to devote financial and personnel support to their in-country programmes, and the support provided by HAP provided capacity building and training as well as advice and support.

The majority of agencies remain focused on complaints and response mechanisms as the key aspect of accountability to their beneficiaries. However, resulting from the engagement with the HAP team, a number of agencies discussed the need to share more detailed information with the beneficiaries and have gained particular knowledge with regards to organising and working with camp committees.

Some agencies felt their Head Office and country office managers did not prioritise the HAP deployment and as a result they under-estimated the level of work needed and organisational impact that accountability would have on the country and programme sites. At times, designated staff felt their competencies did not adequately meet the needs of the role they were asked to fulfil.

As the HAP deployment was focused on the emergency aspect of the crisis, it was difficult for designated staff members to have their colleagues devote the appropriate time.

Outcomes & unexpected results

In terms of outcomes of the after action review, the summary findings are simply put, that the HAP team provided a strong support service to those agencies participating in the various workshops, camp visits, and other activities held in and around Port au Prince. There were a number of areas, in which designated focal points of agencies saw as possible opportunities for the HAP team to engage with national staff and a broader agency base although these were beyond the remit of the terms of reference for the deployment or there was not enough time to pursue all opportunities.

Also HAP, through the member agencies, ought to incorporate into all future deployments an opportunity to second accountability staff to the deployment. During this deployment, as in the Dadaab and Sri Lanka deployments, the benefit for the HAP team (administration task-sharing, gaining local knowledge, having an experienced aid worker on hand to provide advice and context information, etc) and the agency staff that have participated in the secondment have also highlighted the benefits. Most importantly, the secondment adds to the capacity of the particular agency involved but also at the end of the deployment, HAP leaves an in-country well trained staff member to share her/his experiences in workshop facilitation, training and, more broadly, a strong understanding of the HAP Standard to share with peers.

This leads to the final point of this section, one area in which HAP needs to think more strategically, is how best to encourage agencies to establish a sustainable peer support group (be it an ALWG or similar body). Although agencies may not recognise it at the beginning of a HAP deployment, experience shows they will call for it at the end, as has been the case for the past 5 deployments. An ALWG could be built up during the deployment so that prior to leaving the country, the team are assured that the joint lessons learnt and the growing commitment to accountability and quality management is not lost as designated staff return to their daily work.

For future deployments of the HAP Team

1. Varied means of inter-agency learning and the sharing of practice on accountability and quality management should be identified to meet agency staff needs at country-level.
2. HAP should consider, whenever appropriate, to undertake a ToT (Training of Trainers) as a component of the deployment; this was seen as an opportunity lost by many of the agencies during the Haiti deployment.

3. Attendance by agencies to peer to peer support groups, such as the ALWG, was seen as vital opportunities to learn from each other. It was suggested by a number of agencies that **mid-level managers and operational staff ought to attend**.
 4. The HAP team have to be more aware of the level of staff turnover and plan their workshops appropriately. Agencies stated that the HAP team ought to be clear with respect to the target groups, i.e. national staff or longer-term international staff.
 5. Accountability officers highlighted the need for the HAP team to provide a **follow-up for workshop participants** to ask further questions after they have attempted to implement learning from the Workshops.
 6. Local language versions of the HAP Standard are valuable, but take significant time to produce. Their production should be initiated as soon as possible during the preparation for a HAP deployment.
 7. HAP should continue to work with seconded staff from member (and other) agencies, although those seconded **must** hold adequate knowledge of accountability. **Many agencies saw this as an excellent opportunity for staff to gain “expert” knowledge on accountability.**
 8. During preparation for a deployment, the HAP Team and focal points should emphasis increased communication between themselves and the country offices to ensure adequate support for the agency staff who will participate in activities.
 9. Agencies who work through implementing partners should give special attention to preparation for interaction between their partner organisation and the HAP team.
 10. HAP deployments should continue to foster the formation of partnerships between agencies (through ALWGs or other means of Peer Support) responding to the humanitarian situation at hand.
 11. ToRs for the HAP deployment should be finalised 2 weeks **after** the beginning of the deployment, to allow for adjustments based on understanding gained regarding the current context after arrival.
 12. Participating agencies should recognise that collaboration with the HAP team may require allocation of additional staff time and resources, but they can expect significant benefits to their organisation and mission on several levels.
 13. The AAR was a high value activity for participating agencies and should continue to be conducted at the end of HAP team deployments.
 14. The AAR should continue to be facilitated by someone familiar with the deployment activities, but separate from the HAP roving team staff.
 15. Wide invitation to participate in the AAR and the whole deployment should be continued.
-