

## **Evaluation of HAP-International**

### **Terms of Reference**

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.

#### **1. Background**

HAP's establishment in 2003 marked the culmination of the action research programme of the Humanitarian Accountability Project (2001-2003); which in turn was the successor of the Humanitarian Ombudsman Project (1998-2000). While some 22 agencies were formally involved in the decision to set up the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership, only 8 opted to join as full members by the time of the first HAP International General Assembly in December 2003. This disappointing start has arguably characterised much of HAP's subsequent history, with slower than expected growth against key indicators (such as membership recruitment and certification), combined with mixed levels of engagement from members in critical processes (such as developing the HAP Standard).

From 2004 to 2006, HAP's development was based upon a rolling two-year workplan and budget, linked to the objectives set out in the HAP Statutes of Association. During this period HAP also adopted its "New Emergencies Policy" (NEP), "Accreditation: the Way Forward" and a formal funding strategy. As a condition of DFID's three-year grant (2005-2008), HAP developed a three-year strategic plan, covering the period 2007-2009, which was adopted by the Board of HAP International in October 2006. The Secretariat developed the plan with assistance from a consultant, and CEO's and contact persons from all member agencies and donors were consulted in its preparation. The Plan contains a situational analysis, a list of key drivers for change, a set of strategic success indicators, a set of 15 work streams ("approaches") required for achieving the strategic goals, a business model and a log-frame.

Since it was first set up, HAP has been part of an informal group of "quality and accountability initiatives", which now includes People in Aid, Sphere, ALNAP, Synergie Qualité, Emergency Capacity Building Project, the Listening Project and Groupe URD. Together, the "Q & A Initiatives" have sought to present themselves as "complementary", and through regular meetings, have attempted to achieve greater coordination through collaboration in some areas and "inter-operability" of products and services in a few bilateral cases. However, criticisms are still frequently voiced about the "proliferation" of codes, standards and inter-agency initiatives, and in reality the Q & A Initiatives compete with each other for funding, profile and engagement.

However, in April 2007, the Building Safer Organisations (BSO) project transferred from ICVA to HAP. For HAP, the BSO project provided a ready means for

strengthening its complaints and investigation capacity in line with HAP's 2007-2009 strategic plan. For BSO, the main advantage was to connect its complaints investigations capacity with HAP's more comprehensive humanitarian accountability and quality assurance system, where members' commitments to prevent and respond to sexual exploitation and abuse could be monitored and verified through HAP's certification process. A comprehensive plan for harmonising the HAP and BSO activities was completed through the 2008-2009 Workplan approved by the HAP Board in October 2007.

In preparing for the development of the 2010-2012 Strategic Plan, the HAP Secretariat wishes to contract an experienced consultant to undertake an evaluation as highlighted below. It is expected that a strategic planning consultant will be contracted before the end of the evaluation consultancy, so that the two processes are dovetailed.

## **2. Purpose of the evaluation**

1. To document HAP's progress against HAP International's mission and vision, its key policies (NEP, Accreditation and Funding), and the strategic targets set out in the 2007-2009 strategic plan.
2. To review and assess the relevance and appropriateness of the 2007-2009 strategic plan to HAP's mission, and the specific objectives of the BSO project.
3. To recommend changes of strategy and emphasis that should be incorporated into the HAP 2010-2012 strategic plan.

## **3. Scope**

The consultant will raise and address all relevant issues that may emerge during the evaluation, including the key areas highlighted below.

### Achievements to date

Consider progress achieved in HAP's mission and vision and the measures of success set out in the 2007-2009 strategic plan:

- What results have been achieved by HAP since its establishment in 2003?
- What progress has been achieved against the measures of success for 2009 set out in the 2007-2009 strategic plan?
- If implementation diverted significantly from relevant plans, what were these variations, why did they occur, and what have been the consequences?
- Review and summarise the available evidence of the impact on the quality and accountability of humanitarian action resulting from HAP's work, including the BSO project since the merger.
- How has the merger between HAP and BSO affected the objectives of both initiatives?
- How effective has HAP (and BSO) been in positioning and coordinating with the "Quality and Accountability Initiatives"?

### Relevance

Assess the relevance of the 2007-2009 strategic plan and HAP's rolling workplans to the achievement of HAP's mission and vision:

- To what extent are the strategic goals and approaches in the 2007-2009 plan and key policies, relevant to the mission of HAP in 2010?
- To what extent are the BSO activities relevant to its goals and to the goals of HAP?
- To what extent have the approaches identified in key policies, the 2007-2009 strategic plan and HAP's rolling workplans addressed the conditions, needs and interests of key stakeholders and enabled HAP to pursue its mission?

- Were the NEP, Accreditation and fundraising strategies relevant and realistic?
- Was the situational and “SWOT” analysis in the strategic plan sound? Is it still relevant?
- Were the drivers for change identified in the strategic plan relevant and realistic?
- Were the “approaches” set out in the strategic plan relevant and realistic?
- Were the headline targets and measures of success set out in the strategic plan relevant and realistic?
- How has HAP modified its programme to reflect changes in the context or in the needs of its key stakeholders?
- How has HAP sought to define and develop its relations with the “Quality and Accountability Initiatives”?

#### Appropriateness

Consider how HAP’s approaches and activities serve its mission, and how HAP manages them:

- How effective were the different approaches in the key policies (NEP, Accreditation and Funding), the 2007-2009 strategic plan and HAP’s rolling workplans in pursuing the mission and vision of HAP?
- Did HAP, including the BSO project, have the necessary resources and capacity to undertake the activities required to achieve its strategic goals?
- Are HAP’s key stakeholders satisfied with the approaches and activities used to date in achieving its mission?
- Did the HAP-BSO merger significantly affect the ability of both initiatives to achieve their respective objectives?
- Has HAP’s approach to the “Q & A Initiatives” been appropriate?

#### Recommendations

Bearing in mind that the evaluation will partially overlap with the preparation of the 2010-2012 strategic plan and with the HAP Standard Review Process, recommend:

- Changes in the situational and “SWOT” analysis to be considered in preparing the 2010-2012 strategic plan.
- Changes in strategy for scaling up and deepening impact on the quality and accountability of humanitarian action.
- Changes in managing relations with key stakeholders, including disaster survivors, humanitarian agencies, other aid and development agencies, the “Q & A” sector and donors.
- Changes in organisation and functionality of HAP’s Secretariat and governance.
- Changes in revenue strategy.

#### **4. Activities/Methods**

A combination of primary data collection and secondary data review is expected during the evaluation. Primary data will be collected through a variety of methods, including key informant interviews, focus group discussions and e-mail/phone survey with representatives of key stakeholder groups. Visits to member and non-member agencies at two different locations are budgeted for this work.

It is expected that the consultant will undertake the following tasks:

1. Familiarisation with the HAP Statutes of Association, 2007-2009 Strategic Plan and relevant Secretariat workplans, budgets and reports.
2. Onsite interviews with HAP staff
3. Interviews with key stakeholders:

- a. Chair of the Board and Board members
  - b. Sample of member agency CEOs and staff
  - c. Non-member agencies and other stakeholders
  - d. Donors
  - e. Representatives of the Q & A Initiatives
4. Cross-referencing of field data and seeking further clarification
  5. Draft report
  6. Review draft report
  7. Finalise report

To consult over critical questions, present preliminary findings and collect further data for the evaluation; the consultant will facilitate a ½ day session at the HAP General Assembly in Geneva, 5-6 May 2009.

### **5. Management**

The evaluator will formally report to the Chair of HAP-International (Andreas Kamm), while day-to-day support, facilitation and coordination will be provided by the HAP Secretariat. In the event of any major disagreement over the content of the evaluation, the Chair will endeavour to find a consensus, and, if necessary, ensure that any strategically critical dissenting perspectives are acknowledged in the final report.

### **6. Expected outputs and timeframe**

It is estimated that the consultancy will be completed within 45 working days. The consultant will produce the following by the stated deadlines:

1. Evaluation framework, including methodology and a draft outline of the report (mid April 2009, to be confirmed)
2. List of critical questions and preliminary findings for presentation to the General Assembly in May 2009
3. A short update half way through the process to keep the Secretariat informed of progress (date to be confirmed)
4. Draft report for review by the Secretariat, two Board members and the Chair (by early June, to be confirmed)
5. A final evaluation report with an executive summary within 2 weeks of submitting the draft for comments to HAP. The main report should not exceed 30 pages (excluding relevant material in the appendices). It will include:
  - Findings regarding achievements and the relevance, appropriateness and effectiveness of HAP approaches in achieving its mission.
  - Specific recommendations to inform the 2010-2012 strategic plan.