

# **DfID FINANCED AND UNOCHA COMMISSIONED**

## ***EXTERNAL BASELINE EVALUATION OF THE BURUNDI GOOD HUMANITARIAN DONORSHIP PILOT***

*FINAL REPORT*

*29 May 2004*

*By Salvator Bijojote, Consultant  
And  
Christian Bugnion, Team Leader, Director of Subur Consulting S.L.*

Mission dates: 24 March 2004 to 2 April 2004  
On behalf of UNOCHA: Contract PS-6385 of 17.03.2004

**The contents of the report only reflect the authors' opinions and not necessarily those of the funding and commissioning agencies.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page number
<b>Foreword and report guide</b>	3
<b>Acronyms and abbreviations</b>	4
<b>1. Executive summary</b>	5
<b>2. Sequential Recommendations Summary</b>	11
<b>3. Methodology</b>	14
<b>4. Main Findings</b>	
<u>A)</u> Critical issues in the context	14
<u>B)</u> Planning and prioritisation	15
<u>C)</u> Design of the response based on identified needs	18
<u>D)</u> Donors response and coverage	24
<u>E)</u> Reflections on the GHD process	26
<u>F)</u> Comments and conclusions	27
<u>G)</u> CAP/CHAP SWOT analysis	28
<b>4. List of interviews</b>	30
<b>5. TOR</b>	31
<b>6. Annex 1 – Funding and FTS information</b>	
<b>7. Annex 2 – Questionnaires and cover letter</b>	

## FOREWORD AND REPORT GUIDE

The evaluation report contains three different letter styles which reflect different purposes.

The *italic font* is used for placing some emphasis on the contents.

**The bold font** is normally used for what the evaluation team views as important statements or recommendations.

***The bold italic font*** is used to reflect critical recommendations on key issues which should be given overall priority.

The evaluation report is divided into three different parts: an Executive Summary section (ES), a Sequential Recommendations Summary section (SRS), and a Main Findings section (MF).

For ease of reading and consistency's sake, the report indicates in parenthesis the correlation with the other two sections. For example, an indication (SRS I.1., MF 17.A, 18) in the Executive Summary refers to the corresponding contents of point I.1. of the Sequential Recommendations Summary, and to points 17.A and 18 of the Main Findings.

The evaluation team is thankful for the support received both from UNOCHA at field and Headquarters level as well as from DfID London for facilitating the evaluation through constructive discussions and meetings.

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<b>CA :</b>	Consolidated Appeal (document)
<b>CAP :</b>	Consolidated Appeal Process
<b>CHAP :</b>	Common Humanitarian Action Plan
<b>CRS :</b>	Catholic Relief Services
<b>DfID :</b>	Department for International Development
<b>ECHO :</b>	European Commission Humanitarian Aid Office
<b>FTS :</b>	Financial Tracking System
<b>GHD :</b>	Good Humanitarian Donorship
<b>GoB :</b>	Government of Burundi
<b>HC :</b>	Humanitarian Coordinator
<b>HQ :</b>	Headquarters
<b>HFWG :</b>	Humanitarian Financing Working Group
<b>IASC :</b>	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
<b>ICRC :</b>	International Committee of the Red Cross
<b>IDP :</b>	Internally Displaced Person
<b>IHL :</b>	International Humanitarian Law
<b>INGO :</b>	International Non-Governmental Organisation
<b>MDRP :</b>	Multi-Country Demobilisation and Reintegration Programme
<b>NGO :</b>	Non-Governmental Organisation
<b>OCHA :</b>	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
<b>PCM :</b>	Project Cycle Management
<b>PRSP :</b>	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
<b>Res. Rep.:</b>	Resident Representative
<b>RRA :</b>	Rapid Rural Appraisal
<b>SCF :</b>	Save the Children Fund
<b>SPP :</b>	Strategic Planning Process
<b>TFC :</b>	Therapeutic Feeding Centre
<b>TOR :</b>	Terms of Reference
<b>UN :</b>	United Nations
<b>UNDAF :</b>	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
<b>UNDP :</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>VAM :</b>	Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping
<b>WFP :</b>	World Food Programme

## ***Executive summary***

1. The Burundi Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) pilot is still in its infancy and there has been little leadership from the lead donor in-country to make it become a reality over and beyond simple discussions about the GHD (SRS I.1, MF 18). Within UNOCHA there is a clear commitment to facilitate GHD by incorporating the general principles endorsed by donors in the on-going revision of the 2004 CAP and CHAP.
2. There is a tendency to over simplify the objectives of the GHD by considering it an on-going process feeding on its own momentum. The GHD is a mix of a) objectives and definitions, b) general principles and c) good practices in donor financing, management and accountability. The latter is divided into three sections, the first relating to funding, the second regarding the promotion of standards and enhancing implementation and the third about learning and accountability. **The GHD has a wider audience than donors and involves other humanitarian stakeholders as well.** (SRS I.7, II.2, III.1, MF 17.C, 18). As such, its process must be streamlined and clarity about which concrete objectives can be attained in the set time frame should be established unambiguously in Burundi, especially in order to avoid perception of the GHD having potentially a “hidden agenda” detrimental to some of the stakeholders<sup>1</sup>.
3. Any process built on consensus about good practices will take time before it is actually fully implemented by all stakeholders.
  - **As such a longer time frame detailing the step by step process should be prepared over a conservative period, possibly extending over at least the next five years, with yearly objectives which can be quantified and qualified.** (SRS I.2, I.3, MF 17.B)

A two to three year time frame to implement changes appears much too short, and the evaluation team clearly suspects that overall objectives may not be fully reached in anything but a medium to long time period.

- ***The leadership for such a gradual process should involve adequate inputs and resources from DfID to prepare a realistic plan detailing the responsibilities of each stakeholder level in order to meet the desired results.*** (SRS I.2, I.3, I.5, MF 21)

Yearly results should be established by assessing adequately realistic objectives which can be met given the context rather than optimistic

---

<sup>1</sup> The possibility of donor’s “hidden agenda” under the GHD concept has been mentioned by two NGOs and one UN agency. More generally, however, both NGOs and UN agencies have mentioned the lack of “clear objectives” about the GHD.

estimates which may reflect more desired conceptual results than a field based appraisal of anticipated results. This requires proactive planning on behalf of the lead donor and close partnership with implementing partners.

- ***A first step for the upcoming GHD evaluation could be, after having clarified both objectives and means of implementation of each stakeholder level, to establish amongst the donor community the blueprint of funding systems in Burundi prior to initiating the application of part (or all) of the GDH endorsements made, in order to track changes in time with a starting point clearly defined. (SRS I.2, I.6, MF 16, 21)***

4. **There is an important gap between perceptions at headquarters level and at field level for any category of stakeholders** regarding humanitarian aid (donors, UN agencies, NGOs, etc.)<sup>2</sup>. At HQ level Burundi is only one of the many places in the world where humanitarian assistance is being provided amongst recipient countries. Therefore it is useful to attempt to rationalise the funding through common denominators which allow donors to make a comparison between different situations and countries. At the other end of the spectrum the international community in Burundi (and foremost the NGOs) is essentially concerned about the humanitarian assistance delivered in-country, and so is only partly convinced (if at all) of the need to have comparison instruments. The context in Burundi would be their foremost argument to avoid comparing “apples and oranges” as each complex emergency feeds on a very specific situation which cannot be generalized or applied to other countries. Therefore to a certain extent each complex emergency is unique given the sum of factors which contribute to shape it and which determine where, when and how humanitarian assistance can be provided.

If the stakes are the establishment of common denominators to evaluate humanitarian assistance and apply GHD concepts, then

- a group of ***selected stakeholders representing all three levels (donor, UN and NGO) should be identified, having endorsed the approach both at HQ and field level*** to pilot in two countries such an approach. (SRS I.4, III.2, MF 16)

However it should be noted that previous attempts to rationalize evaluation of humanitarian assistance have often been met with strong

---

<sup>2</sup> Differences between field and HQ perceptions have been confirmed by three donors and two UN agencies. Gaps between donor’s field offices and their respective HQ were also reported by several NGOs.

opposition<sup>3</sup> particularly by the NGO community, in order to avoid what they perceive as excessive standardisation.

5. The complexity of the baseline evaluation rests on the fact that all stakeholders do not clearly understand the CAP/CHAP process and CA document or the GHD<sup>4</sup>. UNOCHA has gone through extensive efforts to clarify and improve the CAP/CHAP and CA *inter alia* through a number of commissioned reviews and evaluations<sup>5</sup>, as well as internal work (CAP launch reviews, technical guidelines<sup>6</sup>), and collaborative efforts (IASC, HFWG, etc.)<sup>7</sup>.
  - **But both the CAP/CHAP and the GHD lack a clear marketing strategy for all stakeholders and there are still different perceptions and understanding amongst stakeholders in Burundi.** (SRS I.1, I.7, II.1, II.2, MF 4)

Indeed this evaluation echoes and endorses many of the points raised in the previous reviews and evaluations on the need to clearly identify the projected outcomes and ensure ownership of the process at all levels. Of particular concern is the need to dissociate the CAP as an inclusive process from the CA fund raising document, the latter being clearly of little interest for most NGOs (none of the NGOs interviewed uses the CAP for fund raising purposes). Doubts remain on the objectives, purposes and use of the CAP/CHAP which is still perceived as an ambiguous process.

6. In Burundi there is no joint planning amongst donors, a common humanitarian strategy or a common position on humanitarian aid. There are only commonly shared concerns and ad hoc meetings to deal with and seek a solution to specific problems as they arise.
  - **DfID could therefore, through networking with the other donors in Burundi, use this opportunity to develop a common approach to humanitarian aid, which would certainly make a stronger case for aid actors at field level and enhance the impact of aid.** (SRS I.7, MF 1)

---

<sup>3</sup> See for example the report of the working group on “quality management tools” in the humanitarian sector, prepared for the ECHO-Partners annual conference in October 2002, or the two ECHO studies on indicators to evaluate humanitarian aid (1998).

<sup>4</sup> A widespread comment amongst NGOs is the lack of clear GHD objectives, also echoed by two UN agencies. Additionally doubts about GHD implementation feasibility in Burundi was voiced by three donors and two UN agencies. The “shopping list” label to describe the CAP was used by two donors, two NGOs and one UN agency.

<sup>5</sup> Such as “A Review of the CAP”, D. Bassiouni, November 2001, “An External Review of the CAP”, T. Porter, April 2002, “Burundi : evaluation of NGO participation in the UN CAP”, September 2002.

<sup>6</sup> “External Review of the CAP Launch”, W. Riches, September 2003, “Technical Guidelines for the CAP”, OCHA, August 2003.

<sup>7</sup> In particular the IASC’s HFWG Study Four : Changes in Humanitarian Financing : Implications for the United Nations, Randolph Kent, Mark Dalton *et al.*, 11 October 2003.

7. If the overarching objective of both CAP and GHD is to ensure good performance of humanitarian assistance and a positive impact of humanitarian aid, the evaluation team recommends moving away from the current “classical” pattern of response to humanitarian aid which has been followed over the past eleven years, essentially based on some degree of sectoral coordination of activities, which become somehow aggregated into an overall analysis and coordination of the humanitarian response, but is neither able to provide a comprehensive picture of the overall humanitarian situation, its trends and needs, nor a geographically disaggregated representation of humanitarian aid in Burundi, nor a vision of humanitarianism in Burundi.

- ***Instead this could be an opportunity to develop a different intervention model and pilot an integrated approach targeted in chosen socio-economic communities geographically defined, in which the entirety of identified humanitarian aid needs will need to be covered, its implementation monitored and its results evaluated (SRS I.8.i, ii, iii, iv, v, II.4, III.2, MF 12)***

This holistic approach implies that beneficiary typology or sector specific needs are not the main concern, but that it is the collective efforts of all humanitarian actors in specific communities (including beneficiary participation in designing the response to the identified needs) which will guide the process. Given the wide range of activities covered by humanitarian assistance,

- ***it is recommended that such an approach be undertaken on a small scale in three “types” of communities : one where acute emergency needs exist (e.g. life saving and life preserving), one where chronic emergency needs exist (e.g. allowing for forward planning), but not excluding recovery or transitional activities, and one where needs are mostly identified as post-conflict in which the security situation allows for more durable solutions to be undertaken (and in close collaboration with development agents working in the same community). (SRS I.8.i, II.4, III.2, MF 12)***
- ***The underlying assumption for the model is the establishment of a normative framework which spells out humanitarian aid typology and intervention priorities according to context specific needs based on comprehensive assessments. (SRS I.8.iii, iv, II.3, III.1, MF 8)***
- ***A formal Case Study should be undertaken in each of the targeted communities prior to the start of the new approach in order to***

***provide the necessary evidence for designing the intervention. (SRS I.8.ii, II.6, MF 12)***

8. Coordination is of paramount importance to ensure a comprehensive coverage of identified needs.

➤ **Coordination goes beyond information sharing and must be undertaken in a decentralized and localized manner at field level to ensure synergies and avoid gaps. (SRS II.7, MF 12)**

Coordination in Bujumbura feeds, essentially, the outside information flow. It should strengthen the internal information flow towards the provinces where humanitarian aid is being provided. Constructive efforts have already been undertaken with this objective and should continue to be supported and encouraged, for example, by establishing OCHA provincial field offices and ensuring provincial coordination meetings which include the authorities.

9. Protection has been for the past ten years and remains a major issue in Burundi, which has been inadequately answered, supported and promoted by the international community. The primary objectives identified by the UN Security Council *Aide Mémoire for the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict* (S/PRST/2002/6 December 2003 draft), have known limited success, if any, in the context of Burundi, particularly in regards to the first two objectives of “Security for IDPS and host communities” and that of “Safe and unimpeded access to vulnerable populations”. Protection in Burundi today is limited to awareness raising, advocacy and training in human rights, but there is no clear programme to diminish the number of exactions and acts of violence committed against the civilian population by all parties in the conflict nor any foreseeable chance of ***providing effective protection*** over the short term. Perhaps the change in government may allow for a wider sensitivity in this field, provided it is supported by adequate pressures from the international community. There remains much to be done in protection although there appears to be limited willingness by humanitarian actors at all levels to engage in such a difficult and risk-prone activity. (SRS I.9, MF 2)

10. Institutional memory tends to be weak within Burundi, as staff turn-over is particularly high, including within UNOCHA<sup>8</sup>. More than half of the interviewees had been in Burundi for less than one year.

➤ **Staff commitment to a minimum two year posting should be required for work in Burundi from all humanitarian actors. Human resource management of each humanitarian actor should ensure adequate overlap between departing and arriving staff, as well as timely availability of an adequate staff number. (SRS II.9)**

---

<sup>8</sup> One NGO mentioned a critical two month OCHA gap in September 2003 due to understaffing.

11. Financial analysis of the funding flows under the CA has been discarded by the evaluation team as being untrustworthy given inadequate reporting to the FTS.

- **A systematic check with donors in Burundi has shown that funding figures are inadequately reported to the FTS.**<sup>9</sup> (SRS I.10, MF 14, 15)

Furthermore the different fiscal years (January-December for ECHO, October-September for OFDA, April-March for DfID) certainly affect the amount of contributions reported according to the date on which the analysis is undertaken, given unspent funds at year's end.

12. Given the number of local stakeholders in Burundi (more than sixty donors, the UN and NGOs), a questionnaire survey was undertaken by e-mail to collect evidence and allow each stakeholder to feed into the evaluation in a structured manner. This methodology was used to avoid perception bias (giving voice not only to the most outspoken) and ensure representative sampling of all three stakeholder levels (namely donors, the UN and NGOs). **The approach was endorsed by the UN HC in Burundi.** However to date only one NGO and one UN agency sent their reply. Therefore at the lead donor's request the questionnaire survey forms are included as an annex but they have not been successful in obtaining a proper response from the targeted international community, leaving some evaluation questions unanswered.

13. The Government of Burundi and the local NGOs<sup>10</sup> were not interviewed in this evaluation for two reasons: first, because stakeholders at the three levels indicate little interest from the GoB for humanitarian assistance, given that it reportedly appears to be seen as funds which escape government control; second, because local NGOs receive little direct funding from donors who channel most external funding through INGOs and UN agencies.

---

<sup>9</sup> Please refer to the donor/FTS comparison table as of 28 March 2004 included as annex for details.

<sup>10</sup> With one exception : AFJB Bujumbura.

*Burundi GHD Pilot external baseline evaluation – Subur Consulting S.L.*  
**Sequential Recommendations Summary**

- I. Priority actions for DfID as lead donor
- II. Priority actions for OCHA as overall humanitarian assistance coordinating office for the UN system
- III. Priority actions for the International Community in Burundi

**I. Priority actions for DfID as lead donor**

1. Clarify the objectives and purpose of the GHD, by increasing information dissemination in-country and develop a formal GHD forum. (ES 1, 2,5)
2. Establish a gradual time-frame over an approximate five year plan for GHD implementation, possibly under a programming format with its corresponding log-frame and hierarchy of objectives. (ES 3)
3. Ensure adequate yearly benchmarks to monitor its evolution, based on results of field appraisal from the Burundi Office. (ES 3)
4. In order to fill the gap between humanitarian actors' field and HQ perceptions, identify willing and committed "champions" at each stakeholder level to pilot in two countries (Burundi and DRC) a HQ-field streamlined and coordinated approach to humanitarian aid. (ES 4, SRS II.1)
5. Immediately deploy an additional person to the Burundi office in charge of at least establishing and monitoring the previous points 1 through 4, but also support actively points 6 to 10. (ES 3)
6. Undertake a study on donor funding motivation involving both HQ and field offices as well as triangulate with funding recipients and FTS information. (ES 3)
7. Seek to obtain a common definition and understanding of humanitarian aid among donors in Burundi and obtain a common donor position to strengthen the humanitarian agenda. (ES 6)
8. Commit to funding alternative approaches to humanitarian response, namely by:
  - i) recognising and being willing to fund the alternative model of humanitarian response based on a holistic needs coverage in selected targeted communities; (ES 7, SRS II.4)
  - ii) funding or commissioning a formal anthropological, social and economic case study in each type of community targeted to pilot a new approach to humanitarian response; (ES 7, SRS II.6)

- iii) actively supporting the UN HC and UNOCHA financially and politically and recognising the necessity for the UN system to be a standard-bearer for humanitarian assistance; (SRS II.3)
- iv) recognising the need for a normative framework for humanitarian assistance, and support its establishment; (ES 7, SRS II.3)
- v) funding and/or supporting the establishment of an independent multi-disciplinary assessment team tasked with country-wide needs assessment, formulation of humanitarian response, and monitoring of results, placed in the UN OCHA office and under OCHA coordination. (ES 7, II.5, III.1)

In addition and in collaboration with other donors, DfID could also:

- 9. Send an unambiguous message to the GoB regarding protection and humanitarian aid, and consider in particular aid conditionality in regards to compliance to IHL and human rights, especially regarding treatment of civilian population by armed forces; (ES 9)
- 10. Request donor field offices to monitor monthly the FTS information and report any difference to their HQ for onward transmission to UNOCHA FTS in order to improve the reporting process and ensure timely and accurate funding information. (ES 11)

## **II. Priority actions for OCHA as overall humanitarian aid coordinating office for the UN system**

- 1. Clarify and determine officially for all stakeholders purpose and objectives of the CAP/CHAP. In particular take an unambiguous position and decide in regards to some unresolved issues which confuse stakeholders. (ES 5)
- 2. Rename the process if NGOs are equal stakeholders to reflect the commonality of interests, possibly as Strategic Planning Process. UN HC to prepare on the basis of this process a vision of humanitarian aid in Burundi over the next few years and present it as the UN's blueprint for humanitarian aid intervention. (ES 7, SRS I.8.iii, iv, MF 4.b)
- 3. UN HC should define a normative framework for humanitarian aid in Burundi, defining the typology of humanitarian situations and priority setting for response according to situation types, based on preparation from a working group of all three stakeholders. (ES 7, SRS I.8.iv, MF 8.a, 13)
- 4. Prepare to market, lead and coordinate a holistic approach to humanitarian assistance in targeted communities with total humanitarian needs coverage (ES 7, SRS I.8.i, iii,v, MF 8.b)

5. Host a multidisciplinary team of experts (including a social anthropologist) for country-wide comprehensive overall needs assessment, response preparation, and monitoring. (ES 7, SRS 1.8.v, MF 8.b)
6. Facilitate and support case studies for pilot target communities. (ES 7, SRS 1.8.ii, MF 12)
7. Continue decentralization and strengthen provincial humanitarian coordination which is more easily inclusive of provincial authorities than at the national level (ES 8)

In addition UNOCHA should strive to improve the following:

8. The decision making process for projects included in the CA. Currently selection is not transparent. (MF 6)
9. The number and duration of its staff posting in Burundi. The office appears to be chronically understaffed. (ES 10)

### **III. Priority actions for the International Community (Donors, UN Agencies and NGOs) in Burundi**

1. Participation into a normative process and seek a common framework for humanitarian assistance. (SRS I.7, I.8.iv, II.2, II.3, II.4, MF 4.b)
2. Participation in an alternative approach to humanitarian response. (ES 7, SRS I.8.i, II.4)
3. Stronger advocacy and pressures on the issue of protection of civilians. (ES 9, MF 2)

## **METHODOLOGY**

- ◆ The evaluation team has followed a two-fold standard methodology, based on: a) a review of the existing documentation provided by OCHA<sup>11</sup> and, b) stakeholder analysis through individual interviews with those donors, UN agencies and NGOs present in Burundi. The average interview time was seventy five minutes. However, given the limited time frame to meet everyone (over sixty individual interviews would have been necessary) and the lack of a presence of some donors in Burundi, the evaluation team had prepared and sent by electronic mail three questionnaire forms (one for donors – including those covering Burundi from Nairobi-, one for UN agencies and one for NGOs) to obtain some critical information and statistical evidence on some of the key issues. The questionnaire survey received practically no response (two replies only) and subsequently has been discarded as inconclusive.
- **MAIN FINDINGS** structured along points 4.1. to 4.5 of the TOR

### **A) Critical issues in the context**

1. Burundi is currently undergoing a major transitional process which should eventually lead to general elections in November 2004 and hopefully lasting peace in the country. As in any other country in transition, the provisional government is weakened, and many things are halted until a new democratically elected government takes office. It is therefore both a constraint and an opportunity for humanitarian aid: slow pace or suspension of reforms, but also the time to send the proper message to those holding power or those expected to be in power shortly. Given the number of inhabitants, Burundi is comparable to a large city, in which personal relations are of paramount importance as practically everyone knows each other. The small donor community present in country could have seized this opportunity to send a common message to the GoB. However this requires an agreement as to which message should be sent, and there is no consensus amongst the donor community on a clear humanitarian aid agenda.
2. Protection has been and remains a major issue in Burundi. Access to vulnerable populations remains at times hindered by military operations or fighting; security of humanitarian staff remains a constant worry (Burundi ranks amongst the highest numbers of expatriate humanitarian workers deaths over the past ten years). Impunity and a weak judicial system are further difficulties which form part of the operational context for the past eleven years. Humanitarian aid is limited to those areas controlled by the government. While currently this is the vast majority of the country (except Bujumbura rural and other specific small areas) this

---

<sup>11</sup> The list of documents reviewed are mentioned in the TOR.

has not been the case over the past few years, as significant portions of the country where important humanitarian needs were believed to exist were not accessible to the humanitarian community. The *regroupement policy* applied by the previous government has drawn strong criticism and has contributed to creating situations of chronic humanitarian aid intervention. Exactions, killings, rape and other forms of violence have been perpetrated on the civilian population indiscriminately on a large scale. Finally, at times, humanitarian assistance has been looted by either of the armed factions or by the military, raising important questions about systematic application of the “do no harm” approach<sup>12</sup>. By and large humanitarian aid has been provided almost continuously over the past eleven years, with little implication and partnership with the GoB.

3. There is certain resentment amongst NGOs towards UN agencies, perhaps partly based on the different approach to security management (the UN agencies had limited movement according to UN security phases, and travel was oftentimes only possible with a military escort, while there was an important risk premium added to basic salaries. NGOs on the contrary are most exposed in the field without obtaining necessarily any monetary compensation and normally without a protective military escort). It is difficult to see a compromise solution given the different philosophical approach and the instruments used by each stakeholder in security management.

## **B) Planning and prioritisation**

4. Is the CAP/CHAP a strategic tool? This question has to be seen in light of the different stakeholders, as each stakeholder category has a different interest. **Again it is repeated that the various objectives of the CAP and CHAP remain unclear, especially for the NGOs, and the CAP/CHAP remains an ambiguous process.** There is undoubtedly added value in sharing an analysis of the situation and the needs of humanitarian aid in the country, which is part of the CAP/CHAP process, but this remains information management. However it is very different to talk about using the CAP/CHAP as a strategic tool, and much less as a planning document. Among donors each has its own strategy towards Burundi, which is not necessarily influenced by CAP/CHAP. The same goes for NGOs<sup>13</sup>. For UN agencies the differences stem essentially from personalities, not from agencies’ mandates: those persons committed to the process will ensure adequate buy-in and ownership, and will invest

---

<sup>12</sup> Confirmed by some NGOs and two UN agencies. The question here is where to draw the line beyond which the humanitarian intervention becomes ineffective. Feedback from the NGOs and UN favours the pragmatic approach: as long as beneficiaries have something left, it is better to have something than nothing.

<sup>13</sup> For example NGOs have their own **longer term** strategic plan, such as: CRS strategy statement 2003-2007 and CARE Plan Stratégique 2003-2005.

time and effort to make the CAP/CHAP a strategic tool<sup>14</sup>. Some others will only participate because it is part of the UN requirements, but without a true commitment to results<sup>15</sup>.

- **It is too ambitious to talk about a single strategic tool for humanitarian assistance for the entire international community in Burundi, and it must be therefore acknowledged that a certain degree of exclusion is bound to exist, no matter how inclusive and participative the process.**

The real issue at hand is **what should the CAP and CHAP be?** There are essentially *two possible alternatives*, which entail radically different consequences.

a) In the first scenario, the CAP and CHAP remains a sort of compromise process, general enough to obtain the consensus of the majority of humanitarian aid stakeholders, ***but without giving a clear sense of direction, a vision of what humanitarian aid should be or how it should be done.*** This is how past CAP/CHAPs have been established in Burundi and into which many efforts have been placed. Things should therefore continue as previously, while improving targeted shortfalls in the process, but without clear overall leadership.

b) In the second scenario, the question should be: What should the CAP and CHAP seek to accomplish?

- **According to a majority of interviewees, the CAP and CHAP should reflect *a common analysis and strategy of humanitarian assistance*. The difference with the current process is that, although inclusive, the CAP and CHAP should *give a leadership vision of what humanitarian assistance should be in Burundi, and this should be reflected in a document established by UN HC and endorsed by as many stakeholders as possible. This requires timely preparation for establishing a common analysis, with a clear agenda and an experienced moderator. A common analysis leads to implications for the definition of the humanitarian strategy.***
- ***The CAP/CHAP should not necessarily have to be limited in time to a one year period, and should likely extend its vision over the next three years, which is the minimum amount of time that***

---

<sup>14</sup> Three individuals amongst the UN agencies interviewed proved seriously committed to the process, in addition to the necessary OCHA staff commitment.

<sup>15</sup> Clearly mentioned by two individual members of UN agencies. It has already been shown in other studies that the largest UN agencies such as UNHCR and WFP are not tributary of the CAP in order to receive funding.

**humanitarian assistance will be necessary in Burundi (best case scenario) according to absolutely all interviewees.** This means that not everyone will perhaps agree with the contents and there is bound to be a percentage of exclusion. This in turn is only normal and reflects the different perceptions of humanitarian assistance amongst humanitarian players. However by defining clear intervention strategies, synergies and complementarities can still be identified even among those actors who have not endorsed the CHAP.

- **The name should also be changed to reflect a different process approach<sup>16</sup>, and leadership of the process and of the resulting analysis and strategy should be ensured by the UN HC with OCHA support.** This is both in line with the GHD recommendations (point 14. of the GHD endorsements) of supporting CHAP as a primary strategic instrument and in line with a need for someone amongst the international community to take a lead role in defining, albeit imperfectly, what global humanitarian strategy is necessary in Burundi<sup>17</sup>. **And this can only be done by an agency without any operational interests to ensure impartiality and neutrality in the process leading to the definition of a strategic humanitarian plan.<sup>18</sup>**

5. In regards to the planning utility of the CAP/CHAP, the same comments as in the preceding point apply. Planning is by and large undertaken by humanitarian actors according to each actor's own system, which may or may not feed into CAP/CHAP. But defining a common strategy and defining a common implementation plan are two different things and this should clearly be understood. NGOs have expressed a strong interest in common analysis and strategy, **not necessarily for a common plan.**
6. The process of prioritisation remains unclear, as well as the selection of the project documents which ultimately are included in the CA<sup>19</sup>. There is an urgent need to clarify the prioritisation process and ensure transparency in project selection. This is directly linked to the credibility of the process. As indicated by four interviewees, **prioritisation is seen as a political choice, and different understanding of humanitarian concepts lead to different approaches, thus different priorities amongst stakeholders.** Also prioritisation implies that not all activities can be undertaken at the same time. In simple logic this means that if all

---

<sup>16</sup> Perhaps to Strategic Planning Process, as suggested by IASC's HWHG Study Four report.

<sup>17</sup> This evaluation puts forward the Standard-Bearer Model presented in the Study Four report as highly necessary in Burundi.

<sup>18</sup> This important comment was made by two NGOs. Despite positive sectoral coordination meetings, some of the UN coordinating agencies have nonetheless their own operational agenda. It is therefore recommended that overall coordination be ensured by non-implementing agencies.

<sup>19</sup> As mentioned by two UN agencies and one NGO, which had a project included in the CA because it was submitted by a UN agency whereas the NGO had not even been asked for approval for its inclusion.

projects within the CA are priority projects, there should be 1) a long list of additional projects not included in the CA, available to donors for funding and 2) that under funding or lack of funding of priority projects in the CA should negatively affect the impact of humanitarian assistance in Burundi (causality factor). However neither appears to be true. This undermines further the credibility of the prioritisation process. **In theory under funded or unfunded priorities should rapidly affect the humanitarian situation in Burundi.** There is an excessive willingness to ensure that all UN agencies and offices are adequately represented in the process, over and beyond the need to establish humanitarian priorities.

As it stands presently, the prioritisation process is biased and flawed, too centred on an adequate representation of the UN agencies as opposed to meeting humanitarian aid needs. **It should be remembered that not all UN agencies are necessarily active in humanitarian aid**, and being overly inclusive can have drawbacks in terms of coherence of the humanitarian approach. This is in part due to the inertia of the system, but also from lack of clear leadership.

7. The Humanitarian Coordinator is also the UNDP Resident Representative and Coordinator of the UN system. This evaluation argues that only one person covering three essential posts is not conducive as there is simply not enough time to devote to humanitarian imperatives in Burundi's complex situation. Additionally the UNDP Res. Rep. and UN Coordinator must by definition work **with** the government, whereas the UN HC must at times be able to be much **more critical about government's attitude** and conduct, in order to maintain a certain independence and credibility. The evaluation team believes therefore that appointing the same person as UNDP Res. Rep. and UN Coordinator, in addition to that of UN HC, leads to conflicts of interest and weakens the UN HC position given the aggregate constraints of the three posts, in detriment of the humanitarian agenda.

### **C. Design of the response based on identified needs**

8. Response to needs lies at the core of the humanitarian imperative. However CAP/CHAP has expanded to include rehabilitation, reconstruction and human rights.<sup>20</sup> Given the wide range of needs in Burundi which can roughly be divided into three types (cf. point 7 of the executive summary), namely emergency life saving, chronic emergency with recovery and post conflict assistance aimed at durable solutions, it is almost impossible to answer globally such a complex question.

---

<sup>20</sup> UNSG report on reform, A/51/950, 1997, point 191.

- **First and foremost it should be clear *which needs are to be covered*. This requires a normative framework which today is non existent.** <sup>21</sup>

Even if it is generally agreed that life saving interventions are the first priority, there is no consensus on defining what life saving interventions are -outside the medical sector (e.g. surgical interventions to patients and other activities clearly labelled as life saving) or in nutrition (TFCs)-, nor how they should be undertaken.

- **There remains therefore certain subjectivity in the needs identification process, which is usually done by the same actors who will be implementing the response. In other words, there can be a tendency to find needs corresponding to the activities regularly undertaken by those same humanitarian actors who are identifying the needs.** If this is to be avoided and an example of good practice established, it is recommended that the following steps should be taken:

- A. *A normative framework*** should be established based on the result of a formal working group encompassing donor representatives, UN agencies and NGOs, under the Secretariat of UNOCHA and UN HC leadership. This normative framework should define the in-country response necessary to *each type of situation*, and *define the typology of humanitarian situations in Burundi*. It should be endorsed by as many humanitarian actors as possible.
- B. *A multidisciplinary joint assessment team*** comprising UN agencies and NGOs staff should be posted at the UNOCHA office with specific assessment expertise. While ideally expertise in all sectors would be necessary, it may be more feasible to start with a more conservative approach and obtain one or two UN and NGO staff (possibly on secondment). Its responsibilities would be country-wide coverage of needs identification and assessment, and its second function would be monitoring of the resulting response. Since both processes would be external and inclusive, greater credibility and better information on the humanitarian situation would be gained. Such an approach has partly been tried successfully in other countries for joint assessments, especially when donors have participated in the field assessment missions. Under the leadership of the HC, UNOCHA is best placed to assume this role of referee and arbitrator in humanitarian assistance as it is not an operational agency and therefore has no conflict of interests in facilitating the lead of such a process.

---

<sup>21</sup> Which could be inspired from the Standard-Bearer Model indicated in the IASC HFWP Study Four.

- C. The normative framework and the joint assessment/monitoring team should both be subject to a formative evaluation roughly one year after its establishment, and the resulting report widely circulated in country for comments on its findings and possible improvements. This should be part of the GHD evaluation expected to take place sometime next year.
9. It is neither the CAP/CHAP nor the GHD which determine the response level, but the level of professionalism of the humanitarian actors. Processes are certainly important, but they must be backed by the personal commitment of the individuals who participate in the process. In the current CAP/CHAP the commitment level varies greatly from individual to individual, as well as length of posting in Burundi. Again it is not possible to expect the same commitment from everyone as each stakeholder (donors, NGOs and UN agencies) has different interests in the process and therefore has different objectives and expect different results.
- ***To be entirely comprehensive and inclusive the CAP/CHAP should ensure a win/win situation for each stakeholder level. The NGOs have largely been marginalised in this process<sup>22</sup>, which is much too UN centred.***

The IASC recommendations of 9<sup>th</sup> April 2002 “affirm the primacy of the Common Humanitarian Action Plan (CHAP) as the central inter-agency strategic planning tool for emergencies, and ensuring that the CHAP is further refined”. **The evaluation considers that as long as the CAP/CHAP does not adequately reflect and encompass the needs of the three stakeholder levels, the process will not be able to be fully comprehensive nor inclusive. Currently it is still essentially donor and UN agency oriented.**

10. The humanitarian response is ultimately implemented at ground level by NGOs and other humanitarian agencies such as the Red Cross family. The large majority of humanitarian aid programme execution is in fact done by NGOs, and major UN agencies have an essential need of partnerships with NGOs to be able to carry out their activities. UNHCR, UNICEF and WFP would only be able to realize a fraction of their programmes if the NGO community was not there to service a large part of their implementation needs.

---

<sup>22</sup> As pointed out by all NGOs and some donors. UN agencies tend to take credit for their work while forgetting the indispensable network of implementation agents, mostly NGOs, who actually execute a large part of UN agencies’ programmes and activities given their extensive field presence, normally not limited by the constraining UN security norms which affect UN agencies and their field deployment. This has led to a certain resentment among the NGO community and a feeling of being used and abused by the UN system, while not obtaining a proper voice in decision making nor a heartfelt recognition of their efforts.

It should be feasible to define the triangle of external humanitarian assistance as an isosceles triangle where each actor –donor, UN, NGO and Red Cross family- must have equal representation and weight in the decisions which are being taken (in this case, one third for each stakeholder category). If initially a common position is sought a) by donors for donors, b) by the UN for the UN system, c) by NGOs and RC for NGOs and RC, it may be easier to start discussions on processes once the stakes for each stakeholder level is clearly presented. This would require each stakeholder level to identify a common position, and present the three positions for the CAP/CHAP. There are actually too many differences even within stakeholder levels to be able to prioritise or manage such an intricately complex process<sup>23</sup>.

11. While the GHD initiative is ultimately about improved performance of humanitarian aid, it should be kept in mind that **good donor behaviour does not automatically guarantee an impact on humanitarian aid beneficiaries**. If late funding or inadequate practices can seriously jeopardise the quality and performance of humanitarian assistance,

- **good donor behaviour will only revert in improved performance if it is concomitantly addressed with the executing humanitarian aid actor's capacity to respond professionally to the situation.**

In other words good humanitarian practice for donors should be matched with good implementation practice from the UN and NGO communities. It is the opinion of the evaluation team that only if the three stakeholders are perceived to be one uneasy but interdependent entity which ultimately determines external humanitarian assistance can global performance of humanitarian aid be improved. This implies that efforts should be taken in a concerted manner (initially on small scale pilots) for all three stakeholder groups at the same time and in the same country.<sup>24</sup>

12. In Burundi there have been important efforts to ensure a better response in humanitarian aid. Specific working groups (thematic or sector specific) have contributed to a better understanding and coordination on difficult issues. Decentralisation is an on-going process as coordination

---

<sup>23</sup> Among the NGO community in Burundi there is a functioning network called RESO (Rassemblement, Echange et Solutions entre ONG) which encompasses some 35 NGOs, and could eventually be used for debating and defining the NGOs current position in regards to humanitarian aid in Burundi. Such an approach entails identifying for each stakeholder level an agreed-upon and appointed spokesperson of decision making calibre to participate and feed into the subsequent discussions involving all three stakeholder levels, in order to strive to obtain a synthesis of all stakeholders by juxtaposing the different positions to feed into a single, common one.

<sup>24</sup> A concrete example would be for implementing partners and UN agencies to determine and abide by the use of a series of technical standards and quality management instruments. The point here is to ensure professionalism at all steps of the PCM rather than recommending a specific instrument over another. Kindly refer to the ECHO Partner's Conference 2002 Group 1 document regarding "quality management tools" in humanitarian aid for more details and suggestions.

mechanisms develop at the province level, therefore much closer to where the actual intervention takes place. UNOCHA has tried to have an encompassing approach to the multi-faceted dimension of humanitarian assistance in Burundi. Both types of efforts (coordination and information sharing in Bujumbura, and establishing offices in the provinces) show a certain level of success. ***However questions remain regarding both the CAP/CHAP and the GHD which need to be answered if the improvement process is to be continued.*** All interviewees agree that even if the best case scenario takes place in Burundi (peaceful transition to a new democratically elected government and end of hostilities) humanitarian needs will continue over the next three years.

Planning a humanitarian response over the next three years requires a certain leadership vision of where humanitarian aid is heading: it can be continued as presently along the same lines, but this seems only to be a “second best”; or it can be done on an experimental basis on a small scale with a different vision, where needs are identified in one geographically defined location, with a socio-economically defined community, where participation from the beneficiaries in establishing needs and a possible response are part of the process. This second pilot option entails an end to the divisive “beneficiary typology” which is so often used in humanitarian aid to target those in need of assistance. Rather, an anthropological and social approach is taken towards the community as a whole, rather than individual groups. In a country divided by armed conflict over the last eleven years, and where the “category” of people is one of the causes of conflict, it is surprising that needs are determined according to “categories of beneficiary” (e.g. women and children, elderly, handicapped, demobilised, returnee, IDP, HIV/AIDS infected, ex-combatant, etc.). This is hardly conducive to reconciliation, and only perpetrates division amongst beneficiary groups (especially if benefits vary according to beneficiary typology). It can even be a cause of hostility amongst community groups, where traditional linkages have been seriously affected or destroyed by the armed conflict. The need to rebuild social fabric and trust among the population will be a key element in securing peace in Burundi. A fourteen year old girl, HIV infected, formerly displaced and recently demobilised can easily be recipient of several humanitarian aid interventions based on “beneficiary typology”.

This second approach to providing adequate humanitarian response is based on a holistic vision of needs coverage and recognises the specificities of each situation (e.g. community) where neither the traditional sector approach nor the beneficiary typology approach is able to provide a comprehensive coverage. This second approach further allows identifying together with the community the type of response which will be provided, and targets explicitly developing the social fabric within the community by making people interact on specific actions of common interest and creating an enabling environment in the

community. While this undoubtedly requires a team of highly experienced and talented staff to conduct the community based needs identification and assessment and to design the humanitarian aid response, there is much to be learned from this different intervention model. More so now at a time when return and demobilisation are expected to increase the number of population in need of humanitarian assistance and where categories of priority beneficiaries (such as ex-combatants) are being discussed.

Some methodologies have been used successfully for understanding community needs. Two of these are the SCF Household Food Economy Survey, or the WFP VAM Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping, which are able to yield useful information regarding needs and possible responses. However it should be noted that these methods focus on specific issues and not necessarily on an overall understanding of the community (for example VAM focuses on food insecurity and malnutrition). Assessments should be comprehensive enough to understand clearly the population's coping mechanisms and should be carried out in such a way that the community participates in the problems identification and possible responses. Greater social and anthropological awareness would also yield richer responses than very narrowly targeted assessments in specific sectors or according to beneficiary typology (such as some RRA techniques).

- **A formal Case Study is highly recommended for each type of community prior to initiating the suggested alternative approach, which would feed into the assessment team's analysis and response design.**

13. Many studies and research have recently been commissioned on needs assessment, which this evaluation does not pretend to replicate or duplicate. A needs assessment matrix has been prepared and many discussions and information sharing is drawn on this issue. Within Burundi there have been quite a large number of needs assessments, the latest in Bujumbura rural (with more than twenty five assessments according to UNOCHA), where armed conflict remains a major issue which conditions humanitarian response.

- **The evaluation team argues that it is not the need for more technical standards which must be done for needs assessment, as there are more than enough guidelines, standards, benchmarks, thresholds, instruments and indicators in general. What is missing and is really necessary is for the humanitarian system to have some kind of identified leadership capable of presenting a driving vision as to what humanitarian assistance in Burundi must seek to accomplish and how this must be done.**

This does not mean that it should be an all inclusive process; enough diversity of interests, capacities, approaches and mandates exist amongst humanitarian players to render any kind of consensual global approach quite idealistic. But if a major humanitarian actor, such as the HC with UNOCHA support, was to draft a humanitarian assistance direction paper, concerned first and foremost with covering humanitarian aid needs in Burundi, this could certainly be used to specifically tailor the subsequent processes of common analysis and strategy which form the base of a consistent and coherent humanitarian response.

There are enough sector specific indicators currently identified and used in Burundi to monitor the CAP, and important efforts –by UNOCHA, UN agencies and NGO partners- have been developed in order to reach this objective. However the process remains short of being able to give a global overall picture of the humanitarian situation. A further step is to undertake a mapping at geographical level which will allow for a comprehensive monitoring of all sectors and the aggregate effect of humanitarian assistance in one geographically and socio-economically defined community, ideally respecting administrative divisions and boundaries.

#### **D. Donors response and coverage**

14. Initially the evaluation team had foreseen a financial analysis of funding patterns and flows. However inadequate reporting to FTS has invalidated such an analysis, as cross-checking with donors in Burundi has shown that FTS figures are not regularly and timely updated. As such, financial reporting is clearly flawed and does not allow an analysis of triangulated funding information evidence. It is also telling that a major donor in Burundi is unaware of the existence of the FTS or its use. Another factor is the lack of standardisation in donors' financial years, leading to many different budgetary periods. While this does not affect FTS reporting, it does affect funding predictability.
15. A major question is therefore who uses the FTS and to what purpose. If the FTS is essentially used, as appears to be the case, by the international community not present in Burundi or by agencies' HQs in order to compare different countries, the same limitations are likely to apply to these other humanitarian aid situations. Therefore comparative analysis of funding flows between countries may be acceptable, as the same shortfalls likely exist. But if there is to be an in-depth study of funding in Burundi for humanitarian aid, this analysis cannot be undertaken unless stricter compliance and reporting is ensured by all donors to the FTS. It is widely known that funding is channelled equally importantly outside of the CAP, and that a majority of humanitarian assistance funding can be at times misreported or unreported. As it

stands currently an analysis of humanitarian assistance channelled to Burundi and its impact on humanitarian aid would entail a significant degree of approximation and have little credibility. This is clearly one field to which donors can clearly contribute at little or no cost. A centralised, updated and adequately reported upon financial system for humanitarian assistance (both within and outside of the CAP) is a valuable instrument which should certainly be used to understand the impact of funding on the humanitarian situation. But this entails a reliable and credible reporting system and discipline from all donors to ensure the validity of the funding information and its timeliness.

- ***In order to improve financial reporting, donors could request their field offices in Burundi to use the FTS monthly for monitoring of contributions. Any differences should be reported by the donor field office to their HQ for onward transmission to OCHA FTS.***

16. In terms of **funding motivation**, a comprehensive evaluation of donors' motivation and behaviour would **require an analysis of who takes the decision to fund and where and how the funding decision is taken**. While in general donors interviewed have indicated that the funding decision is taken at their HQ level but based on recommendations from the field, the final say rests at Headquarters level. Therefore it is possible that recommendations from the in-country donor representative are overturned or discarded, and that funding decisions may be taken in line with other priorities than an analysis of field based needs. A specific example was given where for political interests the humanitarian aid budget was removed to a specific ministry to be used directly by the minister. Other examples of lobbying by the UN agencies or NGOs at donor HQ levels were also reported as common practice<sup>25</sup>.

- ***Addressing donors' motivation and funding patterns would require an evaluation both at donor HQ level and at field level and triangulation with the funding recipients as to the process and procedures for funding allocation and its timeliness.***

This exceeds the scope of the TOR and may be subject to a specific study. In regards to donors based in Burundi, the motivations are based on their understanding of the humanitarian situation and the identified needs which should be covered. However not all donors have the same understanding of the humanitarian situation nor indeed do they share the same vision. Some donors have a clear division between humanitarian aid and other forms of assistance (for example, ECHO and the EC delegation), while for other donors only one person is in charge of the

---

<sup>25</sup> Two donors indicated a certain gap between their own perceptions and that of their HQ, while one donor indicated that this year funding was being increasingly directed from its HQ.

entire assistance policy (for example DfID). It is important to note that **even among the limited number of donors based in Burundi they recognise the absence of consensus on humanitarian aid or on its objectives. This severely limits the degree of persuasion and of advocacy that the international community can exert on the government in favour of humanitarian aid.**

#### **E. Reflection on process/TOR for the evaluation process of the GHD Burundi pilot**

17. A number of issues remain to be refined or more clearly defined before fully engaging in drafting TOR for a formal evaluation of the GHD in Burundi to be tentatively undertaken in a year's time (or for any other country for that matter). Essentially there are three key issues to be addressed :
  - A. What are the objectives of the GHD and how are these to be attained? Evaluations must show progress towards a specific goal, which must be clearly determined. The GHD still needs to be “operationalised”, perhaps by placing it in a programme format with its corresponding log frame, which might help clarify the hierarchy of goals.
  - B. Change is a gradual process. When applied to the donor community, this non-linear process will require time and a phased approach. A long term plan (until complete fulfilment of all GHD objectives) should be prepared, stretching on a period of approximately five years, with participation from each stakeholder level and commitment to the objectives both from HQ and field levels, which is something that does not necessarily exist at present in Burundi.
  - C. Ultimately external humanitarian assistance depends on the aggregate actions and interactions amongst the three stakeholder groups (donors, UN and NGOs). Despite many efforts, there is still no global instrument which serves equally all stakeholder groups. The CAP/CHAP is itself in a constant evolution and improvement process, but remains in need to address the fundamental questions which have been asked about its multiplicity of functions and objectives and the impossibility to be an equal opportunity instrument for each stakeholder group.
18. The Burundi baseline pilot evaluation team sees little interest in-country for the full fledged evaluation to be undertaken as there have been little or no inputs from the GHD except for one visit and discussions with

donors at the end of 2003<sup>26</sup>. There is a need to concretely state and place inputs in order to facilitate and guide the process, to extend it to all stakeholders, primarily the donor community, subsequently to the UN agencies and the NGOs. It is currently viewed as a good intention but with little substance or reality. It is also excessively hopeful to have something for nothing, as there has been much reflection and discussions amongst the international community on these same issues, and this has not been able to give rise to any consensus on how to achieve these goals<sup>27</sup>. The GHD initiative should clearly state what new element it introduces or what is its comparative advantage to bring about change, by clearly spelling out the basic hypotheses and constraints.

#### **F. Comments and conclusions regarding the baseline evaluation**

19. The TOR have conditioned the reporting format along a specific pattern of thought, placing the CAP/CHAP at the centre of the humanitarian strategy, and building upon a series of suggested questions which clearly stem from the existing structure. The scope of the baseline evaluation is equally ambitious, and takes for granted that consensus on humanitarian aid exists to continue with the CAP/CHAP process evolution as it stands in Burundi and essentially just “add” the GHD as a natural evolution of the CAP/CHAP.
20. Both hypotheses, namely that CAP/CHAP lies at the heart of the humanitarian system’s strategy, and that GHD can be naturally built as an additional layer, are unfounded in the current situation in Burundi. Both processes need greater clarity, ownership and participation from the three main stakeholder levels. Neither CAP/CHAP seems to be indispensable for NGOs in its existing form, nor does GHD appear to raise much interest among the donor community in Burundi.
21. It is difficult to understand the choice of Burundi as pilot for the GHD<sup>28</sup> in this context, and both the scope of the baseline evaluation TOR and the GHD initiative seem more to have been designed by a vertical management structure than to have stemmed from a fertile in-country interest and response, even among the lead donor. In consequence a more gradual and less ambitious approach should be chosen, based on adequate in-country appraisals, on what can realistically be achieved over the set time-frame. In concrete terms in regards to the GHD, if Burundi is chosen as the pilot country for the GHD, there is a need to obtain critical information from all donors regarding the motivations and funding allocation system, both looking at field level and at headquarters

---

<sup>26</sup> The positive note is that NGOs welcomed the December 2003 donor mission as it gave them a chance to be heard by donors.

<sup>27</sup> As one donor put it : “leopards don’t change their spots .”

<sup>28</sup> As mentioned by two UN agencies and one donor.

level. While the present baseline has looked at this issue, the limited number of donors present in Burundi who have met the evaluation mission does not allow for generalisation, nor is there a common pattern amongst donors interviewed which could be presented as a conclusion.

At present any attempt to identify attrition or causality between donor behaviour and processes such as CAP/CHAP or GHD is simply too circumstantial and lacking in supporting evidence to be able to carry out a full evaluation.

### **G. CAP/CHAP : A SWOT ANALYSIS**

35. At the request of the commissioning agency, the evaluation report presents a summary of assets and shortcomings of the current CAP, under the SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) format. Some of these elements have also been presented and discussed specifically in the report. Therefore only a brief description is provided here.

ISSUES	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
CAP/CHAP Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognised interest among stakeholders to participate in a common analysis and strategy for humanitarian aid</li> <li>• Aiming at greater participation and inclusiveness</li> <li>• Gradually improving over time, but still perfectible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uneven interest from stakeholders</li> <li>• Not a win/win situation for all, especially NGOs</li> <li>• Unclear objectives and purpose</li> <li>• Not a fund raising instrument for NGOs</li> <li>• Time period too short. A one year strategy is too narrow for agencies and NGOs who have been in the country over ten years.</li> <li>• Does not allow to avoid duplication of activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve marketing</li> <li>• Improve preparation (e.g. clear agenda)</li> <li>• Draft CHAP workshop minutes</li> <li>• Rename the process (SPP?)</li> <li>• More forward looking by covering foreseeable humanitarian needs over the next three years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of commitment</li> <li>• No participation from decision makers</li> <li>• Potential undermining by uncoordinated competing processes (such as Round Table, MDRP, PRSP, UNDAF, etc.)</li> </ul>
Prioritisation	<p>None. A list of projects does not constitute a priority list. Neither is there a hierarchy amongst projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of transparency</li> <li>• Lack of credibility</li> <li>• Lack of vision</li> <li>• No leadership</li> <li>• No list of non-priority projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure clarity</li> <li>• Appoint designated decision maker for establishing priorities based on strategic process (SPP)</li> <li>• Disseminate and improve information flow on decision making process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unwillingness to define priorities</li> <li>• Consensus preferred over actual needs coverage (e.g. beneficiaries voice unheard)</li> <li>• Priority setting seen as political</li> </ul>
Needs assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint assessments with various stakeholders</li> <li>• Sectoral indicators and methodologies identified in working groups already being applied</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comprehensive overall needs assessment of humanitarian aid (e.g. responding to the entirety of needs)</li> <li>• No prioritisation of which needs come first</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine needs typology and response through working group</li> <li>• Identify standards and objectives for such response (normative framework and standard-bearer role of the UN)</li> <li>• Need for a single multidisciplinary mixed team of experts (UN+NGOs) ensuring countrywide coverage and monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Competing agendas among stakeholders</li> <li>• Failure to agree on credibility of expert assessment team</li> </ul>

### List of interviewees :

#### United Nations :

Sunil Saigal, UNDP Resident Representative, Humanitarian Coordinator, Resident Coordinator

Kaba Guichard Neyaga, Representative, UNHCR

Zlatan Milisic, Representative, WFP

Abdel Wahed El Abassi, Regional Director, WHO Burundi

Gloria Fernandez, Head of OCHA

Jean-Alexandre Scaglia, Agricultural Emergencies Coordinator, FAO

Daniel Verna, Health/Nutrition Programme Administrator, UNICEF

Abdoulaye Traoré, Head of Rights Promotion Unit, OHCHR

Jean-Sébastien Munié, Humanitarian Affairs Officer, OCHA

Claude Hilfiker, CAP Monitoring, UNOCHA Geneva

Wendy Cue, CAP Section, UNOCHA Geneva

#### Donors :

Jean-Marie Delor, ECHO

G. André, Délégué CE

Geogina Yates, DfID

Yves Nindorera, Belgian Cooperation

Denise Gordon, OFDA

Luc Vanderlinden, Military Attaché, Belgian Embassy

#### NGOs :

Kassie McIlvaine, CARE

Stephen P. Walsh, CRS

Gérard Gravel, CORDAID

Stéphane Lobjois, Handicap International Belgique

Patricia Ntahorubuze, AFJB

Christophe Beney, ICRC

## **Burundi Good Humanitarian Donorship Pilot: ToR External Baseline Evaluation**

### **1. Background:**

The UN responded to weaknesses in the response to humanitarian crises with the introduction in 1991 of the Consolidated inter-Agency Appeal process (the CAP). This has been refined over time, including through the addition of a process to ensure the CAP fits within a broader humanitarian strategy for that particular crises, i.e. with the introduction of the Common Humanitarian Action Plan (CHAP), which brings in the activities of NGOs and donors who may or may not subsequently work through the CAP.

Nonetheless, problems remain with the response to humanitarian crises. Not all donors and NGOs are able to participate in the CHAP planning process. There remain weaknesses in co-ordination. Problems also persist at the funding stage: because the CAP remains a project-based system, final allocations are often determined largely by the influences of agencies and the interests of individual donors. This can make it impossible to maintain key linkages in CHAPs, resulting in e.g. food being provided without safe water to prepare it. The problem is that it is the way funding is presently provided, rather than strategy, that drives allocations.

These and other weaknesses in donor behaviour are acknowledged in the Conclusions from the 2003 Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) conference. The GHD Implementation Plan includes piloting new approaches to more effective humanitarian outcomes in one or more crises.

A number of donors, in conjunction with the UN, intend piloting new approaches to the planning, co-ordination and financing of humanitarian action in Burundi in 2004. In order systematically to assess the impact of these reforms and – as necessary, to improve them - the pilot will be formally evaluated in real-time.

A key first step is to establish a baseline against which the changes can be compared. This will comprise both a qualitative assessment and quantitative indicators that may be up-dated through the year. It is proposed that lessons drawn from undertaking the baseline exercise should inform the methodology for real-time evaluation. Hence, a “by-product” of this evaluation should be a draft of the ToR for the real-time evaluation.

It is recognised that it is too late fully to pilot the new approach in Burundi in 2004, given the CHAP workshops have already taken place. However, the baseline evaluation will inform a similar exercise to be undertaken for a more comprehensive pilot in DRC based around the 2005 CHAP/CAP.

## 2. Purpose for the External Evaluation of the GHD

Common Observation 33: “As soon as possible and in consultation with humanitarian organisations, donors to select one CAP country, in which they will try to apply, to the fullest extent, a concerted approach to meeting humanitarian needs and implement the forthcoming Good Humanitarian Donorship Principles. This should involve, as far as possible: timely, adequate and flexible funding, the sharing of information, participation in common assessments, strategies and evaluations and their use to prioritise the allocations of funds from all sources and, in particular, full donor participation in the CAP field workshop. This should also involve consultation on funding decisions with the RC/HC, the country team and other donors as well as clear lines of responsibility and systems of accountability centered on the RC/HC. The pilot case would be evaluated for outcomes and the behaviour of participants. This should inform the 2005 CAPs and the further elaboration of the Good Humanitarian Donorship Principles”

*Other relevant observations are:*

Common Observation 11: “Donors request the IASC, with HLWG member participation, to commission an external evaluation of a CAP to look, among other things, at issues of funding and donor behaviour”

Action Point 2 from Montreux IV meeting:

Drawing on Common Observation 11, commission a quick external evaluation of the pilot country’s previous year’s CAP and experience to date with the current year’s CAP.

In the larger frame of the GHD Pilots taking place in Burundi (2004) and the DRC (2005), the Evaluation of the Burundi CAP Pilot will have to test and prove the validity of assumptions on potential impact of the GHD initiative.

## 3. Scope of the Baseline Evaluation of the Burundi CAP Pilot

The main scope of this first baseline evaluation is to collect and synthesise experiences made with previous years (i.e. 2002-2003) CAPs / CHAPs as well as with the current year’s (2004) CAP and CHAP in terms of:

- **Planning (incl. Contingency) and prioritisation** of all needed resources
- **Efficient response** in the different sectors identified on the basis of **documented needs and vulnerability assessments**
- **Donors response: Level, appropriateness, timeliness and flexibility** in the allocation of funds for the different sectors and phases of emergencies (including transitional issues, i.e. clarification of the timescale)

In Addition, the main **contextual factors** potentially influencing the outcome of the GHD will have to be assessed.

The main result of this quick evaluation should be a baseline qualifying the past and actual main outcomes of the CAP and CHAP (as processes and as prioritisation and channelling mechanisms for funds).

This baseline will then be used for the subsequent 'real-time' external evaluation, scheduled to take place during the CHAP process for 2005 (which begins in July 2004). Contrasting the findings of the real-time evaluation against the baseline indicators should provide an insight into the effectiveness of the GHD Pilot, and the extent to which it has improved the effective delivery of humanitarian aid. This evaluation process is also intended to inform the DRC Pilot for 2005.

#### **4. Indicative questions on major issues:**

##### **4.1. Critical Issues in the Context**

- a) What are currently the main factors, which are influencing the effectiveness of humanitarian action? Which are the most critical ones regarding their influence on the outcome of humanitarian action?
- b) How are these being addressed by the various agencies

A non- exhaustive list of such factors might include:

- Protection issues
- Access issues (due to political, security or physical factors)
- Governance issues
- Institutional issues amongst main stakeholders (management, institutional memory, ...)
- Civil-military cooperation
- HIV/AIDS
- Social roles and gender issues

##### **4.2. Planning and prioritisation**

Strategic

- a) What has been the **use of the CHAP as a strategic tool?** For donors, agencies and NGOs?
- b) How has the CAP / CHAP addressed the **issue of transition**, recovery or chronic relief needs? To what extent and in what ways has the CAP facilitated transition to longer-term rehabilitation strategies and resource mobilization mechanisms attached to them and to enhancement of local capacities? (e.g. does the CHAP **take into account PRSP** and UNDAF / CCA , and should it?)

Coordination

- c) To what extent has the CAP and the CHAP promoted effective **interagency planning and coordination?** What have been the advances made and what have been the constraints?
- d) Who are the **agencies** (UN and non-UN) **involved** in the CAP / CHAP and how do these participate?
- e) How **inclusive** has the CAP been in terms of incorporating all humanitarian actions and actors? (e.g. inclusion of NGOs in CHAP and appeal)

- f) How is the CAP used to bring **coherence and focus** for planning the interventions of the respective participating agencies? Are key **programmatic linkages** supported – maintained?

#### Prioritisation

- g) To what extent have **priorities** identified in the CHAP been reflected in the CAP documents? If only to a limited extent, why?
- h) What has been the **process of prioritisation**? How has this taken place within the UN [ie relations between UN agencies] and what has been the role of donors, government, civil society etc? How have activities been prioritised during the year in the light of funding availability?
- i) To what extent is the CHAP updated or otherwise **reprioritised to reflect the evolving situation**?
- j) Do **contingency plans** exist and is there funding available for quick-dispersement of stocks/staff?

#### General

- k) What is the **added value** of the CHAP/CAP in the perception of the main stakeholders?

### 4.3 Design of the Response based on identified Needs

#### Perception of vulnerability and need

- a) What - if any - assumptions have been made regarding **risks and vulnerabilities** in designing the humanitarian response? Have coping capacities been addressed?
- b) In what ways has the CAP / CHAP been based on **needs assessments**? Who has undertaken needs assessment and for what sectors? Are needs assessments available for all the sectors? Have there been joint assessment exercises?
- c) To what extent have assessments drawn on **agreed thresholds/standards** (e.g. Sphere, IDP guidelines, IHL, etc.)? How have these standards been applied?

#### Appropriateness of response

- d) What **issues** are typically **covered** under the CAP / CHAP? (e.g. food security, gender, coping mechanisms, protection, IDPs, etc.) What issues need to be developed more strongly or added?
- e) Have there been major **gaps and overlaps** in the humanitarian response: by region, by sector, by ethnic groups, by gender, by social groups?
- f) How accurately have the CHAP/CAP been addressing the **vulnerability** of distinct groups of beneficiaries? How well are social roles and gender issues taken into account in designing the response strategies?
- g) What is the **credibility** of the needs assessment process with agencies, government and donors?

#### Flexibility of response

- h) How well and through what channels are **donors informed on major changes** and priorities in the humanitarian situation?
- i) How well is **inter-agency coordination** (and are major agencies) **informed by monitoring reporting and evaluation** in order to adjust programs where necessary?

#### 4.4 Donors Response and Coverage

Extent of donor commitment

- a) What has been the **response to the CAP** (percentage of funding pledged and received per year) and the **timeliness** of this **funding**? (i.e. what were the funding lag-times; the time between appeal, commitment and disbursement; Were funds made available to implementing agencies within an acceptable timeframe?)
- b) What was the estimated percentage of humanitarian assistance **channelled through the CAP**?
- c) How well have **donors and agencies** been **reporting to the financial tracking system (FTS)**? What were the main achievements and shortfalls of the FTS?

Motivation and funding patterns

- d) What are **donors' motivations** for funding through the CAP? Motivations for funding outside the CAP? And extent to which funding outside the CAP has been based on priorities agreed through the CHAP process?
- e) Have there been **funding patterns and donor preferences** (geographically, historically, politically, intra-year or by sector) and if so, why? What has been the subsequent impact on effective humanitarian action?
- f) What percentage of funding has been made available for **new activities**? What percentage of funding goes to **multi-year activities**?

Stakeholder Perceptions

- g) To what extent has the **CAP** proven itself as an effective **resource mobilization** tool? For donors, agencies, and NGOs?

#### 4.5. Reflection on process / ToR for the evaluation process of the GHD Burundi Pilot

Give advice on possible ToR and a timeline for an evaluation process to assess the GHD Burundi Pilot's successes and inform further GHD initiatives in Burundi and other contexts (e.g. DRC). The aim is to design, in collaboration with DFID / OCHA "Draft ToR" that should contain

- The whole evaluation process with its main milestones
- Some ideas on key questions (and indicators)
- Refined impact assumptions for the GHD (issues where GHD is expected to make a difference)

#### 5. Methodology:

This evaluation should be based on findings from a field mission in Burundi plus interviews at headquarters (possibly also by telephone) with key persons from all major agencies, OCHA, donors and NGOs, looking into relevant data from the different monitoring systems, including the CAP Financial Tracking System (FTS).

The questions as stated in §4 could be answered, including the ones regarding the context:

- The **contextual factors** (4.1) should be presented according to their **relevance in influencing on the impact of the GHD Pilot**.
- A statement on the degree of compliance to the **major issues** (4.2-4.4) should be given **on the basis of the attached indicators and along the DAC evaluation criteria** (appropriateness, efficiency, effectiveness and coherence).

A first briefing with the leading consultant is to be foreseen with key persons from OCHA as managing body of this evaluation and DFID as lead Donor for the GHD initiative in Burundi.

## **6. Management and Organisation:**

**An international expert as lead consultant and a local consultant are to be appointed and paid by OCHA.**

The present ToR are valid for the international expert. The local consultant will be appointed directly by OCHA Burundi under a separate contract, but will work under the supervision of the expert. The Local consultant(s) should be selected by the team leader in collaboration with the CT.

The evaluation is commissioned by OCHA and will be managed by M&E officer of OCHA's Evaluation and Studies Unit in Geneva in close collaboration with DFID. The funds are provided by DFID (CHAD), but the financial management, accounting etc. will be done by OCHA.

Reporting back mechanisms to main stakeholders involved (IASC members, humanitarian actors outside IASC, Government of Burundi (GoB)) have to be decided between the consultant, DFID and OCHA.

## **7. Qualification of evaluators**

The chosen consultants should have:

- an Advanced University Degree in Social Sciences or equivalent;
- a minimum of ten years experience in humanitarian aid work;
- a solid record of evaluation of humanitarian action at institutional and/or strategic level,
- be familiar with issues of humanitarian financing and funding practices of all major donors;
- in-depth knowledge of main humanitarian (CHAP/CAP) and development aid (CCA, UNDAF, PRSP) planning frameworks;
- in addition practical experience with the consolidated appeals process (CAP);
- be well familiar with the functioning and roles of the UN system, NGOs and donors;
- have excellent English writing skills and be able to speak and understand French;
- excellent communication and presentation skills in English and in French (as he/she is expected to feed back results to high-level donor and agencies meetings both at HQ and in the field);
- be familiar with the context of Burundi and it's latest developments.

If the international consultant is a man, the local consultant should ideally be a woman and vice-versa.

## **8. Reporting requirements:**

The confirmation of acceptance of the revised ToR (methodology and time frame) will serve as an inception report.

A one page max. debriefing document containing the main findings of the mission will be handed out to main stakeholders (i.e. OCHA CO director, DFID Country Rep. and main agencies Rep.) before the end of the mission, ideally at a debriefing meeting.

A succinct 10,000-word report including a 1,000-word executive summary should be submitted at the agreed deadline (see next §). The reports should be made available in English and French (translation to be foreseen). If requested the consultant may translate the report into French.

The report should give clear answers to the key questions, referring to the method used to collect the findings. The report should be structured along the key issues mentioned above and contain clear findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons where applicable for each key issue. Annexes should contain the list of key informants, statistical charts, the inception report, indicators matrix containing the baseline information to the extent possible, other useful documentation to illustrate the findings.

A second deliverable will be the draft ToR for the real-time evaluation (10p. max.).

## **9. Planning and time schedule:**

Finalising TOR	by mid-December 2003
Recruitment and selection of consultant	beginning of March 2004
Briefing of consultants	In Geneva or London resp.by telephone and via email
Mission to Burundi (10-12 working days):	End of March 2004 (22.3.-2.4)
Draft Report/ToR:	Mid April 2004
Final Report / ToR:	by end of April 2004
Debrief DFID/OCHA:	28 or 29.4.2004

## **10. Background Materials**

Indicators proposed for the upcoming evaluation (see Impact Indicators for DRC Pilot in ANNEX)

- Burundi CAPs 2002-2004
- Bassiouni Report
- CAP Launch Review report
- Montreux IV final documents
- Stockholm final documents
- CAP External Review Report
- CAP SWG reports on piloting new approaches to needs assessments
- Humanitarian Financing Work Programme Research

*Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian Donorship*

**Impact indicators for DRC Pilot**

*Revised 20 October 2003*

**1) Donor funding is flexible and timely:**

- a) x% of funding pledged to CAP activities by January 2005
- b) x% of funding disbursed to CAP activities in the first quarter 2005
- c) x% of funding disbursed to CAP activities by the end of the second quarter / at the MYR
- d) x% of funding provided (either new funding or through re-allocation) to new activities and/or in newly accessible areas identified at mid-term review and CAP revision

Note: need to make sure that humanitarian activities are not hampered by lack of available funds, yet no need that all donors disburse in the first month of the year; discussion of funding (intentions) should take place in December 2004

**2) Donors' and agencies' funding is allocated based on needs assessments**

- a) Standard needs assessment criteria elaborated and accepted for all priority sectors
- b) Donor funding for collection of baseline data, in particular number of beneficiaries and for needs assessments
- c) Joint (i.e. agencies, ngo's, beneficiaries and donors) needs assessments conducted for all priority sectors and results used as basis for CHAP/CAP

Note: it is considered of key importance that assessments be done on inter-agency basis; awaiting work by CAP-sub-working group on needs assessments (Andre Griekspoor WHO leads); no separate funding proposals for doing needs assessments; unforeseen needs assessments (made possible by newly accessible areas) should be funded from EHI-like mechanisms under the control of the HC

**3) Local capacities strengthened**

- a) x capacity building activities for local NGOs and local institutions included in CAP and funded by donors
- b) Local capacity component increasingly included in agencies' and ngo's programs
- c) x activities handed over to local authorities and local ngo's for implementation by December 2005

Note: best practices of funding local capacity building to be discussed at a later stage

**4) UN leadership and coordination role supported by international community**

- a) Portion of funds from all donors available for coordination activities
- b) Portion of funds from all donors available for security activities
- c) Coordination component included in all project reports

**5) Earmarking is reduced**

- a) Priorities in CHAP fully funded to implementation capacity
- b) x% of funding provided for non-priority sectors

Note: prioritized activities in the CHAP must be fully funded, but recognition that no humanitarian organization will be able to reach 100% implementation rate; information on funding for non-priority sectors is necessary to analyze whether funding for non-priorities detracts from funding for priorities

**6) Funding is made available on longer-term basis**

- a) x % of agencies funded on multi-year basis for priority activities

Note: indicator measures percentage of agencies funded on multi-year basis, since multi-year funding for particular sectors is not yet feasible

**7) Recovery and long-term development is linked to humanitarian programs**

- a) All assistance integrated into a common country strategy
- b) Priorities identified in CHAP given adequate consideration in PRSP/UNDAF
- c) Development programs in place to encourage durable solutions for refugees and IDPs
- d) x % of humanitarian programs linked to long-term development programs

Note: CHAP and PRSP/UNDAF should inform one another; goal is that 100 % of humanitarian programs are linked to long-term development programs

**8) Funding requirements for assistance effort is shared equitably among donors**

- a) More donors providing funding, including x new (non-traditional) donors

Note: goal is to improve burden sharing among traditional and new (non-traditional) donors; all donors should adhere to the Stockholm-principles; improved burden sharing is also a way to decrease the degree to which agencies might be depending on one or a few major donors, which entails risks for their independence and for the sustainability of their programs

**9) Established good practices are adhered to by humanitarian implementing partners**

- a) SPHERE guidelines applied to CAP programs
- b) Basic humanitarian principles included in all humanitarian programs
- c) IDP programs adhere to and promote the Guiding Principles for Internal Displacement
- d) Donor participation in the elaboration of a common humanitarian framework guided by Good Humanitarian Donorship principles

Note: the Good Humanitarian Donorship principles (para 16) promote the use of Inter-Agency Standing Committee guidelines and principles on humanitarian activities, the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the 1994 Code of Conduct for the International Red

Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief

**10) Safe humanitarian access is promoted**

- a) new areas accessed and jointly assessed by humanitarian agencies/ x% of vulnerable population safely accessible by humanitarian workers
- b) x % of new beneficiaries accessing humanitarian assistance
- c) Outreach strategy articulated jointly with donors

Note: See also Principle 1) d)

**11) Contingency planning is supported by donors**

- a) Programs exist and funding available for quick-dispersement of stocks/staff

**12) Military assets are used appropriately**

- a) Regular coordination meetings held between MONUC (civil and military affairs) and the international humanitarian community
- b) Clear understanding of MONUC support of humanitarian activities articulated
- c) Use of military assets for humanitarian interventions in conformity with international humanitarian law and the MCDA Guidelines

**13) Evaluate performances**

- a) Standard evaluation criteria (linked to needs assessment criteria) for impact elaborated for x sectors (including IDPS) and evaluation(s) undertaken
- b) x % of humanitarian activities evaluated based on standard criteria

Note: donor performance must be part of any evaluation of the DRC-CAP pilot; stock taking of various aspects of CAP-pilot could be done as soon as February 2005

**14) Report contributions in timely and accurate fashion**

- a) All contributions reported to the FTS in a timely and accurate fashion

Note: donors should also encourage agencies and ngo's to improve their reporting to the FTS

“Agencies” is defined as implementers in the field to include UN organizations and NGOs.

**Comparison Burundi as of March 2004  
donor information obtained during interviews**

	CAP	outside CAP
ECHO*		14.987.000 €
European Com.**		3.000.000 €
		11.200.000 €
United Kingdom***	£1.500.000	CAP 2004 commitment
	£500.000	CAP 2003 WHO+OCHA
		£1.700.000
Belgium		2.500.000 €
		5.500.000 €
OFDA (USAID)	\$3.000.000	\$9.000.000
sub-total	\$3.000.000	\$9.000.000
US\$/Euro : 1,20		\$44.624.400
US\$/£ : 1,75	\$3.500.000	\$2.975.000
<b>total</b>	<b>\$6.500.000</b>	<b>\$56.599.400</b>

**explanation/label**

food aid WFP-GTZ-Euronaid  
remaining HCR funding of €25 mio  
outside CAP  
Unicef-ICRC-MSF-IMC  
for UNHCR in 5 countries inc. Bur.  
average yearly funding for  
emergency  
rehabilitation and food aid (50%)

<b>FTS information in US\$ as of 28 March 2004</b>	
CAP	outside CAP
0	0
0	\$18.656.716
\$909.091	0
0	0
\$1.247.630	0
<b>\$2.156.721</b>	<b>\$18.656.716</b>

*correlation (reported versus FTS)*

CAP 3,01

outside CAP 3,03

*In both the CAP and outside CAP contributions, the amounts reported locally are three times the amounts reported to FTS.*

\* ECHO contributions are reported as European Commission within the FTS and there is no distinction made with the EC contributions. Therefore the 15 million Euros from ECHO are roughly the equivalent of 18,6 million usd. mentioned as EC contribution. However no information regarding the EC UNHCR financing is included, nor food aid.

\*\*the EC had 25 million Euros for UNHCR and an additional 56.5 million Euro under the PREBU programme.

In addition some Euro 500,000 for former combatants are also included in the 3 million food aid envelope.

There also remains some Euro 15 million (7th EDF remnants) since 2000 the rural development part of which finishes in Dec. 2004 and governance funding still available until end 2005. There is also a Euro 5.5 million envelope for health in provinces until end July 2004 and a proposal for bridging over 18 months from the 9th EDF of Euro 4 millions.

\*\*\*DfID indicates further that their core programme is £ 4 mio yearly. In addition there is a £ 4 mio HIV programme over 3 years, plus MDRP contribution (WB fund). Total spending over April 2003/2004 amounts to £ 5 million.

Both ECHO and the EC use the natural fiscal year, as well as Belgium

DfID fiscal year is from April 1st to March 31

OFDA fiscal year is from October 1st to September 30

**NB. None of the donors interviewed used the FTS locally, apparently use of the FTS is only at HQ level. One donor was not even aware of the existence of the FTS.**

EVALUATION PILOTE BASELINE AU BURUNDI - GUIDE  
 D'ENTRETIEN /QUESTIONNAIRE POUR ONGS  
 PILOT BASELINE EVALUATION IN BURUNDI - INTERVIEW GUIDE/NGO  
 QUESTIONNAIRE  
 2 Avril 2004 - 2 April 2004

*Nom de l'ONG :*

*Date:*

*Name of the NGO:*

*Date :*

*Bureau de : (ville et pays)*

*Office location : (city and country)*

*Personne de contact et adresse de courrier électronique (facultatif) :*

*Contact person and e-mail address (optional) :*

LE CAP / THE CAP

1. Qu'est-ce que le CAP ?

1. What is the CAP ?

2. Quels sont ses objectifs ?

2. What are its objectives ?

3. Combien de projets avez-vous contribué au CAP :

a) en 2002 Nombre ..... Monnaie ..... Montant : .....

b) en 2003 Nombre ..... Monnaie ..... Montant : .....

c) en 2004 Nombre ..... Monnaie ..... Montant : .....

3. How many projects have you contributed under the CAP :

a) in 2002 Number ..... Currency ..... Amount .....

b) in 2003 Number ..... Currency ..... Amount .....

c) in 2004 Number ..... Currency ..... Amount .....

4. Combien de projets avez-vous soumis hors du CAP pour financement auprès de vos bailleurs?

a) en 2002 Nombre ..... Monnaie ..... Montant : .....

b) en 2003 Nombre ..... Monnaie ..... Montant : .....

c) en 2004 Nombre ..... Monnaie ..... Montant : .....

4. How many projects have you submitted outside the CAP for funding to your donors? :

a) in 2002 Number ..... Currency ..... Amount .....

b) in 2003 Number ..... Currency ..... Amount .....

c) in 2004 Number ..... Currency ..... Amount .....

5: Avez vous reçu un financement pour ces projets hors CAP ? si oui, combien et en quelle année ?

a) en 2002 Nombre ..... Monnaie ..... Montant : .....

b) en 2003    Nombre .....    Monnaie .....    Montant : .....

c) en 2004    Nombre .....    Monnaie .....    Montant : .....

5. Have you received funding for these projects outside the CAP? If so, how many and when?

a) in 2002    Number .....    Currency .....    Amount .....

b) in 2003    Number .....    Currency .....    Amount .....

c) in 2004    Number .....    Currency .....    Amount .....

6. Avez-vous avoir reçu un financement pour ces projets hors CAP? Si oui, pourquoi? :

a) parce que ça correspond aux priorités des bailleurs

b) parce que cela correspond aux priorités de l'ONU

c) parce que vous avez convaincu votre bailleur de la nécessité du projet

d) autre (veuillez expliquer)

6. Have you received funding for projects submitted outside the CAP? If so, why?

a) because they matched donors priorities

b) because they matched the United Nations priorities

c) because you convinced your donor on the need for the project

d) other (please explain)

7. Souhaitez-vous participer au processus CHAP/CAP ( Oui - Non) : Si oui, lequel :?

a) CHAP et CAP

b) CHAP uniquement

c) CAP uniquement

d) une analyse et stratégie commune pour l'aide humanitaire des acteurs humanitaires (donateurs, agences UN, ONGs) sous un autre nom

e) aucun

Si votre réponse est non, veuillez en expliquer le pourquoi

7. Do you wish to participate in the CHAP/CAP process (Yes - No) : If so, which ?

a) CHAP and CAP

b) CHAP only

c) CAP only

d) a differently named common analysis and strategy for humanitarian aid from humanitarian actors (donors, UN, NGOs)

e) none

If you answer is no, please explain why

8. Quel a été votre budget annuel pour :

a) en 2002    Monnaie .....    Montant : .....

b) en 2003    Monnaie .....    Montant : .....

c) en 2004    Monnaie .....    Montant : .....

8. What was your yearly budget in :

a) in 2002    Currency .....    Amount .....

b) in 2003    Currency .....    Amount .....

c) in 2004    Currency .....    Amount .....

9. Qui décide des projets qui sont inclus dans le CAP?

9. Who decides about the CAP project selection?

10. Avez-vous un ou plusieurs projets qui n'ont pas été inclus dans le CAP? Si oui, en quelle année (2002-4)

10. Do you have one or more projects not included in the CAP? If so, in which year (20002-3-4)

11. Avez-vous reçu une explication de ce rejet? Si oui, par qui et comment?

11. Have you received an explanation for this ? If so, by whom and how was it done?

12. Quelle est la valeur ajoutée du CAP ?

12. What is the CAP's added value ?

13. Utilisez-vous le CAP pour :

- a) planifier vos activités (Oui - Non - parfois)
- b) coordonner vos activités (Oui - Non - parfois)
- c) déterminer votre stratégie (Oui .- Non - parfois)
- d) autres (veuillez expliquer)

13. Do you use the CAP for :

- a) Planning your activities (Yes - No - sometimes)
- b) coordinate your activities (Yes - No - sometimes)
- c) determine your strategy (Yes - No - sometimes)
- d) others (please explain)

#### RESSOURCES HUMAINES

#### HUMAN RESOURCES

14. Dans l'actualité quel est l'effectif de votre organisation?

14. How many people are actually employed by your organisation ?

Expatriés : ..... Nationaux : .....  
à Buja : .....  
dans les provinces : .....

15. Quelle est la proportion de mélange des groupes au sein de l'effectif national?

15. What is the proportion of mixture of groups amongst national staff?

#### REPOSE HUMANITAIRE

#### HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE

16. Quelles sont les faiblesses de la coordination globale de l'action humanitaire au Burundi?

16. What are the weaknesses of global humanitarian coordination in Burundi?

17. Comment peuvent-elles être améliorées?

17. How can they be improved?

18. Quelles sont les faiblesses de la coordination thématique et/ou sectorielle au Burundi?

18. What are the weaknesses of thematic and / or sectoral coordination in Burundi?
19. Comment peuvent-elles être améliorées?  
19. How can they be improved?
20. Les besoins qui rentrent dans la définition de "l'aide humanitaire" sont-ils clairement définis? Si non, pourquoi?  
20. Are needs which fall under the definition of "humanitarian aid" clearly identified? If not, why?

ANALYSE ET STRATEGIE  
ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY

21. Connaissez-vous le CHAP?  
21. Are you familiar with the CHAP?
22. Y avez-vous participé l'an passé? Si non, pourquoi?  
22. Did you participate in last year's CHAP? If not, why?
23. Quels en sont les objectifs?  
23. What are its objectives?
24. Quelle est l'utilité du CHAP?  
24. What is the usefulness of CHAP?
25. Comment peut-on améliorer le CHAP? Ou faudrait-il trouver un nouveau nom pour un processus plus inclusif?  
25. How can the CHAP be improved? Or should it be renamed to reflect a more participatory stakeholder process?
26. Existe-t-il un document CHAP pour l'année 2004?  
26. Is there a CHAP document for the year 2004?
27. Existe-t-il un besoin d'avoir une analyse et une stratégie humanitaire communes (entre bailleurs, UN et ONGs)? Si non, pourquoi?  
27. Is there a need to determine a joint analysis and humanitarian strategy (amongst donors, UN and NGOs)? If no, why?
28. Quels sont les éléments nécessaires au succès d'un tel processus?  
28. What key elements are needed to ensure the success of such a process?
29. Qui devrait diriger un tel processus et avec quels moyens?  
29. Who should lead such a process and what means are necessary?
30. Seriez-vous d'accord à ce que le financement de vos activités soit soumis au respect de cette analyse et stratégie humanitaire commune? Si non, à quoi servirait une analyse et une stratégie humanitaire commune?

30. Would you accept that funding of your activities be subject to compliance to this common analysis and humanitarian strategy? If not, what would be the use of a common analysis and humanitarian strategy?

31. Seriez-vous disposes à intervenir conjointement avec d'autres acteurs humanitaires, de façon coordonnée et complémentaire, dans un nombre restreint de communautés pilotes choisies afin d'assurer la couverture intégrale des besoins humanitaires identifiés, sur la base d'une approche communautaire participative?

31. Would you be willing to take part, jointly with other humanitarian actors, on a coordinated and complementary basis, in a small number of pilot communities chosen to implement an integrated coverage of identified humanitarian needs, based on a participatory community based approach?

32. En plus d'une analyse et une stratégie humanitaire communes, croyez-vous qu'il est également nécessaire d'avoir un plan d'action commun pour l'ensemble des acteurs humanitaires?

32. In addition to a common analysis and strategy, is it also necessary to have a common action plan for all humanitarian actors

33. Connaissez-vous le FTS de OCHA?

Si oui, l'utilisez-vous?

Si oui, à quelle fin?

33. Do you know OCHA FTS?

If so, as user?

If so, with which purpose?

CONCERNANT LE GHD (GOOD HUMANITARIAN DONORSHIP) OU BONNES PRATIQUES DES DONATEURS DE L'AIDE HUMANITAIRE  
ABOUT GHD (GOOD HUMANITARIAN DONORSHIP)

34. Connaissez-vous le contenu de l'initiative du GHD? (oui / non)

Si vous répondez non, le questionnaire est terminé. Si oui veuillez continuer.

34. Do you know the contents of the GHD initiative ? ( yes / no)

If you answer no, the questionnaire is ended. If yes please proceed.

35. Quand en avez-vous entendu parler pour la première fois?

35. When did you first hear about it?

36. Est-il actuellement largement diffusé au Burundi? Si oui, par qui?

36. Is it being currently largely disseminated in Burundi? If so, by whom?

37. Qu'est-ce que le GHD?

37. What is GHD?

38. Que représente-t-il?

38. What does it represent?

39. Quels en sont les objectifs?  
39 If so, what are its objectives?

40. Les objectifs sont-ils suffisamment clairs?  
40. Are its objectives sufficiently clear?

41. Quels en sont les mécanismes de mise en oeuvre?  
41. What are its implementation mechanisms?

42. Faudrait-il créer un groupe de bailleurs localement impliqués dans la promotion et le suivi du GHD?  
42. Should there be a local donor group tasked with promotion and monitoring of the GHD?

43. Qu'attendez-vous du GHD?  
43. What do you expect from GHD?

44. Cela devrait-il affecter l'aide humanitaire au Burundi? Si oui, comment?  
44. Should this affect humanitarian aid in Burundi? If so, how?

45. Croyez-vous que le GHD puisse affecter négativement vos sources de financement habituelles?  
Si oui, de quelle manière?  
45: Do you believe the GHD could negatively affect your traditional funding sources? Is so, how?

46. Existe-t-il une appropriation du GHD par les donateurs à votre connaissance? Si oui, lesquels? Cela s'applique-t-il à la représentation de ce(s) donateurs au Burundi?  
46. To your knowledge do donors have ownership of the GHD? If so which ones? Does this apply to donor(s) offices present in Burundi?

47. Quel pourcentage de votre budget annuel provient des agences des Nations Unies?  
47. What percentage of your yearly budget is channelled through UN agencies ?

Commentaires / comments

Veillez indiquer si vous permettez que les résultats du questionnaire soient annexés au rapport d'évaluation (Oui / Non). Les résultats seront utilisés statistiquement en fonction du nombre de réponses reçues.

Merci beaucoup pour votre patience et votre aimable collaboration.

Please indicate whether you allow the results to be presented individually as annex to the evaluation report (Yes / No ). Results will be used statistically according to the number of answers received.

Thank you for your patience and kind collaboration.

EVALUATION PILOTE BASELINE AU BURUNDI - GUIDE  
D'ENTRETIEN /QUESTIONNAIRE POUR AGENCES ET/OU BUREAU DES  
NATIONS-UNIES  
PILOT BASELINE EVALUATION IN BURUNDI - INTERVIEW GUIDE/UN OFFICES  
AND AGENCIES QUESTIONNAIRE - 2 Avril 2004 - 2 April 2004

*Nom del'Agence ou du Bureau*

*Date:*

*Name of the Office or Agency:*

*Date :*

*Bureau de : (ville et pays)*

*Office location : (city and country)*

*Personne de contact et adresse de courrier électronique (facultatif) :*

*Contact person and e-mail address (optional) :*

LE CAP/ THE CAP

1. Utilisez-vous le CAP pour :

- a) planifier vos activités (Oui - Non - parfois)
- b) coordonner vos activités (Oui - Non - parfois)
- c) déterminer votre stratégie (Oui - Non - parfois)
- d) autres (veuillez expliquer)

Si non, pourquoi?

1. Do you use the CAP for :

- a) Planning your activities (Yes - No - sometimes)
- b) coordinate your activities (Yes - No - sometimes)
- c) determine your strategy (Yes - No - sometimes)
- d) others (please explain)

If not, why?

2. Combien de projets avez-vous contribué au CAP ?

en 2002 : Nombre total .....	Volume total Monnaie .....	Montant
en 2003 : Nombre total .....	Volume total Monnaie.....	Montant
en 2004 : Nombre total.....	Volume total Monnaie.....	Montant

2. How many projects have you submitted to CAP?

in 2002 : total number ..... Total volume specify currency .....  
Amount

in 2003 : total number ..... Total volume specify currency .....  
Amount

in 2004 : total number ..... Total volume specify currency .....  
Amount

3. Combien de projets avez-vous soumis hors du CAP pour financement auprès de vos bailleurs de fonds en :

2002 : Nombre total .....	Volume total Monnaie .....	Montant
---------------------------	----------------------------	---------

2003 : Nombre total .....	Volume total Monnaie .....	Montant
2004 : Nombre total .....	Volume total Monnaie .....	Montant

3. How many projects have you submitted to your donors outside the CAP in :

2002 : Total number .....	Total volume currency	Amount
2003 : Total number .....	total volume : currency	Amount
2004 : Total number .....	total volume : currency	Amount

4. Avez-vous reçu un financement pour ces projets hors CAP ? Si oui, pourquoi?

- a) Parce que ceux-ci entraînent dans les priorités des bailleurs
- b) Parce que les besoins avaient changé depuis l'établissement du CAP
- c) Parce que vous avez convaincu les bailleur de la nécessité des projets
- d) autres (veuillez expliquer).....

4. Have you been funded for these projects presented outside the CAP? If so, why?

- a) because these were within donor priorities
- b) because needs have changed since the CAP was established
- c) because you convinced donors on the need of these projects
- d) other (please explain).....

5. Qui décide des projets qui sont inclus dans le CAP?

5. Who decides about the CAP project selection?

6. Avez-vous un ou plusieurs projets qui n'ont pas été inclus dans le CAP? Si oui, en quelle année (2002-3-4)

6. Do you have one or more projects not included in the CAP? If so, in which year (20002-3-4)

7. Avez-vous reçu une explication de ce rejet? Si oui, par qui et de quelle façon?

7. Have you received an explanation for this ? Si oui, par qui et de quelle façon?

8. Quel montant de vos projets a l'AH a été finance hors CAP pour

8. What amount of your projects to H.A. has been financed outside the CAP for

L'année 2001 : monnaie.....montant ..... [CAP 2002]

L'année 2002 : monnaie .....montant..... [CAP 2003]

L'année 2003 : monnaie .....montant..... [CAP 2004]

Year 20001 : currency .....amount .....(CAP 2002)

Year 20002 : currency .....amount .....(CAP 2003)

Year 20003 : currency .....amount .....(CAP 2004)

9. Pourquoi ces contributions ont-elles été effectuées en dehors du CAP ?

9. Why were these contributions made outside of the CAP ?

10. Les contributions que vous recevez suivent-elles les priorités définies par le CAP ?

10. Do the contributions you receive follow CAP defined priorities ?

11. Pouvez-vous être financé et / ou financer des activités pluri-annuelles ? (veuillez spécifier)

Si oui, quelle est la période de financement la plus longue reçue au Burundi?

11. Can you be financed and / or finance multi-year activities ? (Please specify)

If so, what is the longest period over which you have been financed?

12. Existe-t-il un accord sur la définition de l'aide humanitaire ?

a) parmi les bailleurs

b) entre agences de l'ONU

c) au sein de votre agence

Et sur son contenu ?

a) parmi les bailleurs

b) entre agences de l'ONU

c) au sein de votre agence

12. Is there an agreement on the definition of humanitarian aid?

a) amongst donors

b) amongst UN agencies

c) within your own agency

And about its contents?

a) amongst donors

b) amongst UN agencies

c) within your own agency

13. Le CAP est-il un instrument utile pour mobiliser les ressources ? Si oui, pour qui?

13. Is the CAP a useful instrument to mobilise resources ? If so, for whom?

14. Connaissez-vous le contenu de la retraite de Montreux ? et de la Réunion Internationale sur le GHD à Stockholm ?

14. Are you aware of the contents of the Montreux Retreat? And those of the International Meeting on GHD in Stockholm?

15. Le CAP permet-il une réponse efficiente dans les différents secteurs sur la base de besoins documentés et des évaluations de la vulnérabilité ?

15. Does CAP allow for an efficient response in the different sectors on the basis of documented needs and vulnerability assessments?

16. Quelle est la valeur ajoutée du CAP ?

16. What is the CAP's added value ?

17. Quelles sont les faiblesses de la coordination globale de l'action humanitaire au Burundi?

17. What are the weaknesses of global humanitarian coordination in Burundi?

18. Comment peuvent-elles être améliorées?

18. How can they be improved?

19. Quelles sont les faiblesses de la coordination thématique et/ou sectorielle au Burundi?

19. What are the weaknesses of thematic and / or sectoral coordination in Burundi?

20. Comment peuvent-elles être améliorées?

20. How can they be improved?

## RESSOURCES HUMAINES

### HUMAN RESOURCES

21. Dans l'actualité quel est l'effectif de votre organisation?

21. How many people are actually employed by your organisation ?

Expatriés : ..... Nationaux : .....

à Buja : ..... .....

dans les provinces : ..... .....

22. Quelle est la proportion de mélange ethnique au sein de l'effectif national?

22. What is the proportion of mixture of ethnic groups amongst national staff?

## ANALYSE ET STRATEGIE - ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY

23. Connaissez-vous le CHAP?

23. Are you familiar with the CHAP?

24. Y avez-vous participé l'an passé?

24. Did you participate in last year's CHAP?

25. Quels en sont les objectifs?

25. What are its objectives?

26. Quelle est l'utilité du CHAP?

26. What is the usefulness of CHAP?

27. Comment peut-on améliorer le CHAP?

27. How can the CHAP be improved?

28. Existe-t-il un document CHAP pour l'année 2004?

28. Is there a CHAP document for the year 2004?

29. Existe-t-il un besoin de déterminer une analyse et une stratégie humanitaire communes parmi les acteurs humanitaires pour l'aide humanitaire au Burundi (bailleurs, UN et ONGs)?

29. Is there a need to determine a joint humanitarian analysis and strategy amongst humanitarian actors in Burundi (donors, UN and NGOs)?

30. Quels sont les éléments nécessaires au succès d'un tel processus?

30. What key elements are needed to ensure the success of such a process?

31. Qui devrait diriger un tel processus et avec quels moyens?

31. Who should lead such a process and what means are necessary?

32. Si une analyse et stratégie commune était établie au Burundi pour l'aide humanitaire, acceptées et validées par tous les acteurs humanitaires (donateurs, système UN et ONGs), seriez-vous d'accord de ne financer et/ou de n'exécuter les activités humanitaires (dans ou en dehors du CAP, veuillez préciser) que si celles-ci s'inscrivent dans l'analyse et dans la stratégie commune établie pour le pays?

32. If a common analysis and strategy were established in Burundi for humanitarian aid, accepted and endorsed by all humanitarian actors (donors, UN system and NGOs), would you be willing to finance and / or implement only those humanitarian activities (within or outside of the CAP, please specify) which fall under the common analysis and strategy developed for the country?

33. Avec quel degré de périodicité cette analyse et stratégie communes devraient-elles être actualisées?

33. How often should the common analysis and strategy be updated?

34. Seriez-vous disposés à financer et/ou participer à une approche pilote limitée à quelques communautés spécifiquement ciblées afin de couvrir la totalité des besoins humanitaires clairement identifiés? L'approche entraînerait une intervention intégrée de l'aide humanitaire prenant la communauté comme unité d'analyse et sa participation dans la détermination des besoins (et non pas par secteurs ou typologie des bénéficiaires).

34. Would you be willing to fund a pilot approach to be implemented in a few specifically targeted communities, in order to cover the entirety of clearly identified humanitarian needs? The approach would be participatory community based in order to identify needs, with a view to providing a holistic humanitarian aid intervention (thus without disaggregating in terms of sectors or beneficiaries.).

35. En plus d'une analyse et une stratégie humanitaire communes, croyez-vous qu'il est également nécessaire d'avoir un plan d'action commun pour l'ensemble des acteurs humanitaires?

35. In addition to a common analysis and strategy, is it also necessary to have a common action plan for all humanitarian actors?

36. Connaissez-vous le FTS de OCHA?

Si oui, l'utilisez-vous?

Si oui, à quelle fin?

36. Do you know OCHA FTS?

If so, as user?

If so, with which purpose?

CONCERNANT LE GHD (GOOD HUMANITARIAN DONORSHIP) OU BONNES PRATIQUES DES DONATEURS DE L'AIDE HUMANITAIRE - ABOUT GHD (GOOD HUMANITARIAN DONORSHIP)

37. Connaissez-vous le contenu de l'initiative du GHD? (oui / non)

Si vous répondez non, le questionnaire est terminé. Si oui veuillez continuer.

37. Do you know the contents of the GHD initiative ? ( yes / no)

If you answer no, the questionnaire is ended. If yes please proceed.

38. Quand en avez-vous entendu parler pour la première fois?

38. When did you first hear about it?

39. Est-il actuellement largement diffusé au Burundi? Si oui, par qui?

39. Is it being currently largely disseminated in Burundi? If so, by whom?

40. Quels en sont les objectifs?

40. If so, what are its objectives?

41. Les objectifs sont-ils suffisamment clairs?

41. Are its objectives sufficiently clear?

42. Quels en sont les mécanismes de mise en oeuvre?

42. What are its implementation mechanisms?

43. Faudrait-il créer un groupe de bailleurs localement impliqués dans la promotion et le suivi du GHD?

43. Should there be a local donor group tasked with promotion and monitoring of the GHD?

44. Qu'attendez-vous du GHD?

44. What do you expect from GHD?

45. Cela devrait-il affecter l'aide humanitaire au Burundi? Si oui, comment?

45. Should this affect humanitarian aid in Burundi? If so, how?

46. Croyez-vous que le GHD puisse affecter négativement vos sources de financement habituelles?

Si oui, de quelle manière?

46. Do you believe the GHD could negatively affect your traditional funding sources? If so, how?

47. Existe-t-il une appropriation du GHD par les donateurs à votre connaissance? Si oui, lesquels? Cela s'applique-t-il à la représentation de ce(s) donateurs au Burundi?

47. To your knowledge do donors have ownership of the GHD? If so which ones? Does this apply to donor(s) offices present in Burundi?

48. Quel pourcentage de votre budget annuel est actuellement mis en oeuvre par des ONGs ?

48. What percentage of your yearly budget is actually implemented by NGOs ?

Commentaires / Comments

Veillez indiquer si vous permettez que les résultats du questionnaire soient annexés au rapport d'évaluation (Oui / Non). Les résultats seront utilisés statistiquement en fonction du nombre de réponses reçues.

Merci beaucoup pour votre patience et votre aimable collaboration.

Please indicate whether you allow the results to be presented individually as annex to the evaluation report (Yes / No ). Results will be used statistically according to the number of answers received.

Thank you for your patience and your kind collaboration.

EVALUATION PILOTE BASELINE AU BURUNDI - GUIDE  
D'ENTRETIEN /QUESTIONNAIRE POUR DONATEURS / PILOT BASELINE  
EVALUATION IN BURUNDI - INTERVIEW GUIDE/DONORS QUESTIONNAIRE - 2  
Avril 2004 - 2 April 2004

*Nom du Donateur :*

*Date:*

*Name of the Donor:*

*Date :*

*Bureau de : (ville et pays)*

*Office location : (city and country)*

*Personne de contact et adresse de courrier électronique (facultatif) :*

*Contact person and e-mail address (optional) :*

LE CAP / THE CAP

1. Qu'est-ce que le CAP ?

1. What is the CAP ?

2. Quels sont ses objectifs ?

2. What are its objectives ?

3. Utilisez-vous le CAP ?

3. Do you use the CAP ?

Si oui, comment :

If so ; how :

Si non, pourquoi :

If not, why ?

4. Les chiffres de vos contributions reportés dans les CAP sont-ils corrects ?

4. Are your CAP contribution figures in the CAP documents correct ?

5. Vos contributions suivent-elles les priorités définies par le CAP ?

5. Do your contributions follow CAP defined priorities ?

6. Quelle est la période couverte par votre année budgétaire (jj/mm/aa à jj/mm/aa)

6. What is the time period covered by your yearly budget (dd/mm/yy to dd/mm/yy)

7. Quel montant de vos contributions à l'AH a été financé hors CAP pour

7. What amount of your contributions to H.A. has been channelled outside the CAP for

L'année 2001 : monnaie.....montant ..... [CAP 2002]

Year 2001 : currency .....amount .....(CAP 2002)

L'année 2002 : monnaie .....montant..... [CAP 2003]

Year 2002 : currency .....amount .....(CAP 2003)

L'année 2003 : monnaie .....montant..... [CAP 2004]

Year 2003 : currency .....amount .....(CAP 2004)

8. Pourquoi ces contributions ont-elles été effectuées en dehors du CAP ?
8. Why were these contributions made outside of the CAP ?
  
9. Comment décidez-vous de l'attribution des ressources pour l'aide humanitaire [expliquer svp le processus pour la prise de décision] ?
9. How do you determine resource allocation for humanitarian aid (please explain the decision making process)?
  
10. Où se prend la décision de financement ?
10. Where is the funding decision taken ?
  
11. Quels sont vos délais de financement :
11. What are the funding lag times :
- a) entre le moment de l'engagement et la confirmation de l'allocation
- a) between pledge and commitment
  
- b) entre le moment de la confirmation de l'allocation et son débours
- b) between commitment and disbursement
  
12. Soutenez-vous le financement de nouvelles activités (pas incluses dans le CAP précédent)
12. Do you support financing new activities (e.g. not mentioned in previous CAP)
  
13. Pouvez-vous financer des activités pluri-annuelles ?  
si non, quelle est la période de financement la plus longue ?
13. Can you finance multi-year activities ?  
If not, what is your longest financing period ?
  
14. Quelles sont vos préférences pour le financement de l'aide humanitaire ?
14. What are your preferences for financing humanitarian aid ?
  
15. Existe-t-il un accord entre bailleurs sur la définition de l'aide humanitaire ? Et sur son contenu ?
15. Is there an agreement amongst donors on the definition of humanitarian aid? And about its contents?
  
16. Le CAP est-il un instrument utile pour mobiliser les ressources ? Si oui, pour qui?  
Si non, pourquoi?
16. Is the CAP a useful instrument to mobilise resources ? If so, for whom? If not, why?

17. Connaissez-vous le contenu de la retraite de Montreux ? et de la Réunion Internationale sur le GHD à Stockholm ?

17. Are you aware of the contents of the Montreux Retreat? And those of the International Meeting on GHD in Stockholm?

18. Participez-vous aux réunions de coordination ? Si non , pourquoi

18. Do you participate in coordination meetings ? If not, why?

19. Le CAP permet-il une réponse efficiente dans les différents secteurs sur la base de besoins documentés et des évaluations de la vulnérabilité ?

19. Does CAP allow for an efficient response in the different sectors on the basis of documented needs and vulnerability assessments?

20. Quelle est la valeur ajoutée du CAP ?

20. What is the CAP's added value ?

#### ANALYSE ET STRATEGIE ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY

21. Connaissez-vous le CHAP?

21. Are you familiar with the CHAP?

22. Y avez-vous participé l'an passé?

22. Did you participate in last year's CHAP?

23. Quels en sont les objectifs?

23. What are its objectives?

24. Quelle est l'utilité du CHAP?

24. What is the usefulness of CHAP?

25. Comment peut-on améliorer le CHAP?

25. How can the CHAP be improved?

26. Existe-t-il un document CHAP pour l'année 2004?

26. Is there a CHAP document for the year 2004?

27. Si une analyse et stratégie commune était établie au Burundi pour l'aide humanitaire, acceptées et validées par tous les acteurs humanitaires (donateurs, système UN et ONGs), seriez-vous d'accord de ne financer les activités humanitaires que si celles-ci s'inscrivent dans l'analyse et dans la stratégie commune établie pour le pays?

27. If a common analysis and strategy were established in Burundi for humanitarian aid, accepted and endorsed by all humanitarian actors (donors, UN system and NGOs), would you be willing to finance only those humanitarian activities which fall under the common analysis and strategy developed for the country?

28. Avec quel degré de périodicité cette analyse et stratégie communes devraient-elles être actualisées?

28. How often should the common analysis and strategy be updated?

29. Seriez-vous disposés à financer une approche pilote limitée à quelques communautés spécifiquement ciblées afin de couvrir la totalité des besoins humanitaires clairement identifiés? L'approche entraînerait une intervention intégrée de l'aide humanitaire prenant la communauté comme unité d'analyse et sa participation dans la détermination des besoins (et non pas par secteurs ou typologie des bénéficiaires).

29. Would you be willing to fund a pilot approach to be implemented in a few specifically targeted communities, in order to cover the entirety of clearly identified humanitarian needs? The approach would be participatory community based in order to identify needs, with a view to providing a holistic humanitarian aid intervention (thus without disaggregating in terms of sectors or beneficiaries.).

30. En plus d'une analyse et une stratégie humanitaire communes, croyez-vous qu'il est également nécessaire d'avoir un plan d'action commun pour l'ensemble des acteurs humanitaires?

30. In addition to a common analysis and strategy, is it also necessary to have a common action plan for all humanitarian actors?

#### CONCERNANT LE GHD (GOOD HUMANITARIAN DONORSHIP) OU BONNES PRATIQUES DES DONATEURS DE L'AIDE HUMANITAIRE ABOUT GHD (GOOD HUMANITARIAN DONORSHIP)

31. Connaissez-vous le contenu de l'initiative du GHD? (oui / non)

Si vous répondez non, le questionnaire est terminé. Si oui veuillez continuer.

31 Do you know the contents of the GHD initiative ? ( yes / no)

If you answer no, the questionnaire is ended. If yes please proceed.

32. Si oui, quel en est l'objectif?

32. If so, what is its objective?

33. Les objectifs en sont-ils suffisamment clairs?

33. Are its objectives sufficiently clear?

34. Quels en sont les mécanismes d'application?

34. What are its implementation mechanisms?

35. Faudrait-il créer un groupe de bailleurs localement impliqués dans la promotion et le suivi du GHD?

35. Should there be a local donor group tasked with promotion and monitoring of the GHD?

36. Existe-t-il une appropriation du GHD par les donateurs à votre connaissance? Si oui, lesquels? Cela s'applique-t-il à la représentation de ce(s) donateurs au Burundi?

36. To your knowledge do donors have ownership of the GHD? If so which ones? Does this apply to donor(s) offices present in Burundi?

Commentaires / Comments

Veillez indiquer si vous permettez que les résultats du questionnaire soient annexés au rapport d'évaluation (Oui / Non). Les résultats seront utilisés statistiquement en fonction du nombre de réponses reçues.

Please indicate whether you allow the results to be presented individually as annex to the evaluation report (Yes / No ). Results will be used statistically according to the number of answers received.

Bujumbura, 5 avril 2004

Cher Madame, cher Monsieur

L'UNOCHA à Genève, avec le concours de DFID, a demandé qu'une évaluation externe soit entreprise du projet pilote de Bonnes Pratiques de Donateurs de l'Aide Humanitaire au Burundi. La mission d'évaluation est composée de deux personnes, dont un consultant national, M. Salvator Bijojote, et un consultant international en qualité de chef de mission, M. Christian Bugnion, Directeur de Subur Consulting S.L., entreprise basée en Espagne et spécialisée dans les évaluations. Nous vous remettons les TDR de la mission en annexe.

La mission a identifié trois groupes d'acteurs impliqués dans l'analyse: les donateurs, les agences et bureaux des Nations Unies, et les ONGs et autres organisations internationales comme le CICR. Le gouvernement n'a pas été retenu, pas plus que les ONGs locales, comme partie impliquée pour cette évaluation. Compte tenu de l'impossibilité de rencontrer tous les intervenants individuellement -pour les acteurs humanitaires présents au Burundi, et compte tenu du manque de présence de certains donateurs au Burundi-, nous vous envoyons un questionnaire spécifique selon chaque intervenant (donc selon trois modèles différenciés) afin de vous donner l'occasion d'exprimer votre opinion et vos idées. Il est évident que pour assurer une analyse plus complète, il aurait également fallu envoyer les questionnaires aux sièges de toutes les organisations respectives, autant au niveau des donateurs, du système des Nations-Unies, qu'au niveau des ONGs et autres organismes internationaux. Toutefois ceci excéderait clairement le cadre de la mission pilote au Burundi, et pourrait faire l'objet d'une analyse systémique séparée. Par souci de rigueur méthodologique, nous vous remettons donc ce questionnaire en vous priant de bien vouloir le remplir, si possible directement sur le formulaire en format MS Word, et nous le renvoyer par courrier électronique à votre meilleure convenance, mais au plus tard le 15 avril 2004, à l'adresse suivante :

[suburconsulting@telefonica.net](mailto:suburconsulting@telefonica.net)

Les questions sont établies exclusivement par les consultants et n'impliquent pas l'accord de l'UNOCHA ou de DfID quant à leur teneur.

Un rapport d'évaluation sera remis à UNOCHA à Genève à la fin du mois d'avril 2004.

Nous vous remercions pour votre aimable collaboration et vous assurons que les informations seront traitées de manière confidentielle. Nous vous prions de croire, Madame, Monsieur, à l'expression de notre considération.

Christian Bugnion

Directeur, Subur Consulting S.L.

Bujumbura, 5 Avril 2004

Dear Madam, Dear Sir ,

UNOCHA Geneva has commissioned under DfID funding an external evaluation regarding the Good Humanitarian Donorship Pilot in Burundi. The evaluation team comprises a national consultant, Mr. Salvator Bijojote, and is headed by an international consultant, Mr.

Christian Bugnion, director of Subur Consulting S.L. a Spanish based company specialised in evaluation work. Please find enclosed the TOR for the mission.

An analysis of stakeholder participation has identified three different categories : donors, UN agencies, NGOs and international organisations such as the ICRC. Neither government nor local NGOs have been identified as stakeholders for this evaluation. Given the impossibility to meet every stakeholder individually –for those humanitarian actors with a presence in Burundi, and also given the absence of physical presence in Burundi for some donors- we are mailing a questionnaire (with three different formats) in order to give each stakeholder the opportunity to express freely all opinions and ideas. Certainly in order to have a more complete analysis, questionnaires should have been sent to every stakeholders' headquarters. However this would clearly exceed the mission's mandate in Burundi, but could be the object of a separate systemic study. In order to keep an evidence based methodology, we therefore send you the enclosed questionnaire. Kindly fill it as fully as possible, ideally on the same form and with MS Word software, and return it to us by e-mail at your best convenience, but not later than 15 April 2004, to : [suburconsulting@telefonica.net](mailto:suburconsulting@telefonica.net)

The questions have been exclusively devised by the consultants and do not imply agreement or endorsement from either UNOCHA or DfID.

An evaluation report will be submitted to UNOCHA in Geneva end of April 2004. We thank you for your value and kind collaboration and assure you that all information will be treated confidentially.

Yours Truly

Christian Bugnion  
Director, Subur Consulting S.L.