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## Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADPC</td>
<td>The Asian Disaster Preparedness Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATDR</td>
<td>Advanced Technologies for Disaster Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATSDR</td>
<td>Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCPR</td>
<td>Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDERA</td>
<td>Caribbean Disaster Emergency Response Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERF</td>
<td>Central Emergency Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Central Register of Disaster Management Capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMCS</td>
<td>Civil-Military Coordination Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EADRCC</td>
<td>Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordinator Centre of NATO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC-MIC</td>
<td>European Commission’s Monitoring and Evaluation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSOC</td>
<td>UN Economic and Social Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Evaluation and Studies Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERSHD</td>
<td>Emergency Response Safety and Health Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESB</td>
<td>Emergency Service Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCSS</td>
<td>Field Coordination Support Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTS</td>
<td>Financial Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>United Nations General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSARAG</td>
<td>International Search and Rescue Group Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO</td>
<td>International Standards Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSU</td>
<td>Logistics Support Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDA</td>
<td>Military and Civil Defence Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSOCC</td>
<td>On-Site Operations Coordination Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>Search and Rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGS</td>
<td>Societe Generale de Surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPAC</td>
<td>South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAC</td>
<td>United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

This report is an external review of the OCHA Central Register of Disaster Management Capacities (CR). This review is in response to a 2008 resolution of the UN General Assembly. The objective of this review was to assess the value added and the user satisfaction of the CR.

Established in 1992, the CR contains five directories of specific disaster management assets and three directories of relevant contact persons. The CR was created to support the quick identification and deployment of emergency assistance. The review adopted a mixed-methods approach employing both quantitative and qualitative methods to collect data and information including interviews, an online survey, a usability expert review and analysis of web metrics (page 9).

Overall, this review found that the CR has had limited added value for the UN and the broader humanitarian emergency assistance community. For those that have used the tool their satisfaction has been low.

Limited evidence was found that the CR had improved the efficiency and effectiveness of its users. Instances were identified where the CR had been used as it was intended (page 11). But these were insignificant in number as was their contribution to a more rapid identification and deployment of emergency assistance. The review has found that the CR has had limited added value due to the following key reasons: The CR is not known; its role is misunderstood; it is not fully managed; and it is not always compatible with today’s approach to emergency humanitarian assistance.

The limited added value of the CR was also reflected in its low user satisfaction of 45% and its compatibility of 58% with usability standards, compared to similar online tools which rated between 83 – 92% (page 21).

This review found that the CR had limited relevance to the broader community. The CR did not reach all potential users and this was demonstrated by its low level of usage. The CR has been limited in its effectiveness in providing disaster management information as the majority of CR directories have not been actively managed since 2006 and only 34% of their content was updated in the past two years (page 16). The poor user experience offered by the CR has impacted on its effectiveness in assisting users to obtain and extract information. Alternatives sources now exist and a central repository concept does not seem to be consistent with the way emergency assistance is requested, sourced and delivered today. The CR was not perceived as an authoritative tool or resource for disaster management capacities.

Countries that are in need of emergency assistance have increasingly used bilateral relations, regional mechanism and appeals to source emergency assistance. Governments, NGOs and UN agencies that are sourcing or dispatching emergency assistance have relied on their own mechanisms, existing relationships and networks. The CR has not played an integral role in these processes.

Its low visibility, limited use, out-of-date and incomplete data, poor user experience together with the existence of alternative sources and mechanisms to locate and deploy
emergency assistance has ensured that the CR could not meet the needs of its users in an appropriate way.

The SAR directory was found to have a relevance as a means of recognition for SAR teams but not necessary to assist in the effective and efficient delivery of emergency assistance (page 22).

The sourcing and deploying of military-civil defence asset has changed significantly since the creation of the MCDA directory with a focus currently on more regional and bilateral exchanges. A result of these changes has been that the MCDA directory is no longer relevant (page 23).

Instances were identified where people had used the Stockpiles directory for the purpose for which it was conceived. However, an up-to-date, complete and consequently credible directory would entail that all organisations participate and a common approach to inventory control is adopted allowing the automatic feeding and updating of the directory (page 25).

Given the Roster DME directory’s out-of-date content, low user satisfaction and apparent incompleteness, it was concluded that it had not contributed significantly to the effective and efficient sourcing of roster information (page 26).

Member States had not provided the necessary information to create and maintain a viable ATDR directory. Without this support, it was difficult for OCHA to fulfil the mandate given to it (page 28).

The Customs directory had not been used by the majority of organisations and governments canvassed for this review as it was not known and/or alternative means existed to locate such information (page 28).

The relevance of the Contact DR directory had been reduced given that it is largely out-of-date despite its potential in providing a complete overview of contacts worldwide (page 29).

It was difficult to see the added value of the Donors directory given its state of incompleteness, out-of-date content and low usage (page 31).

Recommendations:

- OCHA should consider the future of the eight directories of the CR.
- OCHA should re-examine the concept of the CR to determine its role in today’s emergency assistance processes.

These general recommendations are complemented by specific recommendations for each of the eight CR directories.
Summary of key findings

This table contains an assessment of the expected results (reconstructed) of the Central Register. These results are explained further in chapter 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight directories of the CR established and accessible to potential users from the disaster management community worldwide.</td>
<td>Largely achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight directories of the CR stocked with relevant, appropriate and up-to-date information on disaster management capacities.</td>
<td>Only partially achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential users from the disaster management community worldwide learned of the CR.</td>
<td>Very limited achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential users from the disaster management community worldwide visited the CR and registered</td>
<td>Very limited achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users obtained information of use to them in one or more of the eight directories of the CR.</td>
<td>Only partially achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users contributed information from their organisations to one or more of the eight directories of the CR.</td>
<td>Very limited achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information found on the CR facilitated the rapid identification of appropriate disaster management services.</td>
<td>Very limited achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information found on the CR contributed to the rapid delivery of humanitarian emergency assistance.</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of humanitarian emergency assistance improved.</td>
<td>Not measured in this review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Achievement rating scale for indicators

The above rating system is based on the following scale from the UK Department for International Development:

1 = fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings
2 = largely achieved, despite a few shortcomings
3 = only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced
4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings
5 = not achieved
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1. Introduction

This report is an external review of the OCHA Central Register of Disaster Management Capacities (CR). This review is in response to a 2008 resolution of the UN General Assembly (GA):

“Takes note that a review of the Central CR of Disaster Management Capacities, planned for 2008, is expected to assess its value added and user satisfaction, and requests the Secretary-General to report on its findings”.

This review covers the time period of the past two years (2007 and 2008) but also considers some historical information dating from the CR’s inception in 1991.

This review has been undertaken by Glenn O’Neil of Owl RE reporting to OCHA’s Evaluation and Studies Section (ESS). Further information about Glenn O’Neil is found at annex 9.

2. Background

In December 1991, the GA requested the UN to “establish a central register of all specialized personnel and teams of technical specialists, as well as relief supplies, equipment and services available within the United Nations system and from Governments and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations that can be called upon at short notice by the United Nations”.

In line with this request, OCHA established the CR in 1992 which today is available as an online tool, accessible via the following link: http://ocha.unog.ch/cr/.

The Central Register contains eight directories in total. Five directories are of specific disaster management assets:

1. Search and Rescue Directory (SAR);
2. Military and Civil Defence Assets Directory (MCDA);
3. Emergency Stockpiles of Disaster Relief Items (Stockpiles);
4. Rosters of Disaster Management Expertise (Roster DME);
5. Advanced Technologies for Disaster Response Directory (ATDR).

And three directories of relevant contact persons:

1. National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation in International Humanitarian Emergency Assistance (Customs);
2. Contact Points for Disaster Response (Contact DR);
3. Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance (Donors).

---

1 Paragraph nine, GA resolution A/RES/62/92 “International cooperation on humanitarian assistance in the field of natural disasters, from relief to development”.
To access the majority of content of two of the directories (MCDA and Stockpiles) a user name and password is required. Initially constructed as a computer database, the CR was transformed into a web-based tool in 2002 with technical support and funding of the Swiss government. According to OCHA staff managing the tool, the CR was conceived as a “user-generated content” website, i.e., once given the necessary access, external users and to a lesser extent, OCHA staff, were to be encouraged to add and modify content.

Concerning the management of the CR, from 1991 to 2006 all eight directories of the CR were managed by the Civil-Military Coordination Section (CMCS) of the Emergency Services Branch (ESB). In May 2006, the responsibilities for each directory were re-distributed to different sections within OCHA. The reason given for this re-distribution was that CMCS did not have the capacity or specific expertise to manage each individual directory. Two directories, the Roster DME and the Contact DR were not allocated to any specific section.

In 2008, the Logistics Support Unit (LSU) of OCHA initiated a re-design of the Stockpiles directory. This initiative was in response to the 2005 Humanitarian Response Review which recommended an expansion of the global mapping of relief stocks.

3. Description of the project objectives evaluated

No logical model or project plan of the CR detailing objectives and desired results was produced when the CR was conceived. Consequently, the evaluator drafted an intervention logic and results framework for the CR (found at annex 4) based on initial interviews and the available documentation. The intervention logic (or outcome hierarchy), as presented in Figure 1, is designed to represent schematically the outputs, outcomes and eventual impact that underlie the project.

![Figure 1: reconstructed intervention logic of CR](image)

---

3 Stevens, Yvette, Assistant Emergency Relief Coordinator and Director, Memorandum, Disaster response mechanisms - the OCHA Central Register of Disaster Management Capacities, 16 May 2006.

4 A, Costanza (team leader), Humanitarian Response Review.
In addition, there was no documentation available concerning which publics were the foresseen contributors of information to the CR (“information providers”) and who were the foresseen publics that would access and use the information (“users”). To facilitate this review, a mapping was undertaken by the evaluator of potential information providers and users per directory (see annex 5). For the purpose of this review, the eventual impact of the CR was determined by the evaluator as “the delivery of humanitarian emergency assistance is improved”. To achieve this eventual impact, the project builds from the initial outputs of establishing the CR, making it accessible and stocking it with relevant, appropriate and up-to-date information to seven outcomes. These outcomes range from short-term outcomes, such as potential users learn of, visit and register for the CR to long-term outcomes, such as users obtain information of use to them and this contributes to the rapid delivery of emergency assistance. This review does not test this model of intervention logic (i.e. validating or not the linkages) but more so focuses on the indicators of the results framework for the two outputs, seven outcomes and the related review questions. An assessment of these indicators is found at page 3 of this report.

4. Overview of review questions and methodology

As detailed in the review’s Terms of Reference (see annex 10), based on the above-mention GA resolution, the overall objective of the review was:

- To assess the value added and the user satisfaction of the Central CR, i.e. to assess the relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, coverage and efficiency of the CR.

The review also sought to answer the following specific questions:

- Is the information provided in the CR relevant and appropriate in meeting the needs of its end users?
- Is the CR an effective tool in obtaining information and extracting disaster management information?
- Does the information provided in the CR authoritatively cover the needs of its users and clients?
- How user friendly is the CR from a technical perspective?

For each specific question, indicators, data collection tools and sources of information were designated (see annex 3). These specific questions were complemented by definitions of key terms, notably “value added” and “user satisfaction” in addition to the key criteria of relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, coverage and efficiency, as found in the Inception Report (annex 10).

The review adopted a mixed-methods approach employing both quantitative and qualitative methods to collect data and information, as follows:

- Desk review of relevant external and internal documents;
- Content analysis of all CR directories;
Semi-structured interviews with OCHA staff, stakeholders, CR users, information providers and non-users;
- Online survey of CR users, information providers and non-users;
- Expert review of the CR (compatibility with usability standards\(^5\));
- Analysis of available web metrics for the CR.

In total, 40 people were interviewed for this review. Out of 1421 persons emailed, 130 persons responded to the online survey, with 47 identifying themselves as having used one or more of the CR directories.

The review methodology is further detailed in annex 1.

4.1. Limitations and constraints

In undertaking this review, the following limitations and constraints were encountered:

- The global nature of the CR implied that the users are dispersed and were difficult at times to contact. For example, of the 2,103 email addresses sourced for the review, 682 were found to be not functioning (further detailed in annex 1);
- The lack of documentation on users and potential users (aside from those that had registered for the CR) meant that it was difficult to contact these publics;
- The brief period of time available to collect and analyse data (four weeks), did not always provide the possibility to contact, re-contact and interview stakeholders and users;
- The technical set-up of the CR did not allow for anything more than a basis analysis of visitor traffic statistics to the tool. For example, it was not possible to obtain statistics on the number of visitors per individual directory due to the way it was originally programmed;
- The external focus of the CR and its existence since over 18 years implied that in-depth knowledge and interest in the CR within OCHA was limited rather than the contrary that it was imbedded within the organisation.

5. Findings

This chapter presents the findings of the review. A brief statement is given summarising the overall findings of the review. This is followed by an analysis to support these findings. Responses are then given to the four specific questions. These general findings are further complemented by specific findings for each of the eight CR directories.

As defined in the inception report (see annex 10), the concepts “value added” and “user satisfaction” are defined as follows:

**Value added:** is the extent to which the needs of users are better satisfied by the existence of the CR as manifested through improvements in efficiency and effectiveness.

**User satisfaction:** is the sum of users’ attitudes towards interacting with the CR. These attitudes can be broken down into positive and negative reactions to a pre-defined set of factors, notably content, accuracy, format, ease of use and timeliness.

\(^5\) ISO standard, 9241-151 “Guidance on WWW user interfaces”.
5.1. General Findings

Global assessment of value added and user satisfaction of the CR

This review has found that the CR has had limited added value for the UN and the broader humanitarian emergency assistance community. For those that have used the tool their satisfaction has been low. These overall findings are supported by the evidence presented in this report.

Added value would be provided if the needs of those that used the CR were better satisfied by its existence and their efficiency and effectiveness was improved. Limited evidence was found that this has occurred. Instances were identified where the CR had been used as it was intended. But these were insignificant in number and their contribution to a more rapid deployment of emergency assistance was not shown. Throughout this report, evidence is provided as to why the CR in its totality has had limited added value and can be summarised as follows:

The CR is not known: Within the community and OCHA, this review has found that the CR is not known. For example, of the 130 persons who completed the online survey, 64% had never used the CR. Humanitarian affairs advisors of three countries that have received significant emergency assistance in the past decade (Turkey, Pakistan and Thailand) had not heard of the CR. This finding is not new: The 2005 Humanitarian Response Review spoke of knowledge and information on the Stockpiles Directory of the CR as “severely restricted”. With reference to the intervention logic of figure 1, the foreseen outcome that “potential users learned of the CR” was not achieved and thus impacted on the potential use of the CR. OCHA staff managing the CR confirmed that no promotional plan existed for the tool which has most likely contributed to the low visibility seen.

The role of CR is misunderstood: Within OCHA and the broader community, the role of the CR is misunderstood. People interviewed that had heard of the CR but not used it, often perceived the CR as being a tool for mobilisation of resources for the UN and more specifically for OCHA.

The CR is not fully managed: Five out of eight directories of the CR have not been actively managed by OCHA. The lack of supervision and promotion of these directories has had a negative impact on their relevance, usage and timeliness. This was apparent when compared to the three directories that were actively managed: SAR, Customs and Stockpiles.

The CR is not always compatible with today’s approach to emergency humanitarian assistance: Conceived in 1991, the CR was constructed for a period of global humanitarian cooperation that has, for the moment, largely dissipated. For example,
OCHA’s CMCS processed some 30-40 requests per year a decade ago for military and civil defence assets; in 2007 and 2008 two to three requests were processed per year. According to OCHA staff, UN agencies, the EU and Member States, international cooperation has been replaced by bilateral actions, regional mechanisms and agency-lead initiatives including OCHA’s virtual OSOCC. The relevance of a repository of resources for emergency assistance was also questioned by almost all users and potential users. Emergency assistance works today on the basis of “demand” and not “supply”. Alternative mechanisms to the CR have been created that respond to this “demand” approach, as explained below (see page 17).

The limited added value of the CR was also reflected in the low user satisfaction with the tool. People surveyed for this review gave a combined positive user satisfaction score of 45% for the CR. This is low for a user satisfaction score. The quality measurement specialists, SGS, consider objectives not met when client satisfaction is less than 70%. By comparison, the 2008 positive user satisfaction score for “Internet News and Information” amongst consumers in the US was 75%. The low user satisfaction was confirmed by the compatibility of the CR with usability standards (the extent to which a tool can be used): the CR has an overall compatibility of 58% while comparable tools rated between 83 – 92% (see chapter 5.1, question 4).

### Awareness of the CR within OCHA

Within OCHA, there is limited knowledge and understanding of the role of the CR. The CR is not integrated into the processes of emergency response that OCHA has established. The following facts and anecdotes illustrate this point:

- 50% of OCHA staff interviewed for this review had very limited or no knowledge of the CR;
- The CR was not mentioned in the UNDAC training attended by a government official interviewed and does not appear to be integrated into the UNDAC handbook;
- A NGO emergency director interviewed had never heard of the CR from her multiple and frequent contacts with OCHA;
- During a disaster, a government official interviewed was contacted by OCHA and asked about their stock details. The official pointed out that the stock was listed in the CR, to which the OCHA staff replied “CR – what is that?”

### Question 1: is the information provided in the CR relevant and appropriate in meeting the needs of end users?

This review has found that the CR has had limited relevance for its users and the larger community. If the CR was highly relevant, then it would have played a significant role in humanitarian emergencies. No evidence was found that such a significant role existed. Instances were identified where the CR did assist users in finding information on capacities and contact points although satisfaction with the information found was low.

A measure of the relevance of the CR is in its actual usage. Figure 2 illustrates the number of visits per month to the CR between 2004 and 2008. An average of 225 visits were made

---

8 See [www.sgs.com](http://www.sgs.com)

9 See the American Customer Satisfaction Index, Scores by Industry, Internet News and Information, [http://www.theacsi.org](http://www.theacsi.org)
to the CR per month with some 40% of these visits being from OCHA staff. In 2007 and 2008, the number of visits had decreased to an average of 193 per month. Considering the internal visits, this means that there have been some 116 external visits per month, or four per day in the period under review. The CR was not designed as a resource for broad public use that would incite a large number of visitors. Nevertheless, the low number of visits is an indication of limited usage, together with the small number of people (284) that are listed as current registered users.

![Figure 2: Number of visits per month to the Central Register: 2004 - 2008](image)

Figure 2 combines different data from the survey results and content analysis to illustrate usage, timeliness and connectivity of the CR directories. The two most visited directories (large in size), Stockpiles and SAR also contain some of the most updated content (red in colour). Users surveyed tended to visit these two directories in addition to the MCDA directory. This directory, along with the Roster DME and Contact DR directories attracted visitors but did not have up-to-date content. The Donors directory contained out-of-date content and attracted limited number of visitors, as did the Customs directory although its content was more up-to-date. The question of timeliness of information is discussed below under question 2.

---

10 Excluding visits to the Search and Rescue Directory (which is hosted on a different website).
Figure 3: Network map of CR usage, timeliness and connectivity

Through the survey and interviews, 64 instances of how the CR has been used were identified and described. Figure 4 categorises these instances into five types of usage:

- **Searching for contact points (19):** finding appropriate contact person or unit.
- **Searching for capacities (16):** finding or assessing assets, personnel and resources for emergency assistance.
- **Updating information (13):** modifying or adding data for own organisation.
- **For information only (13):** looking at what other countries are offering; seeking an overview.
- **As a training resource (3):** preparation for training course or briefing.

These findings indicate that people have predominantly used the CR to search for contact information and capacities in the emergency assistance field, largely using three directories: Stockpiles, MCDA and SAR. People were also updating their organisations’ data and looking for information only. These examples of usage must be considered together with how satisfied users were with the information they found: user satisfaction as measured by the survey was low – 45% positive rating as mentioned above. This dissatisfaction was confirmed by the users interviewed or surveyed with three main
reasons given: the CR is difficult to use and information found on it is out-of-date and incomplete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For information only</th>
<th>As a training resource</th>
<th>Updating information</th>
<th>Searching for capacities</th>
<th>Searching for contact points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockpiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roster DME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact DR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

Each rectangle represents one instance of use
Colors of the rectangles are to distinguish the different directories
Vertical columns represents different types of use

Figure 4: Categorisation of CR usage by directory

**Question 1: Conclusion:** Although instances were found where the CR has been used for its intended purpose – to facilitate locating capacities and contact points – the low satisfaction with the information found indicated that it was, at most times, not able to facilitate the rapid delivery of emergency assistance as desired. The CR did not reach all potential users and this was demonstrated by its low and decreasing level of usage. The
Stockpiles and SAR directories were the most successful in terms of usage and timeliness. The out-of-date nature, usability issues and incompleteness of the data has ensured that it could not meet the needs of the users in an appropriate way. The absence of a promotional plan for the CR, the non-management of most of its directories and its lack of visibility within OCHA and the wider community have all contributed to this situation.

**Question 2: is the CR an effective tool in obtaining information and extracting disaster management information?**

This review has found that the CR has been limited in its effectiveness in providing disaster management information. The CR has not substantially contributed to users obtaining information and consequently using this information to facilitate the rapid delivery of emergency assistance. As detailed above, instances were identified where the CR was used to find disaster management information – but it was not an effective source of information due to the out-of-date nature and incompleteness of the data available.

The out-of-date nature of the information was raised consistently by survey and interview respondents as being a major impediment to the CR being an effective tool. What is the extent of out-of-date information on the CR? Based on a content analysis of contact data for six CR directories\(^{11}\), it was found that on average only 34% of the content has been updated in 2007 and 2008 with wide variation per directory as show in figure 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directory</th>
<th>Percentage of information updated in 2007 &amp; 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCDA</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockpiles Roster</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs DR</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5: Contact data updated in 2007 & 2008 by CR directory*

This data illustrates that the directories actively managed by OCHA, Stockpiles and Customs contain the most up-to-date information. A second major impediment to effectiveness signalled by users, the incompleteness of the data, is considered further in the discussion on question 3 below.

The CR has also been limited in its effectiveness due to the development of other tools that have reduced its relevance as a source of disaster management information.

Persons canvassed mentioned the following alternative sources to the CR:

- **Regional mechanisms:** the European Commission’s Monitoring and Evaluation Centre (EC-MIC), the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordinator Centre (EADRCC) of NATO, the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Response Agency

---

\(^{11}\) The SAR and ATDR directories are not included in this analysis: the SAR directory is hosted on a separate website and it was not possible for the evaluator to extract the necessary data. The ATDR directory does not contain any data.
(CDERA), the South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPOC) and the Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC).

- **Information websites:** Alertnet and DevInfo.
- **Other OCHA tools:** Virtual OSOCC, Reliefweb and the Financial Tracking System (FTS).
- **Exchange platform for humanitarian assistance:** Global Hand.

According to several persons interviewed or surveyed, certain information on the CR that 15 years ago was difficult to locate elsewhere can now be found through searching on the Internet: the Customs, Contact DR and Donors directories were mentioned in particular. Users from the major donor governments interviewed also believed that the CR had not evolved and been integrated with other OCHA tools such as the virtual OSOCC, Reliefweb and FTS. Nevertheless, there was a recognition by some that the CR had the potential to be a unique global source of information on disaster management, but due to the impediments mentioned in this report, it was not able to do so.

Further to the existence of other sources, users, potential users and stakeholders questioned if the concept of the CR, an online centralised database, was the most efficient tool for obtaining and extracting information on disaster management. A central repository was not seen as always being compatible with the way emergency humanitarian assistance is requested, sourced and dispatched today. All major donor governments interviewed shared this opinion as summarised by this comment of an emergency management official and CR user:

“The use of the CR seems a little bit outdated due to the fact that requests for assistance are not made out of the resources listed in the directory but out of needs in the actual situation and response is offered from where the resources are available.”

Countries that are in need of emergency assistance have used bilateral relations, regional mechanism and appeals to source emergency assistance, as confirmed to this review by the humanitarian affairs advisors of Turkey, Pakistan and Thailand. The CR did not feature in these processes. It was highlighted by these officials that their countries often do not have to actively search for emergency assistance; the major challenge is managing the numerous offers of assistance that are made.

Governments, NGOs and UN agencies that are sourcing or dispatching emergency assistance have relied on their own mechanisms, existing relationships and networks. The CR has not played an integral role in these processes. Officials of these organisations emphasised that emergency assistance functions well when they respond to specific requests of countries in need. The process of responding may involve using a request mechanism like EC-MIC or the sourcing of resources and expertise from elsewhere - but this is done by using the above-described processes and not by consulting a central repository such as the CR. Within OCHA, the CR has played no significant role in its rapid response to disaster and humanitarian assistance. As for other organisations, OCHA has developed mechanisms and processes, such as the Emergency Relief Coordination Centre (ERCC) in which the CR plays no central role.

**Question 2: Conclusion:** The out-of-date nature, the incompleteness of the information in CR and the poor user experience it offers (discussed further below) have all impeded the small number of users that sought to use the tool for the purpose for which it was intended.
conceived. As the majority of CR directories have not been actively managed since 2006, it is not surprising that their content is largely out-of-date. Even if a directory is managed well, it has to be questioned if information can be kept up-to-date at an acceptable level, given the constantly changing types and quantities of resources and expertise available. Alternatives sources now exist and a central repository concept does not seem to be consistent with the way emergency assistance is requested, sourced and delivered today. Consequently, the CR is not an integral or central part of emergency response processes of governments, NGOs and the UN – including OCHA.

**Question 3: Does the information provided in the CR authoritatively cover the needs of its users and clients?**

This review has found that information provided in the CR covered only partially the needs of its users and clients in an authoritative manner.

For the CR to have covered “authoritatively” the needs of users and clients, current and complete information on disaster management capacities worldwide would have to be provided in the CR. It could then be viewed as an authoritative and reliable source. The CR has not been able to do this according to people canvassed for this review. This was also confirmed by analysing the information found in the CR.

Two examples illustrate the incompleteness of the information found in the CR. Within the Donors directory, 38 governments and international organisations are currently listed as potential donors. By comparison, the UN Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) lists 107 governments and 13 organisations as donors for 2006-2009. Within the MCDA, 36 countries are listed offering military and civilian assets that may be available in cases of emergency. However, the current main provider of assets is missing – the US military and civil defence agencies. Their contribution to the CR is voluntary but without it, the MCDA directory is largely incomplete. The issue of the out of-date nature of the information is considered in the discussion on question 2 above.

From the users’ point of view, an indication as to whether needs are being met authoritatively is user satisfaction with the tool. People surveyed for this review gave a combined positive user satisfaction score (“good” and “excellent”) for the CR of 45%, a low score for a satisfaction measure. Figure 6 illustrates user satisfaction by directory:

![User Satisfaction - All Directories](image)

**Figure 6: User satisfaction – All directories**


With the exception of the ATDR directory against which satisfaction could not be measured as it contains no data.
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With the exception of the Donors directory, user satisfaction was the highest with the directories that have been updated frequently: Stockpiles, SAR and Customs. Satisfaction was the lowest with the Roster DME, which contains the most out-of-date information, as illustrated in figure 5.

On the whole, directories that were managed and updated more frequently received higher satisfaction scores from users. As a consequence, the CR met better the needs of users with those directories that were actively managed and updated.

Why have the majority of directories not been managed and updated? OCHA units responsible for these directories do not see the CR as having a central role within emergency response, as detailed in the discussion on question 2 above. Therefore, without a central and integrated role, little effort has been put into managing the directories and encouraging government agencies and organisations to update their information. In addition, as mentioned in chapter 2, responsibility for two directories, Roster DME and Contact DR were not given to any OCHA unit, with the result being a complete absence of management and low levels of updated content.

**Question 3: Conclusion:** “Obsolete” and “unreliable” were two descriptions made of the CR by the majority of persons canvassed by this review. Hence, the CR was not perceived as an authoritative tool or resource for disaster management capacities. The incompleteness, poor user experience and out-of-date nature of the information combined with an absence of management and promotion has resulted in a CR that could only partially respond to the needs of its users and clients.

**Question 4: How user friendly is the CR from a technical perspective?**

This review has found that the CR did not fully provide users with a positive “user experience” by assisting them in undertaking tasks and finding information.

In general, users found the CR difficult to navigate, search and locate the information desired. As illustrated in figure 7, users that responded to the survey rated positively “ease of use” of the CR between 17 – 50%, with the exception of the Donors directory which received a higher rating.
The following quotes from users surveyed or interviewed illustrate this point:

“Too difficult to use”      “In desperate need of modernizing”
“Better layout and presentation”    “Make access to the directory easier”
“Easier access in general”      “Unusable”

To further assess user friendliness of the CR, the tool was measured in an “expert review” against an ISO standard for Internet interfaces\(^\text{14}\) together with three comparable web-based tools:

- OCHA FTS
  [http://ocha.unog.ch/fts2/](http://ocha.unog.ch/fts2/)

- Emergency Response Safety and Health Database (ERSHD)

- The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR)

The criteria used to select these tools is found at annex 1.

The following table displays the level of compatibility of CR and the three comparable tools. The data is summarised in five main categories based on 145 criteria of the ISO standard.

\(^{14}\) ISO 9241-151 “Guidance on WWW user interfaces”.

Owl RE
Glenn O’Neil, oneil@owlre.com
This usability assessment of the CR supported the feedback from users that the tool was difficult to use and navigate: the CR has an overall compatibility of 58% while comparable tools rated between 83 – 92%. The complete expert review is found at annex 7.

**Question 4: Conclusion:** The user experience of the CR has impacted on its effectiveness in assisting users in obtaining and extracting information on disaster management capacities. In its current form, the CR resembles a technical database interface where not enough thought has gone into thinking how users will access and find the information. Combined with the impediments not met of timeliness, completeness and coverage, inadequate user friendliness is another barrier to the efficient and effective use of the CR.

### 5.2. Specific findings on the CR directories

As detailed in the review’s Terms of Reference, this review has analyzed the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of each directory, as detailed below and summarised in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>FTS</th>
<th>ERSHD</th>
<th>ATSDR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-level design decisions and strategy</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content design</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation and search</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content presentation</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General design aspects</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall compatibility</strong></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 7: Compatibility of CR and comparable tools with ISO usability standard*
Since more than seven years, the SAR directory has been on a separate website to the CR, the INSARAG section of the central OCHA website. This review has found that the SAR directory has served a purpose – but not the purpose for which it was conceived – as a means to identify, request and dispatch SAR teams to disaster-stricken countries. According to the Field Coordination Support Section (FCSS) that manage the directory, SAR teams seek to have their details and disaster response history listed in the SAR directory for recognition and promotional purposes. By being listed in the directory it illustrates INSARAG membership that is a valuable fundraising advantage. This purpose was also confirmed by the survey; five respondents mentioned having used the directory to find information on INSARAG membership, training courses or preparation.

Government officials interviewed confirmed that they have not used the SAR directory for locating and requesting the services of SAR teams. On the contrary, it was highlighted by several recipient countries that SAR teams are very active in proposing their services in times of disaster and they have no need to locate and request this type of expertise.

Of the users surveyed, this directory has been visited by 17 out of 130 respondents. As it is located on another website it was not possible for this review to extract the data and assess the level of timeliness of the information. However, as the directory is actively managed it is assumed that it is more up-to-date than others.
The following graph displays the user satisfaction for the SAR directory based on the survey responses. Overall, satisfaction was low concerning accuracy and timeliness of information. Improvements to this directory focused on keeping it up-to-date.

Conclusion - SAR directory: this directory has had a relevance to the emergency assistance community – but not as a means to rapidly identify and contact SAR teams. The relevance of the directory is as means of recognition for SAR teams and their record of experience. Consequently, this review has found that the SAR directory is not assisting in the effective and efficient delivery of emergency assistance; but more so has a role that was not foreseen as part of the CR.

**MCDA (Military and Civil Defence Assets) Directory**

*Objective of the Directory:* Military, civil defence/protection expertise, capacities and services that may be offered in case of emergency by Member States.

As found by this review, the MCDA directory has not been an effective and efficient tool to finding, requesting and dispatching military-civilian defence assets within this review period. The relevance of this directory has been reduced given that only 19% of its content has been updated in the past two years and the incompleteness of the information found within it (as discussed in chapter 5.1). Persons interviewed for this review indicated the following reasons why the MCDA directory is not populated with assets and not consulted regularly:
Governments are reluctant to list MCD assets on the directory as they do not want to be approached by countries or organisations that politically it would be difficult to cooperate with;

- The concept of a central repository of assets is not compatible with the way assets are actually requested and deployed today; governments and the UN (including OCHA) respond directly to requests of countries in need and locate consequent assets using their own networks, relationships or internal databases;

- Regional processes exist today that focus more on a request mechanism than the stockage of assets data (as listed in chapter 5.1.). OCHA also has its own MCDA request mechanism that is not integrated with the CR.

Of the users surveyed, this directory has been visited by 17 out of 130 respondents. Ten of these respondents explained that they have used this directory to locate assets, to check information of their own countries or for information purposes only.

The following graph displays the user satisfaction for the MCDA directory based on the survey responses. Satisfaction was low for presentation and timeliness of information. Improvements to this directory focused on keeping it up-to-date and including more assets, particularly those of the US which was mentioned by three respondents.

**Conclusion – MCDA directory:** Since the creation of the MCDA directory over 15 years ago, the sourcing and deploying of MCD assets has changed significantly with a focus currently on more regional and bilateral exchanges. A result of these changes has been that the MCDA directory is no longer relevant to this process and this was demonstrated
by OCHA which has not managed the directory and by Member States that are largely unwilling to add and modify their assets in the directory. The domination of regional mechanisms in managing MCD assets may have implications for the longer term coordinating role of OCHA. As mentioned above, OCHA managed some two–three requests for assets in 2008. In the same period, EC-MIC managed some 17 request\(^{15}\).

**Emergency Stockpiles of Disaster Relief Items**

*Objective of the Directory: Information on emergency stockpiles of different humanitarian organizations that can be provided free of charge to a disaster-stricken country.*

Of all the directories, the Stockpiles directory is the most visited and appreciated, according to the persons canvassed for this review. However this review has found that it has only been partially successful in facilitating the rapid delivery of emergency assistance. Persons interviewed for this review indicated the following reasons why the Stockpiles directory has not been fully successful in achieving its aims:

- Given the current way the directory is updated (manual inputting of data), the directory could never have a 100% accurate view of quantities, ownership and location of stockpiles.

- The concept of a central repository of stockpiles is not compatible with the way relief goods are found, requested and deployed today. Regional mechanisms that do exist, such as EC-MIC, have a repository element but it is combined with a request mechanism.

- According to government officials interviewed, old-fashion competition blocks the UN agencies and other international organisations from full participation in the CR where transparency of their stockpiles is not always desired. According to OCHA, the necessary collaboration is already established with the Emergency and Logistics Clusters.

- The Stockpiles directory has not been integrated into any of the latest tools and concepts of emergency assistance: the virtual OSOCC and real-time reporting were mentioned by persons canvassed.

Out of the users surveyed, this directory had been visited the most - 25 out of 130 respondents had visited the directory. 11 of these respondents explained how they have used this directory, mostly to locate and assess stockpile capacities.

As this directory is actively managed by OCHA, the majority of the content (59%) has been updated in the past two years. Some 40 organisations are listed as maintaining stockpiles in the directory. It is difficult for this review to estimate how representative this is of global stockpiles. The 2005 Humanitarian Response Review found that less than 50% of organisations had registered their stockpiles with the CR\(^{16}\).

The following graph displays the user satisfaction for the Stockpiles directory based on the survey responses. Satisfaction was low particularly with the timeliness of information. The

\(^{15}\) As told to the evaluator by the managers of the EC-MIC, EC DG Environment-Civil Protection.

\(^{16}\) A, Costanza (team leader), *Humanitarian Response Review*, p. 34.
stockpiles had a higher satisfaction rating than other directories – 48% for the positive ratings of “Good” and “Excellent”. As mentioned in chapter 2, the LSU had initiated a re-design of this directory soliciting improvements for the directory from users.

Conclusion – Stockpiles directory: This directory has had limited success in contributing to the effective and efficient sourcing of emergency assistance. Instances were identified where people had used the directory for the purpose for which it was conceived. Despite the best efforts of OCHA, a directory of stockpiles will always be out-of-date due to the nature of the fast moving goods it is endeavours to catalogue. The recent internal review of the directory has identified the necessity of combining a repository function with a request mechanism. However, an up-to-date, complete and consequently credible directory would entail that all organisations participate and a common approach to inventory control is adopted allowing the automatic feeding and updating of the Stockpiles directory. These conditions may prove difficult to meet and the directory will then remain a marginalised tool within the community.

Rosters of Disaster Management Expertise

Objective of the Directory: Data on rosters of internationally available disaster management expertise, general or specialized.

The Roster DME directory contains the most out-of-date content and received the lowest satisfaction rating from users (one third of respondents ranked it as “poor” or “very poor”). Consequently, this review has found that this directory has not played an effective and efficient role in emergency assistance.
The Roster DME directory lists 36 rosters worldwide. Although difficult for this review to assess, this does not appear to cover the majority of rosters available. For example, UNDP’s Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) maintains seven relevant rosters that do not appear in this directory. Only 4% of the contact details of this directory have been updated in the past two years. It should be recalled that the Roster DME directory is not directly managed by any section within OCHA which has had a consequent impact on the very low timeliness of its content. According to the persons interviewed, governments and organisations have developed alternative mechanisms to find and contact rosters if needed.

Of the users surveyed, this directory has been visited by 15 out of 130 respondents. Five of these respondents explained that they have used this directory to try and find expertise for different humanitarian needs.

The following graph displays the user satisfaction for the Roster DME directory based on the survey responses. Overall, satisfaction was the lowest of all directories.

**Figure 12: User satisfaction – Roster DME directory**

**Conclusion – Roster DME directory:** Given this directory’s out-of-date content, low user satisfaction and apparent incompleteness, it can be concluded that it has not contributed significantly to the effective and efficient sourcing of roster information. The overall lack of management of this directory within OCHA demonstrates the lack of interest of the organisation in the directory and its consequence relevance for the community.

ATDR (Advanced Technologies for Disaster Response) Directory

Objective of the Directory: An inventory of advanced technologies for disaster response available to disaster-stricken countries on preferential terms.

Established in 2001, the ATDR directory has never contained any content apart from a brief introduction page. The directory originated from a request expressed in 2000 by Member States at several fora (notably the Fribourg Fora, ECOSOC and UN GA)\(^{18}\). OCHA then established a new directory within the existing CR to accommodate this request. In March 2001, the first meeting of experts on the establishment of the ATDR directory was convened by OCHA\(^{19}\). However, despite these efforts by OCHA, Member States have been unwilling to contribute information to the ATDR directory and no government has done so to date. According to OCHA staff and government officials interviewed for this review, due to the politically sensitive nature of the information, particularly on nuclear and biological response resources, Member States are unwilling to share this information in a semi-public (password protected) online directory.

Conclusion – ATDR directory: Originating from a request from Member States, they themselves have not provided the necessary information to create and maintain a viable directory of ATDR resources. Given the political sensitivity of the information, it is imagined that Member States exchange this information amongst themselves but are not willing to share this is in a wider forum, as is also the case with some MCDA assets. From the user’s point of view, there is no point in maintaining an empty directory online as it can only create confusion and expectations that cannot be met.

National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation in International Humanitarian Emergency Assistance

Objective of the Directory: Data of the national officials responsible for facilitating Customs treatment of international emergency humanitarian assistance, and the relevant national legislation and regulations.

Despite the efforts of OCHA to keep this directory up-to-date and current, it has only played a limited role in facilitating the delivery of emergency assistance. Organisations and governments canvassed for this review that could use the information did not know about the Customs directory and/or found the same information through other methods, such as their own in-country representatives, diplomatic channels and searching on the Internet.

As this directory is actively managed by OCHA, the majority of the content (62%) has been updated in the past two years. The national customs focal points of some 110 countries are listed in the directory. This represents some 50% of all potential national customs focal points. Staff of governments and organisations that transit goods through customs in emergency situations were interviewed for this review. On the whole, they did not see a central role for a repository of customs contacts or legislation. Most governments and organisations use their own representatives on the ground, or failing that; search on the Internet to locate the relevant customs department.


\(^{19}\) OCHA, (2001), First Meeting of Experts on the Establishment of an ATDR Directory.
Of the users surveyed, this directory has been visited by 10 out of 130 respondents. Four of these respondents explained that they have used the Customs directory to find contact details of customs' officials.

The following graph displays the user satisfaction for the Customs directory based on the survey responses. Satisfaction was low particularly for the timeliness and accuracy of information.

**Figure 13: User satisfaction – Customs directory**

**Conclusion – Customs directory:** This directory has only been able to facilitate the efficient and effective delivery of emergency assistance in a limited manner. The directory has not been used by the majority of organisations and governments canvassed for this review as it is not known and/or alternative means exist to locate such information.

**Contact Points for Disaster Response**

*Objective of the Directory: Data on emergency response services of national and international organizations designated by relevant authorities to respond to a disaster in a particular country.*

This review has found that the Contact DR directory has not been able to play an effective and efficient role in emergency assistance. Different from the other directories, this directory is relatively complete in that it lists contact points for over 200 countries with often two to three contacts per country. However, this directory could not fully meet the needs of users as only 26% of these details have been updated in the past two years. It should be recalled that the Contact DR directory is not directly managed by any section within OCHA which has had a consequent impact on the timeliness of its content.
Of the users surveyed, this directory has been visited by 15 out of 130 respondents. Five of these respondents explained that they have used this directory to find contact points in different countries. Even if the data within this directory was up-to-date, does such a directory have a large-scale role to play in ensuring the expeditious deliver of emergency assistance? As detailed in chapter 5.1, governments and organisations have developed alternative mechanisms to find and contact the appropriate emergency response services if required. Within OCHA, as a contact database, the Contact DR directory is not widely used, given that at least five competing contact directories exist\textsuperscript{20}.

The following graph displays the user satisfaction for the Contact DR directory based on the survey responses. Overall, satisfaction was low particularly concerning accuracy, timeliness and quality of information. Improvements to this directory focused on keeping it up-to-date and including more national, regional and international emergency response agencies.

![Figure 14: User satisfaction – Contact DR directory](image)

**Conclusion – Contact DR directory:** This directory has not been an efficient and effective means for governments and organisations in locating and contacting emergency response services. Further so, its relevance within the community has been reduced given that it is largely out-of-date despite its potential in providing a complete overview of contacts worldwide. Within OCHA there is little use of this directory considering the existence of other competing contact directories. The overall lack of management of this directory within OCHA demonstrates the difficulty in keeping such data up-to-date and its relevance to the organisation.

\textsuperscript{20} According to OCHA ITS.
Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance

Objective of the Directory: Data on national and international organizations regularly responding, by contributions in-kind or in cash, to the appeals for international assistance launched by the affected countries.

The Donors directory is a contact list of predominantly the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of major donor countries, with in-country contacts and some Geneva-based contacts.

According to this review, this directory has not played the role anticipated for it on a large-scale – as a tool to facilitate the contact between recipient and donor countries. Recipient countries have their own processes to locate and contact potential donors that do not include using a central repository of information such as the CR provides. On a very small scale, the directory has been useful in some ways: Five survey respondents, the majority from NGOs or international organisations, explained that they have used the Donors directory to find contact details of donor governments in order to submit funding proposals.

Of the users surveyed, this directory has been the least visited of all active directories: out of 130 respondents, nine had visited the directory. Only 36% of the directory’s content has been updated in the past two years and it is assessed as being incomplete in terms of information offered (as explained in chapter 5.1. question 3).

The following graph displays the user satisfaction for the Donors directory based on the survey responses. Overall, satisfaction is higher than other directories although it should be noted that only nine people responded for this directory. Improvements to this directory focused on keeping it up-to-date and adding more donors, notably private donors.

![User satisfaction graph](image-url)

*Figure 15: User satisfaction – Donors directory*
While lacking the precise contact details of donors, the FTS is an alternative source for recipient countries and organisations and contains more precise data than the Donors directory: Providing the who, when, where and what of donors and recipients.

**Conclusion - Donors directory:** It is difficult to see the added value of this directory given its state of incompleteness, out-of-date content and low usage. A balance must be seen between the small number of users that have benefited from this directory and the recipient countries that see no role for such a directory together with OCHA’s External Relations section who sees no value in it (and have demonstrated this by not updating it). For this evaluator, the balance tips towards the latter, especially given that an alternative source exists, the FTS, which is more informative and precise concerning potential donors.

6. **Conclusions**

This review has found that the CR has had limited added value for the UN and the broader humanitarian emergency assistance community and for those that have used the tool, their satisfaction has been low.

Instances were identified where the CR had been used as it was intended. But these were insignificant in number and their contribution to a more rapid deployment of emergency assistance was not shown. Throughout this report, evidence was provided as to why the CR in its totality has had limited added value. This evidence also infers that there will be no longer-term impact of the CR. From this analysis, a number of overriding conclusions can be drawn, which are complimentary to the conclusions of each of the four review questions and the eight directories found in chapter 5.

**To meet the needs of users, tools such as the CR need to be managed:** This review has clearly illustrated that the CR directories that were actively managed were for the large part, more successful in meeting the needs of their users than those that were not managed. In 2006, OCHA management effectively “discontinued” two directories, Roster DME and Contact DR by deciding that they should be managed by “all”, in other words, by no one. In the intervening years, two other directories, MCDA and Donors have not been managed by the sections responsible, effectively decreasing their relevance. Today, only three directories remain that are managed actively and have any relevance: SAR, Stockpiles and Customs. This perception of “gradual disengagement” from a GA requested tool does not place OCHA in a positive light with Member States and other organisations. This absence of overall management of the CR should be of concern to the highest levels of OCHA.

**To play an integrated role within OCHA, tools such as the CR must be promoted:** This review has shown that visibility of the CR was very low within its targeted community thus impacting on its use and consequent lack of success. The visibility of the CR was perhaps even lower within OCHA. According to OCHA ITS, some 70 independent web-based tools exist within the organisation. If a tool like the CR is to be known, used and integrated where it is appropriate, it must be known and understood, firstly within the organisation.

**In a user-generated content tool, what is the interest of the contributor:** It is interesting to note that one of the most successful directories in terms of users contributing content (SAR) was where the users could see a direct benefit for themselves (in this case,
recognition and potential funding). In such a tool which relies on user-generated content to populate it, reflection must be given as to what is the interest of the user in contributing content. In the case of most directories, the benefits were not clearly expressed.

**Is there a place for centralised static information in emergency response:** This review has shown that even where considerable efforts have been made to keep directories up-to-date, due to the nature of emergency response, a directory will be out-of-date as soon as it is updated. Consequently its reliability is constantly in question. The only solution to this dilemma is the integration of real-time data feeds directly from sources.

**Alternative mechanisms have been created and taken priority:** Countries that are in need of emergency assistance and those prepared to deploy it, have developed alternative mechanisms to using a central repository such as the CR. This is why the CR is perceived as obsolete. Even where regional organisations use a repository function (such as EC-MIC), it is combined with a request mechanism which is more in line with how emergency assistance functions today.

**Is decentralisation the future of information management for emergency response:** A global repository of information on emergency response capacities seems like a good idea in theory yet in practice has been difficult to implement. People interviewed for this review believe regional organisations have managed the collection and use of this information much better. But despite ambitions, they remain “regional” and the UN needs to reflect carefully before relinquishing these aspects of information management for emergency response from an international level to a regional level where organisations have their own agendas and priorities.

### 7. Recommendations

The findings and conclusions of this review indicate that a certain amount of reflection is required on the future of the CR. As shown in this review, since the creation of the CR some 17 years ago the sourcing and dispatching of emergency assistance has changed and the concept of the CR and the mandate given to OCHA to manage it needs to be reframed considerably.

These recommendations are for consideration by the senior management of OCHA.

#### 7.1. General

Managers of the OCHA units directly responsible for the individual directories should study this report and formulate proposals to respond to the specific recommendations detailed below.

Once the above process has been completed, under the leadership of ESB or OCHA Geneva Director, the above-mentioned managers should meet to consider the future of the CR and formulate proposals with the objective of OCHA senior management informing the GA on the future of the CR.
OCHA senior management should then consider the global proposal and take a decision concerning the future of the CR and its individual directories, in consultation with the Member States.

7.2. Specific

Recommendations are listed for each directory. These recommendations should be considered in tandem with the general recommendations above.

Search and Rescue Directory: The relevance of this directory to the CR should be reconsidered. This directory serves a purpose as an INSARAG membership directory but not as an emergency response mechanism (page 22).

Military and Civil Defence Assets Directory: OCHA needs to consider if an MCDA directory is still required given the low level of interest in this directory. The need for a mechanism to request MCD assets is still relevant even if demand is limited (page 23).

Emergency Stockpiles of Disaster Relief Items: This directory could play a central role in providing an overview of stockpiles worldwide. However, it should be maintained only with the view of advocating the adoption of standard inventory controls (at least amongst UN agencies) that would allow for the updating of the directory through automatic feeds (page 25).

Rosters of Disaster Management Expertise (Roster DME): There is little interest in maintaining this directory within OCHA and with its intended users. This is evident in the low usage of this directory and its outdated content (page 26).

Advanced Technologies for Disaster Response Directory (ATDR): The ATDR directory has not attracted the necessary support from Member States in order to populate it with pertinent content. Without this support, OCHA cannot fulfil the mandate given to it (page 28).

National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation in International Humanitarian Emergency Assistance (Customs): The relevance of this directory should be reconsidered, given the existence of alternative methods to locate the content found on this directory (page 28).

Contact Points for Disaster Response (Contact DR): Given the existence of other OCHA contact directories, the need for this directory should be reconsidered. An analysis would be needed to determine if similar contact information is available in the other existing OCHA contact directories (page 29).

Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance (Donors): The necessity of this directory should be reconsidered given the existence of the FTS which contains considerable information on donors and could be enhanced with basic contact details per donor listed (page 31).
Annex One: Review Methodology

The review adopted a mixed-methods approach employing both quantitative and qualitative methods to collect data and information. The methodology is further summarised in the review evaluation framework found at annex 3.

Desk review of relevant external and internal documents: Documents and websites relevant to the CR were read and analysed, the main documents consulted are listed at annex 6.

Content analysis of all CR directories: The content of the directories were extracted and their content analysed, mainly to establish the timeliness and completeness of the content stocked within the directories.

Analysis of available web metrics for the CR: Due to the technical set-up of the CR, only a very limited analysis could be undertaken of the web metrics of the CR. These statistics were provided by OCHA ITS.

Expert review of the CR (compatibility with usability standards): An expert review was undertaken of the CR with compatibility assessed with the ISO standard on web interfaces\(^2\). The expert review also assessed three other comparable web-based tools; the FTS, ERSHD and ATSDR. The results of this review are found at annex 7. These tools were selected on the basis of the following criteria:

- Tools that are relevant to emergency response;
- Tools that are public interfaces for repository style databases;
- Tools that require regular updating.

Online survey of CR users, information providers and non-users: an email was sent to 2,103 email addresses inviting these people to complete an online survey (set-up using the Benchpoint survey software). These email addresses were sourced from registered CR users (284), UNDAC focal points (156) and contact persons found on the CR (1,663). Of these 2,103 email addresses, 682 were found to be not functioning. 130 persons responded to the survey, which is a response rate of 9%. Although beneath predicted returns, this was satisfactory to allow for an analysis to draw some conclusions. The survey questions can be found at annex 8 of this report.

Semi-structured interviews with OCHA staff, stakeholders, CR users, information providers and non-users: Interviews were undertaken with 40 persons, in person or by telephone. The full list of persons interviewed is found at annex 2.

\(^2\) ISO standard, 9241-151 “Guidance on WWW user interfaces”
Annex Two: Persons interviewed for the review

OCHA staff:

Andrew Alspach, Information Management Officer, Field Information Section (FIS)
Virginie Bohl, Programme Assistant, LSU
Alan Butterfield, CM Coordination Officer, CMCS
Isabelle De Muyser-Boucher, Chief of Unit, LSU
Ivo Freijsen, Chief of Section, Surge Capacity Section
Chérif Ghaly, Chief of Section, ITS
David Kaatrud, Director, Coordination and Response Division (CRD)
Rashid Khalikov, Director, New York
Jesper Lund, Humanitarian Affairs Officer, FCSS
Rudi Muller, Deputy Director, CRD-
Rene Nijenhuis, Programme Officer, Environmental Emergencies Unit
Thomas Peter, Manager, ERCC
Colin Richards, CM Coordination Officer, CMCS
Ronaldo Reario, CM Coordination Officer, CMCS
Vladimir Sakharov, Chief of Section, EPS
Justyna Susla, Donor Relations Officer, Donor Relations Section

Government agencies and representatives:

John Adlam, Emergency Logistics Management Team, Department for International Development, UK*
Pitchayaphant Charnbhumidol, humanitarian affairs advisor, Permanent Mission of Thailand, Geneva
Astri Endresen, Emergency Response Officer, Permanent Mission of Norway, Geneva*
Michael Hartfield, Programme Manager. Pacific Regional Environment and Vulnerability, New Zealand Agency for International Development*
Ian Howard-Williams, Head of Operations Group, Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs, Department for International Development, UK*
Mazhar Iqbal, Counsellor, Humanitarian Affairs, Permanent Mission of Pakistan, Geneva
Peter Kaas-Claesson, Colonel - Regional Commander, Danish Emergency Management Agency*
Satoshi Kinoshita, Deputy Director, International Peace Cooperation, Japan*
Christoph I. Lang, 1st Secretary, Embassy of Switzerland, Beijing, China*
Kjell Larsson, Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency, Sweden*
Thanh Le, Manager, Emergency Response Operations, Ausaid, Australia*
Julian Neale, Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs, Department for International Development, UK*
Volkan Oskiper, 1st Secretary for Humanitarian Affairs, Permanent Mission of Turkey, Geneva
Andreas Schiess, Policy Coordinator Civil Emergency Planning, Multilateral Division, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Switzerland*
Huy Tan Vu, Humanitarian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Vietnam
Viktor Wohlfart, International Civil Protection and Disaster Relief, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Austria*
NGOs and International Organisations:

Saša Borko, Policy Officer, DG Environment-Civil Protection, European Commission*
Eric Branckaert, Information Management Officer, Logistics Cluster Global Support Cell, World Food Programme (WFP)*
Kim Eling, Counsellor, European Commission, Permanent Delegation to the International Organisations in Geneva
Benedicte Giæver, Director of Emergency Response, Norwegian Refugee Council
Philippe Martou, Deputy Chief of Aviation Service, WFP*
Evgeni Parfenov, Operational Desk Officer, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Private sector:

Niall Roche, public health consultant, Ireland*

*Denotes external user of the CR
**Annex Three: Review evaluation framework (from Inception report)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data collection tools</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Is the information provided in the CR relevant and appropriate in meeting the needs of its end users? | - Level of usage of the CR’s directories  
- Level of relevance and appropriateness of the CR for users  
- Analysis of content compared to users’ needs | - Desk review  
- Interviews  
- Online survey  
- Content analysis  
- Expert review of CR  
- Web metrics | - Documentation  
- Stakeholders / users / non-users  
- Users  
- CR  
- CR statistics |
| 2. Is the CR an effective tool in obtaining information and extracting disaster management information? | - Level of effectiveness of the CR for users  
- Instances of how the CR has contributed towards effectiveness | - Online survey  
- Interviews  
- Expert review of CR | - Users  
- Stakeholders / users / non-users  
- CR |
| 3. Does the information provided in the CR authoritatively cover the needs of its users and clients? | - Level of satisfaction of users and stakeholders  
- Analysis of content compared to users’ needs  
- Instances of how the CR covers the needs of users and stakeholders | - Desk review  
- Interviews  
- Online survey  
- Content analysis  
- Expert review of CR | - Documentation  
- Stakeholders / users / non-users  
- Users  
- CR  
- CR |
| 4. How user friendly is the CR from a technical perspective? | - Level of user friendliness according to users and stakeholders  
- Level of compatibility with usability standards (ISO 9241-151 “Guidance on WWW user interfaces”) | - Interviews  
- Online survey  
- Expert review of CR | - Stakeholders/Users  
- Users  
- CR |
## Annex Four: Reconstructed results framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight directories of the CR established and accessible to potential users from the disaster management community worldwide.</td>
<td>- Eight directories of the CR are created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Eight directories of the CR are available online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight directories of the CR stocked with relevant, appropriate and up-to-date information on disaster management capacities.</td>
<td>- Level of relevance and appropriateness of information found in the CR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Level of currency of information found in the CR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential users from the disaster management community worldwide learned of the CR.</td>
<td>- Level of awareness of the CR amongst the disaster management community worldwide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential users from the disaster management community worldwide visited the CR and registered.</td>
<td>- Number of visitors to the CR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of registered users of the CR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users obtained information of use to them in one or more of the eight directories of the CR.</td>
<td>- Instances of use of information from the CR are documented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Level of user satisfaction with the CR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users contributed information from their organisations to one or more of the eight directories of the CR.</td>
<td>- Level of information on the CR contributed by users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information found on the CR facilitated the rapid identification of appropriate disaster management services.</td>
<td>- Instances of information from the CR facilitating the rapid identification of appropriate disaster management services are documented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information found on the CR contributed to the rapid delivery of humanitarian emergency assistance.</td>
<td>- Instances of information from the CR contributing to the rapid delivery of humanitarian emergency assistance are documented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of humanitarian emergency assistance improved.</td>
<td><em>Not measured in this review</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory</td>
<td>Potential information providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search and Rescue (SAR)</td>
<td>- National search and rescue agencies&lt;br&gt;- National emergency agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military and Civil Defence Assets (MCDA)</td>
<td>- National civil defence &amp; protection agencies&lt;br&gt;- National military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Stockpiles of Disaster Relief Items</td>
<td>- UN agencies&lt;br&gt;- NGOs&lt;br&gt;- International organisations&lt;br&gt;- Corporations&lt;br&gt;- National emergency agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roster of Disaster Management Expertise</td>
<td>- UN agencies&lt;br&gt;- NGOs&lt;br&gt;- International organisations&lt;br&gt;- National emergency agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Technologies for Disaster Response (ATDR)</td>
<td>- National emergency agencies&lt;br&gt;- UN agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation in Focal Points in International Humanitarian Emergency Assistance</td>
<td>- National customs agencies&lt;br&gt;- National emergency agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact points for Disaster Response</td>
<td>- National emergency agencies&lt;br&gt;- National health, security and environment ministries&lt;br&gt;- UN agencies&lt;br&gt;- NGOs&lt;br&gt;- International organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance</td>
<td>- OCHA Donor Relations Section&lt;br&gt;- National aid agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Annex Seven: Expert review of usability – summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CR</th>
<th>FTS</th>
<th>ERSHDB</th>
<th>ATSDR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6 High-level design decisions and design strategy

**6.1 General aspects**

- 6.2 Determining the purpose of a Web application
- 6.3 Analysing the target user groups
- 6.4 Analysing the users' goals and tasks
- 6.5 Matching application purpose and user goals
- 6.6 Recognizing the purpose of a web application
- 6.7 Prioritizing different design goals
- 6.8 Applying ICT accessibility standards
- 6.9 Applying software accessibility standards
- 6.10 Applying content accessibility standards
- 6.11 Identifying the website and its owner
- 6.12 Coherent multi-site strategy

#### 7 Content design

**7.1 Conceptual content model**

- 7.1.1 General
- 7.1.2 Designing the conceptual model
- 7.1.3 Appropriateness of content for the target group and tasks
- 7.1.4 Completeness of content
- 7.1.5 Structuring content appropriately
- 7.1.6 Level of granularity

**7.2 Content objects and functionality**

- 7.2.1 General
- 7.2.2 Independence of content, structure and presentation
- 7.2.3 Selecting suitable media
- 7.2.4 Keeping the content up to date
- 7.2.5 Making the date and time of the last update available
- 7.2.6 Enabling communication with the website owner
- 7.2.7 Accepting online user feedback

**7.2.8 Privacy and business policies**

- 7.2.8.1 Providing a privacy policy statement
- 7.2.8.2 Providing a business policy statement
- 7.2.8.3 User control of personal information
- 7.2.8.4 Storing information on the user’s machine

**7.2.9 Individualisation and user adaptation**

- 7.2.9.1 General
- 7.2.9.2 Taking account of the users’ tasks and information needs
- 7.2.9.3 Making individualization and adaptation evident
7.2.9.4 Making user profiles evident
7.2.9.5 Allowing users to see and change profiles
7.2.9.6 Informing about automatically generated profiles
7.2.9.7 Switching off automatic user adaptation
7.2.9.8 Providing access to complete content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.2.9.4 Making user profiles evident</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.2.9.5 Allowing users to see and change profiles</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.9.6 Informing about automatically generated profiles</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.9.7 Switching off automatic user adaptation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.9.8 Providing access to complete content</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Navigation and search

8.1 General

8.2 General guidance on navigation
8.2.1 Making navigation self-descriptive
8.2.2 Showing users where they are
8.2.3 Supporting different navigation behaviours
8.2.4 Offering alternative access paths
8.2.5 Minimizing navigation effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.2.1 Making navigation self-descriptive</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.2.2 Showing users where they are</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 Navigation structure

8.3.1 General
8.3.2 Choosing suitable navigation structures
8.3.3 Breadth versus depth of the navigation structure
8.3.4 Organizing the navigation in a meaningful manner
8.3.5 Offering task-based navigation
8.3.6 Offering clear navigation within multi-step tasks
8.3.7 Combining different ways to organize navigation
8.3.8 Informative home page
8.3.9 Directly accessing relevant information from the home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.3.1 General</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.3.2 Choosing suitable navigation structures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.3 Breadth versus depth of the navigation structure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.4 Organizing the navigation in a meaningful manner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.5 Offering task-based navigation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.6 Offering clear navigation within multi-step tasks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.7 Combining different ways to organize navigation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4 Navigation components

8.4.1 General
8.4.2 Providing navigation overviews
8.4.3 Maintaining visibility of navigation links
8.4.4 Consistency between navigation components/content
8.4.5 Placing navigation components consistently
8.4.6 Making several levels of navigation visible
8.4.7 Splitting up navigation overviews
8.4.8 Providing a site map
8.4.9 Providing cross linking to potentially relevant content
8.4.10 Making dynamic navigation links obvious
8.4.11 Linking back to the home page or landmark pages
8.4.12 Going back to higher levels
8.4.13 Providing a “step back” function
8.4.14 Subdividing long pages
8.4.15 Explicit activation
8.4.16 Avoiding dead links
8.4.17 Avoiding incorrect links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.4.1 General</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.4.2 Providing navigation overviews</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.3 Maintaining visibility of navigation links</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.4 Consistency between navigation components/content</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.5 Placing navigation components consistently</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.6 Making several levels of navigation visible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.7 Splitting up navigation overviews</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.8 Providing a site map</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.9 Providing cross linking to potentially relevant content</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.10 Making dynamic navigation links obvious</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.11 Linking back to the home page or landmark pages</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.12 Going back to higher levels</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.5 Search

8.5.1 General
8.5.2 Search function

8.5.1 General
8.5.2.1 Providing a search function  Yes Yes Yes Yes
8.5.2.2 Providing appropriate search functions  Yes Yes Yes Yes
8.5.2.3 Providing a simple search function  Yes Yes Yes Yes
8.5.2.4 Advanced search  No No Yes Yes
8.5.2.5 Full-text search  Partially Yes Partially Yes
8.5.2.6 Describing the search technique used  No No Yes Yes
8.5.2.7 Availability of search  Yes Yes No Yes
8.5.2.8 Search field size  Yes Yes No Yes
8.5.2.9 Shortcut to search function  No No Yes Yes
8.5.2.10 Error-tolerant search  Partially Yes Partially Partially

### 8.5.3 Search results
8.5.3.1 Ordering of search results  Yes Yes No No
8.5.3.2 Relevance-based ranking of search results  No Yes No Yes
8.5.3.3 Descriptiveness of results  Yes Yes No Yes
8.5.3.4 Sorting or filtering search results  Partially Yes Partially Yes

### 8.5.4 Using search functions
8.5.4.1 Scope of a search  Yes Yes Yes Yes
8.5.4.2 Selecting the scope of a search  No Yes Yes Yes
8.5.4.3 Providing feedback on the volume of the search result  No Yes Yes Yes
8.5.4.4 Handling large result sets  No Yes No Yes
8.5.4.5 Showing the query with the results  Yes Yes No Yes

### 8.5.5 Repeating and refining searches
8.5.5.1 Giving advice for unsuccessful searches  No No No Yes
8.5.5.2 Repeating searches  Yes Yes Yes Yes
8.5.5.3 Refining searches  No Yes No Yes

### 9 Content presentation
9.1 General
9.2 Observing principles of human perception
9.3 Page design issues functions
9.3.1 General page information  Yes Partially Yes Yes
9.3.2 Consistent page layout  No Yes No Yes
9.3.3 Placing title information consistently  Yes Yes Yes Yes
9.3.4 Recognising new content  No Yes Yes Partially
9.3.5 Visualising temporal status  No Yes Yes Yes
9.3.6 Selecting appropriate page lengths  Yes Yes No Yes
9.3.7 Minimise vertical scrolling  No Yes No Yes
9.3.8 Avoiding horizontal scrolling  Yes Yes Yes Yes
9.3.9 Using colour  Yes Yes Yes Yes
9.3.10 Using frames with care  No N/A N/A N/A
9.3.11 Providing alternatives to frame-based presentation  No N/A N/A N/A
9.3.12 Providing alternative text-only pages  No No No Yes
9.3.13 Consistency across related Web sites  No Yes Yes Yes
9.3.14 Using appropriate techniques for defining the layout  No No No No
9.3.15 Identifying all pages of a Web site  No Yes Yes Yes
9.3.16 Providing printable document versions  No Yes Yes Yes
9.3.17 Use of “white space”  Yes Yes Yes Yes

### 9.4 Link design
9.4.1 General
9.4.2 Identification of links
9.4.3 Distinguishing adjacent links from each other
9.4.4 Distinguishing navigation links from transactions
9.4.5 Self-explanatory link cues
9.4.6 Using familiar terminology for navigation links
9.4.7 Using descriptive link labels
9.4.8 Highlighting previously visited links
9.4.9 Marking links to special targets
9.4.10 Marking links opening new windows
9.4.11 Distinguishing navigation links from controls
9.4.12 Distinguishable withinpage links
9.4.13 Link length
9.4.14 Redundant links
9.4.15 Avoiding link overload
9.4.16 Page titles as bookmarks

9.5 Interaction objects
9.5.1 Choosing appropriate interaction objects
9.5.2 Making interaction objects identifiable/understandable
9.5.3 Providing keyboard shortcuts

9.6 Text design
9.6.1 Readability of text
9.6.2 Supporting text skimming
9.6.3 Writing style
9.6.4 Text quality
9.6.5 Identifying the language used
9.6.6 Making text resizable by the user

10 General design aspects
10.1 Designing for cultural diversity and multilingual use
10.1.1 General
10.1.2 Showing relevant location information
10.1.3 Identifying supported languages
10.1.4 Using appropriate formats & units
10.1.5 Designing presentation of text in different languages
10.2 Providing help
10.3 Making Web user interfaces error-tolerant
10.3.1 Minimizing user errors
10.3.2 Providing clear error messages
10.4 URL names
10.5 Acceptable download times
10.6 Using generally accepted technologies and standards
10.7 Supporting common technologies
10.8 Making Web user interfaces robust
10.9 Designing for input device independence
10.10 Making the user interface of embedded objects usable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>9.4.2</th>
<th>9.4.3</th>
<th>9.4.4</th>
<th>9.4.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of links</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguishing adjacent links from each other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguishing navigation links from transactions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-explanatory link cues</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using familiar terminology for navigation links</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using descriptive link labels</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlighting previously visited links</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking links to special targets</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking links opening new windows</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguishing navigation links from controls</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguishable withinpage links</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link length</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundant links</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding link overload</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page titles as bookmarks</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.5 Interaction objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>9.5.1</th>
<th>9.5.2</th>
<th>9.5.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choosing appropriate interaction objects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making interaction objects identifiable/understandable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing keyboard shortcuts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.6 Text design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>9.6.1</th>
<th>9.6.2</th>
<th>9.6.3</th>
<th>9.6.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readability of text</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting text skimming</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing style</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text quality</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying the language used</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making text resizable by the user</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 General design aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>10.1.1</th>
<th>10.1.2</th>
<th>10.1.3</th>
<th>10.1.4</th>
<th>10.1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designing for cultural diversity and multilingual use</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing relevant location information</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying supported languages</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using appropriate formats &amp; units</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing presentation of text in different languages</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.2 Providing help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>10.3.1</th>
<th>10.3.2</th>
<th>10.4</th>
<th>10.5</th>
<th>10.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making Web user interfaces error-tolerant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizing user errors</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clear error messages</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URL names</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable download times</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using generally accepted technologies and standards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting common technologies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Web user interfaces robust</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing for input device independence</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the user interface of embedded objects usable</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex Eight: Survey of users and non-users

Questionnaire – Feedback on the OCHA Central Register of Disaster Management Capacities

We would appreciate your feedback on the OCHA Central Register of Disaster Management Capacities (http://ocha.unog.ch/cr).

The Central Register was created to support the UN system and the international humanitarian community in their efforts to ensure expeditious delivery of humanitarian emergency assistance. The Central Register contains eight directories:

Five directories of specific disaster management assets:
1) Search and Rescue (SAR)
2) Military and Civil Defence Assets (MCDA)
3) Emergency Stockpile of Disaster Relief Items
4) Roster of Disaster Management Expertise
5) Advanced Technologies for Disaster Response (ATDR)

Three directories of disaster management focal points
1) National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation in Focal Points in International Humanitarian Emergency Assistance
2) Contact points for Disaster Response
3) Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance

This survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. The aim is to help us improve the Central Register. All feedback provided is anonymous.

1. In the past two years, how often do you recall having visited the Central Register?

- I have never visited the Central Register
- 1-5 times in the past two years
- 6-10 times in the past two years
- 1-2 times per month for the past two years
- 1-2 times per week for the past two years
- 1-2 times per day for the past two years

------>Those that answered “I never visit” go to question 56) ------>

Search and Rescue Directory

2. Have you ever visited the Search and Rescue Directory?

- Yes
- No

------>Those that answered “No” go to question 10) ------>
3. How would you rate the Search and Rescue Directory on the following characteristics:

Providing information that I need

- Very poor
- Poor
- Ok
- Good
- Excellent

Quantity of information for what I need

- Very poor
- Poor
- Ok
- Good
- Excellent

Level of accuracy of the information in the directory

- Very poor
- Poor
- Ok
- Good
- Excellent

Reliability of the information in the directory

- Very poor
- Poor
- Ok
- Good
- Excellent

Presentation of the information in the directory

- Very poor
- Poor
- Ok
- Good
- Excellent

Ease of finding information in the directory

- Very poor
- Poor
- Ok
- Good
- Excellent

Ease of using the directory

- Very poor
- Poor
- Ok
- Good
- Excellent

Ease of using the search function of the directory

- Very poor
- Poor
- Ok
- Good
- Excellent

Information provided is up-to-date in the directory

- Very poor
- Poor
- Ok
- Good
- Excellent

Information is available in time in the directory – when I need it

- Very poor
- Poor
- Ok
- Good
- Excellent

4. Can you provide an example of how you have used the information you have found in the Search and Rescue Directory:

5. How important for your work is the Search and Rescue Directory:

- Not important
- Slightly important
- Neutral
- Important
- Very important
6. What is your overall rating of the Search and Rescue Directory:

- Very poor
- Poor
- Ok
- Good
- Excellent

7. What other websites or other sources do you use to find similar information to that found in the Search and Rescue Directory:

8. Is there any information that is missing from the Search and Rescue Directory that you would like to see added:

9. Do you have any comments or suggestions on improving the Search and Rescue Directory:

**Military and Civil Defence Assets (MCDA)**

10. Have you ever visited the Military and Civil Defence Assets (MCDA) Directory?

- Yes
- No

------->>Those that answered “No” go to question 18)------->>

11. How would you rate the Military and Civil Defence Assets Directory on the following characteristics:

- Providing information that I need
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent

- Quantity of information for what I need
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent

- Level of accuracy of the information in the directory
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent

- Reliability of the information in the directory
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent

- Presentation of the information in the directory
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent

- Ease of finding information in the directory
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Can you provide an example of how you have used the information you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have found in the Military and Civil Defence Assets Directory:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How important for your work is the Military and Civil Defence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Directory:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What is your overall rating of the Military and Civil Defence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Directory:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. What other websites or other sources do you use to find similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information to that found in the Military and Civil Defence Assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Is there any information that is missing from Military and Civil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Assets Directory that you would like to see added:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Do you have any comments or suggestions on improving the Military</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Civil Defence Assets Directory:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Have you ever visited the Emergency Stockpile of Disaster Relief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items Directory?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emergency Stockpile of Disaster Relief Items Directory

18. Have you ever visited the Emergency Stockpile of Disaster Relief Items Directory?
   - Yes
   - No
19. How would you rate the Emergency Stockpile of Disaster Relief Items Directory on the following characteristics:

Providing information that I need

- Very poor - Poor - Ok - Good - Excellent

Quantity of information for what I need

- Very poor - Poor - Ok - Good - Excellent

Level of accuracy of the information in the directory

- Very poor - Poor - Ok - Good - Excellent

Reliability of the information in the directory

- Very poor - Poor - Ok - Good - Excellent

Presentation of the information in the directory

- Very poor - Poor - Ok - Good - Excellent

Ease of finding information in the directory

- Very poor - Poor - Ok - Good - Excellent

Ease of using the directory

- Very poor - Poor - Ok - Good - Excellent

Ease of using the search function of the directory

- Very poor - Poor - Ok - Good - Excellent

Information provided is up-to-date in the directory

- Very poor - Poor - Ok - Good - Excellent

Information is available in time in the directory – when I need it

- Very poor - Poor - Ok - Good - Excellent

20. Can you provide an example of how you have used the information you have found in the Emergency Stockpile of Disaster Relief Items Directory:

21. How important for your work is the Emergency Stockpile of Disaster Relief Items Directory:
22. What is your overall rating of the Emergency Stockpile of Disaster Relief Items Directory:

- [ ] Very poor
- [ ] Poor
- [ ] Ok
- [ ] Good
- [ ] Excellent

23. Do you have any comments or suggestions on improving the Emergency Stockpile of Disaster Relief Items Directory:

24. Have you ever visited the Roster of Disaster Management Expertise Directory?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

------->> Those that answered “No” go to question 32 )

25. How would you rate the Roster of Disaster Management Expertise Directory on the following characteristics:

- Providing information that I need:
  - [ ] Very poor
  - [ ] Poor
  - [ ] Ok
  - [ ] Good
  - [ ] Excellent

- Quantity of information for what I need:
  - [ ] Very poor
  - [ ] Poor
  - [ ] Ok
  - [ ] Good
  - [ ] Excellent

- Level of accuracy of the information in the directory:
  - [ ] Very poor
  - [ ] Poor
  - [ ] Ok
  - [ ] Good
  - [ ] Excellent

- Reliability of the information in the directory:
  - [ ] Very poor
  - [ ] Poor
  - [ ] Ok
  - [ ] Good
  - [ ] Excellent

- Presentation of the information in the directory:
  - [ ] Very poor
  - [ ] Poor
  - [ ] Ok
  - [ ] Good
  - [ ] Excellent

- Ease of finding information in the directory:
  - [ ] Very poor
  - [ ] Poor
  - [ ] Ok
  - [ ] Good
  - [ ] Excellent
Ease of using the directory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Ease of using the search function of the directory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Information provided is up-to-date in the directory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Information is available in time in the directory – when I need it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. Can you provide an example of how you have used the information you have found in the Roster of Disaster Management Expertise Directory:

27. How important for your work is the Roster of Disaster Management Expertise Directory:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. What is your overall rating of the Roster of Disaster Management Expertise Directory:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

29. What other websites or other sources do you use to find similar information to that found in the Roster of Disaster Management Expertise Directory:

30. Is there any information that is missing from Roster of Disaster Management Expertise Directory that you would like to see added:

31. Do you have any comments or suggestions on improving the Roster of Disaster Management Expertise Directory:

**National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation**

32. Have you ever visited the National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation in Focal Points in International Humanitarian Emergency Assistance Directory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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33. How would you rate the National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation Directory on the following characteristics:

Providing information that I need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantity of information for what I need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of accuracy of the information in the directory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability of the information in the directory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presentation of the information in the directory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ease of finding information in the directory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ease of using the directory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ease of using the search function of the directory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information provided is up-to-date in the directory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information is available in time in the directory – when I need it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Can you provide an example of how you have used the information you have found in the National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation Directory:
35. How important for your work is the National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation Directory:

- Not important
- Slightly important
- Neutral
- Important
- Very important

36. What is your overall rating of the National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation Directory:

- Very poor
- Poor
- Ok
- Good
- Excellent

37. What other websites or other sources do you use to find similar information to that found in the National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation Directory:

38. Is there any information that is missing from National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation Directory that you would like to see added:

39. Do you have any comments or suggestions on improving the National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation Directory:

**Contact Points for Disaster Response Directory**

40. Have you ever visited the Contact Points for Disaster Response Directory?

- Yes
- No

------->Those that answered “No” go to question 48) ------->

41. How would you rate the Contact Points for Disaster Response Directory on the following characteristics:

- Providing information that I need
- Quantity of information for what I need
- Level of accuracy of the information in the directory
Reliability of the information in the directory

Very poor  Poor  Ok  Good  Excellent

Presentation of the information in the directory

Very poor  Poor  Ok  Good  Excellent

Ease of finding information in the directory

Very poor  Poor  Ok  Good  Excellent

Ease of using the directory

Very poor  Poor  Ok  Good  Excellent

Ease of using the search function of the directory

Very poor  Poor  Ok  Good  Excellent

Information provided is up-to-date in the directory

Very poor  Poor  Ok  Good  Excellent

Information is available in time in the directory – when I need it

Very poor  Poor  Ok  Good  Excellent

42. Can you provide an example of how you have used the information you have found in the Contact Points for Disaster Response Directory?

43. How important for your work is the Contact Points for Disaster Response Directory:

Not important  Slightly important  Neutral  Important  Very important

44. What is your overall rating of the Contact Points for Disaster Response Directory:

Very poor  Poor  Ok  Good  Excellent

45. What other websites or other sources do you use to find similar information to that found in the Contact Points for Disaster Response Directory?

46. Is there any information that is missing from Contact Points for Disaster Response Directory that you would like to see added:
47. Do you have any comments or suggestions on improving the Contact Points for Disaster Response Directory:

**Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance Directory**

48. Have you ever visited the Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance Directory?
  - Yes  
  - No

---------> Those that answered “No” go to question 56) --------->

49. How would you rate the Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance Directory on the following characteristics:

- Providing information that I need
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent

- Quantity of information for what I need
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent

- Level of accuracy of the information in the directory
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent

- Reliability of the information in the directory
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent

- Presentation of the information in the directory
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent

- Ease of finding information in the directory
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent

- Ease of using the directory
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent

- Ease of using the search function of the directory
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent

- Information provided is up-to-date in the directory
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent

- Information is available in time in the directory – when I need it
  - Very poor
  - Poor
  - Ok
  - Good
  - Excellent
50. Can you provide an example of how you have used the information you have found in the Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance Directory?

51. How important for your work is the Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance Directory:

- [ ] Not important
- [ ] Slightly important
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Important
- [ ] Very important

52. What is your overall rating of the Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance Directory:

- [ ] Very poor
- [ ] Poor
- [ ] Ok
- [ ] Good
- [ ] Excellent

53. What other websites or other sources do you use to find similar information to that found in the Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance Directory:

54. Is there any information that is missing from Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance Directory that you would like to see added:

55. Do you have any comments or suggestions on improving the Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance Directory:
Demographic questions

56. Please indicate your country of residence:
[standard ISO list]

57. Which of the following best describes the organization you are working for:
- Academic / research
- Government department, agency or body
- Private company
- UN organization
- International organization/NGO
- Media
- Other
  If OTHER, please specify_________

58. Which of the following best describes your current role:
- Director / senior manager
- Manager
- Professional staff
- General staff
- Other
  If OTHER, please specify_________

59. Would you be willing to be interviewed about the Central Register of Disaster Management Capacities? If so, please write in here your name, email and telephone number:

60. This survey has been about the Central Register of Disaster Management Capacities. Do you have any further suggestions or comments to add?

Thank you for taking the time to share your comments and feedback on the Central Register
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Annex Ten: Inception Report

Objectives and scope of the review

On 1 February 2008, the General Assembly (GA) adopted the Resolution A/RES/62/92 “International cooperation on humanitarian assistance in the field of natural disasters, from relief to development”. In paragraph nine of A/RES/62/92 the GA states that it: “Takes note that a review of the Central CR of Disaster Management Capacities, planned for 2008, is expected to assess its value added and user satisfaction, and requests the Secretary-General to report on its findings”. In December 2008, the GA adopted the Resolution A/RES/63/1.53 in which it reiterated its demand for the review and expected the findings of the review to be presented in the Secretary General’s report of 2009.

The overall objective of the review is therefore:

- to assess the value added and the user satisfaction of the Central CR (CR)
- i.e. to assess the relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, coverage and efficiency of the CR

The review will answer the following specific questions:

- Is the information provided in the CR relevant and appropriate in meeting the needs of its end users?
- Is the CR an effective tool in obtaining information and extracting disaster management information?
- Does the information provided in the CR authoritatively cover the needs of its users and clients?
- How user friendly is the CR from a technical perspective?

The first directory of the CR was launched in 1992. This review will examine the CR as it is now and consider the last two years (2007 & 2008) as the key reference period. Historical data of up to ten years may be used to illustrate trends or patterns, such as user registration or visitor traffic.

As a global tool, the CR has no specific geographic application with this review being guided by the locations of users that both upload information to the CR and those that consult it.

Description of proposed methodology

The review will be carried out through analyses of various sources of information and the deployment of a number of research tools. The information will be obtained from three main sources; documentation; stakeholders and users; and existing statistics and data. The main research tools to be used to collect and analyse this data include: desk review, content analysis, a survey, interviews, expert review and website metrics tool. These tools and sources of information are detailed further in chapter 2.2. Once collected, the
data will be collated and cross-validated. This is an independent review that will seek the views of all involved parties.

**Methodological approach**

The review will adopt a mixed-methods approach employing both quantitative and qualitative methods. The review will focus on outputs (e.g. level of content provided) and outcomes (e.g. level of usage). Although the CR is managed by OCHA, the review will not be strictly intra-organizational as stakeholders, information providers and users will be canvassed which encompasses other UN bodies, governments and the private sector. This is in line with the purpose of the CR, which was set up to support the UN system and the international community and is therefore an externally-focused tool.

The overall objective of the review is to assess the value added and user satisfaction of the CR. For the purpose of this review, the concepts “value added” and “user satisfaction” are defined as follows:

**Value added:** is the extent to which the needs of users are better satisfied by the existence of the CR as manifested through improvements in efficiency and effectiveness.

**User satisfaction:** is the sum of users’ attitudes towards interacting with the CR. These attitudes can be broken down into positive and negative reactions to a pre-defined set of factors, notably content, accuracy, format, ease of use and timeliness.

These two concepts will be assessed on the basis of the following criteria:

**Relevance:** The extent to which the objectives of the intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies.

**Appropriateness:** The tailoring of activities to local needs, increasing ownership, accountability and cost-effectiveness.

**Effectiveness:** The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

**Coverage:** the need to reach major population groups facing life-threatening suffering, wherever they are.

---


Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.

The term “user friendliness” is used in the review questions. User friendliness is the application of “usability”, which is defined by ISO standard 9241-11 as:

"extent to which a product can be used by specified users to achieve specified goals with effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction in a specified context of use."

Whereas “user satisfaction” is assessed by measuring attitudes, “usability” is assessed by measuring a product against a pre-defined set of standards. For this review, the CR will be measured in the expert review against a set of standards for Internet interfaces found in ISO 9241-151 covering five main areas: strategy, content design, navigation and search, content presentation and general design aspects.

The review will collect data and information in a logical and sequenced manner; firstly, the level of information contained in the CR and its usage will be determined by a desk review, web metrics and content analysis. Secondly, the needs of the users will be assessed through surveys and interviews. Thirdly, the satisfaction of users and ease of use of the CR will be determined through surveys, interviews and an expert review.

The following terms used in this Inception Report are defined as following:

**User:** a person who has visited and consulted the CR.

**Non-user:** a person who has never visited the CR but given their professional post is considered to be a potential user.

**Information provider:** a person who as part of their professional role has provided information that is available in the CR.

**Focal point:** a staff member of OCHA who is responsible for managing a directory of the CR.

**Stakeholder:** a person who is representing an organisation that has an interest in the CR. For this review, stakeholders are Member States and OCHA staff.

### Constraints and limitations

In defining the methodology for this review, the following potential constraints and limitations were identified:

- Global nature of the CR implies that users are dispersed and potentially difficult to reach;
- Brief period of time available (four weeks) to collect and analyse data;
- External focus of the CR implies that in-depth knowledge and interest in the CR within OCHA may be limited.

---

26 ISO 9241-151 “Guidance on WWW user interfaces”.
### Data collection tools, sources of information, questions & indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data collection tools</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Is the information provided in the CR relevant and appropriate in meeting the needs of its end users? | - Level of usage of the CR’s directories  
- Level of relevance and appropriateness of the CR for users  
- Analysis of content compared to users’ needs | - Desk review  
- Interviews  
- Online survey  
- Content analysis  
- Expert review of CR  
- Web metrics | - Documentation  
- Stakeholders / users / non-users  
- Users  
- CR  
- CR statistics |
| 2. Is the CR an effective tool in obtaining information and extracting disaster management information? | - Level of effectiveness of the CR for users  
- Instances of how the CR has contributed towards effectiveness | - Online survey  
- Interviews  
- Expert review of CR | - Users  
- Stakeholders / users / non-users  
- CR |
| 3. Does the information provided in the CR authoritatively cover the needs of its users and clients? | - Level of satisfaction of users and stakeholders  
- Analysis of content compared to users’ needs  
- Instances of how the CR covers the needs of users and stakeholders | - Desk review  
- Interviews  
- Online survey  
- Content analysis  
- Expert review of CR | - Documentation  
- Stakeholders / users / non-users  
- Users  
- CR  
- CR |
| 4. How user friendly is the CR from a technical perspective? | - Level of user friendliness according to users and stakeholders  
- Level of compatibility with usability standards (ISO 9241-151 “Guidance on WWW user interfaces”) | - Interviews  
- Online survey  
- Expert review of CR | - Stakeholders/Users  
- Users  
- CR |
The following chart provides further details on the data collection tools and the sources of information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Number planned (if relevant)</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
<th>Measuring Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>OCHA documentation</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All directories of CR</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online survey</td>
<td>1 (questions designed for users of each directory(^{27}))</td>
<td>CR users with 25% response rate desired for each directory</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Stakeholders:</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member states (5):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Singapore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCHA staff (10):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- FCSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- CMCS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- LSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor &amp; external relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ERCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- CRD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- FIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ICTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- SCS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- EPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(above includes focal points for all 8 directories)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Users:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Information providers for the CR (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- users of the CR (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-users:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential users of the CR (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All directories of CR</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website metrics analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visitor statistics from CR</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{27}\) Given that a survey has just been conducted for users of the emergency stockpiles directory, a survey for this directory may not be necessary.
Selection of Member States for interviewing

**Contributing countries** are defined as those which have expressed a political interest and/or made a financial contribution to the CR. In the discussions to date with OCHA, the following countries have been mentioned: Switzerland, Russia, the Netherlands, Canada, Luxembourg, Moldova, Singapore, and Norway in addition to the European Union. Consequently, a selection of these countries (Switzerland, Russia, and Singapore) has been made based on geographic distribution and perceived level of interest in the CR.

**Recipient countries** are defined as those countries which have faced major disasters in the past two years and consequently received significant emergency assistance. Based on the OCHA “Summary of Contributions per Disaster”, the following countries were all major recipients (over 20 million USD) of emergency assistance in 2007 and 2008:

**2008**
- Haiti (storm 09/08)
- China (earthquake 05/08)
- Myanmar (cyclone 05/08)

**2007**
- Bangladesh (cyclone/floods 11/07, 08/07)
- Korea DPR (floods 08/07)
- Mozambique (floods 02/07)
- Pakistan (floods/cyclone 07/07)
- Peru (earthquake 08/07)
- Sudan (floods 07/07)

Consequently, China and Bangladesh have been selected based on the significance of the emergency assistance received.

**Organisation of the review**

The review will be undertaken by an external evaluation consultant, Glenn O’Neil. The Evaluation and Studies Section of OCHA will manage the review within the organisation. A core learning group has been constituted to follow and guide the review.

**Issues to be studied**

To ensure consistency, the issues are grouped under each review question. In responding to these questions and issues, it will be important to consider each directory separately.

1. Is the information provided in the CR relevant and appropriate in meeting the needs of its end users?

---

Relevance
What role has the CR played in humanitarian emergency assistance?

 Appropriateness
What is the focus of the information found on the CR?

 To what extent has the information provided met the needs of users?

 Coverage
To what extent has the CR reached all potential users?

 2. Is the CR an effective tool in obtaining information and extracting disaster management information?

 Relevance
Have other tools been created that reduce the relevancy of the CR?

 Effectiveness
How have users used the CR?

 What can users point towards as concrete results of using the CR?

 Efficiency
Has an online centralised database been the most efficient tool for users to obtain and extract information?

 3. Does the information provided in the CR authoritatively cover the needs of its users and clients?

 Effectiveness
What is the level of satisfaction of users concerning the eight directories of the CR?

 What level of effort is required to manage and promote the CR and who should be responsible for, and supporting this?

 Coverage
Have there been needs unmet by the CR?

 What key functions and/or information are required to meet needs, and of whom?

 Relevance
How should the eight directories of the CR evolve over the next years?

 4. How user friendly is the CR from a technical perspective?

 Effectiveness
How has the user experience of the CR impacted on the ability of users to obtain and extract information?
How compatible is the CR to web usability standards on navigation, search, design, functionality and content?

**Plan of work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation and briefing meetings with OCHA units responsible for the eight directories of the CR</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review of documentation</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of users of the CR and establishing an email list for survey</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation and development of online survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of interview guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of expert review &amp; web metrics criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of content analysis criteria</td>
<td>6 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey management, monitoring and technical support for survey users</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with stakeholders and users (approximately 30 interviews)</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content analysis of CR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert review of CR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis using web metrics</td>
<td>6 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compilation and analysis of results</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of draft report</td>
<td>6 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of final report (incorporating comments)</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of findings in Geneva</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>(45 days)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Timetable**

The following chart illustrates the scheduling of the key tasks of the review. Based on this schedule, the following milestones are established:

- 8 May 2009: Presentation of inception report
- 25 May 2009: Commencement of data collection
- 14 June 2009: Meeting with OCHA ESS to discuss organization of report
- 22 June 2009: Delivery of draft report to OCHA
- 29 June 2009: Delivery of final report to OCHA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 4-10</td>
<td>Preparation &amp; presentation of inception report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11-17</td>
<td>Orientation meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18-24</td>
<td>Desk review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25-31</td>
<td>Creation of evaluation tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1-7</td>
<td>Data collection (survey, interviews, review, analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8-14</td>
<td>Compilation &amp; analysis of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15-21</td>
<td>Production of draft report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22-28</td>
<td>Production of final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1-5</td>
<td>Presentation of findings in Geneva</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reporting**

The evaluation consultant will produce three key reports for the review:

- Inception report (this document)
- Draft report
- Final report
- Summary sheet/presentation of key findings

The evaluation consultant will provide regular updates on the review to the Evaluation and Studies Section of OCHA during the review period.
1. Executive summary

2. Introduction (with background to the review)

3. Description of the project objectives evaluated

4. Overview of review questions & methodology

5. Findings:

   General findings on the CR
   - Global assessment of value added and user satisfaction
   - Relevance and appropriateness in meeting the needs of end users
   - Effectiveness of users in obtaining and extracting disaster management information
   - Authoritatively covering the needs of users and clients
   - User friendliness of the CR

   5.2. Specific findings on the Directories of the CR
   - Search and Rescue
   - Military and Civilian Defence Assets
   - Emergency Stockpiles of Disaster Relief Items
   - Rosters of Disaster Management Expertise
   - Advanced Technologies for Disaster Response
   - National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation in International Humanitarian Emergency Assistance
   - Contact Point for Disaster Response
   - Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance

6. Conclusions

7. Recommendation

8. Annexes:

   - Review methodology (detailed)
   - Review instruments used (survey questions, interview guidelines, content analysis framework)
   - About the author of the report
   - Terms of Reference/Inception Report
   - Persons interviewed for the review
   - Raw data collected
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United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)

Terms of Reference
Review of the OCHA Central Register of Disaster Management Capacities
13 February 2009

1. Establishment, Composition and Management of the Central Register

Establishment

In December 1991, the General Assembly requested the United Nations to “establish a central register of all specialized personnel and teams of technical specialists, as well as relief supplies, equipment and services available within the United Nations system and from Governments and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, that can be called upon at short notice by the United Nations” (Resolution A/RES/46/182 adopted on 19 December 1991).

In line with this request, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) established a Central Register of Disaster Management Capacities, hereafter referred to as the ‘Central Register’, as an operational tool to support, in conjunction with other measures, the United Nations system and the international community as a whole in their efforts to ensure expeditious delivery of the required humanitarian emergency assistance. The Central Register is accessible under the following link: http://ocha.unog.ch/cr/.

Structure

The Central Register comprises eight directories to assist United Nations Agencies, intergovernmental, governmental and non-governmental organizations, in rapidly identifying and contacting the appropriate authorities of a specific service in the event of an emergency. The directories are as follows:

- **Five directories of specific disaster management assets:**
  
  (1) Search and Rescue (SAR)
  (2) Military and Civil Defence Assets (MCDA)
  (3) Emergency Stockpiles of Disaster Relief Items
  (4) Rosters of Disaster Management Expertise
  (5) Advanced Technologies for Disaster Response (ATDR)

- **Three directories of disaster management focal points**
  
  (1) National Focal Points and Legislation for Customs Facilitation in International Humanitarian Emergency Assistance
  (2) Contact Points for Disaster Response
  (3) Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance

Management
The OCHA Civil-Military Coordination Section (CMCS) of the Emergency Services Branch (ESB) is responsible for the overall management and administration of the Central Register, whereas the technical support is provided by OCHA’s Information Technology Section (ITS).

In May 2006, individual ownership of the Central Register’s respective disaster management directories was formally delegated within OCHA in order to improve information management through enhanced accountability. OCHA sections are therefore responsible for the currency of information contained in the directories, to include annual reporting responsibilities to the General Assembly and ECOSOC.

In this regard it is important to note, that the Central Register as such is not managed entirely by one OCHA section, but that it consists of several directories which are under the responsibility of different sections.

- **Disaster management assets directories:**

  1. Field Coordination and Support Section (FCSS): SAR
  2. Civil-Military Coordination Section (CMCS): MCDA, ATDR
  3. Logistics Support Unit (LSU): Emergency Stockpiles
  4. All OCHA sections through Administrative Support: Roster of Disaster Management Expertise

- **Disaster management focal points:**

  1. Logistics Support Unit (LSU): Custom National Focal Points
  2. ALL OCHA sections through Administrative Support: Contact Points for Disaster Response
  3. Donor and External Relations Section: Major Donors of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance

2. **Purpose of the evaluation and overall objectives**

On 1 February 2008, the General Assembly (GA) adopted the Resolution A/RES/62/92 “International cooperation on humanitarian assistance in the field of natural disasters, from relief to development”. In paragraph nine of A/RES/62/92 the GA\(^29\) states that it:

> “Takes note that a review of the Central Register of Disaster Management Capacities, planned for 2008, is expected to assess its value added and user satisfaction, and requests the Secretary-General to report on its findings”.

As requested by the GA resolution, the review\(^30\) has at its main objective an assessment of the value added and the user satisfaction of the Central Register. The review will be guided by three main overall questions considered necessary to measure the effectiveness of this disaster management tool:

\(^29\) In December 2008, the GA adopted Resolution A/RES/63/1.53 in which it reiterated its demand for the review and expects the findings of the review to be presented in the SG report in 2009.

\(^30\) “Review the periodic or *ad hoc* often rapid assessments of the performance of an undertaking, that do not apply the due process of evaluation. Reviews tend to emphasize operational issues.” UNEG, *Norms for evaluation*
1. **Are we doing the right thing?** - The review will assess user satisfaction by examining the rationale of the undertaking, making a reality check and looking at the satisfaction of the intended users.

2. **Are we doing it right?** - The review will analyze the relevance, the effectiveness and the efficiency of each directory for users of the directories of the Central Register when sourcing information.

3. **Are there better ways of achieving the results?** The review will look at possible alternatives, good practices and identify lessons learned. It might also consider whether a possible alternative might be to move one or more of the directories to another agency.

4. **Scope**

   **Time Period to be evaluated**

   Since the way the humanitarian system functions has changed through the introduction of the humanitarian reform process and new instruments, ESS considers that it is rather important to assess user satisfaction and added value for the last two years.

   **Who are the “users” of the directories of the Central Register?**

   Identifying the users and clients of the Central Register is challenging for two reasons:

   (1) Apart from the MCDA directory, no registration is needed to access the directories of the Central Register and there is no possibility to identify who accessed the Central Register and on what frequency. If users do not have to register, it is difficult to identify the users of the Central Register.

   (2) Each directory of the Central Register has a specific objective and therefore might address different “users” and “clients”. Users might not be one single coherent group.

   It is believed, that overall mainly member states (disaster affected countries and donor countries) UN country teams, NGOs, and Clusters are using the register.

   The MCDA directory of the Central Register is password protected and requires registration, in order to view the non-public data of the MCDA directory and the directory of emergency stockpiles. According to the password list, users of the MCDA directory are member states, UN country teams, NGOs and OCHA country offices. No statement can be made on what frequency these users have searched for information in the MCDA directory, or whether the same users have accessed as well the other directories of the Central Register.

   In this view, OCHA ESS proposes that the external consultant undertaking the review will consult with the OCHA sections responsible for each respective directory, in order to identify the primary clients and key stakeholders for each directory.
The review has to take this structure of the Central Register into account and will thus assess user satisfaction and added value for each specific directory of the Central Register and of the Central Register as a whole.

5. Criteria and key questions

The evaluation will review the relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, coverage and efficiency of the Central Register as individual parts and as a whole.\(^{31}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions to the clients of the register addressing user satisfaction and added value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Is the information provided in the Central Register relevant and appropriate in meeting the needs of its end users?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is the Central Register an effective tool in obtaining and extracting disaster management information?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the information provided in the Central Register authoritatively cover the needs of its users and clients?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How user friendly is the Central Register from a technical perspective?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Methodology

The review will be carried out by an external consultant through analyses of various sources of information including desk reviews; surveys and interviews with key stakeholders (such as UN and users of the Central Register); and through cross-validation of data. While maintaining independence, the review will seek the views of all involved parties.

In order to address the objectives of user satisfaction and added value of the Central Register, an online survey will be disseminated to the clients and users of the several directories of the Central Register.

Consultants should apply the norms and standards for evaluation established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (the two documents are available from the website of the OCHA Evaluation and Studies Unit: http://ochaonline.un.org/esu).

7. Management arrangements

The external consultant will report to OCHA’s Evaluation and Studies Section (ESS).

ESS will assign an evaluation manager to oversee the conduct of the evaluation and assure quality control. His/her responsibilities are to: 1) provide guidance and institutional support to the external consultant, especially on issues of methodology; 2) facilitate the consultants access to key stakeholders and specific information or expertise needed to perform the assessment; 3) ensure that all stakeholders are kept informed; 4) recommend the approval of final report; 6) help

---

\(^{31}\) For more information and explanation on criteria, please refer to the DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance (www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation).
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organize and design the final learning workshop; and 7) ensure a management response to the final report and monitor the subsequent follow up.

OCHA ESS proposes the establishment of an OCHA Central Register Core Learning Group (CLG) in order to ensure that the evaluation meets the needs of management and OCHA staff. The CLG will be composed of key stakeholders of OCHA sections which are involved in the Central Register in order to increase ownership, transparency and learning and it will also be involved in the design of the study and in the validation of results. In especially, the CLG will be 1) involved in the selection of consultants; 2) it will provide guidance and suggestions to identify potential material to be used for the evaluation; 3) and it will be involved in the review process by commenting on the inception report, the first draft report, and by participating in a workshop during which the main findings and recommendations will be presented and discussed. The CLG will also follow up on the implementation of recommendations. The CLG will participate in meetings convened by the evaluation manager at critical and assist in steering the evaluation process throughout its cycle.

8. Duration of the Evaluation and the tentative workplan (tbc):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant orientation and briefing meeting with OCHA units responsible for the respective directories.</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review &amp; initial reading of existing documents</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of “users” in collaboration with OCHA and establishing an email list to whom the survey will then be sent</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey design and dissemination</td>
<td>8 days (programming of the online survey might be outsourced to a software company by the consultant, tbd. – if not – that would mean an increase in days for the programming)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up (increasing response rate by calling “users” and push them to fill out the survey)</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In depth-interviews with some users in Geneva &amp; abroad (telephone)</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing survey outcome</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing first draft</td>
<td>8 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating comments &amp; Final draft / report</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Findings in Geneva /CLG workshop</td>
<td>1 day (+2 days travel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>Days 45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9. **Competency and expertise requirements**

This review will require the services of a consultant with the following experience:

- Demonstrable experience in managing and conducting evaluations of humanitarian programmes and the capacity to work collaboratively with multiple stakeholders and on a team
- In-depth knowledge of international emergency response tools and mechanisms
- Experience in survey design, analysis and representation of the results
- Experience in online survey programming/development
- Previous work in or knowledge of the UN and/or donor institutions; and workshop facilitation skills are all desirable.
- Strong analytical skills and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions and to prepare well-written reports in a timely manner.
- Fluency in English and French

A vacancy notice will be posted on ReliefWeb for a minimum of 2 weeks. Applications are received from individual consultants. The vacancy notice will explicitly welcome the application of female candidates as well as candidates from developing countries.

10. **Reporting Requirements & Deliverables**

An **inception report** outlining the proposed method, key issues and potential key informants for the evaluation, will be required. A format for the inception report will be provided by the OCHA Evaluation and Studies Unit.

The final output of the consultancy will be a **report assessing user satisfaction and added value of the respective directories of the Central Register and the Central Register as a whole**. The report will be presented by the Secretary General to the GA as requested by the GA Resolution A/RES/62/92. Moreover, the report shall contain the elements specified in the document on standards for evaluation (pp.17-23) developed by the United Nations Evaluation Group (available at: [http://ochaonline.un.org/esu](http://ochaonline.un.org/esu)). The report shall contain a short executive summary of up to 2,000 words and a main text of no more than 15,000 words, both including clear evidence-based recommendations. Annexes should include a list of all persons interviewed, a bibliography, a description of the method used, a summary of survey results as well as all other relevant material.

The quality of the evaluation report will be judged according to the UNEG Evaluation Standards and the ALNAP Quality Proforma ([www.alnap.org/pdfs/QualityProforma05.pdf](http://www.alnap.org/pdfs/QualityProforma05.pdf)). All external evaluation reports will also be submitted to ALNAP for inclusion in the regular meta evaluation process that rates the quality of evaluation reports. The report will be due end of May – mid June.

3) The consultant will carry out a **presentation, including power point presentation** to OCHA’s Central Register service providers and SMT (or a possible Steering Group) on the main findings and recommendations of the report.

4) A **workshop** will be organized were the findings of the report are presented to an OCHA Core Learning Group.

[All copyrights will remain the property of OCHA.]
CALL FOR EXPRESSION OF INTEREST

February 2009

Consultants for the Review of the OCHA Central Register of Disaster Management Capacities

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)

Closing date: 9 March 2009
Approximate duration of assignment: 45 days (over a period of three months)
Tentative contract starting date: 1 April 2009
Location city: Geneva
Location country: Switzerland

Background

In December 1991, the General Assembly requested the United Nations to “establish a central register of all specialized personnel and teams of technical specialists, as well as relief supplies, equipment and services available within the United Nations system and from Governments and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, that can be called upon at short notice by the United Nations” (Resolution A/RES/46/182 adopted on 19 December 1991).

In line with this request, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) established a Central Register of Disaster Management Capacities, hereafter referred to as the ‘Central Register’, as an operational tool to support, in conjunction with other measures, the United Nations system and the international community as a whole in their efforts to ensure expeditious delivery of the required humanitarian emergency assistance. The Central Register is accessible under the following link: http://ocha.unog.ch/cr/.

Job description

On 1 February 2008, the General Assembly (GA) adopted the Resolution A/RES/62/92 “International cooperation on humanitarian assistance in the field of natural disasters, from relief to development”. In paragraph nine of A/RES/62/92 the GA states that it: “Takes note that a review of the Central Register of Disaster Management Capacities, planned for 2008, is expected to assess its value added and user satisfaction, and requests the Secretary-General to report on its findings”.

The overall objective of the Review is therefore:
- to assess the value added and the user satisfaction of the Central Register
- i.e. to assess the relevance appropriateness, effectiveness, coverage and efficiency of the Central Register

The Review will answer the following specific questions:
- Is the information provided in the Central Register relevant and appropriate in meeting the needs of its end users?
- Is the Central Register an effective tool in obtaining information and extracting disaster management information?
- Does the information provided in the Central Register authoritatively cover the needs of its users and clients?
- How user friendly is the Central Register from a technical perspective?

**Methodology**

The review will be carried out through analyses of various sources of information including desk reviews; surveys and interviews with key stakeholders (such as UN and users of the Central Register); and through cross-validation of data. In order to address the objectives of user satisfaction and added value of the Central Register, an online survey will be disseminated to the clients and users of the several directories of the Central Register. While maintaining independence, the review will seek the views of all involved parties.

A Terms of Reference for the review will made available to the selected candidate(s). Among the deliverables expected, there will be a) an inception report translating the ToR into more detailed methodology and timeline (expected - beginning April), b) the programming of an online survey (expected - April), c) a final report of maximum 15000 words not including annexes (expected mid-June), and c) debrief/presentation in Geneva and possibly in New York (expected end of June).

Consultants should apply the norms and standards for evaluation established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (the two documents are available from the website of the OCHA Evaluation and Studies Unit: [http://ochaonline.un.org/esu](http://ochaonline.un.org/esu)).

**Criteria / skills requested**

This review will require the services of a consultant with the following experience:

- Demonstrable experience in managing and conducting evaluations of humanitarian programmes and the capacity to work collaboratively with multiple stakeholders and on a team
- In-depth knowledge of international emergency response tools and mechanisms
- Experience in survey design, analysis and representation of the results
- Experience in online survey programming/development
- Previous work in or knowledge of the UN and/or donor institutions; and workshop facilitation skills are all desirable.
- Strong analytical skills and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions and to prepare well-written reports in a timely manner.
- Fluency in English

**Who should apply**

Applications from individual candidates are expected. The Evaluation and Studies Section encourages the application of female candidates.

**How to apply**
Interested consultants should submit an expression of interest to pds@un.org. Reference: 0902-EE-Central-Register. The application should contain the following:

1. CV and UN P-11 of candidate
2. Letter expressing interest and clearly identifying how the candidate meets each of the criteria/ skills listed above

Only short listed candidates will be contacted. Contracting is subject to funding.