Five Year Evaluation
of the
Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)

Concept Note

30 March 2010

Prepared by the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
(OCHA) Evaluation and Studies Section (ESS)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.   INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to General Assembly Resolution A/RES/63/139, an independent evaluation must be commissioned by the Secretary General. As specified by the General Assembly, the evaluation will serve as a "**comprehensive review of the activities of the CERF, including the ability to meet its objectives, its administration, the needs assessment process and criteria for resource allocations, at the end of its fifth year of operations**…" A report based on the findings from the evaluation will be presented at the 65th session of the General Assebly in the fall of 2011.

This concept paper has been drafted as part of the initial planning for this evaluation and is intended to serve as a foundation for discussion that will inform the subsequent development of the evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR).

II.   OVERVIEW OF THE CENTRAL EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND (CERF)

The Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) is a $500 million fund established to support rapid response and address critical humanitarian needs in underfunded emergencies, enabling more timely and reliable assistance to those affected by armed conflict and natural disasters.

The CERF was approved by consensus by the UN General Assembly on 15 December 2005[1] to achieve the following objectives:

- Promote early action and response to reduce loss of life;
- Enhance response to time-critical requirements; and
- Strengthen core elements of humanitarian response in underfunded crises.

As one element of the financing pillar of the humanitarian reform agenda, the CERF is expected to contribute to other pillars, including the development of effective partnerships between UN and non-UN humanitarian actors.

The Central Emergency Response Fund was established to upgrade the Central Emergency *Revolving* Fund (created December 1991 pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 46/182), adding a grant element of up to $450 million to the existing $50 million loan mechanism. The grant component is comprised of two windows: one for rapid response and one for underfunded crises. The loan facility is a revolving fund which serves as a cash-flow mechanism for eligible humanitarian organizations, allowing rapid access to funds ahead of the transfer of donor pledges. Only UN funds, programmes and specialized agencies and the International Organization for Migration (IOM) are eligible to apply for funding under the grant facility, but NGOs may receive CERF funds as partners of these entities.

---

[1] General Assembly Resolution 60/124 pursuant to a report of the Secretary General [A/60/432].

Since March 2006, CERF has provided more than $1.5 billion to address humanitarian needs. As of today, 156 Member/Observer States and Territories have either contributed to CERF, received support from CERF, or both. The CERF is funded by voluntary contributions from Member States of the UN, private businesses, foundations and individuals.

Grant proposals for the rapid response window are prepared by the UN agencies under the leadership of the Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator (RC/HC). It is a field-driven process that aims to strengthen the role of the RC/HC. For the under-funded window, the ERC initially makes block allocations of funds for countries for which UN agencies, through the RC/HC, submit proposals for this funding. Proposals under both windows are submitted to the ERC by the RC/HC.

The CERF is managed, on behalf of the Secretary General, by the UN's Under Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) who serves as Programme Manager for the Fund. The ERC regularly consults with the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) and humanitarian/resident coordinators, as appropriate, on matters relating to the utilization of the funds in order to obtain guidance support when determining priorities for their use. An Advisory Group of 16 experts, soon to expand to 18, representing the humanitarian community provides the ERC with broad policy advice on the implementation of the Fund to ensure accountability and transparency.

The Fund is supported by a secretariat and by other branches in OCHA. It is governed by UN Financial Regulations and Rules and financially administered by the Office of the Controller.

III. PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS AND REVIEWS

A number of evaluations and studies have looked at pooled funding mechanisms since 2005. Two were specifically focused on the CERF, namely the 2007 Interim Review and 2008 Two-Year Evaluation. Both emphasized how quickly the CERF had been successfully implemented, overcoming significant hurdles such as capacity constraints, and that stakeholder consensus on the CERF was overall positive.[2] Also noted, however, was the need to further refine and strengthen CERF processes, including criteria for project approval and accountability.

CERF is one of an array of tools aimed at enhancing humanitarian performance and aid effectiveness and operates not in isolation but in concert with other pooled funds and coordination mechanisms, and its performance is strengthened or limited by the effectiveness of those mechanisms with which it works in conjunction. As such, evaluations and studies exploring initiatives such as the Cluster Approach and the Common Humanitarian Funds, among others, will inform the Five-Year Evaluation of the CERF.

---

[2] The response of international NGOs (INGOs) is the exception to this statement. During the 2007 Interim Review, INGOs "expressed concern about the fact that NGOs do not have direct access to CERF funding…"

IV.   EVALUATION PURPOSE AND SCOPE

In 2008, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to commission an independent evaluation of the activities of the CERF in its fifth year of operation. The findings of the evaluation are to be presented at the 65th session of the General Assembly in a report summarizing key strategic recommendations.   Findings and recommendations will also be used to inform actions to further strengthen CERF operations.

The evaluation will:

- Provide an independent five-year comprehensive assessment of the CERF based on its performance and accountability framework and project data to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the CERF as it is employed; and
- Provide actionable recommendations to donors and the UN system at both the policy and operational levels on how the CERF might be strengthened to improve its effectiveness and/or modified in light of changes in the humanitarian context.

The primary purpose of the evaluation is accountability. It will be used at the global level to inform the development of policy in relevant areas. As such, this evaluation will be positioned at the institutional, as opposed to beneficiary, level.[3]

Further utility is envisaged for those at the country level where it is expected that lessons learned will inform improvements in CERF processes and operations. *Table 1* provides greater detail on anticipated Uses and Users.

Table 1:   Uses and Users

	Evaluative Process	Use	Users	
Primary	Summative[4]	Accountability	Global	General Assembly Member States
Secondary	Formative[5]	Learning	Country Level	CERF Stakeholders, including UN Agencies, NGOs, and CERF Secretariat

[3] NONIE identifies two principal levels of evaluation: institutional level and beneficiary level. Examples of the former are policies, training programs, and strategic support to institutional actors. *Impact Evaluations and Development: NONIE Guidance on Impact Evaluation.* World Bank: December 2009.

[4] A study conducted by independent evaluators at the end of a project or programme to measure extent to which anticipated results were achieved; ascertain the effectiveness and relevance of approaches and strategies; indicate early signs of impact; and recommend what interventions to promote or abandon. Summative or Terminal evaluation is intended to provide information about the merit and worth of the project or programme. *UN Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) Monitoring, Evaluation and Consulting Division (MCD) Glossary of Monitoring and Evaluation Teams*, accessed 15 March 2010 via http://www.un.org/Depts/oios/mecd/mecd_glossary/index.htm.

[5] Sometimes known as interim evaluation, it is conducted during implementation phase of projects or programmes to improve their performance. Formative evaluations may also be conducted for other reasons such as compliance, legal requirements or as part of a larger evaluation initiative. It is intended for managers and direct supporters of a project.

To date, 75 countries and territories have received CERF funds, 20 per cent of which will be reviewed for this evaluation. The Evaluation Team will conduct **field visits to six countries**, while another **nine will be assessed remotely**, engaging stakeholders via telephone/videoconference and email. Nonprobability sampling will be used so as to allow for a sample that represents a cross-section of countries based on criteria which will include:[6]

- Magnitude of CERF funding
- Window under which funds were received: Rapid Response and Under-Funded
- Regional distribution
- Nature of emergency: Sudden-onset natural disasters and complex emergencies
- Socioeconomic and political context

V.   METHODOLOGY AND KEY QUESTIONS

The evaluation will explore **CERF processes and performance**. It will draw upon previous evaluations to assess progress and the extent to which recommendations put forth have been addressed. The evaluation will employ the criteria for humanitarian evaluations[7] recommended by ALNAP, namely: Effectiveness, Efficiency, Coverage, Appropriateness and Relevance, Coordination and Coherence.

In 2009, the CERF Secretariat contracted an independent consultant to develop a Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF) for the CERF. The PAF "makes use of a logic model approach as a means of clarifying accountability and performance expectations around a core set of agreed CERF outputs, outcomes and impacts. "[8] At each level, a set of indicators is defined. The evaluation approach will be based on the logic model and evidence will be collected at all levels of the results hierarchy, including inputs, outputs, outcomes/operational effects and operational impact.

Impact at the beneficiary level will not be a focus of this evaluation. As noted previously, this evaluation is positioned at the institutional level and is intended to assess coordination and funding mechanism whose proximate goals are to strengthen the humanitarian response.   The evaluation will refer to the concept of 'operational impact' introduced in the PAF and explore the CERF's progress in achieving its proximate stated objectives of promoting early action and response to reduce loss of life, enhancing time-critical requirements and strengthening core elements of the humanitarian response in underfunded crises.

---

[6] The validity of non-probability samples can be increased by trying to approximate random selection, and by eliminating as many sources of bias as possible. In this way,

[7] Tony Beck, *Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD-DAC criteria for humanitarian agencies: An ALNAP guide for humanitarian agencies.* Overseas Development Institute: London (March 2006).

[8] *Draft Proposal towards the Establishment of a Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF) for the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)*, December 2009, p.2.

Key areas to be examined are:

- The performance and 'value added' of the CERF grant and revolving fund in the context of the overall humanitarian architecture and humanitarian reform process (e.g. RC/HC strengthening, cluster approach).
- The strategic, managerial and operational aspects of the CERF. This will include: structure, and focus, high level leadership, advocacy, the efficiency and effectiveness of administration, fundraising, needs assessment and criteria for allocation of funds.
- CERF's success in meeting its objectives to promote early action and response to reduce loss of life, enhance response to time-critical requirements and strengthen core elements of the humanitarian response in underfunded crises.
- The level and nature of accountability between CERF-recipient actors, to RC/HC, beneficiaries, and others.
- Internal (e.g. capacity) and external (e.g. contextual and political) factors which affect CERF's ability to deliver on its objectives.

A working draft list of evaluation questions areas is attached as *Appendix IV*. This list will be further constructed and refined during the consultative phase which will inform the development of the evaluation ToR and will reflect the collective views expressed by stakeholders who provide inputs.

The overall evaluation methodology will employ both qualitative and quantitative approaches inclusive of a number of data collection tools. Data will be derived from primary and secondary sources, direct observation in the field, key informant interviews and a survey with all stakeholder groups. The Evaluation Team will produce a detailed methodological plan during the inception phase which will incorporate the results framework included in the CERF PAF. It will also include a detailed description of how the evaluation will address gender issues.

It is widely recognized that results attributed to the CERF are heavily influenced by contextual variables. The evaluation will help to develop further insight into how CERF results are affected by these, and under what conditions CERF has exhibited greater or lesser success.

VI. MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

A. Evaluation Management

The evaluation will be managed by OCHA'S Evaluation and Studies Section (ESS), which is **institutionally separate** from the CERF Secretariat. In this function, OCHA will be responsible and accountable for all final decisions, including the delivery of all evaluation outputs and deliverables. OCHA ESS will appoint an Evaluation Manager who will work with a Steering Group. OCHA ESS in its position as managing entity will:

- Advise on strategic direction of the evaluation and provide guidance and input on methodology, content and recommendations;
- Manage progress of the evaluation in accordance with agreed budget and timeline;
- Coordinate, convene and chair Steering Group;
- Work with Steering Group to develop sampling framework;
- Facilitate Evaluation Team's access to key stakeholders and specific information or expertise needed to complete the evaluation;
- Ensure all stakeholders are kept informed;
- Serve as principal interlocutor between the Evaluation Team and Steering Group;
- Comment on inception and draft reports, provide assistance with templates and technical standards;
- Help coordinate field research and organize and design final learning workshops and presentations; and
- Monitor and facilitate follow up and a management response to the evaluation.

The complete ToR for the Evaluation Manager is attached as *Appendix II*.

B.   Headquarters-Level Steering Group

A headquarters-level **Steering Group** will be established whose membership includes representatives with evaluation backgrounds from UN Agencies, Member States, NGOs and independent experts. The Steering Group will provide guidance to the evaluation, helping to ensure its relevance and independence throughout the evaluation process. The body will contribute to key decisions, including approval of consultants and approval and release of the evaluation products. The **main roles** of the Steering Group are:

- Provide background information and contextual knowledge, so as to help ensure that evaluation is relevant, appropriate and adds value to the existing body of work and also that the evaluation contextualizes CERF within the overall humanitarian architecture;
- Provide inputs to the development of, review and provide appropriate and timely feedback on draft documents related (i.e. ToR, Inception Report, draft(s) of evaluation framework);
- Participate in selection of the Evaluation Team;
- Assist Evaluation Manager to ensure quality control according to standards (UNEG / ALNAP) through the provision of advisory services;
- Provide substantive advice and feedback at all phases of the evaluative process.

The complete ToR for the Steering Group is attached as *Appendix I.*

C.   CERF Advisory Group

The CERF Advisory Group will receive regular briefings on the status of the evaluation and recommendations put forth by the Steering Group, and endorsement of the evaluation ToR will be sought from the Group. The Advisory Group will be afforded the opportunity to comment on draft evaluation products.   It is expected the Evaluation Team will take these views under advisement,

and will supply a completed matrix identifying how each comment was addressed, or provide explanation as to why it has not been accepted.

VII.   TIMELINE AND PHASES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation has been divided into four phases:

Design	March – September 2010	Initial planning and concept Development of Terms of Reference Procurement process, including consultant selection and contracting
Inception	September – November 2010	Desk Review and methodology development Field mission planning and preparation Inception Report
Research	November 2010 – March 2011	Meetings with headquarters-based stakeholders Field research Validation workshops
Reporting	March 2011 – July 2011	Production of draft and final reports Development of Management Response Matrix Presentation of findings Drafting of GA report

Further detail on work to be undertaken during each phase of the evaluation is provided in *Table 2*. A summary of key dates pertaining to the evaluation is attached as *Appendix III*.

Table 2: Evaluation Timeline

The timeline spans weekly columns from **Mar-10** through **Nov-10**:
Mar-10 (1, 8, 15, 22, 29), Apr-10 (5, 12, 19, 26), May-10 (3, 10, 17, 24, 31), Jun-10 (7, 14, 21, 28), Jul-10 (5, 12, 19, 26), Aug-10 (2, 9, 16, 23, 30), Sep-10 (6, 13, 20, 27), Oct-10 (4, 11, 18, 25), Nov-10 (1, 8, 15, 22, 29).

Description	Output	Responsible Party	Scheduled weeks (shaded)
I. Design Phase			
1 Initial Planning and Concept			
Identify SG membership		ESS/CERF	Mar 1–22
Develop initial draft ToR	Initial draft ToR	EM/CERF	Mar 1–22
IASC IA HFG discussion	Briefing	ESS/CERF	Mar 22
2 Development of Terms of Reference			
Activate Steering Group		ESS	Mar 29
Stakeholder comments on draft ToR accepted until 23 April.	Stakeholder Comments	SG	Apr 5–19
ToR disseminated widely for comments	Stakeholder comments	ESS	Apr 12–19
CERF AG Meeting discussion of ToR	AG Comments	AG/ESS	May 17
ToR revised based on stakeholder comments and sent to SG for final review.	Revised ToR	ESS/SG	May 10
Final comments received from SG	SG Final Comments	SG	May 24
Final ToR produced and disseminated	ToR finalized	ESS	May 31
3 Consultant Selection			
Initiate Call for Proposals		EM	Jun 7
Procurement processes		PO	Jun 7 – Jul 26
Review Proposals	Team Selected	AB/EM	Aug 9
Submit documentation for contracting	Documentation submitted	EM	Aug 16
Contracting	ET contracted	UN	Aug 30 – Sep 27
II. Inception Phase			
1 Desk Review and Methodology			
Eval Team briefing with Steering Group	Briefing	SG/ET	Sep 27
Desk Review	Context Analysis	ET	Oct 4–18
2 Prepare field missions		EM/ET	Oct 4–18
3 Inception Report			
Prepare draft Inception Report	Draft inception report	ET	Oct 4–11
Review Inception Report	Comments	EM/SG	Oct 18
Revise Inception Report	Final Inception Report	ET	Nov 1
Inception report disseminated to stakeholders		ESS	Nov 8

Abbreviations: CERF= CERF Secretariat; ET = Evaluation Team; ESS = Evaluation and Studies Section; AB = CERF Advisory Board; SG= Steering Group; UN = United Nations; PO = Procurement Office

Description	Output	Responsible Party	Timeline (shaded weeks)
III. Research Phase			
1 Heaquarters Meetings			
Bilateral meetings (in person and telephone) with HQ-based stakeholders	Meetings	ET	Dec-10 (6, 13)
2 Field Missions			
Missions to 6 countries	Field missions	ET	Jan-11 (10–31) – Feb-11 (7)
Field mission validation exercises in country	Validated initial findings	ET	Jan-11 (10–31) – Feb-11 (7)
Validation workshops in NY and Geneva	Validated initial findings	ET/ESS	Mar-11 (7)
IV. Reporting Phase			
1 Evaluation Report			
Prepare and submit draft report to ESS	Draft report	ET	Mar-11 (21)
ESS and SG review draft report	Comments	SG/ESS	Mar-11 (28)
Report revisions and response to comments	Revised draft and completed comments matrix	ET	Apr-11 (18)
Comments period for CERF AG, IASC HFG and stakeholders	Comments	All	Apr-11 (25) – May-11 (2, 9)
Report revisions and response to comments	Revised draft and completed comments matrix	ET	May-11 (23, 30)
Final comments from SG	Comments	ESS/SG	Jun-11 (13)
Report revised and finalized. Submitted to ESS with comments matrix.	Final report and comments matrix	ET	Jun-11 (20)
Final product disseminated		ESS/CERF	Jun-11 (27)
2 Management Reponse Matrix			
Consultations	Inputs	CERF/ESS	Jul-11 (11, 18)
Final MRM	MRM	CERF	Jul-11 (25)
3 General Assembly and ECOSOC			
ECOSOC Side Event		ESS/CERF	Jul-11 (25)
GA Report drafted and submitted	Final GA report	CERF	Jul-11 (25)
Presentation of report at GA (December)		ESS/CERF/ET	

Abbreviations: CERF= CERF Secretariat; ET = Evaluation Team; ESS = Evaluation and Studies Section; AB = CERF Advisory Board; SG= Steering Group; UN = United Nations; PO = Procurement Office

VIII. DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The quality of the evaluation report will be judged according to the UNEG Evaluation Standards and the ALNAP Quality Proforma[9].

All reports listed below will be written in good Standard English. If in the estimation of the OCHA ESS Chief, the reports do not meet this required standard, then the Evaluation Team will ensure at their own expense the editing needed to bring it to the required standard.

A. Inception Report
A report not to exceed 4500 words, excluding annexes, setting out:

- The team's understanding of the context in which the CERFs operate;
- The team's understanding of the functioning of the CERFs;
- Overview of how the CERF is being used in each country: amounts to various categories of agency and types of activity, etc;
- Stakeholder analysis;
- Detailed fieldwork plan;
- Data collection plan;
- Remaining evaluability issues and how they will be addressed;
- Methodology;
- Plan articulating how evaluation approach and methodology will employ gender analysis;
- Any suggested deviations from the ToR;
- An evaluation matrix showing, for each question, the criteria proposed on which the evaluative judgment will be based, and the anticipated sources of information;
- Draft outline for the country level and global synthesis reports; and
- Interview guide, survey instruments, and/or other tools to be employed for the evaluation.

B. Evaluation Report
A country report for each of the fifteen CERF countries being reviewed will be produced. Each will take the following structure:

- Executive summary of 2500 words or less;
- Matrix detailing recommendations, including where responsibility for follow up should lie;
- Table of contents;
- Map showing areas visited by the Team;
- List of acronyms;
- Methodology summary – a brief chapter of no more than 1000 words with a more detailed description provided in the annex;
- Analysis of context in which the CERF was implemented and operating;

---

[9] Available via *www.alnap.org/pdfs/QualityProforma05.pdf*.

- Core report of 25,000 words or less with chapters structured around the evaluation criteria. The chapters should answer the questions outlined in the ToR. Each chapter should present: exactly what was evaluated; what evidence was found; what conclusions were drawn; what lessons were learned; recommendations that do not exceed twenty in number and that are clearly stated and draw logically from the evaluation findings and conclusions, and are actionable; and should include a section on gender;
- Individual stand-alone country reports of no more than 4000 words or less.
- Document review, including annotated bibliography of documents (including web pages, etc.) relevant to the evaluation. The bibliography should have a brief description of the document and a separate comment on how useful the document was for the evaluation;
- Funding flows study showing trends from 2004 onwards; and
- Annexes will include: (1) ToR, (2) Analysis of funding flows, (3) List of persons met, (4) Detailed methodology, (5) Details of all surveys undertaken, (6) Details of any quantitative analysis undertaken, (7) Team itinerary, (8) All evaluation tools employed, and (6) the annotated bibliography.

For accuracy and credibility, recommendations should be the logical implications of the findings and conclusions. Recommendations should:

- Follow logically from the evaluation findings and conclusions;
- Be relevant to the intervention and reflect the reality of the context within which CERF operates;
- Be clearly stated and not broad or vague;
- Be realistic and reflect an understanding of OCHA and potential constraints to follow-up;
- Be prioritized with a timeframe for follow-up; and
- Suggest where responsibility for follow-up should lie.

All reports shall contain the elements specified in the document on standards for evaluation developed by the United Nations Evaluation Group.[10]

IX. COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS AND BUDGET

A. Evaluator Competency and Expertise Requirements
The evaluation will require the services of an Evaluation Team with the following experience and skills:

- Extensive evaluation experience of humanitarian strategies and programmes and in the areas of key humanitarian issues, especially humanitarian finance and funding.

---

[10] Available at: http://ochaonline.un.org/esu.

- In-depth knowledge of the humanitarian reform and coordination processes and issues.
- Proven experience with and institutional knowledge of UN and NGO actors, at both headquarters and field locations;
- In-depth knowledge of inter-agency mechanism at both headquarters and in the field, particularly in the IASC context.
- An appropriate range of regional and country experience.
- Proven experience in facilitation different types of consultative, evaluative workshops involving a wide range of organizations and participants.
- Knowledge and experience with gender analysis, specifically with evaluations that reflect use of a gender-sensitive lens.
- Excellent writing and communication skills in English and French.

The Evaluation Team will, to the extent possible, represent gender and regional diversity and equality. The Evaluation Team will include a **Team Leader**, who is responsible for the overall conduct of the evaluation in accordance with the ToR, including:

- Developing and adjusting the evaluation methodology;
- Managing the evaluation team, ensuring efficient division of tasks between mission members;
- Representing the Evaluation Team in meetings with the Advisory Board, Steering Committees, and ESS;
- Submitting all outputs in a timely manner.

The Team Leader will have no less than 10 years professional experience in humanitarian action, including experience in management of humanitarian operations. S/he will, further, have extensive experience in conducting evaluations of humanitarian operations and demonstrate keen analytical, communication and writing skills.

B.   Budget:
The overall budget for the evaluation is $500,000.

APPENDIX I: FIVE YEAR EVALUATION OF THE CERF - STEERING GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE

Pursuant to General Assembly (GA) Resolution A/RES/63/139, an independent evaluation must be commissioned by the Secretary General. As specified by the GA, the evaluation will serve as a "*comprehensive review of the activities of the CERF, including the ability to meet its objectives, its administration, the needs assessment process and criteria for resource allocations, at the end of its fifth year of operations*..." A report based on the findings from the evaluation will be presented at the 65th session of the GA in the fall of 2011.

The evaluation will be managed by the OCHA's Evaluation and Studies Section (ESS), which is located within the Policy Development and Studies Branch (PDSB) and is institutionally separate from the CERF Secretariat. A Steering Group will be convened to guide the evaluation and help ensure its relevance, independence and transparency. The group will serve in an advisory capacity without management responsibilities. Areas of engagement and responsibilities with which the Steering Group is tasked are:

- Provide substantive advice and feedback at all phases of the evaluative process;

- Provide background information and contextual knowledge, helping to ensure evaluation is relevant, appropriate and adds value to the existing body of work on CERF;

- Provide advice and technical guidance on the development of evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR), methodology and indicators;

- Review and provide appropriate and timely feedback on evaluation deliverables (i.e. ToR, evaluation plan, Inception Report, draft(s) of the final report).

- Facilitate the engagement of key stakeholder groups in consultations around draft documents to help ensure that their perspectives are adequately represented;

- Select a sub-group of no less than four and no more than six individuals to serve as Selection Committee for Evaluation Team;

- Actively participate in meetings and correspondence related to the smooth functioning of the evaluation; and

- Assist Evaluation Manager in ensuring quality control according to standards (UNEG / ALNAP) through provision of advisory services.

Time Commitment

The Steering Group will be activated in March 2010 and is envisaged to exist through July 2011 to allow for it to advise on the entire evaluation process as well as the initial follow up stages. Meetings will be virtual, conducted via email and video/teleconference. It is envisaged that no more than eight such meetings will be convened over the lifetime of the Steering Group.

Key phases in the progression of the evaluation in which the Steering Group will be expected to contribute are:

Phase	Key Activities	Anticipated Timeframe
Design	▪ Develop Terms of Reference ▪ Select Evaluation Team	▪ Mar – Apr 2010 ▪ Aug – Sept 2010
Inception	▪ Contribute relevant background documents to inform desk review by Evaluation Team ▪ Participate in initial briefing of Evaluation Team ▪ Contribute to development of methodology ▪ Review and comment on draft and final Inception Reports	▪ Jul – Aug 2010 ▪ Sep 2010 ▪ Sep – Oct 2010 ▪ Oct – Nov 2010
Research	▪ Provide guidance to Evaluation Team as needed	▪ Nov 2010 – Apr 2011
Reporting	▪ Review and comment on draft and final reports	▪ May – Jun 2011

Composition

The Steering Group will be comprised of evaluation experts from UN agencies, NGOs, member states and academia. So as to allow the group to operate most effectively, membership will not exceed twelve individuals. OCHA ESS will serve as Chair of the Steering Group, coordinating and facilitating its work, providing relevant background information and striving to ensure the evaluation process at all stages reflects the collective vision of the Steering Group.

APPENDIX II: FIVE YEAR EVALUATION OF THE CERF - EVALUATION MANAGER TERMS OF REFERENCE

In collaboration with the relevant stakeholders, Evaluation Manager will be responsible for managing the evaluation in terms of content and coordination. The incumbent will: a) provide advice and strategic direction for the evaluation; b) chair the Headquarters (HQ) and, when appropriate, Country Level Steering Groups; c) provide analysis and input on content and direction of the evaluation and its findings and ensure the evaluation proceeds in accordance with the UNEG *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation*, and that the outcome of the evaluation includes actionable recommendations; and d) liaise with all relevant stakeholders (i.e. UN agencies, NGOs, and Donor representatives) to endeavor for full engagement.

1.   **Representation and Strategic Advice**
   - Provide substantive leadership, advice and strategic support and guidance to evaluation;
   - Represent the participating organizations in discussions with the Evaluation Team conducting the evaluation; and

2.   **Field Research and Reporting**
   - Advise on strategic direction of the evaluation and provide guidance and input on methodology, content and recommendations;
   - Provide analytical advice in the substantive area of investigation;
   - Guide Evaluation Team conducting the field research to ensure appropriate cross-section of stakeholders and issues are being addressed;
   - Report on progress to the Steering Group and participating organizations;

3.   **Coordination and management**
   - Coordinate and collaborate with participating organizations at HQ and field/country offices on matters regarding the evaluation;
   - Manage process of soliciting proposals and selecting Evaluation Team;
   - Assist CERF Secretariat with submission of procurement documents, providing technical specifications and inputs;
   - Ensure Evaluation Team is provided access to relevant and necessary background information;
   - Facilitate Evaluation Team access to individuals embodying information relevant to the evaluation;
   - Assist with logistical planning and matters regarding HQ and field visits;
   - Convene/Chair meetings of the Steering Group and coordinate and manage the meetings and guidance/advice from the Steering Group;
   - Manage the progress of the evaluation according to its pre-determined timeline;

- Act as focal point for participating organizations on substantive issues vis-à-vis the wider community of interest; and
- Ensure involvement of all relevant stakeholders at headquarters, and country offices during field missions (UN, NGOs and member states);
- Review, suggest amendments to, and approve Inception Report, ensuring Evaluation Team clearly understands task and context; and
- Provide quality control oversight to the final report, recommendations and presentations, ensuring ToR met, evaluation questions sufficiently answered in a coherent manner free from internal contradictions, that conclusions and recommendations are clear and supported by evidence, among others.

4.   **Communications and liaising**
- Liaise between participating organizations, Evaluation Team, UN HQ in Geneva, Rome, New York;
- Establish communications between the evaluation and its participants and stakeholders at HQ as well as in the field;
- Initiate development of, and follow up on, utilization of findings via a Management Response Matrix.
- Serve as link to CERF Secretariat and OCHA Senior Management Team.

5.   **Knowledge-sharing and Networking**
- Ensure all interested parties share in the knowledge and recommendations outlined in the final report of the evaluation;
- Ensure member states are informed of its progress and receive timely updates on its development and progress; and
- Network between participating organizations and stakeholders in the field and at HQ to ensure the outcome of the evaluation is comprehensive and includes actionable recommendations.

APPENDIX III: FIVE YEAR EVALUATION OF THE CERF – KEY DATES

I. DESIGN PHASE		
Task	Date	Responsible Party
1. Initial Planning and Concept		
Composition of evaluation Steering Group (SG) discussed and contact initiated with member organizations.	Mar 2010	Evaluation and Studies Section (ESS)
Evaluation discussed during IASC Humanitarian Financing Group (HFG) meeting.	24 March	CERF Secretariat (CERF)/ESS
Concept Note to inform discussion and development of ToR finalized.	30 March	ESS/CERF
2. Development of ToR		
SG activated.	30 March 2010	ESS
Concept Note disseminated for comments to: ERC, CERF Advisory Group (AG), IASC HFG and other stakeholders.	30 March 2010	ESS/SG
Teleconference with SG.	9 April	SG/ESS
CERF AG discussion of Concept Note.	22 April	AG
Final day for stakeholders to submit comments to Concept Note.	23 April	
ToR drafted based on Concept Note and inputs elicited. Sent to SG.	30 April	ESS
SG submits comments on ToR.	7 May	SG
ToR finalized.	10 May	ESS
2. Consultant Selection and Procurement		
Memorandum drafted and submitted with ToR for signatures. Submit to Procurement Office (PO).	11 May	ESS/CERF
Procurement process.	May – July	PO
Review proposals and select evaluation team (ET).	August	ESS/SG
Submit documentation for contracting.	August	ESS/CERF
Contracting.	August – September	PO

II. INCEPTION PHASE		
Task	Date	Responsible Party
1. Desk Review and Methodology Development		
ET commences work.	15 September	ET
ET briefing with ESS.	17 September	ESS/ET
ET briefing with SG.	20 September	ET/SG/ESS
Desk Review, Context Analysis and methodology development completed. Inception Report submitted to ESS.	22 October	ET
ESS and SG review Inception Report and submit comments.	5 November	ESS/SG
Inception report revised based on comments and final document submitted to ESS.	12 November	ET
Inception report disseminated to stakeholders.	19 November	ESS

III. RESEARCH PHASE		
Task	Date	Responsible Party
1. Headquarters Meetings		
Meetings, in person and via telephone, with HQ-based stakeholders.	22 November – 10 December	ET
CERF High Level Conference, including Policy Session	7 December	
2. Field Missions		
Missions to 6 countries.	10 January – 23 February 2011	ET

IV. REPORTING PHASE		
Task	Date	Responsible Party
1. Evaluation Report		
Fifth Anniversary of the CERF.	9 March	
Validation workshops highlighting initial findings and recommendations for discussion undertaken in NY and Geneva	Week of 9 March	ET/ESS
Draft report submitted to ESS.	18 March	
Draft report sent to SG and ERC for comments.	25 March	ESS
SG and ERC submit comments.	8 April	SG
Draft report revised and submitted with completed comments matrix to ESS.	15 April	ET
Report disseminated to CERF AG, IASC HFG, and stakeholders for comments	18 April	ESS
CERF AG Meeting: Discussion of draft report.	29 April	AG
Final day to submit comments.	13 May	All
Report revised based on comments and submitted to ESS with comments matrix.	27 May	ET
Report submitted to SG for final comments.	30 May	ESS
Final comments received from SG.	3 June	SG
Report revised based on SG comments and finalized. Submitted to ESS with final comments matrix.	10 June	ET
Final products disseminated widely.	15 June	ESS/CERF
2. Management Response Matrix		
MRM consultations commence.	20 June	CERF/ESS
MRM finalized.	22 July	CERF
3. General Assembly and ECOSOC		
ECOSOC Side Event.	July	ESS/CERF
GA report finalized.	29 July	CERF
Presentation of report at GA.	December	ESS/CERF/ET

APPENDIX IV: EVALUATION QUESTIONS ORGANIZED ALONG CERF PAF AND OECD DAC CRITERIA – WORKING DRAFT

Inputs and Process	Inclusive Country Level Prioritization Process	✓ Have inter- and intra-cluster discussions and prioritization processes been inclusive and transparent (e.g. are NGO inputs appropriately valued)? ✓ Are the greatest needs being prioritized? ✓ On what information or data were allocation and prioritization decisions based (e.g. comprehensive needs assessment, best available information)? Is there congruity between the identified needs and subsequent direction of funds?
	Coherent Country Submission	✓ Are the revised life-saving criteria being applied and proving to be effective in providing guidance in defining projects that are appropriate for CERF funding?
	Streamlined Review, Allocation and Distribution	✓ Are agencies receiving CERF funds in a timely manner, and are they being applied to the humanitarian response (used) in a timely manner? How does this compare with other funds? ✓ What is the quality of criteria applied by the CERF Secretariat and how thorough are the selection and vetting processes?
	Agency and CERF Secretariat M/R &E Systems in Place	✓ Is narrative and financial reporting adequate for accountability purposes? What is the quality of reporting? ✓ Are adequate accountability mechanisms ensure proper upward and downward accountability? ✓ Does the CERF Secretariat exercise appropriate oversight and due diligence? ✓ To what extent are agencies mutually accountable to one another and to the RC/HC?
Outputs	Life Saving Activities Supported	✓ How has assistance been allocated in terms of geography, sector and gender? ✓ What components of projects are funded by CERF?
	Timely Response	✓ Has CERF led to quicker action and early and timely action? ✓ Time from HQ receiving funds to disbursing to FO and FO receiving funds from HQ to disbursing to implementing partners?
Outcomes	Predictability and Reliability Enhanced	✓ How has the CERF affected the level of funding being directed towards under-funded emergencies? ✓ Has CERF helped balance funding? ✓ How has CERF affected agency ability to respond at both HQ and field levels? ✓ What did agencies do with CERF funds they would otherwise have been able to do? ✓ Did CERF kick start operations? ✓ Have CERF funds strengthened agencies'' capability to leverage donor confidence and elicit further contributions?
	Quality Response	✓ Did CERF allow for better coverage? What, if anything, would improve coverage by CERF? ✓ Is sufficient emphasis being placed on gender concerns to ensure the differential needs of women and men are being addressed? ✓ How well does CERF support transitions to Early Recovery?
	Humanitarian Reform Process Supported	✓ What is the 'value-added' of the CERF grant and revolving fund in the context of the overall humanitarian architecture and humanitarian reform process? ✓ What has been the CERF influence on the humanitarian reform agenda as whole?
Operational Impact	Time Sensitive Coverage of Critical Beneficiary Needs	✓ How has the CERF contributed to strengthened humanitarian performance, namely in promoting early action and response to time-critical needs as well as underfunded crises? ✓ Has CERF responded to time-critical needs?

Additional Questions OECD DAC Criteria	Effectiveness	✓ Is the CERF Secretariat working effectively? ✓ Is the CERF Secretariat sufficiently resourced to do its job? Does it receive adequate support from other parts of OCHA and other parts of the UN Secretariat?
	Efficiency	✓ For what is CERF being used (e.g. situations, types of projects) by recipient agencies? ✓ Are the overall costs in time and resources associated with the CERF reasonable? What is the cost of preparing a CERF proposal as compared to other methods of securing funds? ✓ Is CERF being efficiently managed by the central Secretariat level and the field level? ✓ Have planned improvements in the administration of the funds been correctly implemented since the previous evaluations, with resulting efficiency gains? ✓ Has CERF incorporated recommendations into responses and processes? ✓ What improvements or further efficiency gains are linked to CERF? ✓ How efficient is the utility and constitution of the CERF Advisory Group?
	Appropriateness and Relevance	✓ Has CERF adapted suitably to address changing needs, and how has CERF driven change? ✓ What, if any, changes might be made to make CERF more appropriate and relevant? ✓ Given the current demands and capacities (both of the OCHA Secretariat and implementing agencies), is the current scale (i.e. volume of funding and reach) of the CERF sufficient? ✓ Are the two windows and the loan element the most appropriate structure for the CERF? ✓ Is the project-based funding model the most appropriate, or should there be allowances for programme-based funding?