

**EVALUATION  
REPORT**

**REAL-TIME EVALUATION  
OF UNICEF'S  
HUMANITARIAN  
RESPONSE TO TYPHOON  
HAIYAN IN THE  
PHILIPPINES**

**ANNEXES**

**EVALUATION OFFICE  
JULY 2014**

**unite for  
children**

**unicef** 

**REAL-TIME EVALUATION  
OF UNICEF'S  
HUMANITARIAN  
RESPONSE TO TYPHOON  
HAIYAN IN THE  
PHILIPPINES**

**ANNEXES**

## **Real-Time Evaluation of UNICEF’s Humanitarian Response to the Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines - Annexes**

© United Nations Children’s Fund, New York, 2014  
United Nations Children’s Fund  
Three United Nations Plaza  
New York, New York 10017

July 2014

The purpose of publishing evaluation reports produced by the UNICEF Evaluation Office is to fulfil a corporate commitment to transparency through the publication of all completed evaluations. The reports are designed to stimulate a free exchange of ideas among those interested in the topic and to assure those supporting the work of UNICEF that it rigorously examines its strategies, results, and overall effectiveness.

The contents of the report do not necessarily reflect the policies or views of UNICEF.

The text has not been edited to official publication standards and UNICEF accepts no responsibility for error.

The designations in this publication do not imply an opinion on the legal status of any country or territory, or of its authorities, or the delimitation of frontiers.

The copyright for this report is held by the United Nations Children’s Fund. Permission is required to reprint/reproduce/photocopy or in any other way to cite or quote from this report in written form. UNICEF has a formal permission policy that requires a written request to be submitted. For non-commercial uses, the permission will normally be granted free of charge. Please write to the Evaluation Office at the address below to initiate a permission request.

For further information, please contact:

Evaluation Office  
United Nations Children’s Fund  
Three United Nations Plaza  
New York, New York 10017  
[evalhelp@unicef.org](mailto:evalhelp@unicef.org)

## List of Annexes

Annex 1:	Terms of Reference .....	1
Annex 2:	Evaluation Matrix.....	9
Annex 3:	Haiyan Response Timeline .....	15
Annex 4:	Cluster Survey Report.....	19
Annex 5:	List of those Consulted.....	23

# ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

## UNICEF Evaluation Office

### Real-time Evaluation of UNICEF's Humanitarian Response to Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines

#### 1. INTERVENTION BACKGROUND

On 8 November 2013, category 5 Typhoon Haiyan struck 36 provinces of the Philippines, a densely populated country of 92 million people. Haiyan is possibly the most powerful storm ever recorded in history, and it came weeks after the Bohol earthquake on 15 October that hit some of the same provinces and about a year after Typhoon Bopha. An estimated 14.1 million people in nine regions are affected and more than 3.9 million people have been displaced. About 6,000 people have been killed and many more injured. UNICEF estimates that more than 5 million children are affected and vulnerable to disease and protection risks, including 1.6 million displaced children. Normal provision of basic services, including food, drinking water and healthcare, has been disrupted. Children and youth are at risks of gender-based violence and trafficking, and exposure to abuse, exploitation and violence is likely to be amplified, with marginalized populations particularly vulnerable. The impact of the Typhoon is likely to affect children's psychosocial well-being, particularly for those at risk of prolonged displacement. Education of millions of children has been interrupted due to schools being severely damaged or used as shelter in the aftermath of the Typhoon. Prior to the disaster poverty and malnutrition rates were already higher than the national average. The country has also been responding to the protracted conflict in Mindanao.

As part of the inter-agency Typhoon Haiyan Strategic Response Plan<sup>1</sup>, the UNICEF Philippines Country Office (PCO) is responding to the disaster in collaboration with partners including the Government's National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council and local authorities. UNICEF PCO is prioritizing interventions in water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), child protection, health, education and nutrition. In addition, UNICEF is also supporting national coordination mechanisms as cluster lead agency (CLA) for WASH, education, nutrition and the child protection area of responsibility (AOR). In support of the Government-led response, UNICEF's funding requirements amount to US\$ 96.4 million to support children and women affected across the Philippines by Typhoon Haiyan, Bohol Earthquake and the Mindanao conflict through May 2014.<sup>2</sup>

Given the scale, urgency and complexity of the crisis, UNICEF has activated its Corporate Emergency Activation Procedure (CEAP) and the Simplified Standard Operating Procedures (SSOPs) for Level 3 emergencies to support the PCO on 11 November. The Director of the Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS), in a first phase, and then the Director of the Regional Office, in a second phase, has been appointed as Global Emergency Coordinator (GEC), responsible for overseeing and coordinating the mobilization of support from HQ and the Regional Office for a period of three months.

---

<sup>1</sup> OCHA (Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs), Philippines: Strategic Response Plan for Typhoon Haiyan (November 2013 - November 2014), United Nations, November 2013.

<sup>2</sup> UNICEF, Philippines: Humanitarian Action for Children, UNICEF, November 2013.

In consonance with the CEAP and the SSOPs for Level 3, UNICEF wishes to conduct a Real-time Evaluation (RTE) of UNICEF's response to the Typhoon. As the situation was declared a Level 3 emergency, the evaluation will assess UNICEF's response at all levels: at HQ, at the Regional Office and in country. The RTE seeks to assess (1) UNICEF's progress in achieving results in the initial phase of the response and in transitioning to early recovery, and (2) the implementation of the CEAP and the SSOPs for Level 3 in supporting the response from HQ and the Regional Office.

## **2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES**

The purpose of the RTE is a formative and forward-looking one to help improve the effectiveness and quality of UNICEF's response to the Typhoon Haiyan and learn lessons for application in future emergencies, where appropriate. It will also entail a summative component, reviewing plans and performance to date, in order to provide impartial evidence on how UNICEF has been responding in the initial phase of the emergency. By drawing lessons now, the RTE will provide UNICEF with real-time and practical recommendations to facilitate operational improvements to strengthen the response and the transition to early recovery. In addition, the evaluation will examine the implementation of the CEAP and the SSOPs for Level 3 in supporting the response from HQ and the Regional Office to achieve better results for the affected population, and most especially children and youth. The evaluation will also consider how far lessons learned from previous urban disasters have been applied in implementation of the current response, and it will help draw lessons with regard to working in partnership with national and local authorities in middle-income countries.

At the country level, the RTE will help UNICEF consider which aspects of UNICEF's response to the Typhoon have been working well, which aspects have been working less well, and why, in terms of the specific objectives of the Strategic Response Plan and in relation to established benchmarks – such as the Core Commitments to Children (CCCs), and existing guidelines and standards. The RTE will also consider how well the response has addressed issues of accountability to the affected population.

UNICEF does not work in isolation in the Philippines. The evidence and analysis provided by this RTE will also inform UNICEF's partners in national/local government, as well as the members of the clusters or areas of responsibility (AOR) where UNICEF serves as cluster lead agency (CLA).

At the regional and global level, the RTE is intended to inform any further development of UNICEF's CEAP and the SSOPs to support the response to Level 3 corporate emergencies.

The RTE, overall, will have a strong utilisation focus. The main users of the evaluation will be UNICEF PCO, the Regional Office management, the Global Emergency Coordinator (GEC), and Divisions and Offices in HQ. Other users of this RTE include: co-lead agencies, cluster partners, and other partners in the Philippines (e.g., National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council and local authorities) participating in the response.

## **3. SCOPE**

The main focus of the RTE will be on UNICEF's progress in achieving results in the initial phase of the response to the Typhoon and in the transition to early recovery, in the wake of the declaration of the Level 3 corporate emergency. At the country level, the RTE will examine narrowly the relevance, appropriateness, efficiency, effectiveness, coverage and coordination of UNICEF programmatic<sup>3</sup> and

---

<sup>3</sup> For instance: Performance monitoring, M&E, Nutrition, Health, WASH, Child protection, Education, Supply and logistics.

operational<sup>4</sup> responses in meeting the CCCs. The scope of the RTE will include assessment of the clusters' performance in enhancing coordination and UNICEF's performance as a partner in fulfilling its CLA role. The evaluation will also include consideration of ongoing responses to support children and women affected by the Bohol Earthquake and the Mindanao conflict, and how these affect the Typhoon Haiyan response. At the regional and global level, the RTE will look at the HQ response, and the role of the Regional Office, and whether the CEAP and the SSOPs for Level 3 emergencies have worked effectively.

The period under review will cover UNICEF's response from November 2013 to February 2014, assessing the initial phase of the response and the transition to early recovery. In addition, the RTE will explore issues of preparedness and early warning mechanisms prior to the Typhoon. There are valuable opportunities for lesson learning not only in view of the exceptional the level of devastation of the infrastructure, but also with regard to the relatively high level of national and local capacity in a middle-income country and potential sources of resilience.

The RTE will not preclude more comprehensive evaluation of the response later in 2014 to assess in depth results achieved (or not achieved) at the sector level during the emergency response. It will also inform proposals for an Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation (IAHE) of the response and recovery.

#### 4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation questions below, based on the OECD/DAC criteria and other criteria specific to evaluation of humanitarian action, represent a provisional list of questions to be refined by the Evaluation Team in the scoping and inception phase of the evaluation process. The questions will be tailored to the initial phase of the response and the transition to early recovery, and examine the role of the PCO, the Regional Office and HQ in the response. These include:

- **Relevance/Appropriateness:** How appropriate is the UNICEF's response as a whole, and what programmatic and operational results did it produce in the initial phase of the response and in the transition to early recovery? How closely aligned is the UNICEF's response plan with the inter-agency Typhoon Haiyan Strategic Response Plan, and with the Government's National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council wider response plan? How closely aligned is the conduct of UNICEF's programmatic and operational responses with key sources of guidance and normative standards, including the CCCs? In what ways has the affected population been involved in the design, implementation and monitoring of UNICEF's response? To what degree have gender, disability and ethnicity issues been addressed? How appropriate and consistent is the support provided by UNICEF's HQ and the Regional Office in meeting the needs of the PCO?
- **Efficiency:** How well have UNICEF's resources, both human and financial, been managed to ensure the most timely, cost-effective and efficient response to the Typhoon? How quickly was the CEAP activated, and how clearly have the SSOPs for Level 3 been communicated at various levels of the organization? To what extent has investment in preparedness prior to the Typhoon resulted in a more timely, cost-effective and efficient response? To what extent have innovative or alternative modes of delivering on the response been explored and exploited to reduce costs and maximize results? What has constrained the efficiency of the response?

---

<sup>4</sup> Media and communications, Security, Human resources, Resource mobilization, Finance and administration, Information and communication technology.

- **Effectiveness:** How successful has UNICEF been in delivering results vis-à-vis its programmatic and operational commitments in the initial phase of the response and in easing the transition to early recovery? How well has organization-wide mobilization under the CEAP and the SSOPs for Level 3 supported UNICEF's response in the Philippines?
- **Coverage:** To what extent has the affected population been properly targeted and reached by UNICEF and its partners? How successful has UNICEF been in reaching the most vulnerable groups in the most affected geographic areas? Have data been disaggregated by sex, age, disability status, and ethnicity? To what extent has an equity-based approach contributed to better results for children and young people?
- **Coordination:** How effectively and efficiently has UNICEF fulfilled its cluster leadership obligations? How effectively has UNICEF coordinated its response with other key actors in the initial phase of the response and in the transition to early recovery? How effective, efficient and timely has coordination between the Immediate Response Team, the PCO, the Regional Office and HQ been, in light of the Level 3 requirements?
- **Monitoring and reporting:** To what extent has monitoring and reporting met UNICEF's needs at each level of the organization, and the needs of UNICEF's partners and stakeholders? How far has monitoring and reporting been undertaken efficiently and effectively and in turn how far has it contributed to the efficiency and effectiveness of the various aspects of the response?

## 5. METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

In order to help UNICEF gather as much insight as possible with a light footprint on the PCO and UNICEF's partners, the RTE will follow a phased approach, which also allows time for reflection and real-time feedback. The RTE will be participatory in its approach, so as to ensure ownership and promote interaction with, and feedback from, the UNICEF response team in country, personnel in the Regional Office and HQ, and from UNICEF's partners. In keeping with the IASC Transformative Agenda, the RTE will make special efforts to consult the affected population, notably children and youth, to help inform the on-going response, and promote accountability. In the same way, it is essential that the RTE process is rigorous and evidence-based. It will employ mixed-methods to triangulate qualitative and quantitative data and reach findings and conclusions in each phase, as outlined below.

**Phase 1: Scoping and Inception Phase (February 2014)** – During the first phase of the RTE, the Evaluation Team will conduct a rapid desk review of key qualitative and quantitative data and critical information coming in from the PCO, the Regional Office and HQ, coupled with interviews with key informants. UNICEF will provide the Evaluation Team with all relevant documentation and information, namely: Situation Reports (SitReps), needs assessment reports, key messages, timelines of key decisions and main contact lists of key informants in the PCO, the Regional Office and HQ. Documents, data and other inputs from other agencies will be actively sought. Data collection will entail a scoping mission to the Philippines to interview key informants and triangulate the information obtained. Visits to NYHQ and UNICEF's Regional Office in Bangkok will also be undertaken for briefing and data collection, supplemented by telephone interviews to relevant staff in Copenhagen (Supply Division) and Geneva (EMOPS, PFP). These methods will establish a clear chronology and a broad overview of the initial response to the Typhoon, as well as a framework on priority issues and questions for further examination. The main output of the scoping and inception phase will be an Inception Report, to be approved by the Evaluation Office in consultation with the Reference Groups (see section on Management and Governance Arrangements below)



**Phase 2: Structured Field Work and Feedback Phase (March 2014)** – In the second phase of the RTE, the evaluation will employ a mixed-method approach entailing triangulation of qualitative and quantitative methods to put together a comprehensive and credible evidence base to assess UNICEF's response to the Typhoon at the global, regional and country levels. It is expected that the evaluation will use the following methods to provide an assessment and real-time feedback examining those issues more relevant during the initial phase of the response, their causes, and potential solutions, including at minimum:

- **Key informant interviews and focus group discussions:** The Evaluation Team is expected to interview or conduct focus groups with key informants in person or by telephone or Skype. Key stakeholders will include, but not limited to, UNICEF staff in the PCO, Regional Office and HQ, Immediate Response Team (IRT) members, cluster members and partners, national and sub-national authorities, donors, and affected population (including children and youth).
- **Direct observation:** The Evaluation Team will prioritize field visits to observe the UNICEF's response in the Philippines directly and conduct interviews with affected populations to determine their view of UNICEF's programmatic and operational responses. The team will participate in Emergency Management Team meetings at the global level to inform the analysis on how HQ and the Regional Office support the response. In addition, it will also develop and use tools to record and compare observations.
- **Formal desk review:** In addition to rapidly review data in the scoping and inception phase, the Evaluation Team will conduct a systematic desk review of documents, data and other inputs. The Evaluation Team will use data collection tools to code or organize the information.

In this period, the team will conduct an extended data collection mission to the Philippines to look at the initial relief and time critical programmatic and operational responses, and at the transition to early recovery. Stop-over visits to the UNICEF Regional Office in Bangkok and HQ in New York will be made to provide briefing on emerging results, and to gather further primary information regarding efforts at the regional and global levels. Telephone interviews will cover the involvement of UNICEF offices in Copenhagen and Geneva. The main outputs will be public debriefing sessions at the country, regional and global levels, in the form of participatory workshops, to allow feedback findings on a real-time basis and further validation of emerging findings and conclusions. A short report on emerging findings will be prepared at the end of the mission to promote positive change in real-time.

**Phase 3: Report Preparation Phase (April 2014)** – This phase of the RTE will include the preparation of a final report, based on an impartial analysis of the information gathered in Phase 1 and 2 that provides a comprehensive assessment of the UNICEF's global response to the Typhoon in order to draw conclusions and SMART recommendations. The final report shall contain a short executive summary of no more than 2,000 words and a main text of no more than 12,000 words (plus Annexes).

**Phase 4: Dissemination (May 2014)** – In line with the PCO's wish to ensure maximum utilization of the evaluation results, a final visit to the Philippines will be scheduled to communicate the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation, and to facilitate strategic reflection on response and uptake of useful lessons and recommendations. A series of well-facilitated participatory workshops would be conducted with the PCO and UNICEF's key partners.

This multi-phased approach is conveyed graphically in Figure 1 below.

**Figure 1 – Multi-Phased Approach**



## 6. MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

In keeping with the corporate nature of the UNICEF’s response, the Evaluation Office will manage the RTE, in close collaboration with the PCO, EMOPS, other HQ Divisions concerned and the Regional Office. An Evaluation Manager will lead the process, under the guidance of the Evaluation Office Director. The Evaluation Office will commission a team of external consultants to undertake the evaluation, and provide overall management of the evaluation process. At the country level, the PCO PME Chief will provide day-to-day management and facilitation of the evaluation process in-country, including day-to day oversight of the consultant evaluation team.

Two Reference Groups will be established, one at the country level and one at the global/regional level, to strengthen the relevance, accuracy and hence credibility and utility of the evaluation. The Reference Groups will serve in an advisory capacity, their main responsibility being to review and comment on the main evaluation outputs (i.e., this TOR, the Inception Report, reports on emerging findings and the Draft and Final Reports). At the country level, members of the Reference Group will include programme section Chiefs and UNICEF’s cluster partners. At the global/regional level, a Global Reference Group, chaired by the GEC, will be established with membership composed of members of the (global/regional) Emergency Management Team (EMT). A TOR outlining the roles and responsibilities of the Reference Groups will be developed separately.

UNICEF partners will be kept informed of the RTE's progress on a regular basis. They will be invited to the participatory workshops and consulted on the evaluation outputs. A UNICEF Team Site will be set up for the RTE to post regular updates, promote collaboration and ensure transparency.

## 7. DELIVERABLES AND TIMEFRAME

The Evaluation Team will generate the following major outputs that will be reviewed by the Evaluation Office and the two Reference Groups, and approved by the Evaluation Office before wider dissemination. These include:

- **An Inception Report of maximum 8,000 words (not including annexes).** The Inception Report is intended to outline the team understanding of UNICEF's response to the Typhon Haiyan at the country, regional and global levels. It will include a clear chronology and a broad overview of the initial response to the Typhoon as well as a framework on priority issues and questions for further examination. It will also include a data collection tool-kit (i.e., interview guides, focus group discussion guides, direct observation forms, questionnaires for consultations with affected populations, and so on) to be used in the course of the RTE;
- **Power-point Presentations** that will be used by the Evaluation Team to present the preliminary findings in a set of participatory workshops;
- **Preliminary Findings Reports** of maximum 4,000 words at the end the data collection mission to promote positive change in real-time;
- **A Draft RTE Report** that outlines clear evidence-based findings, conclusions and SMART recommendations, with a clear Executive Summary, for consideration by the two evaluation Reference Groups;
- **A Final RTE Report** of no more than 12,000 words (plus Annexes), with a clear Executive Summary of no more than 2,000 words. This will incorporate responses to the comments of the two Reference Groups.

Given the focus on the initial phase of the response and the transition to early recovery, the RTE will be undertaken over four months from February 2014 to May 2014, as laid out in Figure 2.

**Figure 2 – Indicative Timeline**

Step	End-Date
Finalize TOR (EO/PCO)	24 January 2014
Recruit Evaluation Team (EO)	14 February 2014
Commence Step 1 work, including data collection and data analysis (Evaluation Team)	17 February 2014
Conduct inception mission to NYHQ, EAPRO and PCO (Evaluation Team)	17-28 February 2014
Submit Step 1 outputs, including Inception Report for comment and data collection tool-kit (Evaluation Team)	3 March 2014
Commence Step 2 work (KIIS, FGDs) on initial response and transition to early recovery (Evaluation Team)	10 March 2014
Conduct data collection mission to NYHQ, EAPRO and PCO (Evaluation Team)	10-28 March 2014
Facilitate participatory workshops (Evaluation Team)	1-2 April
Submit Preliminary Findings Report (Evaluation Team)	4 April 2014
Submit first Draft RTE Report for comment (Evaluation Team)	18 April 2014
Submit second Draft RTE Report for comment (Evaluation Team)	2 May 2014
Submit final RTE Report for management response and publication (EO/PCO)	16 May 2014
Facilitate dissemination, strategic reflection and uptake (Evaluation Team)	20-21 May 2014

## 8. EVALUATION TEAM

UNICEF will hire a team of external consultants to conduct the evaluation, comprising:

- a senior team leader with extensive evaluation experience in humanitarian approaches and programmes;
- a senior consultant familiar with UNICEF emergency operations, likely a former UNICEF staff member;
- a national consultant familiar with participatory methods and techniques to promote consultations with affected population; and
- an analyst capable of undertaking back-office analysis (e.g., desk review, analysis of timeline data, analysis of funding resources, etc.).

The team leader will work on the evaluation full time from start to finish, and in a timely and high-quality manner. S/He will be responsible for managing and leading the Evaluation Team, undertaking the data collection and analysis, conducting the participatory workshops, as well as report drafting and dissemination. The other team members will be responsible for carrying out data collection, analysis, and drafting elements of the report.

## ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators/Data sources
<b>1. What has been the quality of UNICEF's programme response to Typhoon Haiyan?</b>		
(i) (a) How well did the UNICEF first four months programme deliver judged against DAC evaluation criteria (+)	<b>Timeliness:</b> Were the UNICEF programme elements (WASH, Health, Nutrition, Education, Child Protection and cash transfer) delivered in a timely way, judged against priority needs over time and against planned delivery schedules?	Interviews with staff and partners Implementation & PCA signature timelines Aid recipient and community stakeholder interviews
	<b>Coherence:</b> Were the appropriate linkages made between WASH, Health, Nutrition, Education, Child Protection, cash and other components of the emergency response?	Interviews with staff and partners Review of UNICEF SRP
	<b>Relevance and appropriateness:</b> Were the WASH, Health, Nutrition, Education, Child Protection and cash interventions relevant to priority needs and appropriate in the context? Especially given the identified priorities for children.	Interviews with staff and partners UNICEF SRP and related assessments Monitoring reports Aid recipient and community interviews
	<b>Effectiveness:</b> Did the various programme elements (W, H, N, E, CP, cash) achieve their immediate objectives? Outputs and short-term outcomes? Differential impacts on children, women, others? To what extent has UNICEF achieved its strategic objectives after 4 months? Is it on track to achieve its medium term (9 month) and longer term (18 month) objectives?	Interviews with staff and partners SRP objectives, partner /UNICEF reporting Monitoring reports Aid recipient and community interviews
	<b>Efficiency:</b> Were the available financial resources put to best use (overall, and by programme element); or could the same ends have been achieved at less cost? Ditto for staff time and other resources?	Review of budgets (delivery costs etc.) Output/input ratios of programme elements Inter-sector/cross-sector comparison
	<b>Coverage:</b> Was the coverage achieved by the UNICEF programme elements (W, H, N, E, CP, cash) proportionate to the overall needs? Were significant groups / areas omitted in the programme areas?	Interviews with staff, government, partners UNICEF SRP and related assessments Monitoring reports Beneficiary and community interviews

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators/Data sources
(i)(b) How well did the UNICEF programme deliver against key benchmarks?	<b>Coordination:</b> How well did UNICEF coordinate its planning and activities with other actors (government, UN agencies, NGOs etc.)?	Interviews with partners Interviews with other government depts
	<b>Connectedness:</b> How well did UNICEF's initial 'relief' response connect to medium-longer term recovery objectives? Overall and by programme element?	Interviews with staff, government, partners Review of UNICEF SRP and Country Strategy. Review of PCAs
	How well did the programme deliver against the CCCs? And against relevant UNICEF guidelines? Were UNICEF's sectoral interventions (W, H, N, E, CP, cash) compliant with Sphere and other best practice standards?	Interviews with staff Monitoring reports Interviews with staff (section chiefs etc.) Project plans and reporting CCCs, guidelines and standards
(ii) Emergency preparedness	How well prepared was UNICEF to respond (with others) to the emergency caused by Typhoon Haiyan? Did it have appropriate contingency plans of its own? Was it part of effective system-wide contingency planning? Did it have appropriate contingency stocks?	Interviews with staff Contingency plans Interviews with government, partners
(iii) Partnerships	How effective were the various forms of collaboration and partnership formed by UNICEF: with INGOs, local NGOs, central government bodies, LGUs? Could alternative partnerships have proved more effective? To what extent did UNICEF capitalise on existing partnerships?	Interviews with staff, government, partners Review of lessons from wider responses (OPR, other evaluations, etc.)
(iv) Strategy and needs analysis	How clear and coherent was the overall UNICEF programme strategy? How well was it connected to (i) the UN SPR, (ii) GoP strategy (RAY)? How well were the related planning and implementation processes coordinated (inter-agency, government)?	Review of UNICEF SRP Interviews with staff and partners (and particularly government counterparts)
	How clear and coherent were the sectoral strategies of UNICEF? Were they the right strategies?	Review of UNICEF SRP Interviews with staff, government, partners
	What was the quality of UNICEF's needs and situational analysis (overall, by sector) underpinning its plans? On what was it based (initial and on-going analysis)?	Review of needs analysis documentation (assessments etc.) and SRP Interviews with staff

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators/Data sources
(v) Monitoring	How well did UNICEF monitoring systems work (strengths/weaknesses)? Did they provide adequate understanding of (i) evolving context and (ii) the continued relevance and effectiveness of UNICEF's programme? How well were the HPM and existing PCO processes combined?	Review of monitoring reports and process documentation Interviews with staff and partners Interviews with independent monitors
(vi) Accountability and community engagement	How well did UNICEF and its partners engage with communities in relation to each programme element and more generally? <i>Criteria: consultation on priorities; transparency and communication about available assistance; involvement in programme design and implementation; response monitoring; feedback and complaints.</i> How well did UNICEF contribute to wider AAP efforts? How well did UNICEF engage directly with children to voice their priorities and needs? Link to C4D efforts of PCO?	Aid recipient and community interviews, focus group feedback, and other existing feedback Staff, government, partner interviews
(vii) Transition to recovery	How well was the programme adapted to the evolving priorities for (i) relief and (ii) recovery support? How well integrated were the relief-recovery elements? How clear is the transition strategy? How clear and appropriate is UNICEF's recovery strategy? Overall and by programme element.	Review of UNICEF SRP Review of mid-term revisions to plans Review of PCAs
(viii) Lessons learned from previous disaster responses	How well did UNICEF's response reflect the relevant lessons from recent evaluations of major emergency responses?	Review of key recent evaluations Interviews with staff and partners
	Specifically, how well did UNICEF's response reflect lessons concerning response to urban disasters (from Haiti etc.)?	As above
(ix) Advocacy	How well did UNICEF perform as an advocate for children in the Haiyan emergency? Did it have an advocacy strategy? With what positive outcomes?	Interviews with staff and partners SRP and monitoring reports. Advocacy and communications strategy
<b>2. How strong has UNICEF's contribution been to the wider system response to Typhoon Haiyan?</b>		
(i) Cluster lead role	How well did UNICEF perform its cluster lead role? Did the global cluster support team + surge capacity and standby partnerships work well? Did UNICEF offer sectoral leadership as well as coordination capacity?	Interviews with cluster support staff (in country and at Geneva level) Interviews with cluster members Survey of cluster members

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators/Data sources
	Did UNICEF manage the relationship between its own programme partnerships and its cluster co-lead role appropriately? How well did UNICEF coordinate its own programme with others in the relevant clusters? How appropriate were the UNICEF management arrangements for cluster coordinators and other support staff?	Interviews with staff (programme, cluster) Interviews with cluster members Survey of cluster members
	Co-leadership: how well did UNICEF share its leadership role with co-leads (government, Save the Children)?	As above
(ii) Involvement with UNCT, HCT and joint processes	How well did UNICEF engage with HCT and other international-national forums?	Interviews with HC & other UN agencies Interviews with staff
	What was the quality of UNICEF's engagement in joint assessment processes?	Interviews with HC & OCHA Interviews with staff
(iii) Coordination and collaboration with government at national, provincial and local levels	How well did UNICEF coordinate with relevant government bodies at the national (Manila) level?	Interviews with government officials Interviews with staff
	How well did UNICEF coordinate with relevant government bodies at local levels (provincial, city/municipality, barangay)?	Interviews with government officials Interviews with staff Interviews with community stakeholders
<b>3. How well did UNICEF processes serve the response to Typhoon Haiyan?</b>		
(i) L3: CEAP, SSOPs, GEC, etc.	Was it appropriate to invoke the L3 mechanisms in this case -- given the MIC context, UNICEF country and regional capacities, etc.?	Staff interviews at all levels (HQ, region, country) plus HC/OCHA
	How well adapted were the SSOPs and L3-related processes to such a context? How well did all staff – CO, Surge, EAPRO, HQ, Geneva and Copenhagen – understand the provisions of the SSOPs?	Staff interviews plus review of procedures
	How well were the CEAP and SSOPs implemented in practice? Were the SSOPs used appropriately? Did they deliver the intended benefits? How appropriate was the 'no regrets' policy? E.g. regarding staff deployment, procurement? Was it implemented in an appropriate way? How well managed were the associated risks?	As above Review of operational decisions and timelines



Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators/Data sources
	How appropriate were the management arrangements in this case - as between New York, the regional and country offices? How well did they work in practice? How well did the EMT mechanism work?	Staff interviews at all levels
(ii) IRT and surge deployments	How well was the IRT deployment managed? How well did the IRT work alongside existing country staff? Were the capacities of each used to best effect? Did the IRT members fill real gaps in capacity?	Staff interviews at all levels (current staff plus selected former IRT)
	How well were the surge and standby partner deployments managed? How well did they work alongside existing country staff? Did they fill real gaps in capacity?	Staff interviews at all levels (current staff plus selected former surge)
(iii) Human Resources	How well were recruitments and staff deployments managed at HQ, regional and country levels? Was there a good understanding of the needs in the field? Were the deployments timely? Were the procedures appropriate in regards to the urgency of the situation? What was the quality/appropriateness of the staff deployed? Did they have a good understanding the context, the organisation, of the job? Was there an appropriate level of experience? What was the quality of staff support and staff welfare measures in country?	Review of timelines Staff interviews at all levels (current staff plus selected former IRT/surge) UNICEF staff lessons learned exercises
(iv) Supplies and logistics	How appropriate and timely was the supply component of the response? Were contingency stocks at country level available and useful? Was there any main and/or sector-specific bottleneck at either delivery or distribution level? How relevant and appropriate were the goods procured and distributed? How effective and appropriate was the use of contributions in kind?	Review of main supply statistics Interviews with Supply staff (surge and PCH) and programme staff. Interviews with aid recipients

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators/Data sources
(v) Other areas of operations: ICT, security, finance, administration, risk management	<p>How did other operations processes and sections adapt to and support the response? Were there bottleneck at any level? What caused them?</p> <p>How effectively did the VISION system serve the response?</p> <p>How good was the financial management of the response? Was the right balance struck between the need for control and the demands of timely and efficient programme delivery?</p> <p>How well managed were the risks associated with a response of this kind (fiduciary and other)? Particularly given the combination of high proportion of unrestricted funding (=&gt; 'soft' budgets?) and adoption of a 'no regrets' policy.</p>	Operations and other staff interviews
(vi) Fundraising and communications	<p>How well did UNICEF's fundraising efforts support the response? Were they well-coordinated at country, regional and HQ level? How well were they in turn served by communications?</p>	<p>Senior managers interviews in Manila, Bangkok and HQ</p> <p>Interviews with selected NatComs</p>

## ANNEX 3: HAIYAN RESPONSE TIMELINE

### UNICEF Haiyan Response Timeline (5 Nov. 2013 to 10 Feb 2014)

Date	Key external events	Critical UNICEF interventions and decisions
8 Nov.	Haiyan Typhoon hits Philippines at 4:30 am	RD informs EMOPS Director of retention of EPF and potential re-purposing. EMOPS Director agrees in response. Rep sends first update to EMOPS and RD. First Deployment plans done in country. First request for additional surge after exchanges.
9 Nov.	138 people dead, 14 injured, 4 missing	UNICEF's first priorities are focused on life-saving interventions – getting essential medicines, nutrition, safe water and hygiene to children and families.
10 Nov.	10,000 people dead and 9.5 million affected	L2-L3: CO/RO analyse the five Emergency Level criteria in collaboration with EMOPS. The current situation is <i>defacto</i> considered as L2, and considerations for L3 will be made in next 24 hours. IASC meeting held. UNICEF CO relays requests for support from member states' militaries and review of sector prioritization and UN staff missions to Tacloban. UNICEF steps up emergency response. Draft OSM under development. Staff have already been mobilized from the region (e.g., Coms), Stand-by partners and HQ ERT. The CO requests that surge staff remain on board for at least three months to allow for some continuity. Urban water and sanitation SBPs on standby.
11 Nov.	9.8 million affected people	CERF to be requested. Agreement to set up hub offices in Tacloban, Roxas City, Cebu, and possibly Busuanga. WASH, health, food and shelter sectors prioritized in discussion with HCT and Government. Decision taken to activate L3 for 2 months, deploy the Immediate Response Team and appoint GEC. EMOPS internal meetings (plus DHR) to prepare for L3 CEAP issuance.
12 Nov.	OCHA SitRep estimates 11.5 million people affected and 544,000 displaced	EMOPS Director establishes EMT and circulates EMT TOR. IASC declares system-wide Level 3 emergency. UNICEF supports DHC at D1-D2 level. US\$ 4 million EPF released to CO and US\$ 1 million to DHR. OSM circulated. Core IRT members identified and begin deploying. DHR holds coordination meeting to identify focal points, information management and coordination processes. EMOPS team assembles and sends package of L3 procedures, guidance and lessons learned to CO.

Date	Key external events	Critical UNICEF interventions and decisions
13 Nov.	Not enough aid reaching affected people due to logistical challenges	CO requests support around account closures/end of year closures. IRT team leader arrives, as well as HPM specialist and reports officer. ERT member deployed from Manila to Tacloban. Eight IP deployed to crisis, plus eight nationals. Three hub offices being established in Cebu, Tacloban and Roxas. CO distributes emergency organigrams. CO requests P4 security officer for Tacloban urgently. HQ to propose candidate immediately. DSS has surged two security officers. EMOPS humanitarian policy chief advises GEC on the use of military and civil defence assets.
14 Nov.	Political tensions between local and national authorities	EMOPS internal strategy meeting to advise GEC on humanitarian programme cycle, CivMil policy issues. Chief HPS provides simplified draft position on the use of military assets to GEC. EMOPS Director advises RO/CO on the status of the IRT deployment.
15 Nov.	4,460 people dead	PARMO shares resource mobilization plan with OED and EMOPS.
16 Nov.		UNICEF Response plan process and timeline shared with EMOPS.
17 Nov.	13 million people affected and 4 million displaced	On a request from the government UNICEF has taken the lead on Cold Chain for the affected regions. UNICEF has developed an internal strategy to address identified challenges related to Infant Feeding in Emergencies (IFE), particularly the use of infant formula. UNICEF is providing technical support for child, newborn and maternal health, and is procuring and distributing essential medicines and supplies, including the distribution of family health kits, in Cebu. DED authorizes delayed submission of PCO and EAPRO annual reports. Division Director arrives into Manila, Supply Division Director arrives on mission.
20 Nov.		CFS have been established. UNICEF working with Dept. of Ed to reopen schools late Nov/early Dec. UNICEF to support UNFPA to take the lead on coordinating the GBV AOR and to do so effectively. PCO to flag to EMOPS if there are issues to be solved. GEC requests that all deployment discussions and decisions be routed through DHR. Media have largely left the scene, need to re-engage. Planning for Goodwill Ambassador to accompany ED on his CO visit.
25 Nov.		MIRA first phase is completed in Philippines. CO raises concern about data collection methodology results. WASH indicators have been combined into a general “restoring basic social services” category. EMOPS and PD begin preparation of lessons for CO on UNICEF experience in construction.

Date	Key external events	Critical UNICEF interventions and decisions
26 Nov.		PCO develops scope for RTE learning exercise to be undertaken by third party. Of the 89 surge staff deployed, 58 staff are on the ground in affected areas.
28 Nov.		MIRA initial phase results released. IA decision to undertake a second MIRA exercise. Water not initially classed as 'lifesaving need' and grouped under social services, changed after further discussion.
30 Nov.		1st PCA signed (WASH).
2 Dec.		UNICEF has deployed 95 surge staff. Of the 95 surge staff deployed, 68 staff are in the affected areas.
3 Dec.		GEC flags concerns regarding MIRA.
05 Dec.		PCO finalizes revisions to PBR. Interim measures taken and confirmed with PCO/RO/GEC that staff leave and R&R process that should be instituted immediately. Formal classification and R&R cycle pending ICSC approval.
09 Dec.		GEC gives NYHQ debriefing on his mission to Philippines.
13 Dec.		CO decision taken to implement cash-based response.
18 Dec.		CO programme strategy meeting in Tacloban.
20 Dec.		MIRA II issued.
2 Jan.		In light of Representative's need to go on extended medical leave outside of the Philippines, decision was taken between RO, OED and EMOPS for IRT Team Leader to act as OIC starting on 2 January/today thru the beginning of January.
6 Jan.		CO internal coordination: establishment of daily stand ups with Section Chiefs and senior management.
7 Jan.		Dedicated EMT conference call for programmatic issues. PD & EMOPS share LLs.
9 Jan.		Planning underway to extend the UNICEF L3 with OED.
10 Jan.		EMOPS drafts memo & global broadcast on extension of L3.
13 Jan.		EMOPS coordinates with PARMO on request for extension of deadline on donor report to DFAT/AusAid Revisions to memo & global broadcast on extension of L3. Correspondence between ED, EMOPS Director & EAPRO Director on management arrangements for one month extension of L3.
14 Jan.		ED declares one-month extension of Philippines L3. EAPRO Director to be GEC for remainder of response.
15 Jan.		EMOPS Director provides EAPRO Director with GEC handover package. Cebu partnership meeting bringing national, provincial and local governments, NGOs, private sector partners, and UNICEF led clusters to establish the institutional framework for an optimal delivery of the response. UNICEF signs MoUs with 39 priority Local Government Unit Mayors.

Date	Key external events	Critical UNICEF interventions and decisions
24 Jan.		Dedicated programme call between Manila & NYHQ on crosscutting issues.
28 Jan.		Programme meeting between Manila and Tacloban: Request of guidance on the LGU planning meeting.
30 Jan.		CO shares L3 exit strategy plan with EMOPS. EMT conference call. Explanation for WASH and immunization target revisions, discussion on the OPR. Confirmed revision of Bohol Earthquake Action Plan with reduced target and request for funds.
4 Feb.		CO Call with EAPRO Regional Emergency Advisor: - Request of RO support for child protection in emergencies training; - Request to RO on final decision and/or action plan for DFID preparedness fund; - Discussion on the capacity development of PHCO staff on DRR/resilience.
8 Feb.		Senior management level conference call on exit strategy for deactivation of L3. Incoming new Representative participates.
10 Feb.		UNICEF Level 3 is deactivated /expires. GEC shares plans for transition period: - EMT will scale back to monthly calls for the next three months; - HR fast-track procedures remain in effect thru 31 March to aid completion of new PBR; - CO is developing a transition plan at national and sub-national levels for UNICEF led clusters/AORs; - Evaluation findings will be used to inform CO preparedness & post-typhoon strategies.

# ANNEX 4: CLUSTER SURVEY REPORT

## Survey of UNICEF led or co-led clusters

### Name of the Organisation:

#	Response
1.	ACF International
2.	ActAlliance
3.	Bukidnon Resource Management Foundation, Inc. (BRMFI)
4.	Catholic Relief Services
5.	ChildFund
6.	Children International - Quezon City
7.	Children International Inc.
8.	Community and Family Services International
9.	Department of Health Western Visayas
10.	Department of Social Welfare and Development - Protective Services Bureau
11.	Disaster Management and Crisis Intervention Unit, DSWD Field Office VI
12.	Emergency Architect
13.	Feed The Children
14.	GOAL
15.	Good Neighbours International
16.	Health Organization for Mindanao
17.	International Medical Corps
18.	National Nutrition Council Region VIII
19.	Nazarene Compassionate Ministries - Nazarene Disaster Response
20.	Norwegian Church Aid
21.	Oxfam
22.	Philippine Red Cross
23.	Plan International
24.	Samaritan's Purse
25.	Save the Children International
26.	SC
27.	Solidarites International
28.	Tacloban City Mayor's Office
29.	UNICEF
30.	World Food Programme
31.	World Vision Development Foundation - ABK3 LEAP
32.	World Vision International
33.	WVDF

**Please clarify what is the type of organisation:**

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Government co-lead		5.7%	3
Government		5.7%	3
NGO co-lead		1.9%	1
Local NGO		5.7%	3
International NGO		60.4%	32
Local Red Cross		1.9%	1
IFRC/ICRC		0.0%	0
UN		15.1%	8
Other (please specify)		3.8%	2
Total Responses			53

**Please clarify what is the type of organisation:**

#	Response
1.	Faith Based
2.	INGO with LOCAL NGO (WVDF)

**Participation:**

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Nutrition		34.0%	18
Education		15.1%	8
WASH		32.1%	17
Child Protection		18.9%	10
Total Responses			53

**Cluster Location:**



Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Manila		28.3%	15
Tacloban		45.3%	24
Roxas		13.2%	7
Guiuan		13.2%	7
Total Responses			53



**Please rate UNICEF in its role as cluster (co-) lead:**

	<b>Very Poor</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
Overall leadership	0 (0.0%)	3 (7.9%)	6 (15.8%)	22 (57.9%)	7 (18.4%)	38
Technical expertise and technical support	0 (0.0%)	4 (10.8%)	9 (24.3%)	12 (32.4%)	12 (32.4%)	37
Inclusiveness (included all relevant stakeholders)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.6%)	7 (18.4%)	20 (52.6%)	10 (26.3%)	38
Coordination of cluster members	1 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (23.7%)	16 (42.1%)	12 (31.6%)	38
Ensuring coordination with the other clusters	1 (2.8%)	2 (5.6%)	11 (30.6%)	13 (36.1%)	9 (25.0%)	36
Efficiency (timely decisions and clear action points)	2 (5.3%)	1 (2.6%)	13 (34.2%)	17 (44.7%)	5 (13.2%)	38
Effectiveness (cluster work improves work at field level; coverage of response expanded, gaps filled; marginalised people reached; etc.)	1 (2.7%)	3 (8.1%)	8 (21.6%)	19 (51.4%)	6 (16.2%)	37
Planning and strategy development	2 (5.3%)	3 (7.9%)	7 (18.4%)	19 (50.0%)	7 (18.4%)	38
Promotion of best practice standards	1 (2.8%)	0 (0.0%)	14 (38.9%)	15 (41.7%)	6 (16.7%)	36
Coordination of needs assessment	1 (2.9%)	2 (5.9%)	11 (32.4%)	11 (32.4%)	9 (26.5%)	34
Attention to priority cross-cutting issues (e.g. age, diversity, environment, gender, human rights)	0 (0.0%)	3 (8.1%)	10 (27.0%)	13 (35.1%)	11 (29.7%)	37
Supporting training activities and capacity building	1 (2.8%)	1 (2.8%)	8 (22.2%)	18 (50.0%)	8 (22.2%)	36
Play a significant advocacy or influencing role	0 (0.0%)	2 (5.4%)	6 (16.2%)	22 (59.5%)	7 (18.9%)	37
Help shape the way funds are allocated (e.g. influence on donors, inputs to appeals, CERF allocations)	1 (2.9%)	2 (5.7%)	11 (31.4%)	14 (40.0%)	7 (20.0%)	35
Help support emergency preparedness for future emergencies	0 (0.0%)	2 (5.9%)	13 (38.2%)	11 (32.4%)	8 (23.5%)	34
Sharing its leadership role appropriately with the government	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (21.6%)	12 (32.4%)	17 (45.9%)	37
Included and maintained good relationships with all level of the government	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (13.9%)	16 (44.4%)	15 (41.7%)	36

**Did the cluster system already in operation for prior emergencies (including Bohol and Zamboanga) help facilitate the response to Haiyan?**

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Yes		79.3%	23
No		20.7%	6
	Total Responses		29

## ANNEX 5: LIST OF THOSE CONSULTED

### List of people interviewed for the RTE

Location	Organisation	Name	Title
	UNICEF	Andrea Berther	IRT (Deployed as Education Specialist)
	UNICEF	Azimir Rahman	IRT (Deployed as HR Advisor)
	UNICEF	Claire Mariane	Head Field Office, UNICEF Afghanistan (Deployed as Cash Specialist)
	UNICEF	Hendrik Van Norden	IRT (Deployed as WASH Advisor)
	UNICEF	Pernille Ironside	IRT (Deployed as Child Protection Specialist)
	UNICEF	Rado Ramanahadray	IRT (Deployed as ICT Specialist)
	UNICEF	Teija Vallandingham	IRT (Deployed as Education Specialist)
Balanginga	Albino Duran Memorial Hospital	Dr Garcia	Albino Duran Memorial Hospital Doctor
Balanginga	Albino Duran Memorial Hospital	Jonathan Licatan	Albino Duran Memorial Hospital Building Officer
Bangkok	OCHA	Marcus Werne	Deputy Director, OCHA
Bangkok	SCF Asia	Nick Finney	Operations Director, SCF Asia
Bangkok	UNFPA	Francesco Ambrogetti	Regional Resource Mobilisation and Partnership Adviser, UNFPA RO
Bangkok	UNFPA	Maryline Py	Special Assistant to RD, UNFPA RO
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Ada Ocampo	Regional Evaluation Advisor
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Bertin Gbayoro	Monitoring Specialist, Planning Section
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Christiane Rudert	Nutrition Specialist
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Christopher de Bono	Regional Chief of Communications
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Colette Turmel	Regional Chief of Operations
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Dan Toole	Regional Director
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	David Parker	Regional Program Monitoring specialist
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Dominik Horneber	Consultant, Social Policy & Economic Development Section
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Dorothy Foote	Programme Specialist, National Security Project Coordinator
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Grace Agacoli	Child Protection Specialist

<b>Location</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Guy Mbayo Kakumbi	WASH Specialist
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Isiye Ndombi	Deputy Regional Director
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Khun Vijuu Kasapanandha	Senior Admin Assistant
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Kristen Wenz	Consultant, Child Protection Section
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Lizamma Thomas	Regional Chief of HR
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Mary Grace Agcaoili	Child Protection Specialist
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Mioh Nemoto	Acting CP Specialist
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Sammy Njoe, Technology, Regional ICT	Regional Chief of Information Communication
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Shirley Mark Prabhu	Consultant, HIV & AIDS Section
Bangkok	UNICEF EAPRO	Xavier Foulquier	Consultant
Bangkok	WFP	Geoffrey Pinnock	Regional Emergencies Officer
Bangkok	WFP	Katrien Ghos	Senior Regional Nutrition Advisor
Bangkok	WFP	Lindsey Horton	OIC Nutrition Response
Bangkok	WFP	Peter Guest	Programme Advisor, Regional Bureau for Asia
Bangkok	WFP	Samir Wanmali	Senior Programme Officer
Borongan	Provincial Government, Borongan	Eva Esplago	Provincial Sanitation Inspector
Burauen	Residents	Interviews with cash transfer beneficiaries	
Copenhagen	UNICEF HQ	Ashley Wax	Evaluation Specialist, SD
Copenhagen	UNICEF HQ	Chris Cormency	Chief WASH, SD
Copenhagen	UNICEF HQ	Gemma Orta-Martinez	Market Research Specialist, SD
Copenhagen	UNICEF HQ	Jean-Cedric Messus	Senior Emergency Supply Specialist, SD
Copenhagen	UNICEF HQ	Joselito Nuguid	Deputy Director, SD
Copenhagen	UNICEF HQ	Lena Romer	Supply Specialist, SD
Copenhagen	UNICEF HQ	Raju Shrestha	Chief Logistics, SD
Copenhagen	UNICEF HQ	Shanelle Hall	Director, SD
Dagami	Municipality of Dagami	Norman Delos Reyes	Social Worker
Geneva	UNICEF HQ	Anthony Spalton	Emergency Specialist, EMOPS (Deployed to work on resilience)
Geneva	UNICEF HQ	Ayadiil Saparbekov	Deputy Global Nutrition Cluster Coordinator, EMOPS (Deployed as Nutrition Cluster Coordinator)

Location	Organisation	Name	Title
Geneva	UNICEF HQ	Catherine Barnett	Global Child Protection Cluster Co-Coordinator, EMOPS (Deployed as Child Protection Cluster Coordinator)
Geneva	UNICEF HQ	Dermot Carty	Deputy Director, EMOPS
Geneva	UNICEF HQ	Ellen Van Kalmthout	Global Education Cluster Co-Coordinator, EMOPS (Deployed as Education Cluster Coordinator)
Geneva	UNICEF HQ	Franck Bouvet	Deputy Global WASH Coordinator, EMOPS (Deployed as WASH Cluster Coordinator)
Geneva	UNICEF HQ	Gavin Wood	Information Management Specialist, EMOPS (Deployed as Inter-Cluster IM Support)
Geneva	UNICEF HQ	Gwyn Lewis	Chief Cluster Coordination, EMOPS (Deployed as Inter-Cluster Coordinator)
Geneva	UNICEF HQ	Josepine Ippe	Global Nutrition Cluster Coordinator, EMOPS
Geneva	UNICEF HQ	Julie Verhaar	Programme Specialist, PFP
Geneva	UNICEF HQ	Paul Shanahan	Global WASH Coordinator, EMOPS
Guiuan	Guiuan Central School	Interviews with teachers	
Guiuan	Municipality of Guiuan	Lea Chua	Public Nurse
Guiuan	Municipality of Guiuan	Neneth Ecleo	Planning & Development Officer
Guiuan	Municipality of Guiuan	Rebecca Nadores	Day-care Worker
Guiuan	Municipality of Guiuan	Recti Melquiades	Focal Point for Typhoon Yolanda
Guiuan	Municipality of Guiuan	Zenaida Cunanan	Social Worker
Guiuan	Oxfam	Humphrey Marangu	WASH Engineer
Guiuan	Oxfam	Maria Libertad Dometita	Gender Officer
Guiuan	Oxfam, Guiuan	Abdullah Ampilan	PHP Team Leader
Guiuan	Oxfam, Guiuan	Ernesto Casiple Jr	Deputy Programme Manager
Guiuan	UNICEF	Prem Bahadur Chand	WASH Specialist, Cluster Coordinator, Chief Field Office
Guiuan Bunkhouses	Residents	Interviews with families in bunk houses	
Guiuan Tent City	Residents	Interviews with TLS volunteer workers	
Lawaan	Oxfam Community Workers	7 community health workers	Maaslog Community Latrine

<b>Location</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
Lawaan	Residents	1 family beneficiary	Maaslog Community Latrine
Manila	Child Fund	Katherine Manik	National Director
Manila	Department of Education	James Cheche	Education Specialist
Manila	Department of Education	Usec Mario Denriquito	Partnership Specialist
Manila	Department of Health	Dr Irma Asuncion	OIC, Disaster Prevention & Resp. Office
Manila	H&N Section	Alex Iellano	IYCF Specialist
Manila	National Nutrition Council	Maria Bernadita T. Flores	Assistant Secretary of Health
Manila	NDRRMC	Edwin Sadang	OIC, Operations Division
Manila	NEDA	Emmanuel Esguerra	Deputy Director-General
Manila	OCHA	Agnes Palacio	National Disaster Response Advisor
Manila	OCHA	David Carden	Country Director
Manila	OCHA	Fotini Rantsiou	Inter Cluster Coordinator
Manila	OCHA	Gil Francis Arevalo	CWC Officer
Manila	OCHA	Joseph Addowe	IM Analyst
Manila	OCHA	Luisa Carvalho	UN RC/HC
Manila	OCHA	Shawn Boeser	Chief IM
Manila	Save the Children Philippines	Edwin Horca	
Manila	SCF Philippines	Dr Pathak	Chief of Health
Manila	UNICEF Geneva	Joanne Dunne	Inter Cluster Coordinator
Manila	UNICEF IRT	Angela Kearney	IRT Team Leader
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Abdul Alim	Deputy Representative
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Anne Ong Lopez	Former Philippines Staff Association
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Annie Rosario	Admin Officer
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Anselme Motcho	Chief of Operations
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Anthony Hudson	Logistics Officer, Emergency
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Augusto Rodriguez	Chief, Social Policy
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Bettina Hasel	Human Resources Specialist
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Cecile Dajoyag	Education Specialist (ECCD)
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Flora Sibanda-Mulder	Nutrition Cluster Coordinator
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Frederik Telle	Education Cluster Coordinator
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Giovanni Lapina	WASH Officer
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Gwendoline Fernandez-Estrada	HR Officer
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Hammad Massod	Chief, PME
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Jeremy Shusterman	Consultant
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Leon Dominador Fajardo	Chief, DRR

Location	Organisation	Name	Title
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Lotta Sylwander	Country Representative
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Madeleine Francisco	Finance Officer
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Margaret Sheehan	Chief of Field Operations
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Maria Lourdes de Vera	Chief Education Section
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Mariella Castillo	Senior Health Specialist, Emergency
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Michael Emerson Gnilo	WASH Specialist
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Raju Shreshta	Supply Officer
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Rene Galera	Emergency Nut. Specialist
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Richard Wecker	Nutrition Cluster IM
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Rodeliza Barrientos	CP Officer
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Sarah Norton-Staal	Chief, Child Protection
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Susan Prosser	CP Cluster Coordinator
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Umar Daraz	CP Cluster, IM
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Willibald Zeck	Chief, Health & Nutrition
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Ysmael Martinez	Supply Officer
Manila	UNICEF PCO	Zafrin Chowdhury	Chief, Communication
New York	UNICEF HQ	Andrew Parker	Senior WASH Advisor, PD (Deployed as WASH Specialist)
New York	UNICEF HQ	Barry Wentworth	Deputy Director, DFAM
New York	UNICEF HQ	Betel Tassew	Chief Business Partner Emergency, DHR (Deployed as IRT/HR)
New York	UNICEF HQ	Brenda Haiplik	Senior Education Advisor, PD
New York	UNICEF HQ	Diane Holland	Senior Nutrition Advisor, PD
New York	UNICEF HQ	Dominique Hyde	Deputy Director, PARMO
New York	UNICEF HQ	Eddie Carwardine	Deputy Director, DOC
New York	UNICEF HQ	Frederic Sizaret	Surge Specialist, DHR
New York	UNICEF HQ	Genevieve Boutin	Chief of Humanitarian Policy Section, EMOPS
New York	UNICEF HQ	George Paltakis	Donor Relations Officer, PARMO
New York	UNICEF HQ	Gina Gugliotta	Emergency Specialist, EMOPS
New York	UNICEF HQ	Heather Papowitz	Senior Health Advisor, PD (Deployed as Health Advisor/IRT)
New York	UNICEF HQ	Kathryn Donovan	Senior Communication Specialist, DOC (Deployed as Communication Specialist)
New York	UNICEF HQ	Kent Page	Senior Communication Specialist, DOC
New York	UNICEF HQ	Luis Soares	Budget Specialist, DFAM (Deployed as Budget/Finance Specialist)
New York	UNICEF HQ	Martin Engels	Emergency Specialist, EMOPS

Location	Organisation	Name	Title
New York	UNICEF HQ	Martin Porter	Emergency Specialist, EMOPS (Deployed as IRT/HPM Specialist)
New York	UNICEF HQ	Sandra Lattouf	Head of Tacloban Office, Senior Emergency Specialist, ERT EMOPS (Deployed as Field Coordinator)
New York	UNICEF HQ	Silvia Danailov	Chief Field Support Section, EMOPS
New York	UNICEF HQ	Ted Chaiban	EMOPS Director (GEC for the Haiyan response till January)
New York	UNICEF HQ	Yasmin Haque	EMOPS Deputy Director (Member of the OPR)
New York	UNICEF HQ	Yodit Abdisa	Emergency Specialist, EMOPS (Deployed as Emergency Coordinator)
New York	UNICEF US Fund	Lisa Szarkowski	Vice President of Public Advocacy and Strategic Communications
Palo	Cogon Elementary School		Cogon School Director
Pastrana	Municipality of Pastrana	Mayor Cherry Espero	Municipality of Pastrana
Quinapondan	Quinapondan Community Hospital	Dr Baby Makabare	Chief of Hospital
Quinapondan	Quinapondan High School	Joel Bagalay	Quinapondan High School Property Custodian
Regional	Department of Education	Atty. Rhoan Obrera	OIC Assistant Regional Director
Regional	Department of Education	Cora Abrera	Vice Chair, Education Cluster
Regional	Department of Education	Elma Herrera	Education Program Supervisor, Training And Development Division
Regional	Department of Education	Ramon Daga	Regional Facilities Coordinator
Regional	Department of Education	Rita Dimakiling	OIC Office of Planning
Regional	Save the Children	Kate Nolan	Program Development and Quality Manager
Roxas	ACF	Gladys Montales	Head of WASH
Roxas	ACF	Isabelle Ordonez	Head of Base
Roxas	ACF	Shiela Cabigas	Head of Nutrition Programme
Roxas	ACF	Shiela Cabigas	Head Programmes
Roxas	Barangay Banica	Anna Marie Albaladejo	Violence Against Women and Children Desk Officer, Banica Barangay



Location	Organisation	Name	Title
Roxas	Barangay Banica	Meeting of Banica Barangay BCPC	
Roxas	Barangay Kabuhayan	Rene Dador	Brgy Kabuhayan Captain
Roxas	Child Fund	Babes Chua	Team Leader Emergency Response
Roxas	Child Fund	Ethel Frogosa	Team Leader RISE Project
Roxas	Child Fund	Joy Ayupan	Technical Education Lead
Roxas	Child Fund	Marilyn Tumilba	Nutrition Specialist
Roxas	Child Fund	Mederick Ybanez	Finance/Admin Emergency Response
Roxas	Department of Education	Dr. Eveleth Gamboa	Capiz Schools Division Superintendent
Roxas	Department of Education	Nilo Domingo	Capiz Division
Roxas	Department of Health Maayon	Dr. Sandra Sorongon	LGU of Maayon
Roxas	Ivisan Rural Health Clinic	Visit to Ivisan Rural Health Clinic - IYCF-CMAM awareness session, with Child Fund (±30 mothers, ±40 children 0-59 months)	
Roxas	Loctugan Elementary School	Mario Cerajuco	School Principal
Roxas	MDRRMO	Eugene Tentativa	MPDC/EO MDRRMO, Estancia
Roxas	Municipality of Maayon	Mayor & Vice Mayor	
Roxas	Municipality of Maayon	Sanitation Officers (2)	
Roxas	Municipality of Panay	Sheila	Panay Latrine sites, Pawa
Roxas	Municipality of Panay Panay	Rey Cordeño	Municipal Administrator
Roxas	Municipality of Pilar	Catherine Casipit	Pilar Day Care Worker, President & Trainor
Roxas	Municipality of Pilar	Interviews with 10 day care workers	
Roxas	OCHA Roxas	Jean-Luc Tonglet	Head of Office
Roxas	Panital Hospital	Dr Advincola	Chief Doctor, Panital HC
Roxas	Pilar Rural Health Clinic	Amorosa	Pilar RHU Midwife
Roxas	Provincial Health Office, Capiz	Ayr Altavas	MNCHN Assistant Coordinator
Roxas	Provincial Health Office, Capiz	Cecile Tuazon	Family Planning and CHT Coord

<b>Location</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
Roxas	Provincial Health Office, Capiz	Dr. Leah Del Rosario	Provincial Health Officer
Roxas	Provincial Health Office, Capiz	Julius de la Cruz	EPI Coordinator
Roxas	Residents	Welry Dorado & Fernando Dorado	Informants on hygiene kits issues
Roxas	Rural Health Clinic, Pilar	Cherry Grace Leda	
Roxas	UNICEF PCO	Angelita Evidente	Nutrition Officer
Roxas	UNICEF PCO	Anna Layto	Education Programme
Roxas	UNICEF PCO	Martin	Education Officer
Roxas	UNICEF PCO	Patrick Nyeko	WASH Programme
Roxas	UNICEF PCO	Poona Durdana	Health Specialist
Roxas	UNICEF PCO	Sam	Head of Office
Roxas	UNICEF PCO	Samuel Mawunganidze	Chief of Field Office
Roxas	World Vision	Roussam Dillig	Roving Engagement Officer, ABK3 LEAP
Stockholm	UNICEF Sweden	Véronique Lönnerblad	Deputy Executive Director
Tacloban	ACF	Jesus	WASH Specialist,
Tacloban	Child Fund	Fe Suelam	
Tacloban	Child Fund	Ivy Itom	
Tacloban	Department of Health	Dr. Paul Sydingco	Regional GD Deputy
Tacloban	Department of Social Welfare	Agnes Bugal	Social Welfare Officer 2, Camp Manager
Tacloban	Department of Social Work, Tacloban	Lillia Baltazar	
Tacloban	IFRC	Camelia Marinescu	WASH Manager
Tacloban	IFRC	Steve McAndrew	Operation Manager
Tacloban	OCHA	Christine Mougne	CP Cluster Coordinator
Tacloban	OCHA	Kasper Engborg	Head of Office
Tacloban	OCHA	Megan Wiezoreck	CP Cluster
Tacloban	Plan International	Richard Sandison	Emergency Response Manager
Tacloban	Residents	Rowena Ponce and 3 neighbours, Tent City dwellers	
Tacloban	Tent City Residents	9 women dwellers, near airport	
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Alvin Manalansan	Nutrition Officer
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Arifa Sharmin	Communication Officer
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Bella Ponferrada	Health Officer
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Chris Wiezoreck	IM
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Dominik Koepl	Nutrition Cluster

<b>Location</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Emily Grande	Nutrition Officer
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Faye Balanon	CP Cluster
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Galit Wolfensohn	Child Protection Manager
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Leah Tacsan	Supply Officer
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Matthew Swift	Education IM
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Moulid Warfa	Chief of Field Office
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Naoko Imoto	Education IM
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Nicole Hahn	Cluster Coordinator
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Rory Villaluna	Cluster Coordinator
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Rosanat Mota	Operation Manager
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Sheena Calub	National IM
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Simone Klawitter	WASH Specialist
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Sweetc Alipon	Health Specialist
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Tai Ring Teh	WASH Specialist
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Tim Grieve	WASH Chief of Section
Tacloban	UNICEF PCO	Yule Olaya	Education Officer
Tacloban	Various Municipalities	LGU DSWD Officers (focus group 7)	
Tacloban	World Vision	Adam Riddell	Admin Officer
Tacloban	World Vision	Ronnie Santos	WASH Coordinator
Tanauan	Sto Nino Elementary School	Priscila Mesias	Head Teacher, Sto Nino Elementary School

