

Annex 2

L3 Drought Horn of Africa Response Evaluation - Evaluation Matrix

CCC COMMITMENTS	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	Sub-questions	Indicators/ Measures	Data Collection Methods	Sources
GLOBAL STANDARDS AND PRINCIPLES					
Humanitarian principles	1.1. To what extent did UNICEF make efforts to be recognized as a neutral, impartial, independent humanitarian actor?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence and quality (e.g., relevance, coherence, coordination) of efforts to operationalize humanitarian principles Evidence of stakeholders' perceptions of UNICEF compliance with the humanitarian principles (including the affected populations, the IPs and in-country authorities) Evidence of advocacy strategies to strengthen a collective approach to a principled humanitarian response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KII FGD Online survey Client/Rights-holders journey Desk review Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNICEF senior management, current and former HCs, OCHA, cluster/AoR partners, IPs Country office advocacy strategies Press releases, statements, etc. at country, regional, and HQ levels
OVERARCHING COMMITMENTS					
Preparedness	2.1 How well have UNICEF preparedness efforts informed and supported the delivery of the response?	a) What preparedness measures had HQ/RO and the five UNICEF COs (Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia; Eritrea and Djibouti) undertaken right after the L3/L2 activation? To what extent did these measures facilitate the response?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Type of decisions made/actions taken by the five UNICEF CO right after the L2/L3 scale up to better anticipate and respond to the needs of the affected populations in drought-prone areas in their respective countries Evidence of adherence to the Minimum Preparedness Standards (MPS) as per the UNICEF Procedure on Preparedness for Emergency Response and the Guidance Note on Preparedness for Emergency Response in UNICEF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KII FGD Online Survey Client/Rights-holders journey Desk review Direct observation Analyses of external admin data/secondary datasets (e.g. DHS, satellite data for climate shocks etc.), depending on availability; correlation analyses with UNICEF activities/financial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) IPs (national or international NGOs) Emergency Preparedness Platform (EPPI) CO contingency plans Standby / contingency partnership agreements / programme documents (PCAs) Emergency supply and distribution plans, evidence of pre-positioned supplies Country office annual reports (COARs) Country programme management plans (CPMPs)

				investments could be explored	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Situation reports
		b) To what extent did early warning systems and lessons learned from previous crises inform UNICEF preparedness plans?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to (a) early warning systems (internal, external) and (b) lessons learned from past crises in key UNICEF documents • Implementation of management response actions from previous (relevant) evaluations • Number of learning events (and related knowledge products) organized by UNICEF to capture the key achievements and challenges encountered during the roll-out of previous responses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF Staff (HQ) • UNICEF Staff (RO), including past Regional Emergency Advisers • UNICEF Staff (CO), including past Chiefs of Emergency • UNICEF Staff (FO) • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • Appeals (Call to Action, HACs) • Country programme documents (CPDs) • EPP • (R)EMT meetings • Response plans • COARs • Situation reports
Coordination	2.2. To what extent did the Emergency Procedures (EP), which calls for greater coordination across the different levels of the Organization during the development and implementation of the response, add value to the response?	a) To what extent were the UNICEF emergency procedures (EP) known, used and relevant to the design and successful implementation of the response?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of knowledge of the procedures among UNICEF staff (HQ, RO, CO) • Percentage of UNICEF CO staff sensitized on EP (by levels and function) • Instances of use (or lack thereof) of EP during the implementation of the response • Percentage of key UNICEF staff and key partners (if familiar with EP) involved in the response who acknowledge the EP contribution of the success of the response • Bottlenecks identified with regards to the use of the EP and the translation of their use to concrete results for the affected populations • Evidence of clear accountability lines • Degree of compliance with mandatory elements of EP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • Desk review • Direct observation • Online Survey (of CO and RO staff) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF Staff (HQ) • UNICEF Staff (RO) • UNICEF Staff (CO) • UNICEF Staff (FO) • IP (National or International NGO) • Governmental Entities • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • (R)EMT meetings (recordings, action matrix) • Human resources data (surge response) • Financial data (Emergency Programme Fund, humanitarian thematic funds, etc. allocations and expenditure) • Supply and procurement data • COARs

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Situation reports
		<p>b) To what extent did Emergency Procedures (not only the simplifications, prioritizations, and streamlined processes but also the different requirements entailed by their application) contribute to a more efficient response?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of key UNICEF staff and key partners (if familiar with the EP) involved in the response who acknowledge the EP contribution to more efficient and effective delivery on the ground • Performance against KPIs (HR, finance, supply, coordination, PSEA) as compared to previous crises (2011, 2017) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • Desk review • Direct observation • Online Survey (of HQ, RO and CO, staff) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • (R)EMT meetings (recordings, action matrix) • Human resources data (surge response) • Financial data (Emergency Programme Fund, humanitarian thematic funds, etc. allocations and expenditure) • Supply and procurement data • COARs • Situation reports
	<p>2.3. To what extent have HQ, regional office and the concerned country offices coordinated with each other vertically (across different levels of the organization) as well as horizontally (among their respective</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of compliance with CCC benchmarks on coordination and leadership • Evidence of integrated/multisectoral advocacy and resource mobilization efforts at the HQ and RO levels • Evidence of convergent programming at CO level • Frequency of meetings to plan jointly and share information as well as good practices about the response within each level (Divisions in HQ, sections in RO and CO) as well across levels? • Evidence of joint contingency or response plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Donors • Cluster/AoR partners • OCHA • Other UN agencies • COARs • Situation reports • CPDs

	<p>division/sections or among the concerned COs) towards the DESIGN of the response?</p>		<p>/ activities for cross-border issues (e.g., refugee flows, unaccompanied and separated children, insecurity, cholera, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the positive contribution (if any) that such coordination had on the success of the response • Key partners' perception of UNICEF response being well coordinated internally 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPMPs
	<p>2.4. How well has UNICEF fulfilled its cluster lead/co-lead agency (CLA) role and responsibilities (not only in terms of coordination but also in terms of strategic visioning/leadership?)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness of staff deployed for CLA function (cluster coordinators and IMOs) • Timeliness of staff deployed / average time to fill vacant positions • Staff turnover rates and deployment gaps • Evidence UNICEF has fulfilled the six core functions defined by the IASC • Perceptions of cluster members vis-à-vis UNICEF performance as CLA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD or online survey with cluster members • Desk review • Direct observation (<i>if possible, the evaluators will participate in one of their meetings</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population (<i>details will be provided based on the personae identification process – please refer to the Client/Rights holder journey section in the inception report</i>) • Donors • Cluster/AoR partners • OCHA • HR dashboard • Cluster meeting notes • Programme Strategy • Notes, • Programme Document and Programme Management Plan • Cluster coordinator • ICCG • Donors • UNICEF partners • Cluster documents (contingency and response plans, minutes, 4W matrix, ToR) • COARs • Situation reports

<p>Humanitarian Access</p>	<p>2.5. To what extent has UNICEF been able to reach those most in need (children with disabilities; IDPs; unaccompanied/separated children; affected populations in hard-to-reach areas; marginalized and excluded populations) also in light of security/access constraints and risk mitigation needs?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of compliance with CCC benchmark on humanitarian access • Investments made towards ensuring humanitarian access (including the hiring of a humanitarian access specialist, the costs of coordination meetings to discuss humanitarian access with IP) • Evidence of use of Minimum Quality Standards and Indicators for Community Engagement • Evidence of programme analysis taking into account conflict dynamics, political economy, gatekeeping, patterns of marginalization and exclusion • Evidence of advocacy with all parties for humanitarian access, as well as with high-level political actors (regional organizations, special representatives/envoys, national governments, etc.). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey of partners • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Donors • OCHA • Other UN organizations • Local organizations with relevant mandates (e.g., for persons with disabilities, women, youth) • Situation reports • Humanitarian performance monitoring (HPM) • Third-party monitoring (TPM) • CO advocacy strategy • CO strategies and dashboards for 'hard-to-reach' areas/populations • Press releases
<p>Accountability to affected populations, community engagement for behaviour and social change, and protection from sexual exploitation and abuse</p>	<p>2.6 To what extent were the affected populations (especially women and girls and other vulnerable groups) informed, involved and took part in the different stages of the response?</p>	<p>a) To what extent did affected populations have the opportunity to share feedback and complaints and was feedback, in turn, acted upon?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of compliance with CCC benchmarks on accountability to affected populations (AAP) (participation, access to life saving information, feedback mechanisms) • Evidence of use of Minimum Quality Standards and Indicators for Community Engagement • Evidence of systematic reporting on AAP by IPs • Level of understanding of complaint feedback mechanisms among both IP and members of the affected population • Evidence of availability of complaint feedback mechanisms in the response implementation sites • Evidence of use of such mechanisms • Evidence of adjustments made in response to the complaints 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Donors • OCHA • Country office and regional dashboards • CO PSEA strategies • CO AAP strategies • HPM • TPM • Needs assessment tools

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceptions of partners and affected people with regard to UNICEF work on AAP 		
		<p>b) How accessible and safe were these mechanisms) including for PSEA), also in light of the different cultural and security specificities of each context?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease of accessibility to AAP mechanisms (including for PSEA) • Evidence of safety guidelines in place (if any) pertaining to the use of such mechanisms • Evidence of compliance with EP and CCC PSEA benchmarks (access to reporting, referral and investigation of PSEA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population
		<p>c) To what extent did the affected populations participate in response-related planning processes and in decisions that affected their lives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of affected populations participating in response-related planning processes and in decisions that affected their lives 		

PROGRAMME APPROACHES					
Quality of programmes	3.1. To what extent was the response planned and adapted over time to meet the needs of the affected populations?	a) To what extent did the five concerned countries plan and adapt their response over time to meet the needs of the affected populations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends in the evolution of needs • Examples of adaptation of the response according to the evolving needs • Clarity and transparency of communication on changing needs and adjustments of interventions and related targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey of IP • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation • Dire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Donors • Other UN agencies • Response plans • Situation reports • HPM • Appeals (Call to Action, HAC, etc.) • Country management team / CO emergency management team meetings • Cluster meetings
		b) In light of evolving needs on the ground, adapting roles, structures and infrastructure may take place, what have been the costs (financial or otherwise) or benefits of making such adjustments?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceptions of costs and benefits associated with the adaptation of the response to the evolving needs • Evidence of repurposing of funds within the scope of the response • Lessons learned from IP on the ground on what have been the achievements and costs/challenges their response activities on the ground. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs (HPD) • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Donors • Cluster meetings

	3.2. To what extent was the response timely?	a) To what extent were financial resources and supplies disbursed and distributed in a timely fashion?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time elapsing between the <u>expected</u> timing of funds disbursement and supplies delivery and the <u>actual dates</u> of provision of funds to the response actors on the ground and provision of supplies to expected beneficiaries • Gaps in days/months between the identification of needs and the realization of activities (funds disbursed/supplies delivered) to address them • Perception of the partners and NGOs participating in the clusters that the timing of the response is adequate • Review of internal and external enablers/barriers to timeliness • Changes in programming • Reprogramming of funds • Revision of timelines for implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation • Timeline of events and UNICEF actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Donors • Other UN agencies
	3.3. To what extent did the response achieve its (intended targets and) overall objectives, including in terms of coverage and quality?	a) To what extent did the five concerned countries attain their expected coverage targets and quality requirements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of adaptation of coverage targets over time (and related justification) • Reach against UNICEF targets and total population in need for nutrition, health, WASH, education, child protection and social protection • Enabling and hindering factors with regard to the response coverage • Percentage of funding received against requirements • Amount of allocations by sector and level of balance of expenditures across sectors. • Quality requirements taken into account during the planning and implementation of response activities (by sector) • Degree of compliance with CCCs/Sphere standards (by sector) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Cluster/AoR partners • HPM • TPM • COARs • Dashboards • RAM
		b) What were the factors (internal and external to UNICEF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of organizational processes as well as contextual factors either contributing or hindering the success of the humanitarian 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities

		that affected the performance of the response, including its UNICEF leadership?	response in the Horn of Africa, including its UNICEF leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cluster/AoR partners • TPM • COARs • Dashboards • RAM
		c) To what extent have there been unintended consequences (positive or negative)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of unexpected / unintended (positive and negative) consequences of the response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities
Multisectoral and integrated programming	3.4. To what extent were the different sections in RO and COs in the three concerned countries as well the different divisions in HQ fully engaged in the response and working closely with each other to IMPLEMENT a more holistic and more cost-effective response?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of programme integration • Evidence of gaps or duplication of efforts • Percentage of implementation sites with at least two sections implementing joint activities • Level of integration of programmes and operations in the HoA response narrative, including resource mobilization efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Cluster/AoR partners • PCAs/PDs • COARs • HPM • TPM • management team / CO emergency management team meetings
Equity	3.5. To what extent were issues of gender, disability inclusion, equity and protection systematically and meaningfully		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of availability of data pertaining to the needs of vulnerable groups within the affected population • Type of corrective actions/activities/strategies being implemented to respond to the needs of marginalized and excluded groups • Extent to which the response tackled and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of the affected population • PCAs/PDs • CO-generated analyses, reports (e.g., situation analysis for children) • Programme strategy notes

	integrated in the design, implementation and monitoring of interventions?		removed some of the barriers hindering the access to basic services among the most in need within the affected population		(PSNs) <ul style="list-style-type: none">
Linking humanitarian and development, resilience and climate change	3.6. To what extent has the drought response taken into account other emergencies and overlapping drivers of vulnerability that affect the HoA, including conflict, grave violations, climate change, displacement etc.?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict analyses undertaken in each one of the concerned countries and that have affected HDP planning of programme analysis including overlapping drivers of vulnerability, risk, and exclusion including conflict, marginalization, displacement, disaster risk • Level of integration of conflict analyses in the HDP planning (for each one of the 5 concerned countries) • Example of adaptability of the response according to the evolving conflict situation • Degree of inclusion of climate change considerations in the planning and implementation of the response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population • OCHA • PCAs/PDs • Response plans • • CO-generated analyses, reports (e.g., situation analysis for children) • Programme strategy notes (PSNs) • Needs assessment tools
	3.7. To what extent is the UNICEF response addressing the immediate humanitarian needs, while also supporting the achievement of long-term development goals to reduce the needs, vulnerabilities and risks for children?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of compliance with CCC benchmarks on linking humanitarian to development programmes • Evidence of a clear understanding internally of what the operationalization of the humanitarian-development-peace nexus means in the Horn of Africa overall and sectorally • Evidence of programme analysis and planning explicitly including risk-informed programming approaches • Evidence of clear linkages between emergency response results and AWP/CPD results (clear results chains, theories of change, etc.) • % of multi-year funding raised by UNICEF 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population • CPDs/AWPs • PCAs/PDs • Response plans • TPM • Programme strategy notes (PSNs) • CPMP • Resilience strategies (CO, interagency, etc.)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % utilization of flexible (non-earmarked) funding for resilience activities • Evidence / % multi-year funding and flexible funding passed to UNICEF Ips • Evidence of advocacy with donors, development actors and financial institutions to support resilience programming. • Evidence of resilience strengthening being built into the system for early recovery 		
Localization	3.8. To what extent did UNICEF rely on local partners when planning and delivering the response?	<p>a) To what degree has the UNICEF response contributed to strengthening preparedness, resilience and response efforts among: a) national governments; b) local organizations; and c) communities?</p> <p>b) How do UNICEF compliance procedures enable or constrain the localization agenda?</p> <p>c) To what degree does UNICEF see benefits and challenged in advancing the Localization agenda?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of local actors' increased capacity (if any) in the area of preparedness, resilience and emergency response • Evidence of capacity-building efforts in favour of local organizations • Availability of contingency/preparedness among partners • Availability of staff (per entity/IP) that possess an adequate understanding of how to anticipate and/or respond to the effects of an emergency • Evidence of compliance with CCC benchmark on localization • Evidence of longer-term strategic partnerships that aim to build systems and processes mirroring the ambition and goals of the local or national partners • Evidence of increased decision-making power of local and national actors within partnership • % funding directed to L/NNGOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Financial data • CO localization strategies • PCAs/PDs •

		<p>d) To what extent did UNICEF build local partner capacity in the preparedness phase?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of local actors' increased capacity (if any) in the area of preparedness, resilience and emergency response • Evidence of capacity-building efforts in favour of local organizations • Partners' perception to possess capacity to manage the security risks adequately • Level of coordination between UNICEF and IP to manage the security risks jointly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Donors • Other UN agencies • PCAs/PDs •
		<p>e) To what extent did UNICEF rely on local partners for early warning?</p>	<p>Instances where the local partners provided valuable information on needs and upcoming risks in the affected areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Donors • Other UN agencies • Situation reports • Country management team / country-level emergency management team meetings

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPP
SECTORAL COMMITMENTS					
Needs assessments, planning, monitoring and evaluation	4.1. How consistently and accurately have needs been assessed at the outset and during the response, including with the participation of the affected populations?	a) To what extent has programming drawn on a viable base of timely evidence, supported by ongoing monitoring?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of robustness of the methodologies used to measure needs • Frequency of needs assessments throughout the response • Frequency of monitoring missions by UNICEF staff and/or IP and TPM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF • Other UN agencies • Needs assessment tools • HPM • TPM
		b) To what extent were investments made in gender evidence and analysis?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of gender analysis being incorporated in programme analysis and design • Availability of gender-disaggregated data for planning and monitoring purposes • Evidence of gender capacity (number, level, type of staff) in affected Cos • Evidence of gender strategy at CO level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff • CO gender strategy • /AWPs • Response plans • HPM • TPM • Needs assessment tools • CPMP • Situation analyses
OPERATIONAL COMMITMENTS					

Administration and finance, including risk management	5.1. How well has UNICEF identified, managed and mitigated risks in its response (including relative to its 'scale-up' response and the increased level of scrutiny deriving from it) and to the affected populations, children in particular?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguards put in place to curb risks associated with the response, with a focus on: • Fiduciary risks among partners (both NGOs and government entities) • Do no harm among IP and affected populations • Evidence that UNICEF proactively adopts a range of strategies to mitigate risk which includes acceptance through community engagement • Evidence of compliance with EPs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Donors • Other UN agencies • CO business continuity plans, other risk management plans mandated by EPs • Risk management committee meetings, country management team meetings, CPMP • EPP
	5.2. To what extent has UNICEF allocated financial resources according to a) needs and b) quality concerns?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link between investments levels (by sector/geographical area) and corresponding needs • Degree of compliance with CCC quality benchmarks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Donors • Other UN agencies • OCHA • Financial data • HPM • TPM • COARs
Humanitarian cash transfers	5.3. To what extent have cash transfers been distributed to those most in need?	a) What are good practices in the area of cash transfers that ought to be replicated in the future and what are some limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which targeting of the cash transfer interventions was needs-based • Extent to which cash transfers were able to reach the most vulnerable • Good practices identified in the planning, targeting, distribution and monitoring of the cash transfers delivery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Donors • Other UN agencies

		that deserve being better anticipated in the near future?			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HPM • TPM
Human resources	5.4. To what extent has UNICEF allocated human resources (including through surge and repurposing of staff) that were: a) Sufficient in number b) Appropriate, and c) Timely in deployment/distribution?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of repurposed staff • Number of surges to assist the response • Average number of days between the CO surge request and the in-country deployment to fill the vacancy • Key challenges encountered to ensure a timely deployment of surges • Level of adequacy of surge expertise against the needs of the requesting CO • Staff turnover rates and deployment gaps • Workforce diversity • Evidence of clear accountability lines • Extent of integration of regular programme staff in the L3 response • Degree of achievement of CCC and EP benchmarks for surge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • Online survey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Cluster/AoR partners • (R)EMT meetings / action matrix • DHR surge records • Standby partners / surged staff •
Communications and advocacy	5.5. To what extent did communications and advocacy contribute to the success of the response?	a) To what extent was there a clear narrative on the greatest needs on the ground and other key priorities of the response (across the three CO and across levels within the organization)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity and consistency of UNICEF messaging as expressed in key documents (appeals, press releases, statements, donor reports, situation reports, etc.) • Evidence of adaptation of narrative as the situation evolved (as needed/ appropriate)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • Online survey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Cluster/AoR partners • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Donors • Other UN agencies • Appeals • Press releases • Statements • Donor reports • CO resource mobilization strategies
Partnerships with	5.6. To what extent has UNICEF	a) In the context of collaborating with	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and typology of partners engaged in the response (IPs, authorities, IFIs, other UN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs

<p>governments and civil society organizations for programme implementation</p>	<p>collaborated and coordinated with partners (IPs, authorities, IFIs, other UN agencies, international partners, other implementing actors) in responding to the emergency?</p>	<p>partners, what were the main strengths and weaknesses exhibited by UNICEF?</p>	<p>agencies, international partners, other implementing actors)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of good and innovative partnership practices implemented within the scope of the response • Key challenges encountered and successful mitigation strategies put in place • Degree of achievement of CCC benchmark on partnerships • Partner feedback on UNICEF support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online survey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cluster/AoR partners • Government entities • Members of the affected population • Donors • Other UN agencies • PCAs/PDs • COARs
<p>Resource mobilization</p>	<p>5.7. What could have been done differently to maximize the resources made available for the response?</p>	<p>a) To what extent did the different funding mechanisms and conditionalities/ donor allocation modalities (including timing of disbursements, eligibility funding criteria for activities and donors' thematic priorities) influence the timeliness or cost of interventions?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of funding targets reached • Donors' and other funding partners' thematic priorities vis-à-vis the drought response (for each one of the concerned countries) • Degree of flexibility of funds made available for the response • Degree of evolution of funding and support (by sector and donor/partner) • Diversity of donors and partners engaged in the funding of the response • Perceptions of enabling and hindering factors in the area of resource mobilization for the drought response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • Online survey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Cluster/AoR partners • Government entities • Donors • Other UN agencies • Appeals • CO fundraising strategies
<p>Supply and logistics</p>	<p>5.8. To what extent has the supply function contributed to the response, especially in the areas of planning, prepositioning,</p>	<p>a) To what extent has UNICEF mobilized supplies that were: a) Sufficient in number b) Adequate in quality and distribution c)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantity, quality, appropriateness and timeliness of supplies mobilized during the response (reaching CO, FO, 'last mile') • Quantity and appropriateness of prepositioned supplies (by sector/country) • Availability of up-to-date supply and distribution plans at country level, including to reach the last mile 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online survey • Client/Rights-holders journey • Desk review • Direct observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF staff (HQ/RO/CO/FO) • IPs • Cluster/AoR partners • Government entities • Donors • Other UN agencies • EPP • COARs

	warehouse capacity, supply route assessments, procurement of LTA-holding and other providers; environment footprint	Timely in deployment/distribution?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of accurate forecasting of supply needs to facilitate supplier elasticity • Degree of achievement of CCC benchmark on supply and logistics • Evidence of actions to green the supply chain and work more closely with local actors to decrease long distance transport • Evidence of actions to reduce plastic (where possible), implementing a robust waste management system and choose materials with a lower carbon footprint. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO supply plans • HPM • TPM
CEED¹: The following questions are related to a key element of the CCCs Programme Approaches (Environmental Sustainability and Climate Change). In addition, 6 of the 7 questions below will touch upon a second specific aspect of the CCCs as indicated in the first column to the left					
CCC Programme Approaches/ Commitments (Quality of Programmes)	6.1.To what extent did UNICEF develop a cohesive strategy (HQ, RO and CO) for CEED to contribute to and guide the design and delivery of the CEED related activities to address the climate emergency in the Horn of Africa?	a)To what extent did the coordination and collaboration within and across levels of the Organization (HQ, RO and CO) contribute to the roll out of CEED related interventions to the affected populations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of knowledge and use of the CEED concept by COs • Level of shared understanding of CEED across different levels of the Organization (CO, RO and HQ) • -Modalities of coordination and collaboration across the three levels in the coordination and coordination around CEED 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online Survey • Client/Rights-Holders Journey • Desk review • Direct Observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF Staff (HQ) • UNICEF Staff (RO) • UNICEF Staff (CO) • UNICEF Staff (FO) • IP (National or International NGO) • Governmental Entities • Members of the Affected population • Donors • Other UN Agencies • Humanitarian Action for Children (HAC) for 2022 and 2023- country and regional • Monthly SitReps for each country from April 2022 to August 2023 • Country Program Full Approved Report for 2022 (RAM) • Country Office End of Year

¹ Based on the strategic document “*A livable planet for every child: UNICEF’s strategy at a glance for Climate, Environment, Energy and Disaster Risk Reduction (2022-203)*”, the domains of CEED are understood to be Climate, Environment, Energy and Disaster Risk Reduction.

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> results summary (2022) Country Office End of Year results summary (2022) Any response strategies or plans developed by countries
		<p>b) To what extent did a cohesive strategy for the CEED-related interventions contribute to and guide the design and delivery of the CEED activities to address the climate emergency in the Horn of Africa?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of Availability of a clearly formulated CEED strategy Extent to which a CEED strategy (if available) informed the design and delivery of CEED activities In the absence of a strategy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -extent to which CEED considerations were factored in during the design and implementation of CEED activities on the ground as part of the drought response -evidence of use of sectoral frameworks related to transition to climate resilience approaches by Cos -Evidence of position dedicated to CEED in the three COs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KII FGD Online Survey Client/Rights-Holders Journey Desk review Direct Observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNICEF Staff (HQ) UNICEF Staff (RO) UNICEF Staff (CO) UNICEF Staff (FO) IP (National or International NGO) Governmental Entities Members of the Affected population Donors Other UN Agencies
		<p>c) To what extent did the support provided by HQ and RO to the five COs on CEED as part of the L3 response contribute to the roll out of the CEED related interventions?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Type and modality of CEED technical assistance and support (if any) made available by the HQ and RO to CO which influenced the response Evidence of job posts dedicated to CEED in RO and HQ supporting the COs as part of the response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KII FGD Online Survey Client/Rights-Holders Journey Desk review Direct Observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNICEF Staff (HQ) UNICEF Staff (RO) UNICEF Staff (CO) UNICEF Staff (FO) IP (National or International NGO) Governmental Entities Members of the Affected population Donors Other UN Agencies
	6.2. What can we learn about the extent to which the	<p>a) How were people most in need identified</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that needs assessments were used to guide the CEED related activities. Degree of Robustness of the methodologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KII FGD Online Survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNICEF Staff (HQ) UNICEF Staff (RO) UNICEF Staff (CO)

	CEED interventions address the needs of those most in need?	and how were their CEED related needs assessed?	used to measure CEED-related needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency of CEED needs assessments throughout the response • Frequency of CEED monitoring missions by UNICEF STAFF and/or IP and TPM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client/Rights-Holders Journey • Desk review • Direct Observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF Staff (FO) • IP (National or International NGO) • Country Program Full Approved Report for 2022 (in RAM) • Country Office End of year results summary (2022) • Needs Assessments
CCC Programme Approaches/ Commitments (Quality of Programmes)	6.3. To what extent were the envisaged targets related to CEED met? What were the unexpected outcomes of the interventions implemented in the area of CEED?	b).To what extent did the CEED related interventions address the needs of the those most in need?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that CEED-related interventions were designed and implemented to meet the needs of those most in need. • Level of needs-based targeting among CEED-interventions implemented as part of the drought response • -Groups identified as the most in need vis-à-vis CEED -Reasons for not being able (if applicable) to address the needs of those most in need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online Survey • Client/Rights-Holders Journey • Desk review • Direct Observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF Staff (HQ) • UNICEF Staff (RO) • UNICEF Staff (CO) • UNICEF Staff (FO) • IP (National or International NGO) • Governmental Entities • Members of the Affected population • Donors • Country Program Full Approved Report for 2022 (in RAM). • Country Office End of year results summary (2022) • Needs assessments •
		b) What were the unexpected positive and negative outcomes of the CEED related interventions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and typologies of positive and negative outcomes of the CEED related interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online Survey • Client/Rights-Holders Journey • Desk review • Direct Observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF Staff (HQ) • UNICEF Staff (RO) • UNICEF Staff (CO) • UNICEF Staff (FO) • IP (National or International NGO) • Governmental Entities • Members of the Affected population • Donors • Other UN Agencies

CCCs Operational Commitments (Administration and finance, including risk management)	6.4. How do the costs of the CEED interventions implemented as part of the L3 Horn of Africa compare with those of similar interventions that pursue the same outcomes/results, (e.g., by comparing outcomes/results with spending on different types of interventions)?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs of CEED by response activity/sector by country implemented by UNICEF and other Agencies in the HoA • Costs of CEED by activity/sector by country implemented by UNICEF and other Agencies in similar contexts • Evidence of measures to reduce costs and maximize value for money of CEED related activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online Survey • Client/Rights-Holders Journey • Desk review • Direct Observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF Staff (HQ) • UNICEF Staff (RO) • UNICEF Staff (CO) • UNICEF Staff (FO) • IP (National or International NGO) • Vision, Insight • Internal financials results
CCC Programme Approaches/ Commitments (Quality of Programmes)	6.5. What are the specific domains of CEED ⁱ where the greatest areas of improvement were identified and what were the most innovative solutions delivered by UNICEF related to CEED to address identified challenges and contribute to the improvement of the response?	a) What are the specific domains of CEED where the greatest areas of improvement were identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key challenges encountered during the planning, implementation and monitoring of CEED activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online Survey • Client/Rights-Holders Journey • Desk review • Direct Observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF Staff (HQ) • UNICEF Staff (RO) • UNICEF Staff (CO) • UNICEF Staff (FO) • IP (National or International NGO) • Governmental Entities • Members of the Affected population • Donors • Other UN Agencies • Country Program Full Approved Report for 2022 (in RAM) • Country Office End of year results summary (2022). • Field notes and case studies by COs/RO and
		b) What were the most innovative solutions delivered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of innovative solutions as identified by UNICEF staff, government and implementing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online Survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF Staff (HQ) • UNICEF Staff (RO) • UNICEF Staff (CO)

		by UNICEF related to CEED to address identified challenges and contribute to the improvement of the response	<p>partners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number and type of effective mitigation and prevention strategies of the challenges identified in relation to the implementation) of the response. (by country and level within Organization) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Client/Rights-Holders Journey Desk review Direct Observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNICEF Staff (FO) IP (National or International NGO) Governmental Entities Members of the Affected population Donors Other UN Agencies Country Program Full Approved Report for 2022 (in RAM). Country Office End of year results summary (2022). Field notes and case studies by COs/RO and HQ.
CCCS Programme Approaches (Community Engagement for Social and Behavioural Change and Linking Humanitarian and Development)	6.6. To what extent are communities and support systems showing resiliency, including climate resilience, and learning in light of sequential droughts?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree to which the communities are showing an improved capacity to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cope with external shocks Adapt their behaviors and practices vis-à-vis repeated shocks Modify their revenues so as to satisfy their needs? Use lessons learned while overcoming challenges in the past so as to be better prepared for the future Use of early warning system to prevent future risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KII FGD Online Survey Client/Rights-Holders Journey Desk review Direct Observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNICEF Staff (HQ) UNICEF Staff (RO) UNICEF Staff (CO) UNICEF Staff (FO) IP (National or International NGO) Governmental Entities Members of the Affected population Donors Other UN Agencies
CCCs Programme Approaches (Environmental Sustainability and Climate Change).	6.7. What was the response's environmental footprint and, where significant, how could it be reduced?	a) What interventions implemented in the response had the greatest environmental footprint?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Type of impacts that the response has on the environment CO and partner staff perceptions on activities with greatest environmental impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KII FGD Online Survey Client/Rights-Holders Journey Desk review Direct Observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNICEF Staff (HQ) UNICEF Staff (RO) UNICEF Staff (CO) UNICEF Staff (FO) IP (National or International NGO) Governmental Entities Members of the Affected population

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donors • Other UN Agencies • Country office Climate Briefs • Environmental and Social Safeguard reports
		<p>b). For those interventions/activities with a significant negative environmental footprint, how could the response's environmental footprint be reduced?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realistic and feasible strategies that have proved to be beneficial to reduce the response's environmental footprint • Extent to which negative environmental impacts of the activities are assessed and avoided or mitigated in the project design and implementation. • CO and partner staff recommendations on actions to reduce environmental impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII • FGD • Online Survey • Client/Rights-Holders Journey • Desk review • Direct Observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF Staff (HQ) • UNICEF Staff (RO) • UNICEF Staff (CO) • UNICEF Staff (FO) • IP (National or International NGO) • Governmental Entities • Members of the Affected population • Donors • Other UN Agencies • Country Office Climate Briefs. • Environmental and Social Safeguard reports.
