

Introduction to the Indicators – why do we need to look at AAP?

Despite increasing numbers of humanitarian partners demonstrating considerable success in building an organizational “culture of accountability” and [the commitments made by the IASC Principals in 2011](#), accountability to affected populations (AAP) is still not sufficiently prioritised at the senior, inter-agency, or cluster levels. This reflects the need for (1) a more coordinated setting of priorities between key stakeholders and (2) regular communication with affected populations throughout a humanitarian response. Successful and effective AAP measures are not only the right of every disaster affected person but also produce better quality projects with a higher potential for enduring impact. They also ensure that an age, gender and other diversity-sensitive approach will result in diverse and varying needs within all communities being recognised and responded to appropriately. One avenue to assess how and if AAP measures are integrated into the humanitarian response is by reporting on indicators capturing the “way we do business”.

Evaluations of humanitarian response frequently highlight insufficient accountability, especially to the people affected by emergencies, such as failure to provide communities with even the most basic information on which programs are being implemented and why; beneficiary selection criteria; program duration; etc. Country offices often lack clearly defined accountability frameworks and related tools that would enable them to systematically assess performance and ensure their response meets sector-accepted quality standards for AAP. In particular evaluations of agencies’ response highlight insufficient or non-existent feedback mechanisms, participation and transparency – with regard to communicating decisions made about programmes, involving participants in decision-making processes and supplying enough information for participants to make informed decisions about that programme.

Proposal of Key Elements and three AAP Indicators

The [ECB AAP elements and associated indicators](#) inspired the five AAP [commitments on accountability \(CAAP\)](#) and text from that document has been significantly borrowed to support these indicators. Key to some of the thinking during the conception of the ECB project was the wish and need to increase and include the voices of beneficiaries in the decision-making, implementation and judgment of humanitarian responses.

The ECB project defined accountability as: the process through which an organisation makes a commitment to respond to and balance the needs of stakeholders in its decision-making processes and activities, and delivers against this commitment. This means making sure that women, men and children affected by an emergency are involved in planning, implementing and judging the response to their emergency.

The indicators that we agree as being core to all agencies and clusters need to be appropriate and measurable at this level. They can also be used as proxy indicators for impact, since more **accountable programmes** have been shown to be **better quality programmes**.

Participation – how are we involving affected populations in the decisions that affect them?

The common AAP indicator

Number of persons consulted (disaggregated by sex/age) before designing a program/project [alternatively: while implementing the program/project].

Participation: how an organisation enables key stakeholders to play an active role in the decision-making processes that affect them. It is unrealistic to expect an organisation to engage with all stakeholders over all decisions all of the time. Therefore each organisation must have clear guidelines (and practices) enabling it to prioritise stakeholders' participation appropriately and to be responsive to the differences in power between them. These guidelines can be harmonized/developed by the cluster for all members. Mechanisms need to be in place to ensure that the marginalised and diverse views of those affected are represented and have their opinions considered. Participation here also encompasses the processes through which a cluster monitors and reviews its progress and results against goals and objectives; feeds learning back into the cluster on an on-going basis; and reports on the results of the process. To increase accountability to stakeholders, goals and objectives must be also designed in consultation with those stakeholders.

Guidelines

- Organisation has a verifiable record of how it identified interest groups in the affected communities, and the power relationships that exist.
- Organisation documents how it speaks with a balanced cross-section of representatives from the affected communities.
- Organisation keeps a record of how communities (or their representatives) are demonstrably involved and influential in decision-making, implementation and impact of projects.
- Organisation has mechanisms in place to monitor and evaluate outcomes and impact and these are reported against (incl. to affected communities).

Possible Indicator Suggestions

These indicators below are **possible suggestions** that your cluster could develop based on the common indicator above, depending on the context. Of course you may develop other indicators.

- * # of indicators developed by cluster in consultation with affected community
- * % of female and % of male parents actively participating in the conception and implementation of M&E of education in emergencies services.
- * % of those who participated directly in decision making about food assistance interventions who are women
- * # of focus group discussions organized with affected girls, women, boys and men that have been used to influence decisions made on design of assessments, programmes, standards, selection criteria, etc.