

## 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**.

## Transparency – what is the cluster doing, and how is it being communicated?

### The common AAP indicator

*Number of information products distributed to the affected population through a variety of mechanisms on humanitarian program planning, functioning and progress.*

**Transparency:** the sharing of accessible and timely information with stakeholders and the opening up of cluster procedures, structures and processes that affect them. To be transparent a cluster needs to do more than disclose standardised information. It also needs to provide stakeholders with the information they require to make informed decisions and choices. In this way transparency is more than just a one-way flow of information; it is an on-going dialogue between a cluster and its stakeholders over information provision.

**Guidelines** - The following are made public in a way that is accessible and acceptable<sup>1</sup> to all in affected communities:

- Information about a cluster's mission, values, legal status and contact details.
- Information about projects, plans and activities (in particular beneficiary selection criteria, time/location/procedures for distributions, and relevant financial information).
- Regular reports of actual performance in relation to previously agreed goals.
- Explanation of why/how actual performance differed from what was originally communicated to the community (if relevant).

### 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 printed and disseminated information products, designed for non-literate people, regarding cluster decision on provision of shelter materials and assistance
- \* # of specific SMS broadcasts sent
- \* # of 'Frequently Asked Questions' documents about the work of the cluster disseminated
- \* # of Focus Group discussions held with affected girls, boys, women and men from the camp/community to inform them about the planning of the cluster assistance.
- \* # of talkback radio programmes joined to explain response planning and selection criteria of cluster to affected population
- \* % awareness of information messages disseminated by cluster

---

<sup>1</sup>Being accessible and acceptable to all may require employing different methods for different groups. For example, illiterate people, those who speak a different language, those who cannot or do not access certain public spaces, etc.