

Indicators and collective outcomes

Type: Analysis, knowledge-share; Time: 90 minutes; Credit: Tristan Hale (2018)

Participants are split into groups. Each group formulates objectives and indicators for a particular sector or working-group based on a provided case study and response-level strategic objectives. As a full group, participants then collectively formulate a set of response-level indicators.

<i>Preparation</i>	<p>If not using the case study provided, locate and prepare similar materials.</p> <p>Print handouts (minimum 1 per group).</p> <p>OCHA Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs) can be found here in several languages: https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/documents/document-type/strategic-response-plan</p> <p>The OCHA YouTube channel offers short videos covering a range of crises: https://www.youtube.com/user/ochafilms</p>
<i>Materials</i>	<p>Handouts, flipcharts/flipchart paper (1 per group), marker pens, large Post-Its.</p> <p>If showing an introductory video: projector, screen and speakers</p>
<i>Knowledge</i>	<p>Reread the HB introductory chapter. Revise collective outcomes and HRPs: https://www.unocha.org/ending-protracted-internal-displacement/achieving-collective-outcomes</p>
<i>Learning objectives and key messages</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participants are familiar with the new indicators in the 2018 Handbook, notably the “progress” indicators which require the user to set targets in agreement with stakeholders. Subsequent progress on the indicator implies progress on the standard. - Sector-specific objectives and indicators are considered in relation to each other at response level. Targets are timebound, representing target progress over a stated period. - If you are making measurements to determine whether a standard is being met, the target must not be set based on available resources, but rather on contextual factors. In many cases, the standard will only be <i>fully met for everyone</i> when the measurement is 100%. Even then, there is no guarantee that their rights are being respected. <i>Planning</i> targets should be aspirational but achievable in the right conditions.

Method

- **Present the exercise** (2 minutes)
- **Introduce the case study** (3 minutes): If the group is not familiar with the selected case-study/scenario, consider showing an introductory video. This 2-minute OCHA video from September 2017 covers Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan and Yemen: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=quTBK3bx1ig>.
- **Split participants into groups** (2 minutes): These can be self-selected based on interests. Working groups are ideally selected from WASH, Food Security, Nutrition, Shelter and Health (to align with the Sphere Handbook), but groups may select another area of expertise such as child protection, GBV, education, logistics, protection, site management, livelihoods, telecommunications, communicating with communities, coordination, etc.

Indicators and collective outcomes

Continued...

- **Distribute the handouts and give instructions** (3 minutes): The handouts provided with this activity are extracted from the OCHA Nigeria HRP issued in December 2017. Each group replicates and completes the final page on a flipchart, with each indicator on a Post-it. They start by reformulating the response-level objectives for their working group. They then select indicators – with baselines and targets where appropriate and possible. The objectives and indicators should cover 1 year¹ (January to December 2018). **Advise groups not to spend excessive time on numerical calculations.**
 - **Small-group work** (30 minutes)
 - **Playback** (25 minutes)
 - **Whole-group work** (15 minutes): On a new flipchart, ask the group to suggest strategic indicators and targets. These may summarise the indicators of a single working-group (e.g. “Number of people receiving food, cash transfers, and/or vouchers” for Food Security), or can be cross-sector (e.g. “Number of beneficiaries reached through provision of specialised and multi-sectorial services”). The objective of this activity is for different sectors to attempt to achieve consensus on a small set of indicators (3 or 4 per objective) which can be used to monitor progress of the overall response towards the strategic objectives. A model answer for this activity can be found on page 58 of the Nigeria HRP.
 - **Plenary discussion** (10 minutes): Start with some questions about the exercise:
 - o How did you select indicators and how did you determine targets?
 - o Suppose it’s one year later and your programme achieved all it’s targets. Are standards being met, and are the rights of the affected population(s) being respected?
 - o What other working-groups should/could also be represented?
 - o How might your response-level indicators be different if we had also included groups representing coordination, communicating with communities, etc.?
 - o Are Food Security and protection concerns adequately integrated in your response-level indicators?
Note: For the Nigeria case-study, after Food Security (\$435 million), Protection (including child protection and GBV) is the next most expensive item (\$194 million).
- Start wrapping up by moving the discussion away from the activity and towards somewhat more closed questions regarding Sphere and the Handbook:
- o What are the advantages of different groups working with a single set of indicators, such as the Sphere Minimum Standards? (A: Common language, etc.)
 - o Who should you agree indicators and targets with, and why is this important?
(A: Handbook introduction, response-level view, etc.)
 - o What should you do if you can’t meet targets or standards?
(A: Handbook introduction: complying with Sphere)
- **Wrap up**, ensuring to cover the learning objectives above.

¹ The Nigeria HRP has a 1-year timeframe but is underpinned by multi-year strategy (see page 3).