Information and communication

Evaluation of IT humanitarian platforms and their possible utilisation as co-ordination instruments

Marcel Hummelink

Amsterdam, September 2002

Table of contents

Information and communication. Evaluation of IT humanitarian platforms and their possible utilisation as co-ordination instruments.

Marcel Hummelink, September 2002

Executive summary

Purpose and methodology
This report was produced in the context of the follow-up on the ECHO Partners' Conference of 2001 and the preparation for the Partners' Conference of 2002. With the aim to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the European response mechanism to humanitarian emergencies, ECHO and its partners intend to improve their co-ordination and communication systems. These systems rely more and more on information technology (IT). This report studies the utility of the existing IT tools and the feasibility of developing a complementary database.

The report is the result of a consultative process. ECHO's partners were asked to respond to a questionnaire on the utility of the existing humanitarian IT tools and on the feasibility to set up a new information exchange system. An analysis of the response to the questionnaire and a survey of existing Internet tools lead to the following conclusions and recommendations, which may be presented and discussed at the Partners' Conference of 2002.

Conclusion 1:
Although it relies heavily on reliable information and long distance communication, the humanitarian community has never taken the lead in developing technologies that are particularly suited to its needs. Over the last decades it has greatly profited, however, from technological innovations in telecommunications and information technology. Besides, a number of applications has been developed that are particularly aimed at the humanitarian community. In particular static products that don't need to be frequently updated, such as maps, training materials et cetera, have been widely disseminated: the development of this kind of products has become an important aspect of disaster preparedness.

Recommendation 1:
Under the heading of disaster preparedness humanitarian organisations should continue to develop information products that can easily be used under a variety of field conditions. Donors, including ECHO, should (continue to) provide funding for such projects. The sharing of these IT tools should be encouraged: as a matter of fact, a culture of sharing information and IT among humanitarian organisations should be promoted.

Conclusion 2:
The development of sophisticated, interactive software specifically dedicated to humanitarian aid has been hampered by the general level of IT skills of field personnel. A lack of in-house IT skills has also been found to cause poor connectivity of and within some field offices.

Recommendation 2:

Humanitarian education should have a strong IT component, while field personnel should have more opportunities and facilities for IT training. The experience that has been gained in in rapidly deploying information and technology specialists in the initial response to crises deserves to be shared, joint IT initiatives of humanitarian organisations deserve to be encouraged, and NGO's that provide IT services to the humanitarian community deserve to be supported.

Conclusion 3
The World Wide Web is at present undoubtedly the most widely used information platform for the humanitarian community. Humanitarian organisations regularly visit each other's web sites. These sites hardly reflect this reality: the public part of the web sites of most humanitarian organisations is aimed at a vast, anonymous audience, while the restricted part is reserved for staff. Apart from information on the owner of the site and links to related organisations, the sites seldom provide IT services to visitors.

Recommendation 3
The web sites of many humanitarian organisations could be greatly improved. They might reflect more that they are regularly visited by humanitarian professionals. This also counts for ECHO's web site. This site has already been greatly improved over the last years. However, it still doesn't provide links, for example, to the sites of all ECHO's partners, nor does it allow to submit project proposals. If its want to support the co-ordination of European humanitarian aid through IT, the office might make its site an inspiring example for its partners. Besides, it might set up a platform where these partners can meet. If it were impossible to provide these services on the Europa server, ECHO might support the creation of a new European humanitarian information site.

Conclusion 4
ReliefWeb is widely used as a platform for and source of information for the humanitarian community. It is the one site that at present may reasonably claim to be a good portal to the vast array of humanitarian information on the World Wide Web. On the ReliefWeb platform humanitarian organisations communicate more directly with one another than through their proper web sites. Also field-based web-platforms, functioning as an interface for humanitarian organisations that are active in certain crisis areas, have in several countries proven to fulfil a real need.

Recommendation 4
ReliefWeb deserves ECHO's continued support. The support of field-based web platforms should be seriously considered on a case-by-case basis.

Conclusion 5
Technological advances have increased expectations: aid should be available as fast as information. Besides, in the light of what's at stake in humanitarian aid, there has always been little patience with any lack of co-ordination among donors and implementing agencies. Some humanitarian organisations tend to take a very defensive stance on these expectations.

Recommendation 5
The expectations the humanitarian community has to life up to may not be fully realistic. Yet it is highly recommendable that organisations take a constructive and pro-active stance on developments that are largely beyond their control. In order to remain in touch with the ever

growing information tide and to assure a minimum of co-ordination, organisations ought to share the information they possess and contribute to an integrated information platform.

Conclusion 6
Agreement on common geographic codes and adherence to the rules of Standard Humanitarian Assistance Reporting, have been some of the most successful ways to integrate information and co-ordinate interventions.

Recommendation 6
Organisations ought to actively contribute to the further dissemination of largely accepted and successful information standards.

Conclusion 7
In several crisis affected regions 'Who is doing what where' databases have successfully contributed to the co-ordination of humanitarian interventions.

Recommendation 7
The development of 'Who is doing what where' databases needs to be seriously considered in any major crisis situation. In general OCHA should take the lead in setting up the necessary information systems – and should be financially supported for doing so.

Conclusion 8
IT opens new, tempting opportunities for voluntary action, for in kind donations and for joint initiatives. Academic institutions may for the moment be the most obvious and uncomplicated IT-partners for the humanitarian community. Besides, some NGO's have appeared that in as their core activity provide IT services to the humanitarian community.

Recommendation 8
Humanitarian organisations ought to actively explore the new opportunities that are opened by IT and humanitarian IT-NGO's ought to be supported.

Conclusion 9
The recent OCHA symposium on 'Best practices in humanitarian information management and exchange' successfully defined a number of principles, themes, best practices and recommendations that are highly relevant for the future of IT in humanitarian aid.

Recommendation 9
Humanitarian organisations should define their stance on the results of the OCHA symposium. Since any joint initiative will always have to remain within the boundaries of a consensus, the construction of such a consensus in the filed of humanitarian information exchange is highly desirable.

Conclusion 10
IT services and integrated IT systems do not exclude each other. Until now, IT developments in the humanitarian community have mainly followed the 'services model'. At the same time, the practice of organisations 'buying in' to certain services by providing their own information, has lead to some integration of information.

Recommendation 10

ECHO and other donors should continue to financially support the development of IT services that come to the benefit of the whole humanitarian community. Besides, they should encourage the development of IT-based information sharing systems.

Conclusion 11
The European humanitarian community is still a rather long way from developing an information sharing system along the lines of the '14 point fax system' that is used as a co-ordination tool by the European Commission and the Member States of the European Union. Most of the current objections do not fundamentally stand in the way of such a system, which might become an important co-ordination and information tool..

Recommendation 11
ECHO should seriously consider supporting any initiative to set up an IT platform for European humanitarian information exchange. It might contribute to such a platform by publishing details on the projects it supports – and by encouraging the Member States to do the same.

Conclusion 12
ECHO's partners differ greatly, both in their attitude towards IT and in their ability and opportunity to develop IT tools

Recommendation 12
Any collective initiative by the European humanitarian network in the domain of IT will have to recognise the important differences between the organisations that make up the network. Rather than setting the same standards and using the same systems for all organisations, a European humanitarian IT platform should reflect and encourage the establishment of sub-circles and sub-networks.

Introduction

Partners in aid
European humanitarian aid rests on a network of mutually dependent organisations. This mutual dependency is particularly felt by donors and implementing organisations. The mandates of these groups are largely complementary, which makes them natural allies. At the same time, they maintain their individual accountability. Consequently, the need to strike a balance between upholding organisational independence and adapting to a collective effort is felt in almost everything they do.

Ever since its creation in 1992, the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid Office (ECHO) has tried to maintain a positive and constructive attitude towards this complex situation. This attitude is reflected in the notion of partnership that ECHO has always actively promoted and that has been welcomed, be it sometimes sceptically, by almost all organisations in the humanitarian world. While maintaining their respective roles and responsibilities, ECHO and its partners work together towards a common goal.

In order to maintain and strengthen the partnership between the different humanitarian actors, the interface between these organisations needs to be regularly updated. That counts for their formal working relations, that are regulated for ECHO and its partners in the Framework Partnership Agreement. But it counts even more for their day-to-day communication systems. Partnerships only survive as long as they are nourished by inspiring initiatives. This report should be seen in that light.

Formalised co-operation mechanisms
The issue of partnership was one of the main issues of the ECHO Partners' Conference, held in Brussels in November 2001. The members of a workshop within this Conference tried to analyse the concept of partnership and to identify the limits, the potential and the characteristics of the partnership-relation between ECHO and the humanitarian NGO's. Eventually, they proposed to set up a working group to further develop these issues.

In the course of 2002 this working group formulated three objectives that might be pursued in order to strengthen the co-operation between ECHO and its partners: the development of formalised co-operation mechanisms; the development of communication strategies from both sides; and the development of programmes to address specific policy and strategy issues.

ECHO has taken on the responsibility to prepare working documents on these issues. In the Partners' Conference of 2002 it intends to continue the debate on partnership and to prepare the ground for relevant joint actions with partners, for which it is ready to carry the financing costs. One such action might be the development of a new co-ordination instrument: a new mechanism, complementary to the ones already in place, might strengthen the co-operation between ECHO and its partners to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of European humanitarian aid.

ICT tools as co-ordination instruments
The last ten years have seen an explosive dissemination of information and communication technology (ICT) in all walks of life. Particularly over the Internet, the technologies of data processing and long distance communication can be seen to integrate. This process is also reflected in the work of the humanitarian community: almost all organisations have created

their own web sites and a few specifically humanitarian 'portals' have been set up, while e-mail and web-transfer have become a regular means of communication.

This new and developing technology has its weaknesses: it poses new security problems and new difficulties regarding the recognition of reliable information. Nevertheless, it still offers possibilities to improve and speed up information flows. When talking about new co-ordination mechanisms between ECHO and its partners, web-based technology therefore seems appropriate. This report deals with the question how this technology might be applied to create a new co-ordination tool and how this tool might fit in with the existing humanitarian web-facilities for information and communication.

Method
This paper is the result of a consultation round, whereby all ECHO's partners have been asked to provide information on their current utilisation of web-based information and communication tools, and to reflect on the progress that might be made through a collective effort in this domain. This consultation round was streamlined through the use of a questionnaire, based on a preliminary analysis of a number of existing Internet tools in the humanitarian sector.

The consultation round aimed first of all at obtaining a tentative overview of the existing tools, with a description of their main features, their objectives and their underlying logic. The list of humanitarian web sites, that can be found in Annex 4, is a result of the descriptive information that was provided by the partners and that was gathered on the World Wide Web.

This evaluation also aimed at assessing the overall and relative impact of the existing tools, and the questionnaire therefore also contained a number of questions on their utility.

Finally, the questionnaire also asked the partners' opinions on the utility and feasibility of a common information system to improve co-ordination among humanitarian agencies and donors. In that context, the idea of a '14-point fax system' for the exchange of information and co-ordination, much alike the system that is presently used for the co-ordination of the aid efforts of the European Commission and the Member States of the European Union, was put forward and tested. The full questionnaire can be found in Annex 6.

On the basis of the response to this questionnaire, an analysis was made of the current use of IT tools in the humanitarian sector and of the utility of a new mechanism. This analysis led to a number of conclusions and recommendations that may be presented and discussed at the Partners' Conference in October 2002.

Structure of this report
This report has a simple threefold structure:
- The first chapter deals with the present situation. It contains a analytical description of the existing IT tools and an evaluation of the uses made of them by humanitarian organisations.
- The second chapter deals with the future, and specifically with the steps that ECHO and its partners might jointly take in the field of IT. It contains the partners' opinions on the desirability of a new form of information exchange and on the feasibility of a so-called '14 points fax system' to streamline the information flow between ECHO and its partners.
- Finally, the conclusions and recommendations of this evaluation are put forward.

Word of thanks

This paper would not have been possible without the support and the kind collaboration of a great number of people. In particular, I want to express my gratitude to all those who have invested their time and knowledge in responding to the questionnaire: I hope this report doesn't disappoint the expectations the questionnaire may have raised. Besides, I explicitly want to thank ECHO's policy unit for its continuous support.

1. Present

Introduction
For all those involved in humanitarian aid it is clear that information technology (IT) is penetrating ever deeper into their work. However, the humanitarian community has never been in the forefront of the technological revolution that over the last two decades has affected almost all walks of life. None of the existing hard-ware has been developed for the purpose of dealing with humanitarian needs. The humanitarian community is merely using technological tools that have mainly been developed for military, scientific and commercial purposes. This background makes it difficult to keep an open mind to the issue of information technology in humanitarian aid: only in their wildest dreams humanitarian aid workers sometimes look beyond what has already been proven to work elsewhere.

At the same time most victims of humanitarian crises stand on the wrong side of the so-called 'Digital Divide': they don't have access to the digital information and communication network that has unequally spread around the world. Old and well known concerns about 'the voice of the beneficiaries' in discussions that touch upon their fate are further fuelled by the fact that donors and implementing agencies are investing in information and communication systems from which these 'beneficiaries' are technically excluded.

Some aid workers therefore feel that the digital revolution has been forcing them in directions that are only negatively dictated by their humanitarian interests and intentions. They regard information technology as a 'necessary evil' that the aid community simply has to accept, even though its advantages might never weigh up to its costs.

Clearly this attitude stands in the way of any initiative to develop IT tools for the humanitarian sector. Before we tackle the question whether the development of such tools is feasible and desirable, however, we must first try to analyse the present situation.

Static products
The existing IT tools that are used in the humanitarian community may be categorised in terms of interconnectedness and interactivity. On the one end of the scale stands the read-only file on the single personal computer; on the other hand the open communication line that is part of an integrated and integrating long-distance information network.

Although it seems almost too obvious to mention, it is important to note that the European humanitarian community is virtually saturated with servers and personal computers: both in Europe and in the field these information tools seem to be readily available. From the responses to the questionnaire it was clear that all NGO's try to make sure their systems remain ahead of their immediate needs. This means that an important prerequisite for the improvement of European aid efforts through IT has already been met: a lot of multifunctional hardware is in place and is regularly updated.

Over the last decades several specifically humanitarian IT tools have been developed in the form of soft-ware, that can be run on individual, stand-alone computers. On this 'low' end of the interconnectedness and interactivity scale we find a number of 'cold', static products, such as maps, encyclopaedia's, manuals, data standards, training materials and databases that are directly related to humanitarian aid and that can be used in a variety of crisis situations: the 'toolboxes' that OCHA has developed for the rapid deployment of Humanitarian Information

Centres (HICs) in crisis-affected countries, for example, include a whole range of these products.

The development of this kind of tools, that don't need to be frequently updated and that function under a wide variety of field conditions, has become an important aspect of any disaster preparedness project. Particularly in areas with fragile and unreliable connections there is a strong awareness that the personal computer must be able to maintain its vital functions off-line: in these areas CD-ROMS, down-loads and e-mail attachments are more valuable than on-line functions.

Dynamic products
In humanitarian IT toolboxes one usually also finds software applications that at least in terms of their interactivity belong to the high end of the scale. These flexible, dynamic products allow users to produce or adapt information. The Rapid Village Assessment (RVA) may be mentioned as an example of such a 'hot' product: it allows field officers to make local needs assessments in a common format.

In general, however, humanitarian organisations are very hesitant in developing and applying new, interactive software, simply because it will require new skills from end users. Organisations generally count on the ability of their staff to use standard office applications. Sometimes they develop standards and formats to assure and improve the quality and relevance of the information that is produced within the organisation. But these standards and formats must always be applicable without additional IT training: most humanitarian organisations are intense users of a limited number of software products.

Particularly when computers must be able to stay functional under a wide variety of field conditions, the overriding principle is to 'Keep It Simple, Stupid' – or rather: to 'Keep It Familiar'. Only when one can rely on more or less permanent and reliable network connections, the advantages of developing specific applications begin to weigh up to the investments.

Networks
While computers can even be found in the most remote places and amidst the deepest crises, there are enormous differences in their connectivity. Even though the technical infrastructure for world-wide data-communication already exists and while there is a tendency towards an ever greater integration of computers and networks into one global web, there still are many places that are more or less isolated. Another prerequisite for the further integration of information systems has therefore only partially been fulfilled: the existing systems are not fully interconnected yet. Nevertheless, some feel that the necessary hardware is already in place to further develop particularly humanitarian IT tools: in their eyes the main challenge, apart from further refining the system and keeping it up-to-date, is to discover opportunities and to take appropriate action.

For the humanitarian community the main advantages of linking computers lie in the expansion of the digital space that is accessible from the individual workstation and in the acceleration of digital communication. These advantages, however, are very unevenly spread, even among users with optimal connections. Individual users possess and provide varying degrees of access to the information within or without their proper digital environment. Organisations usually give their staff access to an internal 'Intranet', whereas outsiders may access a much more restricted area through the 'Internet': although the connections may

technically be identical, this theoretical distinction underlines the will to maintain the integrity of organisations in the information age.

The survey conducted for the purpose of this report confirmed that ECHO's partners differ greatly in the way they have established internal and external connections. In many cases Local Area Networks (LANs) are connected through password protected Internet connections to a web-based 'Intranet'. Yet sometimes field workers are only connected to the computers at headquarters through basic e-mail services. Such gaps in the internal network are sometimes due to the fact that in some countries no Internet Service Provider (ISP) can provide the required services, but sometimes also to the fact that there isn't sufficient IT skill within the organisation to set up and securely maintain a network.

Even though the problems and needs of many organisations are similar, they seldom take part in joint IT initiatives. Only international 'families' of national organisations, such as Caritas, Save the Children and Food for the Hungry, tend to share IT resources. Here still lies a great opportunity for organisations to learn from one another and for specialised services that might particularly be developed for the humanitarian community. This latter point was understood by the founders of sites like Aidcommunity.org and Reliefguide.com, the one allowing aid workers in the field to access the Internet and each other, the other functioning as an interface between buyers and suppliers of relief goods.

Direct and indirect communication
Once their hardware is interconnected, aid workers and organisations can communicate digitally. This communication may be more or less direct: web sites are a rather indirect mode of communication, whereas telephone conferencing allows for collective communication in real time. All these different forms of digital communication require their proper tools.

The World Wide Web is at present undoubtedly the most widely used IT-based information platform for the humanitarian community. The survey conducted for the purpose of this report confirmed that the Internet is indeed mainly used to access information on the World Wide Web: organisations sometimes even seem to forget that other ways of information retrieval through the Internet still exist.

Among the sites that are most visited, news sites, such as IRIN, AlertNet, CNN and BBC, seem to be particularly popular. Besides, humanitarian organisations frequently consult each other's web sites.

Most of ECHO's partners possess their own web site, as shown in the list in Annex 5. These web sites are usually mainly informative, designed to inform the public of the vision and activities of the organisation and aimed at increasing interest and gathering support. Beside the option to make donations, to apply for jobs, and to contact the organisation through e-mail, they sometimes also possess interesting educational features: the site of the Spanish NGO Rescate, for example, gives visitors insight in the life of refugees.

More often than not, the web sites of humanitarian organisations are cut off from the rest of the organisations' management: most sites are managed as stand-alone tools, often connected to the organisations' e-mail-systems, but remaining under the strict and constant control of a single webmaster. The unrestricted part of these sites is conceived as a number of static pages aimed at a vast, anonymous audience. This situation is at present a major obstacle to the integration of the information that is available throughout the humanitarian community: the

barriers around some of the information on the local networks have been raised so high, that any sharing of information demands additional work.

Portals
The weakness of indirect communication is the distance between senders and receivers: documents are drafted for a target group that in fact may never be reached, while users may be unable to find the most relevant information. There are different techniques to minimise this problem, both from the side of the sender and from the side of the receiver. At the same time, a number of tools has been created to facilitate this kind of communication. Among those, so-called portals have proven to be particularly helpful.

Many humanitarian organisations set the home page of their web site as the home page of their staff, so that this page takes on the double function of providing information to the world at large and functioning as a portal for the organisation's members. The web sites of most humanitarian organisations aren't sophisticated enough, however, to uphold their role as portals. To properly guide users to relevant information on the World Wide Web, a portal should at the very least provide reliable search facilities and web guides.

The search facilities included in most humanitarian web sites limit their search to the pages belonging to the organisation's proper domain. This doesn't make these sites less valuable: as long as they provide reliable information that cannot be found elsewhere, even sites that technically might seem obsolete retain their fundamental utility. Yet they do not qualify as portals to the World Wide Web – and it would benefit many users if the uses and limitations of any particular web site would be better, explicitly specified.

Many sites of humanitarian organisations, including some of ECHO's partners, do include links to other web sites. Yet the range and reliability of these links is often limited, favouring the sites of partner organisations and providing little guidance through the vast array of humanitarian information sites. Also in this respect is would benefit users if they are informed of the limitations of the services provided. The complete logistic guide for European NGO's on the site of Atlas-logistique is a good example of a valuable and reliable service aimed at the humanitarian community.

ReliefWeb
Upholding the broad range of the functions usually associated with a portal, such as updating relevant information, providing web-guides and maintaining search engines, is a demanding task. Much of this task would best be left to those portals that have explicitly been set up to cover the information needs of the humanitarian community at large. The one single web site that was explicitly set up as a portal and platform for the humanitarian community and that according to the response to the questionnaire is indeed widely used, is www.reliefweb.com.

ReliefWeb was set up by OCHA and includes numerous functions that are particularly useful for aid workers. It contains a guide to humanitarian web sites, a search engine, and direct links to news sites – such as the related IRIN news service. Besides, it functions as a platform for humanitarian organisations that want to post vacancies and news messages.

This platform function ties in humanitarian organisations and provides them with the opportunity to communicate more directly than through their autonomous web sites. As with direct network connections, this communication can be more or less exclusive. Thus, within

ReliefWeb a variety of platforms has been created, to which the public and humanitarian organisations have varying access.

Over the last years web-based information platforms have been emerging as remarkably useful co-ordination instruments. Apart from the global ReliefWeb platform several local and field-based web sites have been set up, functioning mainly for the humanitarian organisations that operate in the area. UgandAid is a good example of such a local humanitarian platform. With their common content structure, these sites form a new humanitarian web 'genre': the public area of these sites usually contains static resources such as maps, local regulations and links to support services; a restricted community area then features contact lists, notice boards, discussion boards et cetera.

E-mail, internet relay chat, telephone and video conferencing
While the discussion boards on dedicated web sites are slowly replacing them, e-mail discussion lists still function as an important mode of communication within the humanitarian community. These discussion lists have for long been the most direct mode of collective communication on the web.

On a more individual level, e-mail remains the most widely used IT-based communication tool: this mode of communication has become so wide-spread that it has made IT of vital importance to the communication of and within many organisations. Even where computer networks are only partially and indirectly interconnected, as in some organisations with field offices in remote areas, e-mail, together with telephone, remains the backbone of all communications.

For those who are permanently on-line, e-mail can be an extremely direct mode of communication, only surpassed in speed by internet relay chat, telephone and video conferencing. Some of the existing humanitarian platforms also provide chat boxes –or conference rooms- for the use of humanitarian workers. Telephone conferencing, a service that previously was only provided by telephone companies, is now also functioning in a Internet version. And slowly but surely the quality of web-based video conferencing is improving.

Yet while the technology for collective real time communication is improving, this technology may never cover the whole area affected by any particular crisis, let alone the whole community of victims. Fast communications are no guaranty for fast, relevant and co-ordinated humanitarian action: it is rather in the integration of scattered bits of information that a lot a progress can still be made.

Integrating information
The main condition for the integration of scattered information is the introduction of common standards: only when the producers of the different pieces follow common rules and procedures, those pieces may eventually add up to a larger picture.

Adhering to common geographic codes, to eliminate confusion about locations, can be a first and necessary step to improve the co-ordination of humanitarian actions. The 'p-codes' that were used to facilitate the work of humanitarian organisations in Kosovo, are a good example of such a basic success. To assure this kind of basic geographic understanding, a number of large humanitarian organisations has formed GIST, a team of geographic information focal points.

A more far reaching effort to assure the integration of humanitarian information is the dissemination of the SHARE approach. Standard Humanitarian Assistance Reporting (SHARE) is a standard to promote data sourcing, dating and geo-referencing, thus facilitating the integration of data from multiple sources and enhancing verifiability, assessment, analysis and accountability. According to the SHARE approach, when information important for emergency relief and recovery operations is collected, reported and represented, it should include:

• Geo-reference or locational information indicating *where* the data was collected or what location or area it represents

• A time-stamp indicating *when* the data was collected and in some cases at what frequency – to determine the currency of the information

• Information about the data itself (metadata), including *who* collected the information (the source), *what* standards and indicators were used, and *how* the data was measured or derived – to evaluate the credibility of the information

The SHARE approach has become widely used and accepted in the humanitarian community and provides a good example of the fact that, although it might in general be wise to follow global trends and use the most widely known and available programs and protocols, there may still be space for specifically humanitarian initiatives: when they are user friendly and serve important purposes, it is almost impossible to stop their spreading.

A final step is the actual integration of existing information, be it manually or automatically. Fine examples of this important work are the so-called 'Who is Doing What Where' databases (WDWW), that have been set up in a number of crisis regions. Apparently until now the need for such a database has been felt stronger in the field than on the global level. Nevertheless, together these local databases eventually might add up to a global information system on current humanitarian aid projects.

2. Future

Opportunity cost
Ideas about the future of IT tools in humanitarian aid are sometimes almost diametrically opposed. While some see information technology as a sure way to improve the work of the humanitarian community, others are deeply concerned about the opportunity-cost of IT investments. The yearly expenditure of humanitarian organisations on IT and the number of staff permanently dedicated to IT are indeed considerable: between 0,5 and 10% of all resources is spent on IT. Some organisations seem to make these investments only half-heartedly: they feel they have to follow technological developments in order to survive, but they doubt whether the benefits of IT for the humanitarian community as a whole justify its costs.

Unfortunately, little research has been done in this domain, so that opinions are still mainly based on gut-feelings. The inconclusive debate on this issue should, however, not lead the humanitarian community to take a passive stance on IT. Investments in this technology might not only improve the functioning of existing systems, but might actually create new venues for action.

In the domains of voluntary action, in kind donations and joint action, for example, IT opens the way to unexplored resources. News about humanitarian crises in many people still provokes the urge to 'do something'. This urge is still mostly translated in physical action or financial donations. Yet physical distances are often hard to overcome, whereas the readiness to donate money has been explored through other the mass-media – and it is indeed questionable whether the option to make on-line donations, found on the web site of many NGO's, is a major asset for the aid community.

Through the Internet, however, volunteers can fulfil a number of computer-related tasks from their homes. This is not the place to fully explore these possibilities, but many humanitarian organisations might greatly benefit from the experience that has already been gained and the resources that have already been accumulated in the domain of 'virtual volunteering'. The web site of UNITeS, the specialised United Nations agency that has been set up to promote developments in this area, might prove a useful starting point for organisations that consider to widen their scope in this direction.

Business, intelligence and knowledge
At the same time, IT-companies may be willing to make in-kind donations to humanitarian organisations in the form of hard- or software, or in assisting humanitarian organisations to make their products useful for humanitarian purposes. The co-operation between Microsoft and Mercy Corps and Save the Children, to develop logistics tracking and needs assessments software packages for use with Personals Digital Assistants, is an example of such profit-non-profit collaboration. The Geography Network (GeoNet), a global network of geographic information users and providers created by ESRI, an American Geographic Information System (GIS) and software company, is another.

In fact, commercial companies might even consider setting up their own humanitarian funds and programs. The American company i2 Technologies, for example, a provider of value chain management solutions, founded the i2 Foundation that in its turn set up Aidmatrix, an Internet-based solution to connect multiple charities in a more efficient and effective manner.

The question of commercial 'profits' to be gained from 'investments' in humanitarian aid still hasn't been fully explored. But the temptation to forge partnerships with commercial companies in the field of information technology are felt by many humanitarian organisations.

Similar hesitations as may be felt in the face of commercial companies may play a part when considering co-operation with military organisations, which have traditionally played a leading role in the development of information technology. Some indeed see the military as an interesting partner for humanitarian organisations in search of technological support, whereas others strongly fear that humanitarian organisations might lose their credibility as independent actors once they openly co-operate with the military.

Perhaps academic institutions, that also have played a leading role in the development of IT, are for the moment the most obvious and uncomplicated partners for the humanitarian community in this field. Thus the University of Georgia Information Technology Outreach Services (ITOS), under contract with the Geographic Information System Team (GIST), is already working the Afghanistan Information Management Service (AIMS), the Sierra Leone Information System (SLIS) and the Data Platform for the Horn of Africa (DEPHA), to manage and host a data repository of critical high-memory graphics, satellite imagery and metadata files.

Best Practices in Humanitarian Information Management and Exchange
Apart from taking such individual initiatives, the humanitarian community might take collective initiatives to further develop the current humanitarian response system. Any such initiative, however, has to take account of the divergent views on the future of the humanitarian system in general, and more particularly on the role of information in that system. Regular surveys and exchanges of opinion on this matter are vital to determine the boundaries for innovative action. The ECHO Annual Partners Meeting may become such a regular forum. Yet this forum will always have to stay closely in touch with the wider, global context. Before embarking on any particular European initiative, it is therefore important to note the current state of ideas on 'Best Practices in Humanitarian Information Management and Exchange', as reflected in the international symposium organised under that name in February 2002.

The symposium was organised by OCHA to take stock of achievements in the humanitarian information management field, to identify future challenges in this field and to agree on next steps. Some of its participants were ready to give priority to information as a core humanitarian function and resource and tended to place information on an almost equal footing to food, potable water, medicine and shelter. Thereby they perhaps over-stressed their point that the importance of information management and exchange ought to be recognised by the humanitarian community at large, and more particularly by the donors. And they strongly reminded information professionals that tend to focus on inter-agency communication and co-ordination that the question of informing the beneficiaries is one of the most important aspects of humanitarian information management and exchange.

The symposium resulted notably in a final statement, endorsed by all participants, that contains a collection of principles, themes, best practices and recommendations. Most of this statement, that can be found on the OCHA web site, is phrased in general terms and it is hard to disagree with its content. The most concrete recommendation for future action is for OCHA to set up a multi-stakeholder steering committee that should draft specific guidelines for humanitarian information management and exchange, that should catalogue best practices in

this domain, and that in general should 'steer' the implementation of the recommendations of the conference.

Mental systems
In his report of the symposium Robin Schofield from Accenture Consulting recently pointed out that two differing 'mental models' increasingly seem to dominate discussions about the future development of humanitarian information systems: a highly structured 'systems' model, with field agencies feeding an information system at the local level, desk officers distilling this information at the national, regional or headquarters levels, and donor officials responding with policy decisions and funding at the international level; and a loosely knit 'service' model, in which agencies or their employees freely choose whether and how to use the available information services that are available to respond to their particular needs.

According to Schofield most donors and information specialists prefer the 'systems' model. But he doubts whether this model is suited to the realities of humanitarian aid and whether it will yield quality results. Besides, further systems integration may in Schofield's view work against the interests of operational agencies. In the context of humanitarian aid, therefore, the 'services' model, with its multiple information sources and 'market-driven' character, would be best suited to effectively improve the humanitarian response system.

To promote developments in this direction, operational agencies should try to temper the enthusiasm of information professionals and the donor community for greater systems integration. Simultaneously, NGOs would have to commit more resources to their own efforts to develop information systems, in order to avoid dependency on one centrally delivered vision.

Facilities and education
Now one may question whether Schofield does not exaggerate the contrast between the two 'mental systems' he distinguishes. The two systems aren't mutually exclusive and may be useful for both donors and implementing agencies. Obviously, all actors will be most interested in developments that correspond most closely with their information needs and with their operational logic. Rather than focusing on their differences, one might therefore focus on their similarities and common interests. And rather than focusing on the eventual long-term impact of choosing for any one 'mental model', one might focus on the present realities in the humanitarian world and on the evaluation of practical initiatives.

Until now, IT developments in the humanitarian sector have followed the 'services' model. A number of information and communication services are widely used, as was described in the previous chapter. Indeed all organisations believe that the dissemination of this kind of services has improved the co-ordination of humanitarian aid, and Schofield quotes one experienced OCHA information manager saying "indirect facilitation has proved to be the most productive means by far to get agencies working together". As long as the services do not demand advanced computer skills, the majority of aid workers can use them to their benefit. ECHO and other donors might therefore consider supporting further developments in this area – as they are already doing through their support for ReliefWeb and other information and co-ordination services.

Yet clearly only limited progress can be made if the knowledge and mastery of IT within many humanitarian organisations does not go beyond the most widely used office applications. Investments in human capital are vital when it comes to constructing information

networks in exceptional circumstances. IT training should be an integrated part of any humanitarian education effort. The development of such educational efforts remains important if one is to improve the quality of humanitarian aid.

The fundamental weakness of the services model is the lack of commitment of the users. This commitment is vital, however, in order to produce the kind of integrated information that is needed to make well-founded and well-co-ordinated decisions. Knowledge is the basis of wisdom and can only be acquired by integrating scattered information. Apart from developing IT services and educational programmes, ECHO and its partners might therefore consider developing a common information system.

14 points fax
The European Union, as a treaty organisation of independent states, has a large experience in coping with co-ordination problems. In the preparatory phase of this evaluation it was therefore suggested that some of the co-ordination mechanisms that function within the EU might be adapted to the larger humanitarian community.

To improve the co-ordination of EU humanitarian aid a so-called '14 points fax system' has been introduced a long time ago – as the name of the system already suggests. The European Commission and the Member States of the EU agreed that they would systematically share information about their funding decisions. An information sheet was then designed that could easily be processed, so that one would always have an updated view of the Union's efforts in any given humanitarian crisis. (see annex 7)

This system of information exchange has a certain symbolic value, but it has also proven to provide decision makers with important and relevant information. The system has therefore survived in its original form for many years, until recently the old-fashioned fax system was changed into an Internet system: the results can be found on the ECHO web site.

Obviously this system would have to be adapted if it was to function for implementing agencies rather than for donors. For the purpose of this report the information sheet was therefore slightly adapted, so that it could pass as a project information sheet. ECHO's partners were then asked whether they would be willing to systematically provide information on their programmes and projects along the lines of this adapted form.

Project database
Most organisations that responded to the questionnaire were perfectly willing to participate in such an information sharing system. As a matter of fact, some already provide this kind of information through their web sites, so it would cost them hardly any effort to pass it on to a central database.

A few organisations, however, voiced more of less serious concerns. Some mainly hesitate for security reasons: they do not think it a good idea, for example, to disseminate information on the dates of shipments and the amounts of cash involved. In order to commit them to this kind of collective initiative, access to sensitive information would at the very least have to be highly restricted.

Others are concerned about the opportunity cost of setting up an information sharing system. CAFOD, for example, fears that its involvement in such a system could represent a major increase in workload and costs. Besides, the organisation would be reluctant to support a

system that effectively was establishing a parallel process to other interagency co-ordination systems and would need to be convinced of a clear and major added value if it were to commit itself to such an initiative.

This latter point was also raised by Mission East: even though this organisation can easily provide the requested information, it does not immediately see a real identifiable benefit from a project database, and therefore sees no point in adding any extra work. Apparently some organisations do not immediately recognise the added value of a humanitarian project database for their own work. They worry about who is going to use the information they might provide and do not seem to feel the need to join in collective co-ordination efforts, be it through IT or otherwise, in addition to those already in place.

Information sharing
"By sharing information, we all become aware of which humanitarian and funding needs are being met, or not, and of what new factors or developments need to be taken into considerations in our decision making, thus enabling us to better target our respective responses to the victims of disasters, " Carolyn MacAskie said in her opening speech to the OCHA symposium. Unfortunately, several factors stand in the way of acting in accordance with these words. Apart from the technical and financial constraints that are felt by some organisations to provide information on their own activities, humanitarian organisations are said to sometimes withhold information to maintain competitive advantage, particularly when funding is at stake. The final report of the OCHA conference on 'Best Practices in Humanitarian Information Management and Exchange' therefore concluded that "perhaps the greatest challenge for this field [of humanitarian information] is creating a culture of information sharing that promotes the systematic collection, use and free flow of data, information and ideas, facilitates informed decision-making and builds trust and commitment among stakeholders."

While not sharing information by humanitarian organisations might indeed, directly or indirectly, harm the interests of the victims of humanitarian crises, it may prove very difficult to break through the barriers that for the moment stand in the way of developing collective information systems in the humanitarian community. At present, probably the best way to promote a culture of information sharing is by a combination of providing services, of having organisations 'buy in' to systems that are of obvious use to their work, and of constantly repeating the collective aim of the organisations that are involved. Where the systems and services cannot be expected to constantly produce tangible benefits for all stakeholders, an approach is needed that combines practical solutions and deeply felt convictions.

In the mean time, any initiative must reflect clear vision on the shape humanitarian aid can and should take in the near future. In fact, developments in IT are already testing the ability of the established humanitarian community to adapt to new realities. While the principles of humanitarian aid remain the same, its character is constantly changing. These changes must be recognised and must be addressed in policies, that may not seem humanitarian in a narrow sense, but that determine the quality and success of any important enterprise in the 21st century. Coming to terms with the digital revolution is one of the major challenges the humanitarian organisations will have to face in the years, if not in the decades, to come.

Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusion 1:
Although it relies heavily on reliable information and long distance communication, the humanitarian community has never taken the lead in developing technologies that are particularly suited to its needs. Over the last decades it has greatly profited, however, from technological innovations in telecommunications and information technology. Besides, a number of applications has been developed that are particularly aimed at the humanitarian community. In particular static products that don't need to be frequently updated, such as maps, training materials et cetera, have been widely disseminated: the development of this kind of products has become an important aspect of disaster preparedness.

Recommendation 1:
Under the heading of disaster preparedness humanitarian organisations should continue to develop information products that can easily be used under a variety of field conditions. Donors, including ECHO, should (continue to) provide funding for such projects. The sharing of these IT tools should be encouraged: as a matter of fact, a culture of sharing information and IT among humanitarian organisations should be promoted.

Conclusion 2:
The development of sophisticated, interactive software specifically dedicated to humanitarian aid has been hampered by the general level of IT skills of field personnel. A lack of in-house IT skills has also been found to cause poor connectivity of and within some field offices.

Recommendation 2:
Humanitarian education should have a strong IT component, while field personnel should have more opportunities and facilities for IT training. The experience that has been gained in in rapidly deploying information and technology specialists in the initial response to crises deserves to be shared, joint IT initiatives of humanitarian organisations deserve to be encouraged, and NGO's that provide IT services to the humanitarian community deserve to be supported.

Conclusion 3
The World Wide Web is at present undoubtedly the most widely used information platform for the humanitarian community. Humanitarian organisations regularly visit each other's web sites. These sites hardly reflect this reality: the public part of the web sites of most humanitarian organisations is aimed at a vast, anonymous audience, while the restricted part is reserved for staff. Apart from information on the owner of the site and links to related organisations, the sites seldom provide IT services to visitors.

Recommendation 3
The web sites of many humanitarian organisations could be greatly improved. They might reflect more that they are regularly visited by humanitarian professionals. This also counts for ECHO's web site. This site has already been greatly improved over the last years. However, it still doesn't provide links, for example, to the sites of all ECHO's partners, nor does it allow to submit project proposals. If its want to support the co-ordination of European humanitarian aid through IT, the office might make its site an inspiring example for its partners. Besides, it might set up a platform where these partners can meet. If it were impossible to provide these

services on the Europa server, ECHO might support the creation of a new European humanitarian information site.

Conclusion 4
ReliefWeb is widely used as a platform for and source of information for the humanitarian community. It is the one site that at present may reasonably claim to be a good portal to the vast array of humanitarian information on the World Wide Web. On the ReliefWeb platform humanitarian organisations communicate more directly with one another than through their proper web sites. Also field-based web-platforms, functioning as an interface for humanitarian organisations that are active in certain crisis areas, have in several countries proven to fulfil a real need.

Recommendation 4
ReliefWeb deserves ECHO's continued support. The support of field-based web platforms should be seriously considered on a case-by-case basis.

Conclusion 5
Technological advances have increased expectations: aid should be available as fast as information. Besides, in the light of what's at stake in humanitarian aid, there has always been little patience with any lack of co-ordination among donors and implementing agencies. Some humanitarian organisations tend to take a very defensive stance on these expectations.

Recommendation 5
The expectations the humanitarian community has to life up to may not be fully realistic. Yet it is highly recommendable that organisations take a constructive and pro-active stance on developments that are largely beyond their control. In order to remain in touch with the ever growing information tide and to assure a minimum of co-ordination, organisations ought to share the information they possess and contribute to an integrated information platform.

Conclusion 6
Agreement on common geographic codes and adherence to the rules of Standard Humanitarian Assistance Reporting, have been some of the most successful ways to integrate information and co-ordinate interventions.

Recommendation 6
Organisations ought to actively contribute to the further dissemination of largely accepted and successful information standards.

Conclusion 7
In several crisis affected regions 'Who is doing what where' databases have successfully contributed to the co-ordination of humanitarian interventions.

Recommendation 7
The development of 'Who is doing what where' databases needs to be seriously considered in any major crisis situation. In general OCHA should take the lead in setting up the necessary information systems – and should be financially supported for doing so.

Conclusion 8
IT opens new, tempting opportunities for voluntary action, for in kind donations and for joint initiatives. Academic institutions may for the moment be the most obvious and uncomplicated

IT-partners for the humanitarian community. Besides, some NGO's have appeared that in as their core activity provide IT services to the humanitarian community.

Recommendation 8
Humanitarian organisations ought to actively explore the new opportunities that are opened by IT and humanitarian IT-NGO's ought to be supported.

Conclusion 9
The recent OCHA symposium on 'Best practices in humanitarian information management and exchange' successfully defined a number of principles, themes, best practices and recommendations that are highly relevant for the future of IT in humanitarian aid.

Recommendation 9
Humanitarian organisations should define their stance on the results of the OCHA symposium. Since any joint initiative will always have to remain within the boundaries of a consensus, the construction of such a consensus in the filed of humanitarian information exchange is highly desirable.

Conclusion 10
IT services and integrated IT systems do not exclude each other. Until now, IT developments in the humanitarian community have mainly followed the 'services model'. At the same time, the practice of organisations 'buying in' to certain services by providing their own information, has lead to some integration of information.

Recommendation 10
ECHO and other donors should continue to financially support the development of IT services that come to the benefit of the whole humanitarian community. Besides, they should encourage the development of IT-based information sharing systems.

Conclusion 11
The European humanitarian community is still a rather long way from developing an information sharing system along the lines of the '14 point fax system' that is used as a co-ordination tool by the European Commission and the Member States of the European Union. Most of the current objections do not fundamentally stand in the way of such a system, which might become an important co-ordination and information tool..

Recommendation 11
ECHO should seriously consider supporting any initiative to set up an IT platform for European humanitarian information exchange. It might contribute to such a platform by publishing details on the projects it supports – and by encouraging the Member States to do the same.

Conclusion 12
ECHO's partners differ greatly, both in their attitude towards IT and in their ability and opportunity to develop IT tools

Recommendation 12
Any collective initiative by the European humanitarian network in the domain of IT will have to recognise the important differences between the organisations that make up the network. Rather than setting the same standards and using the same systems for all organisations, a

European humanitarian IT platform should reflect and encourage the establishment of sub-circles and sub-networks.

Annex 1: Terms of reference

For the thematic evaluation: Information and communication: evaluation of IT humanitarian platforms and their possible utilisation as co-ordination instruments

1.   __Introduction__

a) *Context*: Together with the issue of quality in humanitarian aid, the issue of partnership was at the core of the latest ECHO's Annual Partners Meeting, held in Brussels in November 2001.

The topic was addressed in a specific workshop within the Conference, which carried out an analysis of the concept of partnership and tried to identify limits, potential and characteristics of the ECHO-NGOs partnership model.

It also emerged with some recommendations for ECHO to take forward and with some priorities for consideration by the joint working group set up to ensure the follow-up of the Conference. This latter pointed out the need to articulate more clearly the relationship between ECHO and NGOs and to explore certain topics of mutual interest.

b) *ECHO's response:* by ensuring an appropriate follow-up to the Partners Conference all along 2002 and by responding to the outcome recommendations to act as an 'intelligent' donor, ECHO aims at concretely enforcing the concept of partnership by promoting awareness of key-issues, collecting and disseminating best humanitarian practices, offering concrete know-how support to partners. This shall be done in parallel with the introduction of higher quality standard requirements for partnership and a redefinition of the concept of partnership itself. It is ECHO's intention to bring forward the debate on partnership in the framework of the Partners' Conference 2002, where it is envisaged to further kick off relevant joint actions with partners, for which ECHO is ready to carry the financing costs.

c) *Justification and timing of the evaluation*: The need for a multifaceted analysis of the means to improve co-operation between ECHO and its partners has been highlighted by the working group, which carried out a preliminary reflection and an outline of the project. The group identified three possible domains of intervention: the development of a formalised co-operation between ECHO and its partners, the development of a communication strategy from both sides, and the development of programmes to address specific policy and strategy issues. While ECHO has committed to an internal co-ordination effort in order to address the issues of improving co-operation with NGOs on strategy matters and public-oriented information, it appears appropriate to entrust an experienced consultant with the task of producing an analysis of the existing IT tools in the humanitarian sector, so as to verify their potential as co-ordination instruments.

The outcome of the evaluation will be presented and discussed within the Partners Conference 2002, scheduled on 14 and 15 October in Brussels, where it will constitute the starting basis for debate.

2. Purposes of the evaluation

2.1. Global objective

To strengthen co-operation between ECHO and its partners in order to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the European response mechanism to humanitarian emergencies.

2.2. Specific objectives

To research the Web in order to identify the existing IT tools (sites, portals, platforms, search engines etc.) in the humanitarian sector (e.g.: Relief Web).

To draft a comprehensive list of these tools with a description of their main features and the key-concept(s) behind each.

To assess the impact of these tools and formulate working hypothesis on their utilisation to improve co-ordination among humanitarian agencies and donors.

To involve humanitarian agencies in the collection of data, by means of directs contacts, web-site visiting and the elaboration and processing of a questionnaire.

To promote a participatory approach to building a common platform of information-sharing and mutual alert.

To enquire the possibility to develop a system of exchange of information between ECHO and its partners, on the model of the existing 14-point fax system, set up for the exchange of information and the co-ordination of interventions between ECHO and donor Member States.

To produce an index of tools and a set of recommendations, together with a proposal document for distribution before the Partners Conference 2002.

2.3. Desired results

The desired results of the evaluation are:

- To obtain an overall view of the IT tools used by the different humanitarian agencies in Europe, showing their objectives and the underlying logic.

- To start an analysis of the relevance and effectiveness of these tools in different organisational contexts, as compared to the declared objectives.

- To outline a first set of conclusions and recommendations both at strategy level (relations donor/implementers) and at operational level (impact on the quality of aid).

- To determine the feasibility of a "14-point fax system" to be used for the exchange of information and co-ordination between ECHO and its partners.

3. <u>Work Plan</u>

The evaluation is made in 3 stages:

3.1. Briefings in Brussels:

- A **briefing** at ECHO with the responsible staff during which all the documents available and necessary clarifications will be provided to the consultant by the requesting service. Days allocated = 1 (first week of August).

- A **debriefing** at ECHO with responsible staff and the Partners Conference Steering Group. Days allocated = 1.

- **Participation** to the Partners Annual Conference 2002 in Brussels (14-15 October). Days allocated = 2.

3.2. Data collection and study:

- The consultant will work in co-operation with the relevant ECHO staff and ECHO partners. Days allocated = 20.

3.3. Submission of report:

- The first **draft report** shall be submitted to ECHO and discussed in a meeting with ECHO staff and the Partners Conference Steering Group on 13 September 2002.

- On the basis of the feedback received from ECHO and the Steering Group, the **final report** will be submitted to ECHO by electronic transmission (Word 7.0 format or a more recent version) by 30 September 2002. ECHO should mark its agreement within 5 calendar days or request further amendments.

4. <u>Reports</u>

4.1.   The evaluation will result in the drawing up of a report written in a straightforward manner in either English or French, of a **maximum** length of 20 pages (not taking into account annexes and support documentation), and including a short Executive Summary which should appear at the beginning of the report.

4.2.   The evaluation report is an extremely important working tool for ECHO. The report format appearing below must, therefore, be strictly adhered to:

- Cover page
  - title of the report:
  - date of the report;
  - name of the consultant;

-indication that "the report has been produced and financed by at the request of the European Commission. The comments contained herein reflect the opinions of the consultant only".

- Table of contents

- Executive Summary:

  A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary is an essential component. It should focus on the key issues of the analysis, outline the main points and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned and specific recommendations. Cross-references should be made to the corresponding page or paragraph numbers in the main text.

  The structure of the Executive Summary must be as follows:

  - SUBJECT
  - DATE OF THE EVALUATION
  - CONSULTANT'S NAME
  - PURPOSE & METHODOLOGY
  - MAIN CONCLUSIONS
  - RECOMMENDATIONS
  - LESSONS LEARNED

- Main body of the report:

  The main body of the report shall elaborate the points listed in the Executive Summary. In particular, <u>for each key conclusion there should be a corresponding recommendation</u>. Recommendations should be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the analysed context, and of the resources available to implement it.

- Annexes:

  - Terms of Reference;
  - List of persons interviewed and sites visited;
  - Abbreviations

4.3. All confidential information shall be presented in a **separate annex**.

4.4. Each report shall be drawn up in 20 copies and transmitted to ECHO.

4.5. An **electronic copy** of the report (diskette or CD ROM, Word 7.0 format or a more recent version) **<u>including all annexes</u>** must be submitted together with the final report's hard copies.

5. <u>Required skills for the consultants</u>

- This evaluation is part of a set of evaluations that will be carried out by a team of experts with experience both in the humanitarian field and in the evaluation of humanitarian aid. Solid experience in relevant fields of work to the evaluation is required (familiarity with IT tools is indispensable). Knowledge of ENGLISH AND FRENCH is obligatory.

- The consultant is fully responsible of the research carried out, of the elaboration of data and of the final coherence and content of the report.

6. <u>Timetable</u>

The evaluation will last 24 working days, beginning with the date of signature of the contract by the last party and ending no later than 4 October 2002 with the acceptance of the final report. This will include 2-working-day participation to the Annual Partners Meeting on 14 and 15 October in Brussels.

Annex 2: Sources

Documents concerning the ECHO Annual Partners Meeting 2001 and the subsequent meetings of the Steering Group

Documents concerning OCHA's symposium on 'Best Practices in Humanitarian Information Exchange and Management', Geneva 4-8.2.2002 posted on www.reliefweb.int

Report on UNDHA's symposium on 'the Role of Information in Humanitarian Coordination' in October 1997, posted on www.odihpn.org

Robin Schofield, "New technologies, new challenges: information management, coordination and agency independence", report of 8.8.2002 on OCHA's symposium on 'Best Practices in Humanitarian Information Exchange and Management', Geneva 4-8.2.2002, posted on www.reliefweb.int

Col. Michael J. Dziedzic and Dr. William B. Wood, "KOSOVO BRIEF: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT OFFERS A NEW OPPORTUNITY FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN CIVILIAN AND MILITARY ENTITIES", posted on www.usip.org

Web sites of ECHO Partners (see list in Annex 5)

Other humanitarian web sites (see alphabetic list in Annex 4)

Replies of ECHO partners to the questionnaire drafted for the purpose of this report

Annex 3: Abbreviations and acronyms

AIMS	Afghanistan Information Management Service
DEPHA	Data Exchange Platform for the Horn of Africa
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Aid Office
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GIST	Geographic Information Systems Team
GLIDE	Global Identifier Numbers
HCIC	Humanitarian Community Information Center
HIC	Humanitarian Information Center
HTML	Hypertext Markup Language
ICT	Information and communication technology
IRIN	Integrated Regional Information Network
IT	Information technology
ITOS	Information Technology Outreach Services (University of Georgia)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OCHA	UN Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs
SHARE	Structured Humanitarian Assistance Reporting
SLIS	Sierra Leone Information Service
UN	United Nations
UNITeS	United Nations Information Technology Services
VOICE	Voluntary Organisations in Cooperation in Emergencies
WDWW	Who is doing what where
WWW	World Wide Web
XML	Extensible Markup Language

Annex 4: Alphabetic list of humanitarian websites

Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance (ALNAP)
www.alnap.org

Afghanistan Information Management Service (AIMS) (UNAMA)
www.aims.org.pk

Aidcommunity.org
www.aidcom.org

AlertNet (Reuters)
www.alertnet.org

Asian Disaster Reduction Center
www.adrc.or.jp

Asia Disaster Preparedness Center
www.adpc.ait.ac.th

Assistance Georgia Web (Save the Children)
www.assistancegeorgia.org.ge

AzerWeb (Open Society Institute)
www.azerweb.com

Center for Humanitarian Cooperation (CHC)
www.cooperationcenter.org

Centre for humanitarian dialogue
www.hdcentre.com

Center for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED) (Catholic University of
Leuven, Belgium)
www.cred.be

Center of Excellence in Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance
www.coe-dmha.org

CLONG / NGDO-EU Liaison Committee
www.oneworld.org/liaison

Conflict prevention network (Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik)
www.swp-berlin.org

Coordination Sud
www.coordinationsud.org

CrisisWeb (International Crisis Group)
www.crisisweb.org

DEC Disasters Emergency Committee
dec.londonweb.net

Eldis
www.eldis.org

E-Mine Electronic Mine Information Network (UN Mine Action Service)
www.mineaction.org

ECHO
www.europa.eu.int/comm/echo

European Platform for Conflict Prevention and Transformation
www.euconflict.org

Euronaid
www.euronaid.nl

Global Information and Early Warning System on
www.fao.org/giews

FEWSNET (US Agency for International Development, Famine Early Warning System)
www.fews.net

Geography Network
www.geographynetwork.com

Global Disaster Information Network (GDIN)
www.gdin.org

Global IDP Database
www.idpproject.org

Groupe de recherche et d'information sur la paix et la sécurité
www.grip.org

Heidelberg Institute of International Conflict Research
www.hiik.de

Humanitarian Action in the Northern Caucasus
www.ocha.ru

Humanitarian Affairs Review
www.humanitarian-review.org

Humanitarian Practice Network (Overseas Development Institute)
www.odihpn.org.uk

Human Rights Watch
www.hrw.org

ICVA
www.icva.ch

Information Technology Outreach Service (ITOS) (University of Georgia)
www.itos.uga.edu

Integrated Regional Information Networks (IRIN)
www.reliefweb.int/irin/

InterAction
www.interaction.org

The International Committee of the Red Cross
www.icrc.org

The International Federation of Red Cross Societies
www.ifrc.org

Journal of Humanitarian Assistance
www.jha.ac

Kosovo Humanitarian Community Information Centre (HCIC)
www.reliefweb.int/hcic

Martus
www.martus.org

Mozambique Flood Information (US Agency for International Development)
edcnts11.cr.usgs.gov/mozflooding/

NetAid
www.netaid.org

Northern Caucasus web site
www.ocha.ru

Occupied Palestinian Territories Humanitarian Information Centre
www.reliefweb.int/opt-hic

OCHA
www.reliefweb.int/ocha_ol

OneWorld
www.oneworld.org

Operation Lifeline Sudan

www.olssudan.org

PFEDA Project; Partners and Food in Emergency and Development Aid
www.univ-lille1.fr/pfeda/

PROMIS-Afghanistan
www.pcpafg.org

ProVention Consortium
www.proventionconsortium.org

Regional Disaster Information Centre (CRID)
www.disaster.info.desastres.net

Reliefguide
www.reliefguide.com

ReliefWeb
www.reliefweb.int

SIGCO (Sistema de Gestion de Informacion sobre Cooperacion Internacional)
www.reliefweb.int/SIGCO

Sphere Project
www.sphereproject.org

SUMA (Pan American Health Organization)
www.disaster.info.desastres.net/SUMA

UgandAid
www.ugandaid.net

UNHCR
www.unhcr.ch

UNICEF
www.unicef.org

Virtual Diplomacy Initiative (US Institute of Peace)
www.usip.org/oc/virtual_dipl.html

Voluntary Organisations in Cooperation in Emergencies (VOICE)
www.ngovoice.org

Volunteers in Technical Assistance (VITA)
www.vita.org

World Agricultural Information Centre (WAICENT) (FAO)
www.fao.org/waicent

World Bank Development Gateway
www.developmentgateway.org

World Health Organization Emergency and Humanitarian Action website
www.who.int/eha/disasters

Annex 5: Web sites of ECHO Partners

Austria:
AUSTRIAN HELP PROGRAM ahp.or.at
CARE ÖSTERREICH care.at
CARITAS AUSTRIA caritas- austria.at
MALTESER HOSPITAL DIENST malteser.at
HILFSWERK AUSTRIA- AUSTRIAN ASSOCIATION FOR DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION
austria. hilfswerk.at
ÖSTERREICHISCHES ROTES KREUZ roteskreuz.at
SOS- KINDERDORF INTERNATIONAL sos- kd. org

Belgium:
CARITAS SECOURS INTERNATIONAL caritasint. be
CAUSES COMMUNES
CROIX ROUGE DE Belgique redcross- fl. be
FONDS MEDICAL TROPICAL (FOMETRO)
HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL handicap.be
IEDER VOOR ALLEN : BOERENBOND.BE ?
ARTSEN ZONDER GRENZEN / MEDECINS SANS FRONTIERES: msf.be
MEMISA BELGIUM: memisa.be
OXFAM-SOLIDARITÉ: oxfamsol.be
SOLIDARITE LIBERALE INTERNATIONALE
VETERINAIRES SANS FRONTIERES BELFGIQUE vsf-belgium.org

Switserland :
CARITAS SUISSE : caritas.ch
CROIX ROUGE SUISSE : redcross.ch
MEDECINS SANS FRONTIERES-CH : geneva.msf.org
HEKS [SWISS INTERCHURCH AID] : hekseper.ch
INTERNATIONAL CATHOLIC MIGRATION COMMISSION ICMC: icmc.net
TERRE DES HOMMES: tdh.ch

Germany:
ACTION MEDEOR medeor. org
ADRA adra- ev. de
ARBEITER- SAMARITER- BUND asb-online.de
CARE DEUTSCHLAND care.de
DÄZ
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION welthungerhilfe.de
DEUTSCHER CARITASVERBAND caritas-international.de
DEUTSCHES ROTES KREUZ drk.de / rotkreuz.de
DIAKONIE DER EVANGELISCHEN KIRCHE IN DEUTSCHLAND diakonie-emergency-aid.org
HELP - Hilfe zur Selbsthilfe e. V.
HILFE FÜR KINDER IN NOT
HUMANITARIAN CARGO CARRIERS (HCC) hcc-berlin.org
JOHANNITER- UNFALLHILFE E. V. johanniter. de
KINDERBERG INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARE HILFSORGANISATION E. V. kinderberg. org
LAZARUS HILFSWERK lazarus.de
MALTESER HILFSDIENST malteser-ald.de
MEDICO INTERNATIONAL medico.de
WORLD VISION DEUTSCHLAND worldvision.de

Denmark:
ADRA – ADVENTIST DEVELOPMENT AND RELIEF AGENCY adra.dk
ASF DANSK FOLKEHJAELP asf-dansk-folkehjaelp.dk
CARITAS DENMARK caritas.dk
DANISH REFUGEE COUNCIL / DANSK FLYGTNINGEHAELP drc.dk
DANSK RODE KORS redcross.dk
FOLKEKIRKENS NODHJAELP-DANCHURCHAID dca.dk

MISSION OST miseast.org (miseast.be)
RED BARNET- DENMARK redbarnet.dk

Spain :
A. C. S. U. R. ASOCIACION PARA LA COOPERACION CON EL SUR acsur. org
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE (ACH) achesp.   org
ASAMBLEA DE COOPERACION POR LA PAZ (ACP) acpp. com
ASOCIACION NAVARRA NUEVO FUTURO (ANNF) nuevo- futuro. org
AYUDA EN ACCION ayudaenaccion. org
CARITAS ESPAÑOLA caritas- espa. org
CENTRO DE COMUNICACION, INVESTIGACION Y DOCUMENTACION EUROPA- AMERICA
LATINA (CIDEAL) cideal. org
CODESPA codespas. org
COMITE INTERNACIONAL DE RESCATE (CIR) ongrescate. org
CRUZ ROJA ESPAÑOLA cruzroja. es
ENTRECULTURAS - FE Y ALEGRIA entreculturas. org
FARMACEUTICOS SIN FRONTERAS (FSF)
GEOLOGOS DEL MUNDO
INTERMON intermon. org
MEDICOS DEL MUNDO
MEDICOS SIN FRONTERAS barcelona. msf. org
MEDICUS MUNDI ESPAÑA medicusmundi. es
MOVIMIENTO POR LA PAZ, EL DESARME Y LA LIBERTAD (MPDL)
NOUS CAMINS
PAZ Y TERCER MUNDO (PTM)
SOLIDARIDAD INTERNACIONAL (SI) solidaridad. org

France :
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM acf. imaginet. fr
ACTION D'URGENCE INTERNATIONALE aui- ong. org
AGENCE D'AIDE A LA COOPERATION TECHNIQUE ET AU DEVELOPPEMENT (ACTED) acted. org
AIDE MEDICALE INTERNATIONALE amifrance. org
ASSOCIATION POUR L' ACTION HUMANI TAIRE
ATLAS LOGISTIQUE atlas- logistique. org
AVIATION SANS FRONTIERES (ASF) asf- fr.org
CARE- FRANCE carefrance. org
COMITE D'AIDE MEDICALE ET DE PARRAINAGE SANS FRONTIERES (CAM) cam- fr.org
CROIX- ROUGE FRANCAISE croix- rouge. fr
DIA
ENFANTS DU MONDE/DROITS DE L'HOMME (EMDH) emdh. org
ENFANTS REFUGIES DU MONDE
FRANCE LIBERTES FONDATION DANIELLE MITTERRAND
HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL/ ACTION NORD SUD FRANCE handicap- international. org
INITIATIVE DEVELOPPEMENT
INTERAIDE
INTERVENIR
MEDECINS DU MONDE medecinsdumonde.net
MEDECINS SANS FRONTIERES paris. msf. org
MISSION D'AIDE AU DEVELOPPEMENT DES ECONOMIES RURALES (MADERA)
OEUVRES HOSPITALIERES FRANCAISES DE L'ORDRE DE MALTE
PHARMACIENS SANS FRONTIERES COMITE INTERNATIONAL (P. S. F. C. I.) psf- ci. org
PREMIERE URGENCE premiere- urgence.org
SECOURS CATHOLIQUE- CARITAS- FRANCE secours- catholique. asso. fr
SECOURS POPULAIRE FRANCAIS secourspopulaire. asso. fr
SOLIDARITE PROTESTANTE FRANCE ARMENIE
SOLIDARITES solidarites. org
TELECOMS SANS FRONTIERES tsfi. org
TRIANGLE

Finland:

FINNCHURCHAID
SUOMEN PUNAINEN RISTI (Croix Rouge Finlande) redcross. Fi

Greece
EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE
GREEK COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY
HELLENIC INSTITUTE OF SOLIDARITY AND COOPERATION (HELINAS)
HELLENIC RED CROSS redcross. gr
INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL AFFAIRS iisa.co.yu (Belgrade field office)
INTERNATIONAL ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN CHARITIES
KESSA DIMITRA – GR kessa.dimitra. gr
MEDECINS DU MONDE mdmgreece. Gr

Italy
ALISEI (ex NUOVA FRONTIERA) alisei. org
AMICI DEI BAMBINI (Ai. Bi.) aibi. it
ARCI Cultura e Sviluppo (ARCS) arci. it
ASSOCIAZIONE ITALIANA AMICI DI RAOUL FOLLEREAU (AIFO) aifo. it
ASSOCIAZIONE ITALIANA PER LA SOLIDARIETA TRA I POPOLI (AISPO)
ASSOCIAZIONE PER LA PARTECIPAZIONE ALLO SVILUPPO (APS)
ASSOCIAZIONE PER LA SOLIDARIETA INTERNAZIONALE IN ASIA (ASIA)
ASSOCIAZIONE VOLONTARI PER IL SERVIZIO INTERNAZIONALE (AVSI) avsi. org
CARITAS ITALIA caritasitaliana. it
CENTRO REGIONALE D'INTERVENTO PER LA COOPERAZIONE (CRIC)
CESVI Cooperazione e Sviluppo cesvi. org
COMITATO COLLABORAZIONE MEDICA (CCM)
COMITATO DI COORDINAMENTO DELLE ORGANIZZAZIONI PER IL SERVIZIO
VOLONTARIO (COSV)
COMITATO EUROPEO PER LA FORMAZIONE E L'AGRICOLTURA (CEFA)
COMITATO INTERNAZIONALE PER LO SVILUPPO DEI POPOLI (CISP) cisp- ngo. org
COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (COOPI)
COOPERAZIONE ITALIANA NORD SUD (CINS)
COOPERAZIONE PER LO SVILUPPO DEI PAESI EMERGENTI (COSPE)
CROCE ROSSA ITALIANA
CUAMM cuamm. org
EMERGENCY emergency. it
GRUPPO DI VOLONTARIATO CIVILE (GVC)
ISTITUTO PER LA COOPERAZIONE UNIVERSITARIA (ICU) icu. it
ISTITUTO SINDACALE PER LA COOPERAZIONE ALLO SVILUPPO (ISCOS)
INTERSOS (ASSOCIAZIONE UMANITARIA PER L'EMERGENZIA) intersos. org
LVIA – ASSOCIAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE VOLONTARI LAICI
MOVIMENTO SVILUPPO E PACE
MOVIMONDO
TERRA NUOVA
UN PONTE PER… unponteper. it
TERRE DES HOMMES ITALIA tdhitaly. org
VISPE – Volontari Italiani Solidarieta Paesi Emergenti

Ireland
CONCERN WORLDWIDE concern. ie
GOAL goal.ie
IRISH RED CROSS SOCIETY
REFUGEE TRUST
TROCAIRE trocaire. ie
WORLD VISION IRELAND wvi.org

Luxemburg
CARITAS caritas. lu
CROIX ROUGE LUXEMBOURG croix- rouge. lu
MEDECINS SANS FRONTIERES luxembourg. msf.org

Netherlands
CORDAID cordaid. nl
CARE NEDERLAND (former Dutch Relief & rehabilitation agency) carenederland.org HEALTH NET INTERNATIONAL hni. nl
HET NEDERLANDSE RODE KRUIS redcross. nl
INTERCHURCH ORGANIZATION FOR DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION (ICCO) icco. nl
MEDECINS SANS FRONTIERES/ARTSEN ZONDER GRENZEN amsterdam. msf. org NOVIB (NETHERLANDS ORGANIZATION FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION) novib. nl
SAVE THE CHILDREN – NL savethechildren. nl
ZOA REFUGEE CARE ZOAweb. org

Norway
NORWEGIAN CHURCH AID nca..no
NORWEGIAN PEOPLE'S AID npaid.org
NORWEGIAN RED CROSS redcross. no
NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL nrc. no

Portugal
ASSISTENCIA MEDICA INTERNATIONAL (AMI)
ASSOCIACAO DE BENEFICENCIA LUSO- ALEMA (ABLA)
ASSOCI ACAO PARA A COOPERACAO INTERCAMBIO E CULTURA (CIC)
CRUZ VERMELHA PORTUGUESA
MEDICOS DO MUNDO
OIKOS oikos. pt

Sweden :
CARITAS SWEDEN caritas.se
CHURCH OF SWEDEN AID svenskakyrkan. se
DIAKONIA- SWEDEN diakonia. se ERIKSHALPEN erikshjalpen. se
INTERNATIONAL AID SWEDEN ias.nu
PMU- IINTERLIFE pmu.se
THE QANDIL PROJECT
MEDECINS DU MONDE
SVENSKA RODA KORSET redcross.se
SWEDISH COMMITTEE FOR AFGHANISTAN sak.a.se

United Kingdom:
ACTIONAID actionaid.org.uk
AGA KHAN FOUNDATION akdn.org; akf. org. uk
AGENCY FOR CO- OPERATION AND RESEARCH IN DEVELOPMENT; ASSOCIATION DE COOPERATION ET DE RECHERCHES POUR LE DEVELOPPEMENT (A. C. O. R. D) acord.org.uk
THE AMAR INTERNATIONAL CHARITABLE FOUNDATION amar.demon.co.uk
BRITISH RED CROSS redcross. org. uk
CARE INTERNATIONAL UK ciuk. org
CATHOLIC AGENCY FOR OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT (CAFOD) cafod. org. uk
CHRISTIAN AID christian-aid.org
CONCERN UNIVERSAL concern- universal. org
THE EUROPEAN CHILDREN'S TRUST eur- child- trust. org. uk
FOOD FOR THE HUNGRY / UK uk.fhi.net
THE HALO TRUST halotrust.org
HELPAGE INTERNATIONAL helpage.org
ISLAMIC RELIEF islamic-relief.com
MARIE STOPES INTERNATIONAL stopes.org.uk
MEDAIR UK medair.org.uk
MEDICAL AID FOR PALESTINIANS map-uk.org
MEDICAL EMERGENCY RELIEF INTERNATIONAL (MERLIN) merlin. org. uk
MERCY CORPS SCOTLAND mercycorps- scotland. org
MINES ADVISORY GROUP (MAG) mag. org. uk

OCKENDEN INTERNATIONAL (OI) ockenden. org. uk
OXFAM UK oxfam. org. uk
PLAN INTERNATIONAL plan- international. org. uk
PROJECT HOPE projecthopeuk. org
SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND scfuk. org. uk
TEARFUND tearfund.org
VETAID UK vetaid.org
WORLD VISION UK worldvision.org.uk

United States:
CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES (CRS) catholicrelief.org
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE intrescom.org
INTERNATIONAL ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN CHARITIES iocc.org

International
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE (FICR) ifrc.org
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX ROUGE (CICR) icrc.org
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (IOM) iom.int
ORDRE SOUVERAIN ET MILITAIRE DE ST. JEAN DE JERUSALEM, DE RHODES ET DE MALTE

Annex 6: Questionnaire on IT tools in humanitarian aid

Part I: IT within your organisation

1. Do all members of your organisation have access to the same computer-network? Or are there large gaps, for example between the network at HQ and the computers used in the field? For which aspects of your organisation's work is IT crucial (communications, finance, etc.)?

2. Does your organisation have a web site? What is the address? What are the main features of the web site? Is it mainly informative? Does it allow to make queries through e-mail and to make online donations? Does it provide links to other organisations? Does it provide services for other organisations, such as web-guides, discussion boards etc.?

3. How does the information get to your organisation's web site? Is the site directly linked to other computer-applications within your organisation, such as databases? Or is it managed separately as a stand-alone tool?

4. Can you give an indication of how many staff members are dedicated to IT within your organisation as related to the overall size of the organisation? And can you give an indication of your organisation's yearly expenditure on IT as related to the overall budget?

5. Can you describe the aims and objectives of your organisation's IT efforts for the near future?

6. Are there any other remarks you would like to make regarding the current and future role of information technology in the work of your organisation?

Part II: IT tools developed by other organisations

7. Can you describe to what extent your organisation relies on the Internet to obtain information on the humanitarian situation around the world? Which information sites and sources are most widely used within your organisation? Does your organisation systematically keep track of the way in which the Internet is used as an information source?

8. What Internet-based communication services does your organisation use? (e.g. e-mail, e-mail discussion groups, telephone conferencing, video conferencing, etc.) Who provides these services to your organisation?

9. Does your organisation use the Internet for the procurement of goods? How?

10. Does your organisation use the Internet to recruit personnel? How?

11. Are there any other remarks you would like to make on the use your organisation makes of the Internet to obtain information and services?

Part III: Partnership and IT

Is your organisation actively involved in joint IT initiatives with other organisations?

12. Are there serious obstacles that prohibit your organisation from taking part in such initiatives?

13. Do you think that the integration of dispersed information through new IT tools might improve the co-ordination, and thereby the efficiency and effectiveness, of aid efforts?

14. What role and opportunities do you see for the European humanitarian network in the development of such new IT tools?

15. Would your organisation be willing to systematically provide information on its programmes and projects, for example along the lines of the attached form?

16. Are there any other remarks you would like to make on the issue of IT in humanitarian aid, particularly in the context of your organisation's partnership with ECHO?

Humanitarian aid project information sheet

1. Organisation			
2. Value	cash/in-kind	currency:	amount:
3. Recipient country(ies) and breakdown *(please use a continuation sheet if necessary)*			amount:
			amount:
4. Crisis/Disaster			
5. Date of decision	DDMMYY		
5a. Project code			
6. Donor(s)	name:		amount:
	name:		amount:
7. Local implementing agency(ies)			
8. Area(s) of destination			

9. Project descrip-tion	**Objective:**			
	Beneficiary group:			
	Aid sector(s)	Logistics & operational support/Health & Medical/ Sanitation/Food/Social/Water/Shelter/ Transport/Education/Institutions/Demining/Energy/Post-conflict reconstruction/Agriculture/Human Rights/Household items/Other (describe)		
	Type of aid	Core humanitarian/Food aid/Disaster Preparedness & Prevention/Other (describe)		
	Continuum	Urgent relief	Care and maintenance	Rehabilitation	Development
	Duration	**Start** (DDMMYY)		**End** (DDMMYY)

10. Name and tel. no. of contact person	
11. Embargo date	

THE FOLLOWING FIELDS MUST BE COMPLETED WHENEVER AN IN-KIND CONTRIBUTION IS MADE:

12. Description of relief items and services provided; quantity		
13. Transport	land/sea/air	value:
14. Estimated date/place of arrival		

Annex 7: The 14 point fax

1. Donor				
2. Value	Cash/in-kind	currency		amount
3. Recipient country(ies) and breakdown *(please use a continuation sheet if necessary)*			amount:	
			amount:	
			amount:	
4. Crisis/Disaster .				
5. Date of decision	DDMMYY			
5a. Project code				
6. Channel(s) *(please use a continuation sheet if necessary)* TYPE : choose between NGO/UN/ IGO/Red Cross/Bilateral (direct)/ Private/Other (specify)	name		type	amount
	name		type	amount
	name		type	amount
7. Local implementing agency				
8. Area of destination				

9. Description of aid	**Objective:**			
	Benef. group:			
	Aid sector(s)	Logistics & operational support/Health & Medical/ Sanitation/Food/Social/Water/Shelter/ Transport/Education/Institutions/Demining/Energy/ Post-conflict reconstruction/Non-earmarked grant/Agriculture/Human Rights/Household items/Other (describe)		
	Type of aid	**Core humanitaria**n/Other food aid/Other refugee/Disaster Preparedness/Prevention/Other (describe)		
	Continuum	Urgent relief	Care and maintenance	Rehabilitation	Development
	Duration	**Start** (DDMMYY)		**End**(DDMMYY)

10. Budgetary source		
11. Name and tel. no. of contact person		
11a. Embargo date		

THE FOLLOWING FIELDS MUST BE COMPLETED WHENEVER AN IN-KIND CONTRIBUTION IS MADE:

12. Description of relief items and services provided; quantity		
13. Transport	land/sea/air	value
14. Estimated date/place of arrival		