

# Findings from the systematic review of evaluations by H2H Network member organisations

April 2022



Image source: Alvaro Reyes, Unsplash



**BODHI**  
GLOBAL ANALYSIS

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Project Background . . . . .	4
2.2	Review Guidelines and Goals from H2H . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Review Methodology</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Phase 1 – Scoping and Inception . . . . .	7
3.2	Phase 2 – Data Review, Synthesis and Analysis . . . . .	9
<b>4</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Annexes</b>	<b>29</b>
7.1	Included Service Providers . . . . .	29
7.2	Coding Outputs . . . . .	31

## List of Acronyms

**ACF** Action Contre la Faim / Action Against Hunger

**ASTROS** Association of Road Transport Operators of Sofala Province

**CCE** Communications and Community Engagement

**DFID** Department for International Development

**H2H** Humanitarian to Humanitarian

**KIIs** Key Informant Interviews

**MEAL** Monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning

**MSF** Médecins Sans Frontières

**PDM** Post Distribution Monitoring

**SI** Solidarités International

**TNH** The New Humanitarian

**ToC** Theory of Change

**ToR** Terms of Reference

**VSPD** Vanuatu Society for People with Disabilities

**WASH** Water, Sanitation and Hygiene



image source: H2H website

## 1. Executive Summary

This systematic review assessed the evidence of the Humanitarian to Humanitarian (H2H) organisation model's effectiveness in action; its alignment with the broad strategic aims of the network; and, its contribution to humanitarian action globally. To conduct this review, Bodhi Global Analysis systematically reviewed the H2H body of evidence - in the form of documentation and key informant interviews (KIIs) - against the Review Questions (RQs). Assessment utilised a systematic quantitative document review (against RQs and internal/external criteria), and qualitative synthesis.

Overall, this review generated the following findings:

- Review Question 1: Provided evidence supports the notion that H2H created an enabling environment for humanitarian action, enhancing the agency of crisis affected populations.

- Evidence suggests that H2H contributed to the enabling environment through fostering cross-network information sharing on pressing humanitarian concerns, particularly with respect to COVID-19 response.
  - Members worked concertedly to improve affected populations' agency through the employment of information dissemination and community feedback mechanisms.
  - Select interventions contributed to a stronger humanitarian environment and improved agency through employment of assessments to ensure relevant programming that assisted affected populations in the manner which they required and desired.
  - Select interventions contributed to realised agency through mobilising populations from within target communities to actively implement the interventions (e.g., supporting local journalists to combat misinformation within their communities).
- Review Question 2: Provided evidence suggests that the H2H fund contributed towards more contextually adapted humanitarian action by making the sector more inclusive and diverse.
    - H2H improved inclusivity and diversity through including specialised actors (in the network) who had been reportedly excluded from funding at H2H's visibility level, in turn enabling engagement with previously inaccessible humanitarian actors.
    - Funding also enabled network members, as specialised actors, to work with directly-placed local organisations who often cannot access international donor funding.
    - While not an explicit directive, network members also reportedly improved contextual adaptation through localising efforts, including local actors and voices in decision-making processes and implementation.
- Review Question 3: Provided evidence suggests that H2H fostered collaboration and connectedness both between humanitarian agencies and between the humanitarian sector and non-humanitarian actors.
    - Network members were enthusiastic about the collaboration opportunities facilitated by H2H, with one member describing H2H as a 'matchmaker' who is good at reaching out, identifying the strengths of its members and proposing collaboration opportunities.
    - The review evidenced several examples of collaboration between members both within and outside of H2H activations. The review also evidenced examples of collaboration between members and non-members, facilitated through connections from the network.
    - H2H-provided opportunities for transfer of best practices also fostered connectedness. Specifically, evidence identified the flow of best practices and lessons learnt both horizontally (across H2H partner organisations) and vertically (to and from other partners).

- Internal criteria: Provided documentation evidenced H2H value-add.
  - Funding, knowledge sharing, networking and collaboration opportunities stood out as the primary value added by H2H Network membership, with all key informants mentioning funding and/or collaboration opportunities as key value-adds.
  - Specifically regarding funding, H2H facilitated investments that were reportedly not otherwise possible, including core staff and services, or expanded activity scale.
- Internal criteria: Network members' internal evidence generation and performance monitoring (i.e., MEAL) efforts varied in comprehensiveness.
  - Provided documentation largely discussed performance objectives and targets, although standards varied, by design.
  - While several members had not undertaken any formal evaluation of their programmes, most of the members reported high value for their services among the target groups.

Overall, the findings from this study suggest that H2H is meeting its objectives, through contributing to and furthering an enabling environment for humanitarian action, contextually adapted humanitarian action and improved collaboration and connectedness between humanitarian actors. Moreover, evidence suggests that the H2H model supports members, adding value in key programmatic and operational areas. The evidence underlying these conclusions is 'moderate' (Review Questions) to 'high' (Internal criteria 1) in strength, indicating room for improvement in the network's internal evidence generation capacity.



## 2. Introduction

### 2.1. Project Background

In support of the H2H Network's commitment to systematic learning, Bodhi Global Analysis conducted a review of available evidence and documentation. The H2H ('humanitarian to humanitarian') Network is intended to support a network of 'humanitarian enablers' – i.e., service providers that support the wider humanitarian response system – by providing them with funding, collaboration opportunities and knowledge sharing.<sup>1 2</sup> The service providers (also referred to here as 'members') within the H2H Network do not typically provide services directly to people affected by crises; rather, they provide services to other humanitarian actors through

<sup>1</sup>Danish Refugee Council (DRC). (2021). Annex B: Terms of Reference (ToR) For: Systematic review of evaluations by H2H Network member organisations.

<sup>2</sup>H2H Network. (2022). The H2H Network: Driving collective action in the humanitarian system. Funding Concept Note, January 2022.

technical services, logistical support and/or the development of new or improved approaches. The service providers in the H2H Network share the common goal of supporting more effective, more accountable and wider-scale humanitarian action,<sup>3</sup> as well as the common values of diversity, connectedness and evolution.<sup>4</sup>

Humanitarian actors that have benefitted from H2H Network services include donors, operational agencies, decision-makers and local responders.<sup>5</sup> Since its inception in 2016, the H2H Network has grown to consist of over 60 service providers. The Network is intended to help smaller, niche organisations overcome barriers to entry.<sup>6</sup> H2H funding is intended to allow for rapid deployment to support and complement humanitarian action. Moreover, once H2H funds a service package, the services become open source.<sup>7</sup>

The review's primary objective is to "review the evidence of the H2H organisation model's effectiveness in action, its performance against the new strategic direction of the network, and its contribution to humanitarian action globally."<sup>8</sup>

## 2.2. Review Guidelines and Goals from H2H

As H2H itself notes, the Network 'is a new and still emerging concept, and the need to learn from and evidence its practical approach and way of working is imperative.'<sup>9</sup> H2H described its new strategic direction, which consists of a theory of change (ToC) and a recognition of what its members like, don't like and want going forward. Specifically, the 'theory of change for H2H is that small, specialised, highly connected agencies can enable the wider humanitarian system by providing niche capabilities that accelerate the effectiveness of a response.'<sup>10</sup> H2H's new value proposition is aimed at framing the Network as a 'swarm' of change agents, rather than disparate parallel programmes, that offer complementary, rather than alternative, services.<sup>11</sup> This approach views the humanitarian landscape as an 'ecosystem' where the Network members interact with the broader humanitarian community in a 'plus-sum,' rather than zero-sum, manner.<sup>12</sup> With these ideas in mind, the H2H Network's approach is based on three core values: diversity, connectedness and evolution. That is, the Network aims to advance institutional diversity within the humanitarian sector, especially for smaller organisations. For connectedness, it aims to help broker partnerships between members and clients, as well as to facilitate learning between members. The H2H Network's new strategic direction and new

---

<sup>3</sup>DRC 2021. Annex B.

<sup>4</sup>H2H 2022. Funding Concept Note.

<sup>5</sup>H2H 2022. Funding Concept Note.

<sup>6</sup>DRC 2021. Annex B.

<sup>7</sup>H2H 2022. Funding Concept Note.

<sup>8</sup>DRC 2021. Annex B: p.2.

<sup>9</sup>H2H 2022. Funding Concept Note: p.3.

<sup>10</sup>H2H Network. Strategy framing document for H2H. Internal document: p.2.

<sup>11</sup>H2H Network. H2H Platform Value Proposition and Pitch. Internal document. p.1.

<sup>12</sup>H2H Network. H2H Platform Value Proposition and Pitch. Internal document. p.2.

value proposition both emphasise expanding diversity and inclusion within the humanitarian landscape and fostering collaboration. The new strategic direction also emphasises the importance of H2H added-value, primarily through offering smaller organisations opportunities for funding, collaboration, knowledge sharing and credibility.

The review team therefore assessed for evidence of the realisation of these values, along with the key questions presented in the ToR, to create specific sets of criteria for reviewing the submitted documents. These sets of criteria are outlined in the following section.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>The DFID criterion 'credibility' was not assessed, as it does not apply to single pieces of evidence. Additionally, for parsimony collaboration and knowledge sharing were collapsed into a single concept.



Image source: Humanity and Inclusion

### 3. Review Methodology

#### 3.1. Phase 1 – Scoping and Inception

In Phase 1 of this review, the team conducted an initial review and synthesis of the over 600 pieces of document-based evidence received from the H2H Network. The research team distilled the H2H Network’s goals for this systematic review into three sets of criteria: (1) the objectives and key questions outlined in the ToR provided by H2H; (2) achievements made, progress against targets and H2H value-add (labelled here as ‘internal criteria’); and (3) a set of external criteria for documents that were designed as research studies.<sup>1</sup>

##### ***Inclusion Criteria***

<sup>1</sup>DFID, ‘A DFID practice paper: Assessing the Strength of Evidence’ (2013): pg 14

The team first systematically collated and recorded all received document-based evidence into a single catalogue that listed the service provider(s), project name, type of document and methodology expressed in each document. The team received 606 pieces of document-based evidence.

The team then conducted a preliminary review of every document and determined criteria for the inclusion of document-based evidence in this analysis, in particular assessing each document's level of usefulness for the purpose of this review.

As a result of this process, Bodhi used the following inclusion criteria:

- Documents are formal products rather than rough notes, and are complete or final versions;
- Documents are relevant to one or more of the analysis objectives (i.e., they pertain to the H2H Network's goals for this systematic review).

Given evidence limitations (for more on this point, please see '11.a.iii Limitations' below), the team relied only on these two inclusion criteria to avoid restricting the available data and documentation further and hence further constricting the scope of the analysis.

Where documents did not meet these criteria, the review team did not include them within the analysis; a total of 468 pieces of evidence were removed. However, the review team did track the proportion of documentation meeting and not meeting the criteria in order to be able to draw broader conclusions relating to the strength of the overall body of evidence.

Included document-based evidence is of the following types: final narrative reports; after action reports; MEAL logs; after-deployment reports; narrative reports; applications; and case studies. These pieces of evidence match the core inclusion criteria of being of a minimum standard of quality, while also being relevant.

### **Document Synthesis**

Following this collation step, the team conducted a pilot assessment of ten examples of useful reports: a final narrative report; an after action report; an application; a lessons learned report; a project update; a user interview; two types of MEAL logs (one for a single service provider and one for several service providers); and two types of case studies (one produced internally by the service provider and one produced by an external consultant).<sup>2</sup> These materials were assessed against the review questions outlined in the ToR, as well as the internal and external criteria. This pilot validated the evidence assessment approach, while illustrating limitations.

At this stage, the review team also reached out to all membership contacts provided for additional documentation and evidence, and subsequently incorporated all newly-submitted relevant materials.

---

<sup>2</sup>Details of these examples can be found here

**Scoping Limitations**

Most provided documentation, or 77 per cent, failed to meet inclusion criteria; excluded documents were largely draft versions (thus, the total sample universe was artificially inflated) or not relevant (e.g., financial narratives). Therefore, the review is critically limited by overall document quality and relevance. This limitation challenged the extent to which the review team was able to centre the analysis around the quantitative assessment against coding criteria. For example, document-based evidence pertaining to the following categories are limited or unavailable:

- Detailed monitoring and evaluation reports that provide measurable targets and progress (e.g., completed results frameworks); and
- Quality research and analyses on H2H membership’s work that aligns with external strength of evidence criteria (e.g., external evaluations).

The review team recognises that limited available documentation is in part a consequence of the H2H Network’s operating model which seeks to deliver funding and support swiftly, limiting cumbersome and onerous reporting and monitoring requirements on its membership. In fact, preventing overly burdensome documentation is part of H2H’s future strategy. In its Strategic Framing document, H2H recognised that many of its members had voiced dissatisfaction with the perceived administrative burdens, and expressed its intention to streamline its administrative processes.<sup>3</sup>

## 3.2. Phase 2 – Data Review, Synthesis and Analysis

The following subsections set out the team’s analysis approach, which included: 1) coding evidence against the sets of criteria, 2) conducting a systematic qualitative review of the documents in full; and, 3) thematically analysing data from the Key Informant Interviews (KIIs).

**Coding Documents**

The review team developed the following steps in coding documents against the sets of criteria. First, each document which meets the core inclusion criteria of quality and relevance was coded against the Review Questions set out in the ToR using numerical scoring as follows:

- Created an enabling environment for humanitarian action, enhancing the agency of crisis affected populations
  - Code evidence using the following scoring: 1 = no evidence of enabling environment created; 2 = some evidence of enabling environment created; 3 = strong evidence of enabling environment created.

---

<sup>3</sup>Strategy framing document for H2H.

- Contributed towards more contextually adapted humanitarian action by making the sector more inclusive and diverse
  - Code evidence using the following scoring: 1 = no evidence of contribution; 2 = some evidence of contribution; 3 = strong evidence of contribution.
- Fostered collaboration and connectedness both between humanitarian agencies and between the humanitarian sector and non-humanitarian actors
  - Code evidence using the following scoring: 1 = no evidence of collaboration and connectedness fostered; 2 = some evidence of collaboration and connectedness fostered; 3 = strong evidence of collaboration and connectedness fostered.

For each key question, the team defined:

- ‘Some evidence’ as “document mentions achievement of [key question] with limited explanatory detail on mechanism and extent of achievement”;
- ‘Strong evidence’ as “document mentions achievement of [key question] with explanatory detail on mechanism and extent of achievement”.

As such, materials with higher-quality evidence earn higher scores (maximum score = 3 per objective) while those with lower-quality evidence are given lower scores (minimum score = 1 per objective). The documents were then scored against several internal and external criteria, namely evidence of H2H value-add and evidence of member-led evidence generation and performance monitoring.

Once each document was coded, the team reviewed each document in-depth to consider its strength of evidence, scoring according to the coding criteria. The utilised coding framework is found here.

### **Analytical Approach**

The analytical approach followed the steps outline below:

1. Following the coding and assessment of strength of evidence, the research team assessed the overall body of evidence by calculating the size of the body, strength of the body and consistency of the body.
2. The team then assessed the achievements against each objective by multiplying the extent of evidence (i.e., coding outputs) by the average of the percent of total points of the internal and external criteria, for each selected document.<sup>4</sup> The outputs from this exercise are found under ‘VI.b Coding Outputs’.

---

<sup>4</sup>Pieces of evidence that were double coded used the average score.

3. Documents identified as both relevant and complete (i.e., through the scoping exercise) were then reviewed in full, with the review team’s analysis assessing documents for evidence of achievement against the Review Questions.
4. The team then produced a thematic analysis of the content from the KIIs.

Through these approaches, the team employed triangulation throughout. The quantitative coding was largely used as a framing device, with data from the qualitative document synthesis providing contextualisation and depth.

### **Coding Outputs**

The corpus of reviewed evidence ranged from ‘moderate’ to ‘high’ strength of evidence against the Review Question criteria and internal criteria, suggesting strong evidence of programmatic success.<sup>5</sup> Specifically, the strongest evidence was found in relation to Review Question 3, while the (marginally) weaker evidence was found in relation to Review Question 2. The strongest evidence within the internal criteria was found in relation to internal criterion 1, while the (marginally) weaker evidence was found in relation to internal criterion 3. These findings are supported by evidence from the qualitative review, which is documented under the proceeding finding header. Full outputs are located in the Annex section.

**Coding and Analysis Limitations** Aligned to the internal criteria, much of the documentation referenced instances of collaboration and value-added from the H2H Network, typically referring to funding and sometimes to collaboration opportunities. Assessing projects’ progress against specific targets proved more challenging, because targets are often unspecified or vague (e.g., they lack numerical indicators). Moreover, while some intra-agency collaboration is mentioned in some of the evidence, few address measures for enhancing the agency of crisis-affected populations, for increasing inclusivity and diversity in humanitarian action or for collaborating with non-humanitarian actors. The review team reviewed the document-based evidence against these internal criteria using binary scores as well.

The external criteria were taken from (former) DFID’s 2013 ‘Assessing the Strength of Evidence’ practice paper. Few documents met suitability criteria to be assessed against the external criteria, as these documents were not written to be held to robust academic-oriented standards. To account for this, the review team reviewed the materials against the external criteria using binary scores, only for fully relevant evidence (i.e., that which was explicitly framed as a research study). Moreover, the outputs from this exercise did not serve as stand-alone findings, or weigh heavily in the production of findings.

---

<sup>5</sup>See Annex on Coding Outputs



Image source: H2H Network's website

## 4. Findings

**Members valued several components of H2H's value-add, but believe that H2H could improve its offer.** Based on 27 interviews with member representatives, H2H determined that what its members value most about being part of the H2H Network include: collaboration opportunities; seed funding; the strategic potential offered by membership; networking opportunities; the sharing of knowledge, challenges and lessons learned; and the credibility and stamp of quality that come with membership. H2H determined that its members are most challenged by the burden of administrative requirements.<sup>1,2</sup>

In terms of what members want going forward, H2H learned that its members would especially like to see: more localisation and contact with the global south; some exclusivity regarding guidelines and criteria for membership; improved collaboration platforms; increased visibility and advocacy for small organisations; a better, more substantive website that includes a re-

<sup>1</sup>Note, the source does not specify when these interviews took place.

<sup>2</sup>Strategy Framing Document for H2H

source library; a streamlined funding process, reduced due diligence and longer timeframes; and, lastly, help with monitoring and evaluation.<sup>3</sup>

Moreover, collaboration came out strongly in the narrative reports as a value-add. Organisations observed that through partnerships and collaborations with other network members, they were able to create synergies and compliment each other's expertise in the implementation of programmes. Collaboration as a value-add also was noted with respect to information sharing, including the transfer of lessons learnt and best practices among members. The New Humanitarian (TNH)'s narrative report noted how the project reminded them of the 'value of collaboration' with regular communication with different actors, 'including through H2H', enabling them to understand their contexts of operation better.<sup>4</sup> Insecurity Insight further supports this and notes that collaboration between H2H members 'enhances the outputs', going on to highlight collaboration with other member organisations.<sup>5</sup>

**Provided evidence supports the notion that H2H created an enabling environment for humanitarian action, enhancing the agency of crisis affected populations.** The quantitative assessment identified 'moderately strong' evidence to support this finding, which was strengthened by findings from the provided documentation and KIIs. Overall, evidence illustrates the creation of an enabling environment through fostering cross-network information sharing on pressing humanitarian concerns. COVID-19 response was cited as an example of this environment by several respondents. One network member stated that readily available access to programmes in different contexts is helpful for quickly designing future COVID-19 response programmes.<sup>6</sup>

Members also worked concertedly to improve affected populations' agency through the employment of information dissemination and community feedback mechanisms. For example, the CDAC Network's "Embedding Communication and Community Engagement" project, from the start of the response to Category 5 Cyclone Harold in Vanuatu involved sharing life-saving information in person and through print and digital media, including information on disaster response and preparedness.<sup>7,8</sup> The Communications and Community Engagement (CCE) Sub-Cluster developed a community feedback mechanism to improve responder effectiveness and accountability. This mechanism facilitated two-way communication between affected populations and responders. Information gathered from this feedback mechanism was also shared, representing improved agency through knowledge sharing.

A stronger humanitarian environment and improved agency was also reportedly improved through employment of assessments, to ensure relevant programming that assisted affected populations in the manner in which they required and desired. Atlas Logistique's "Humanitar-

<sup>3</sup>Strategy Framing Document for H2H

<sup>4</sup>The New Humanitarian. (2020). Narrative report: 'Humanitarian logistics analysis and access in Sofola province.'

<sup>5</sup>Insecurity Insight. (2020). Narrative Report: 'COVID Final.'

<sup>6</sup>KII with network member, February, 2022.

<sup>7</sup>CDAC Network. (Oct 2020). Final narrative report: 'Embedding Communication and Community Engagement from the start of the response to Category 5 Cyclone Harold in Vanuatu.'

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

ian Logistics Analysis and Access in Sofala Province” project serves as an example.<sup>9</sup> This project sought to understand the needs of affected populations through multi-sectoral assessments. Atlas partnered with local and international actors on identifying and prioritising the needs of affected populations. Atlas also engaged in a working group with local actors in order to allow for continued action after the NGOs’ departure, thereby supporting the project’s sustainability. Officials from the municipality provided Atlas with a list of beneficiaries, and Atlas used this list (along with other selection criteria) to select beneficiaries to be employed in the debris removal activities. Prioritising the needs of affected populations through assessments helps enable humanitarian action.

Agency was also realised through mobilising populations within target communities. For example, BBC Media Action, through its project “Combatting the Covid-19 ‘info-demic’ through media”, created an enabling environment for young journalists to produce impactful and unique broadcasts.<sup>10</sup> Engaging with local actors can contribute to enhanced agency, although this is difficult to prove conclusively.

While documents suggest the contribution of an ‘enabling environment’, KIIs expressed some disagreement, stating that substantive change to the humanitarian environment, and affected populations’ agency cannot be fully determined. The nature of H2H funding is not designed to make substantive changes.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, another respondent remarked that the short-term nature of the programme inhibits robust impact analysis, or assessment of contribution to the humanitarian sector.<sup>12,13,14</sup>

**Provided evidence suggests that the H2H fund contributed towards more contextually adapted humanitarian action by making the sector more inclusive and diverse.** The quantitative assessment identified ‘moderately strong’ evidence to support this finding, which was strengthened by findings from the provided documentation and KIIs.

Improved inclusivity and diversity was represented in two manners: First, the fund included a diverse set of specialised actors who have been reportedly excluded from funding at H2H’s visibility level. One network member attested to this empowerment of smaller organisations. In this respondent’s words:

‘The speed of the funding to very small actors enabled us to be part of the conversation with WHO and UNICEF and not have an engagement dominated by the multilaterals. This helped us to be able to nudge them in a different direction a little bit.’<sup>15</sup>

Moreover, funding enabled these specialised actors to work with directly-placed local organi-

<sup>9</sup>File name: ‘190706 Annex V-narrative reporting-AL’

<sup>10</sup>BBC Media Action. (2020). Narrative report: ‘H2H COVID-19-Narrative Report -BBC MA v1.’

<sup>11</sup>KII with network member, February, 2022.

<sup>12</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

<sup>13</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

<sup>14</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

<sup>15</sup>KII with network member, February, 2022.

sations who often cannot access international donor funding. In a KII with one network member, the representatives referenced a ‘tiny, informal’ organisation in Haiti that typically gets ‘totally overlooked.’<sup>16</sup> They did not mention the name of this organisation, but they explained that the value of H2H is that through funding, the network member was able to work in a small, tight-knit community and provide technical training to this local organisation.

While not an explicit directive, network members also reportedly improved contextual adaptation through localising efforts, including local actors and voices in decision-making processes and implementation.<sup>17</sup> The nature and extent of the collaboration/partnership between member organisations and these local organisations varies by member organisation. Specifically, 32 of the 39 narrative reports reviewed indicate that network members worked with local actors, including community members, grassroots organisations, national and international organisations working in the specific countries of operation. For example, The New Humanitarian (TNH)’s “Insecurity in the Sahel: Media coverage exploring the humanitarian impact and response” project offered some examples of engaging with representatives from local organisations.<sup>18</sup> These included: the president of the Burkinabé Movement for Human Rights; the director of Labo Citoyennetés, a Burkinabé think tank; the coordinator of a group of organisations that fights for women’s rights locally; the founder of Community Initiative for Changing Lives, a local aid group; and the president of Burkina Faso’s national journalists’ association. TNH also reported that H2H funding enabled them to feature local voices within their reporting, which they argued can contribute to improved humanitarian responses. Specifically, meeting with representatives from local organisations and featuring local voices within reporting helps empower local organisations and actors, thereby contributing – at least to some degree – to a contextually adapted and more inclusive and diverse humanitarian landscape. However, one H2H member suggested that H2H could more actively challenge the humanitarian system. This respondent specifically mentioned that this could be done through proposing alternative approaches to the structures designed by multilateral organisations. The respondent also stated that H2H could play a bigger role in fostering localisation, decolonising aid, and pushing for greater inclusion of local organisations. Provided evidence largely did not speak to the extent to which local voices were involved in shaping humanitarian response.

Additionally, most organisations, through the reviewed narrative reports, reported working with different government ministries and agencies, with some reporting challenges as a result of the collaboration. Atlas, for example, mentioned that they have sent letters to different local and national authorities but have been unsuccessful in their objectives.<sup>19</sup> Additionally, Insecurity Insight reported hostile attitudes towards its activities from the Ethiopian government while in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Internews reported ‘lack of transparency’ and ‘editorial limitations’ from the government.<sup>20,21</sup> Specifically, Internews noted that govern-

<sup>16</sup>KII with network member, February, 2022.

<sup>17</sup>The New Humanitarian. (2020). Narrative report: ‘Humanitarian logistics analysis and access in Sofola province.’

<sup>18</sup>Ibid.

<sup>19</sup>Narrative report-final clean (Atlas)

<sup>20</sup>Insecurity Insights. (2020). Narrative Report: ‘H2H-2020-II-Tigray II.’

<sup>21</sup>Internews. (2020). Narrative report: ‘H2H-2019-EBO-04-Inter.’

ment agencies, in this case officials from the Ministry of Health, dismissed some community concerns they 'deemed controversial.'<sup>22</sup>

**Provided evidence suggests that H2H fostered collaboration and connectedness both between humanitarian agencies and between the humanitarian sector and non-humanitarian actors.** The quantitative assessment identified 'moderately strong' evidence to support this finding, which was strengthened by findings from the provided documentation and KIIs.

Network members were enthusiastic about the collaboration opportunities facilitated by H2H, although one highlighted that the esoteric nature of some projects makes it hard to understand what other actors in the network are doing.<sup>23,24</sup> A representative from one network member remarked that 'part of the value of the [H2H] Network is building relationships and connections.'<sup>25</sup> This sentiment was echoed by the representative from another network member, who commended H2H for ensuring 'great collaboration' between member organisations.<sup>26</sup> The respondent noted that H2H always makes an effort to bring people together, and they described H2H as a 'matchmaker' who is good at reaching out, identifying the strengths of its members and proposing collaboration opportunities. As an example, the representative noted that their respective organisation had a strong collaboration experience with another humanitarian organisation, and that this relationship was strengthened as a result of a H2H project on which the two organisations had worked. This connection resulted in another project which now operates in several countries globally.

Another network member provided further examples of collaboration. In addition to having regular calls with other partners, the respondent explained that H2H helped them collaborate with organisations like Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) and the British Red Cross. They also described the 'speed dating meeting' they had with other H2H Network members as a positive opportunity to connect and build networks.<sup>27</sup>

Documentation supported these KII responses; reports outline collaboration opportunities with other organisations, as specified in the narrative reporting template. For example, CDAC Network's "Embedding Communication and Community Engagement" project highlighted a collaboration with another H2H service provider, Field Ready, as well as an example of collaboration between Field Ready and an external humanitarian organisation, CARE.<sup>28</sup> In its collaboration with Field Ready, CDAC provided 450 copies of contextually-adapted COVID-19 booklets to households, while Field Ready constructed handwashing stations. Field Ready collaborated with CARE on a menstrual hygiene feasibility study.

Additionally, Atlas Logistique's "Humanitarian Logistics Analysis and Access in Sofola Province"

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

<sup>23</sup>KII with network member, February, 2022.

<sup>24</sup>KII with network member, February, 2022.

<sup>25</sup>KII with network member, February, 2022.

<sup>26</sup>KII with network member, February, 2022.

<sup>27</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

<sup>28</sup>CDAC Network. (Oct 2020). Final narrative report: 'Embedding Communication and Community Engagement from the start of the response to Category 5 Cyclone Harold in Vanuatu.'

project provides another example of collaboration, with another H2H member (ACAPS), with international NGOs and with the private sector. Atlas collaborated with ACAPS on an elaboration of a logistics vulnerability report. Atlas engaged with the broader humanitarian community by working with MSF to share information – including prices, contacts, capacity, handling and storage areas – on the transportation of materials for a mobile hospital. Atlas also collaborated with Action Against Hunger (ACF) on debris removal for ACF’s WASH and cholera prevention programmes. Atlas similarly collaborated with Solidarité International (SI) on debris removal for SI’s WASH programmes; specifically, this collaboration led to 26 trucks being used to remove debris across nine districts. Within the private sector, Atlas collaborated with the Maritime Carriers Association to produce information on available sea carriers, and it worked with the Association of Road Transport Operators of Sofala Province (ASTROS) to provide information on available road transporters.

**Evidence suggests that H2H provided the opportunity for transfer of best practices between actors across all levels.** Narrative reports highlighted network member efforts to share lessons learnt in the programme implementation and transfer best practices to other H2H member organisations or to other non-member organisations. H2H member organisations operate in different financial, human and generally organisational capacities. As such, transfer of information, lessons learnt and best practices from one organisation to the other is beneficial to all involved organisations. The flow of best practices and lessons learnt was observed to be both horizontal (across H2H partner organisations) and vertical (to and from other partners). This translates to a dynamic and diverse flow of lessons, knowledge comparative advantages, and expertise between organisations across different levels. For example, CartONG observed how its programme ‘provided the opportunity to work with local actors abroad’ and that it has been a ‘great opportunity to exchange on practises.’<sup>29</sup> Another report by GTS highlighted their ability to support local and national actors in different countries, assisting them to integrate elements of GTS’ work into their work processes.<sup>30</sup>

Collaboration between partners also led to a deeper understanding of contexts of operation and provided an opportunity for implementing organisations to effectively and efficiently undertake their interventions. iMMAP observed that through the meetings it had with partners, it was able to quickly understand the humanitarian situation in Burkina Faso.<sup>31</sup> This report further mentions that through partnership with ACF, which has a long presence in the intervention country, it was able to quickly understand the context.<sup>32</sup> Additionally, Sphere observed that interactions between different actors provide an opportunity for exchange of information and capacity building on the application of humanitarian standards.<sup>33</sup>

Provided documentation evidenced H2H value-add. The quantitative assessment identified ‘highly strong’ evidence to support this finding, which was strengthened by findings from the

---

<sup>29</sup>CartONG-Final narrative report

<sup>30</sup>GTS-Final narrative report

<sup>31</sup>Annex IV Final narrative report-iMMAP-VF

<sup>32</sup>Annex IV Final narrative report-iMMAP-VF

<sup>33</sup>Sphere-Final Narrative Report

provided documentation and KIIs. A total of 121 out of 138 documents relevant to this criteria provided evidence of this achievement.

**This review determined several areas where H2H adds value for network members.** Funding, knowledge sharing, networking and collaboration opportunities stood out as the primary values added for H2H Network membership, with all key informants mentioning funding and/or collaboration opportunities as key value-adds, and provided documentation evidencing how H2H funding facilitated their projects' activities.

In addition to the collaboration opportunities provided by H2H, one network member focused primarily on funding as the value-added from H2H. They noted that they are a smaller organisation, and that as such 'H2H funding gave [them] a place at the table.'<sup>34</sup>

A representative from another network member noted that the funding provided by H2H allowed them to 'exponentially' invest in staff and services that they otherwise would not have been able to invest in.<sup>35</sup> The respondent further noted that the funding allowed them to scale up their work and potentially expand to new locations. While they appreciated the usual rapidity of the funding, they also noted that there were sometimes funding delays, which meant they were not able to use those funds for the immediate disaster but instead kept them for future response efforts. As a smaller organisation, they appreciated the 'unprecedented quality assurance' facilitated by additional H2H resources. They further commended H2H for being a 'motivating factor' by encouraging them to think about what else their organisation could be doing in humanitarian response.

Provided documentation further highlighted this role in funding. For example, The New Humanitarian (TNH)'s "Insecurity in the Sahel: Media coverage exploring the humanitarian impact and response" project document notes that support from the H2H Fund gave them a 'boost' that allowed them to produce high-quality reports on the quickly emerging crisis without having to divert resources and focus from elsewhere. The rapidity of the funds allowed them to deploy to the field in a matter of weeks.<sup>36</sup> Rapidity was also highlighted by Atlas Logistique's "Humanitarian Logistics Analysis and Access in Sofola Province" project report.<sup>37</sup> This report noted that they were able to 'operationalize actions' as soon as they arrived on location, thanks to H2H funding.<sup>38</sup>

A network member representative further appreciated that H2H afforded them the opportunity to focus on one context, which has inspired them to consider what other work can be done in the future.<sup>39</sup> They also offered recommendations for ways H2H could improve, including helping organisations develop their capacities and scale up, facilitating more interactions (e.g., through brown bag events) and providing contacts for specialised services. They stated that it

<sup>34</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

<sup>35</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

<sup>36</sup>File name: H2H-2020-BF2-TNH Final report.doc

<sup>37</sup>Atlas Logistique. (April 2019). Narrative report: 'Humanitarian logistics analysis and access in Sofola province,' p.3.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid.

<sup>39</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

would be ‘fantastic’ if H2H could connect or advocate for second-line interventions.

**Network members’ internal evidence generation and performance monitoring (i.e., MEAL) efforts varied in comprehensiveness.** Provided documentation largely discussed performance objectives and targets, although standards varied, by design. All organisations, through narrative reporting, were required to produce results indicator tables and some referenced to comprehensive logframes/ITTs and M&E reports. While a number of members had not undertaken any formal evaluation of their programmes, most of the members reported high value for their services among the target groups. The measurements for this finding is through mechanisms such as community satisfaction surveys, PDM surveys, social media engagements, and partner surveys.

Specifically, KIIs highlighted that H2H leaves MEAL details to the service providers. One network member explained that H2H only provides minimal input on project objectives or performance milestones and that they are not prescriptive on performance targets.<sup>40</sup> Instead, H2H leaves it to the service providers to determine the appropriate response in a given situation evidencing trust in smaller and more specialist humanitarian actors.<sup>41</sup> A representative from another network member noted that it is useful to have conversations with smaller organisations on MEAL indicators.<sup>42</sup> This is because it helps donors acknowledge that the same indicators do not always work for everyone in the humanitarian sector.

<b>Service provider, project and source</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Contribution to Review Question</b>
CDAC Network: Embedding Communication and Community Engagement from the start of the response to Category 5 Cyclone Harold in Vanuatu <sup>43</sup> Source: final narrative report	As with other final narrative reports, CDAC Network listed its outputs (as stated in its application), the indicators that have been agreed upon with H2H and qualitative descriptions of progress made against those targets.	Results achieved against the planned outputs included the following:

<sup>40</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

<sup>41</sup>While light-touch MEAL requirements from H2H can be considered good practice in relieving reporting and administrative burden on network members - which is particularly important in humanitarian situations where quick turnarounds and fast reporting processes can be invaluable to swift response - it could also present a risk with regards to challenges in determining, robustly, the value-add of H2H and H2H Network members, and in ensuring that objectives for H2H funding are met

<sup>42</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

- **Output 1:** 'CDAC is able to mobilise immediately and its partners in Port Vila quickly adapt their programme to address Cyclone Harold response as a priority over ongoing work.'<sup>44</sup>

*Indicator 1:* 'The CCE Sub-Cluster is enabled to have an action plan linked to the Cyclone Harold response and the actions of this project support their roll out.'<sup>45</sup>

- **Output 2:** 'The information and communication needs of people in the worst affected islands are largely met, including vulnerable or marginalised women, men, girls, boys and other gender distinctions.'<sup>47</sup> *Indicator 2:* 'Key response actors address identified gaps and ensure accuracy and consistency in the lifesaving and life sustaining information being disseminated to affected communities.'<sup>48</sup>

- **Results achieved 1:** (a) Ensured the affected communities received essential information and had the opportunity to give feedback; (b) Mobilised two-way communication with the affected communities; (c) Survey results suggest that most respondents were able to give feedback and ask questions 'as a result of this work.'<sup>46</sup>

- **Results achieved 2:** (a) Post-monitoring reports show that the affected population received informational messages and were able to give feedback and ask questions via their local representative; (b) Locally-based networks were 'strengthened through support through the project.'<sup>49</sup> (c) Worked with the Vanuatu Society for People with Disabilities (VSPD) to identify people living with disabilities and to share information and feedback mechanisms with them.

	<p><b>- Output 3:</b> 'All actions and project movement consider COVID-19 regulations as set out by the government and health technical experts in the MoH/WHO.'<sup>50</sup> Indicator 3: 'A 'Do No Harm' COVID-19 approach was adopted in all CDAC work related to this project.'<sup>51</sup></p>	<p><b>- Results achieved 3:</b> (a) Ensured the public remained aware of COVID-19 protection measures; (b) Disseminated information materials, including a COVID-19 booklet; (c) Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) surveys, conducted by CARE, revealed that this distribution of information was effective, with between 87 and 98 per cent of respondents saying they received some form of COVID-19 awareness.<sup>52</sup></p>
--	--	---

A limited number of network members implemented robust internal evidence generation, producing research products that largely met external criteria (i.e., that derived from (former) DFID's Strength of Evidence Criteria). That is, the research products conformed to academic research standards and thus the evidence of achievement generated through these products are stronger, and more conclusively establish the relationship between programming and realised outcomes.

<sup>43</sup>CDAC Network. (Oct 2020). Final narrative report: 'Embedding Communication and Community Engagement from the start of the response to Category 5 Cyclone Harold in Vanuatu.'

<sup>44</sup>CDAC Network. (Oct 2020). Final narrative report: 'Embedding Communication and Community Engagement from the start of the response to Category 5 Cyclone Harold in Vanuatu,' p.4.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid.

<sup>47</sup>CDAC Network. (Oct 2020). Final narrative report: 'Embedding Communication and Community Engagement from the start of the response to Category 5 Cyclone Harold in Vanuatu,' p.5.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid.

<sup>50</sup>CDAC Network. (Oct 2020). Final narrative report: 'Embedding Communication and Community Engagement from the start of the response to Category 5 Cyclone Harold in Vanuatu,' p.6.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid.

<sup>52</sup>This number varies depending on the location.



Image source: RedRUK, Paul Jawo

## 5. Conclusions

The H2H Network's strategic direction and value proposition both emphasise expanding diversity and inclusion within the humanitarian landscape and fostering collaboration. Thus, they speak directly to ToR Review Questions 2 and 3 (see discussion of these below). Specifically, the new value proposition's core values are diversity, connectedness and evolution. While evolution could not be assessed here, the first two are directly related to ToR Review Questions 2 and 3. The new strategic direction also emphasises the importance of H2H added-value, primarily through offering smaller organisations opportunities for funding, collaboration and knowledge sharing.

**Review Question 1: Created an enabling environment for humanitarian action, enhancing the**

**agency of crisis affected populations.** The strength of evidence across document-based evidence for this Review Question is ranked as ‘moderate.’ KIIs noted that information sharing, such as on COVID-19 misinformation mitigation strategies, helped enable other COVID-19 responses.<sup>1</sup> However, as some key informants interviewed pointed out, the small-scale and short-term nature of the funding makes it difficult to have a noticeable impact on the humanitarian sector.<sup>2</sup> Document case studies reveal that some projects addressed this Review Question by developing community feedback mechanisms and sharing knowledge as well as by prioritising the needs of affected populations through needs assessments and collaboration with local actors.<sup>3,4</sup>

**Review Question 2: Contributed to more contextually adapted humanitarian action by making the sector more inclusive and diverse.** This Review Question was addressed least by the assessed evidence, with the strength of evidence across assessed pieces of evidence ranked as a low ‘moderate.’ KIIs offered some examples of H2H funds supporting small organisations and some projects reported engaging with local actors and featuring local voices in publications.<sup>5</sup> While these are steps toward the advancement of diversity and inclusion within the humanitarian sector, there is room to do more on this. This was specifically mentioned during KIIs, with one informant wanting to see greater advocacy from H2H, and another wanting to see H2H do more to actively challenge the humanitarian system and to decolonise aid and foster localisation.<sup>6,7</sup>

**Review Question 3: Fostered collaboration and connectedness.** Evidence suggests that the H2H Network is effective at fostering collaboration between organisations, thereby meeting ToR Review Question 3 most fully. The strength of evidence assessed for this Review Question is ranked as ‘moderate.’ While two key informants spoke only positively on their experiences, the third suggested there is room for improvement (e.g., by increasing understanding of what other members are doing, which is important given the niche and esoteric nature of some Network members’ work).<sup>8,9</sup> Instances of collaboration were well documented, in particular in the different types of narrative reports. Case study examples are offered by the CDAC Network’s final narrative report, wherein they collaborated with Field Ready on producing COVID-19 booklets, and by Atlas Logistique’s narrative report, wherein they collaborated, for example, with ACAPS on a logistics vulnerability report.<sup>10,11</sup>

**Internal criteria: Evidenced H2H value-add.** Of the pieces of evidence reviewed, 86 per cent

<sup>1</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

<sup>2</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

<sup>3</sup>CDAC Network. (Oct 2020). Final narrative report: ‘Embedding Communication and Community Engagement from the start of the response to Category 5 Cyclone Harold in Vanuatu.’

<sup>4</sup>Atlas Logistique. (April 2019). Narrative report: ‘Humanitarian logistics analysis and access in Sofola province.’

<sup>5</sup>The New Humanitarian. (2020). Narrative report: ‘Humanitarian logistics analysis and access in Sofola province.’

<sup>6</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

<sup>7</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

<sup>8</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

<sup>9</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

<sup>10</sup>CDAC Network. (Oct 2020). Final narrative report: ‘Embedding Communication and Community Engagement from the start of the response to Category 5 Cyclone Harold in Vanuatu.’

<sup>11</sup>Atlas Logistique. (April 2019). Narrative report: ‘Humanitarian logistics analysis and access in Sofola province.’

identified the role or contribution of H2H, which ranks as 'high.' Funding, knowledge sharing, networking and collaboration opportunities stood out within the documentation as the primary added values of being a member of the H2H Network. This is supported by evidence from the KIIs and case study documentation. All KIIs mentioned funding and/or collaboration opportunities as value-adds of H2H Network membership, and case study documents provide some examples of how H2H funding facilitated their projects' activities. Specifically, TNH noted that H2H funding enabled them to report on the rapidly emerging crisis in Burkina Faso, and Atlas Logistique reported that H2H funding allowed them to take action as soon as they arrived on location.<sup>12,13</sup>

**Internal criteria: Evidence generation and performance monitoring.** The strength of evidence analysis found that 74 per cent of reviewed pieces of evidence listed the project's targets or objectives, which also ranks as 'high.' KIIs noted that there is some discussion of MEAL between H2H and members.<sup>14</sup> For example, the CDAC Network's final narrative report on their Vanuatu project outlines a list of outputs, indicators and results achieved.<sup>15</sup> This is a representative example of similar reports produced by other service providers on other projects. Generally, however, specific indicators are left to the discretion of service providers.<sup>16</sup> This review notes that this demonstrates trust in network membership and is likely advantageous in cutting reporting bureaucracy for swift humanitarian response. However, it may also pose challenges to H2H's ability to evaluate the performance of H2H-funded projects and H2H's own long-term value-add.

---

<sup>12</sup>The New Humanitarian. (2020). Narrative report: 'Humanitarian logistics analysis and access in Sofola province.'

<sup>13</sup>Atlas Logistique. (April 2019). Narrative report: 'Humanitarian logistics analysis and access in Sofola province.'

<sup>14</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.

<sup>15</sup>CDAC Network. (Oct 2020). Final narrative report: 'Embedding Communication and Community Engagement from the start of the response to Category 5 Cyclone Harold in Vanuatu.'

<sup>16</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.



Image source: CartONG

## 6. Recommendations

It is clear from KIIs and project reports that members are generally positive and enthusiastic about their experiences with the H2H Network. Nonetheless, the review team offers a selection of recommendations to help H2H achieve its specific goals and enhance its future work and collaboration with network members.

**Recommendation 1. Develop an understanding of members' internal evidence generation capabilities, as they relate to network needs.** Network members were inconsistent in their internal evidence generation processes. Select members implemented robust evidence generation, in line with research standards (e.g., external evaluations), while others implemented limited evidence generation (e.g., implicitly equating output production to impact). While network members are constrained by the nature of funding, nonetheless the network could identify opportunities to support members' evidence generation, first through understanding members' capabilities in relation to network needs.

- Action: Hold an internal (i.e., H2H programme staff) discussion to assess where the role of evidence generation falls within H2H programmatic needs - what evidence of achievement is needed to further H2H's mission?
- Action: Canvass members through a landscape assessment - implemented remotely through form-based feedback or through member meetings - to develop a preliminary un-

derstanding of members' perspectives towards evidence generation. This assessment could orient around the following key questions:

- How do members define evidence generation within their organisation?
  - \* How is it then implemented or realised?
- To what extent is evidence generation an organisational strategic priority?
  - \* To what extent is the organisation adequately addressing this priority?
- To what extent do members perceive H2H activations as strategically valuable to organisational sustainability? That is, do members perceive H2H activations as 'tent-pole' projects for their organisation, around which they can increase visibility, access to funding, etc.?
  - \* How can evidence generation contribute to this sustainability?
- How do members define H2H's role in ensuring improved humanitarian action, and where does evidence generation fall within that responsibility?
  - \* What evidence generation gaps do members self-assess, and how can H2H contribute to closing those gaps?
- Further consideration: Identify opportunities for the network to meet needs raised through the landscape assessment.
  - Further consideration: In the next funding request(s), request an allocation for member capacity building to respond to identified gaps. Specifically focus on approaches that can be implemented without being resource intensive - capturing change stories/harvesting outcomes, conducting case studies or soliciting beneficiary feedback.
  - Further consideration: Encourage network members to propose joint programming that utilises comparative advantages with respect to evidence generation.
- See Recommendation 5 for linkages.

**Recommendation 2. Canvass network members' views on additional areas of H2H value-add.**

With regard to opportunities for value-add beyond H2H's current areas of value-add (such as collaboration and networking opportunities), one key informant felt H2H could do more to support network members on advocacy (on their behalf), with the aim of giving them a greater voice in discussions with major humanitarian actors, such as UN agencies. They also felt that H2H could provide more support in the form of capacity building.

- Action: Implement an annual membership needs and perceptions assessment, to identify opportunities for future value-add.
- Action: Develop an action plan for realising identified value-add.

- Further consideration: Network members highlighted the network's value add in promoting collaboration. The network could identify opportunities for internal activations; that is, opportunities for the network to support members enhancing other members' programming, as a means to strengthen the enabling environment.

**Recommendation 3. Build on good practice such as cross-network information-sharing.** Evidence from this review suggests that the availability of cross-network information on pressing humanitarian issues fosters an enabling environment for effective humanitarian response.

- Action: Collate and synthesise 'lessons learned', identifying consistent themes and encouraging production of lessons learned or guidance documentation.
  - Note: The study team has collated lessons learned identified through accessible narrative reports, found here<sup>1</sup>
  - Action: Host documentation on an internal (or external) learning and resource library.
- Action: Utilise existing member data to produce matches (e.g., on geographic area of focus, thematic concentration, etc.), whereby newly created lessons learned or other resources can be directly shared to members who are likely to find them most valuable.
- Action: Upscale internal joint learning sessions, where members are paired to present learning from activations done jointly or independently, when there is thematic alignment.

**Recommendation 4. Improve understanding of how localisation applies to or fits within the network and its members' priorities.** Provided documentation and interviews with members suggests that members are approaching contextually adapted humanitarian action and improved actor agency through localisation in different manners. Specifically, members had different approaches to involvement of local actors, with some respondents stating that the network could improve in this area. Moreover, localisation, particularly through engaging with local actors, will by design apply differently to different members based on their area of programming.

- Action: Host a round-table discussion(s), whereby members of diverse organisational backgrounds can share their organisational approach to localisation - what it means within their organisational/programmatic context and how they realise localisation.
- Action: In line with Recommendation 3, encourage network members to produce localisation-focused lessons learned resources.

---

<sup>1</sup>This matrix pulls content from the accessible narrative reports, for select reporting criteria. All content is unedited from the source material.

- Future consideration: With members, co-create a localisation guidance note, specifically for how members can improve localisation within the parameters of H2H activations, taking into account organisational diversity.

**Recommendation 5. Showcase successful collaboration.** This review evidenced a range of successful collaborations between network members, facilitated by members themselves and by H2H. As a KII noted, the network itself is a motivating factor that encourages members to think about what else they can be doing.<sup>2</sup>

- Action: See Recommendation 3 - provide opportunities for joint learning sessions, led by members who have successfully collaborated, or identified opportunities for mutual learning (e.g., when implementing in a similar environment).
- Further consideration: Develop and implement an advocacy and outreach strategy, to connect network members to like-minded donors, in-turn solidifying the network's incubator status.

---

<sup>2</sup>KII with network member, February 2022.



## 7. Annexes

### 7.1. Included Service Providers

- ACAPS
- Atlas Logistique
- BBC Media Action
- CartONG
- CDAC Network
- Evidence Aid
- Field Ready

- Fondation Hironnelle
- Global Nutrition Cluster Technical Alliance's Technical Support Team (TST)
- Ground Truth Solutions
- Humanitarian Academy for Development (HAD)
- Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team (HOT)
- iMMAP
- IMPACT Initiatives
- Insecurity Insights
- International Health Partners (IHP)
- Internews
- IRIN
- MapAction
- RedR UK
- SPHERE
- The New Humanitarian (TNH)
- Translators Without Borders (TWB)

## **7.2. Coding Outputs**

Table 7.1: Example analytical framework

Document	Evidence strength <sup>1</sup>	Internal criteria <sup>2</sup>	Evidence criteria <sup>3</sup>	Total (internal) <sup>4</sup>	Total (external) <sup>5</sup>
Piece 1	1	.5	.33	.5	.33
Piece 2	3	.7	1	1.98	3
Piece x ...	2	.3	.66	.6	1.32
Average					1.55

Note: a Low score is  $\leq 1$ ; a Moderate score is  $>1$  and  $\leq 2$ ; a High score is  $>2$  and  $\leq 3$ .

Therefore, for the given document, the extent of achievement, adjusted by the strength of evidence, is 'moderate.' This level of achievement is then qualified through a discussion of the underlying documentation (e.g., specific findings from the relevant documentation, supplementary KII findings, etc.).

Table 7.2: Evidence assessment of ToR objectives<sup>6</sup>

	Review Question 1 - Created an enabling environment for humanitarian action (scale: 0-3)	Review Question 2 - Contribution to more contextually adapted humanitarian action (scale: 0-3)	Review Question 3 - Fostered collaboration and connectedness (scale: 0-3)	Average across objectives (scale 0-3)
Average numerical value	1.65	1.40	1.73	1.59

<sup>1</sup>Extent of evidence for each objective (min 1 / max 3)

<sup>2</sup>min 0 / max 1

<sup>3</sup>min 0 / max 1

<sup>4</sup>min 0 / max 3

<sup>5</sup>min 0 / max 3

Rank	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
------	----------	----------	----------	----------

Table 7.3: Internal Criteria<sup>7</sup>

	Describes activities	Identifies H2H contribution or role	Sets objectives or performance targets	Total score (%)
Per cent	89%	86%	74%	83%
Rank	High	High	High	High

Table 7.4: External Criteria 1: Conceptual Framing

	1.a Does the document acknowledge existing research?	1.b Does the document construct a conceptual framework?	1.c Does the document pose a research question?	1.d Does the document outline a hypothesis?
Per cent	28%	41%	75%	34%
Rank	Low	Moderate.	High	Moderate

Table 7.5: External Criteria 2: Openness &amp; Transparency and Criteria 3: Appropriateness &amp; Rigour

---

<sup>6</sup>For scores based on a 1-3 scale: 0-1.33 = Low; 1.34-2.66 = Moderate; 2.67-3.99 = High.

<sup>7</sup>Percentage scores: 0-33 = Low; 34-67 = Moderate; 67-100 = High.

	2.a Does the document present or link to the raw data it analyses?	2.b Does the author recognise limitations/weaknesses in their work?	3.a Does the document identify a research design?	3.b Does the document identify a research method?	3.c Does the document demonstrate why the chosen design and method are good ways to explore the research question?
Per cent	84%	28%	59%	88%	53%
Rank	High	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate

Table 7.6: External Criteria 4: Validity and Criteria 5: Reliability

	4.a Has the study demonstrated measurement validity?	4.b Is the study internally valid?	4.c Is the study externally valid?	5.a Has the study demonstrated measurement reliability?	5.b Has the study demonstrated that its selected analytical technique is reliable?
Per cent	22%	56%	22%	11%	0%
Rank	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Low

Table 7.7: External Criteria 6: Cogency

	6.a Does the author 'sign-post' the reader throughout?	6.b Are the conclusions clearly based on the study's results?
Per cent	81%	75%
Rank	High	High

Bodhi Global Analysis Ltd is an independent international development research consultancy firm, based in the UK and Kenya. It was born out of a recognition that effective programming strategies in international development required an understanding of political context and a commitment to objective knowledge and the firm aims to bridge the gap between policy and academia. Bodhi specialises in delivering conflict analysis and political economy analysis in fragile and conflict-affected states (FCAS), as well as contextual and situational analysis, and barrier assessments.

Bodhi Global Analysis Ltd  
85 Great Portland Street  
London W1W 7LT  
UK

<https://www.bodhiglobalanalysis.com>  
[info@bodhiglobalanalysis.com](mailto:info@bodhiglobalanalysis.com)