CMG Teleconference: 20th January 2006
Draft Minutes

Present:

Susanne Frueh (SF) OCHA (Chair)
John Cosgrave (JC) ALNAP/TEC
Niels Dabelstein (ND) Danida
Stefan Dahlgren (SD) Sida
Andre Griekspoor (AG) WHO
Rachel Houghton (RH) ALNAP/TEC (minutes)

Christoph Jacob (CJ) SDC
Laura Kitchin (LK) ALNAP/TEC (minutes)
Wayne MacDonald (WM) UNICEF
John Mitchell (JM) ALNAP
Suppiramaniam Nanthikesan (SN) UNDP
John Telford (JT) ALNAP/TEC

Apologies:

Mihir Bhatt (AIDMI)
Tijana Bojanic (IFRC)
Amy Cavender (WV) (DEC)

Francois Grunewald (Groupe URD)
Miles Murray (CARE) (DEC)
Jodi Nelson (IRC)

1.   UPDATE FROM EVALUATION MANAGERS:

1.1   The evaluation managers updated the CMG on the progress of the thematic reports. This was an information item only. The full discussion can be found in <u>Section **6.1**</u>. In brief:

Coordination:	Draft 1 by end of January. This will include comments by the SC.
Capacities:	Draft 0 today (20th Jan). Comments from stakeholders back by 4th February, when it will go to the Working Group as Draft 1 on February 10th.
LRRD:	Draft 1 of the LRRD synthesis for wider circulation by first week of February.
Needs assessment:	Final draft by end of January.
Donor response:	Near final draft by 3rd February.

1.2   It was noted that the capacities evaluation is annexing the executive summaries of its country reports to the main evaluation report. This was considered a good solution to both cutting down the length of the reports as well as overcoming the issue of unequal quality of some of the country reports.

1.3   Within the context of the TEC communication strategy, each commissioning agency / steering committee will do its own work to promote the respective thematic evaluation reports in addition to that work undertaken by the TEC Sec.

2.   SYNTHESIS REPORT:

2.1   JT introduced the synthesis team time plan which had been amended in light of a synthesis team meeting held on 18th January 2006. Key dates were noted as:

Friday 17 March:	1st draft to CMG
Friday 7 April:	CMG meeting to discuss 1st draft (now agreed to take place in Copenhagen)
Friday 21 April:	2nd draft to CMG
Friday 12th May:	Provisional date for CMG meeting to discuss 2nd draft. Face-to-face or telecon, depending on the content of the comments (venue: London)
Friday 26th May:	Final draft

2.2   The following agreements and actions came out of the discussion. The full discussion can be found in <u>Section **6.2**</u>.

2.3   <u>Agreements and actions:</u>

- The CMG endorsed the timetable.
- In order to facilitate the work of the synthesis team and respective steering committees, evaluation managers will inform their teams that they should clearly highlight what has been changed from previous drafts (particularly in terms of content and conceptual direction). This will apply particularly to the main reports (ie, not to the country reports) and would apply to any drafts after draft 1. This will be done by means of a covering note as well as highlighting what has been changed in yellow in the text. **Action: evaluation managers**.
- A CMG meeting will be held in Copenhagen on 7th April 2006 to discuss the first draft. A start time will be confirmed once everyone has booked their flight. **Action: CMG members to notify ND of their arrival time.**

- It was agreed that the first draft of the synthesis will go to the CMG, peer reviewers and evaluation managers who will share it with their steering committee and evaluation teams as deemed appropriate. The second draft will go to a broader audience but it is up to the evaluation managers who they share it with within each individual evaluation working group, steering committee, and team. Each evaluation manager should check in advance whether key actors are available to comment due to tight guidelines. **Action: evaluation managers**.
- Comments will go directly to JC, copied to the evaluation managers. JC will collate the comments in a manner where it will be possible for everyone to be able to see who has suggested what.
- It was agreed that additional suggestions for peer reviewers, specifically the names of those in the regions, should be suggested by the CMG. **Action: CMG members (by Weds 25th Jan). JM to follow up as soon as he hears back from the CMG.**
- It was agreed that peer reviewers will comment on drafts 1 and 2. It was also agreed that it may not be necessary to offer payment to peer reviewers; however this will be reviewed if necessary.
- It was agreed that CMG would be informed by the Secretariat of substantive changes suggested by peer reviewers
- The procedures for settling disputes will be as previously agreed.

3. FUNDING PROPOSAL AND BUDGET FOR TEC 2006-07
The funding proposal and budget for TEC 2006-07 was discussed. The following agreements and actions came out of this discussion.

3.2 Agreements:
- It was decided that for Personnel costs, Option B will be pursued (the cheaper option) especially in light of the popular consensus amongst CMG members that the TEC should become 'embedded' within ALNAP in the forthcoming financial year.
- JM will 'unpack' this preference to clarify what it would mean in practice, and will take it up with the ALNAP Steering Committee on 14th March 2006. **Action: JM**.
- The role of the CMG and the ALNAP Steering Committee in relation to the TEC will also be discussed at the ALNAP Steering Committee. It is possible that the CMG could become an ALNAP working group.
- In the meantime the TEC should start fundraising now irrespective of what the ALNAP Steering Committee decides. **Action: RH.**
- Agreement was given to employ a Media Specialist for the TEC. **Action: RH.**
- Further discussion on the TEC budget for May 2006 to January 2007 will take place at the next CMG meeting on 15th February in London. However, overall the proposal and budget was approved.
- It was noted that the TEC has not budgeted for follow-up (ie, tracking of the utilization of TEC findings and recommendations) in 2007 as this is more naturally the responsibility of ALNAP. This was agreed.

4. TEC REGIONAL FEEDBACK WORKSHOPS
The important role of the TEC Regional Feedback Workshops was discussed. The full discussion can be found in Section **6.3**.

4.1 Agreements and actions:
- The regional workshop budget should be reviewed; it looks too low. **Action: TEC Sec.**
- The TEC Sec will write a concept note for the regional workshops by end of Feb / early March, once the Media Specialist is on board. This will be based on two large regional workshops: one in Sri Lanka covering S Lanka, southern India and the Maldives; one in S E Asia covering   Indonesia, Thailand etc. **Action: TEC Sec.**
- A third could be held around the ECOSOC meeting in July. SF would lead on this. **Action: SF**.
- UNICEF noted that it is planning to launch a lessons workshop in the region (tentatively scheduled for March/April). The intent is to bring together the results of its performance review work (evaluation and audit). It will be approaching TEC to solicit their interest and/or involvement in this initiative.

5. TEC COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY AND PLAN
RH provided an update on how the strategy is developing, and what action is currently being undertaken by the Secretariat to 'work' the plan. This was an information item only as the strategy and plan will be amended in light of the discussions in this meeting before being distributed next week.

5.1 Agreements and actions:
- The CMG will support the communications strategy by informing the TEC Sec of any upcoming events, and who's doing what. The TEC Sec will then collate and re-circulate to the CMG at regular intervals. **Action: CMG & TEC Sec**.
- WM raised again the concern about the communication strategy, especially appropriate linking of products to target audiences. RH re-assured him this was a central component of the work being undertaken as was established in Copenhagen. It was agreed that he will input into the development of the strategy and plan accordingly. **Action: WM & TEC Sec**.
- The TEC Sec will finalise the strategy and plan by Friday 27th January – though the Media Specialist will also input once employed [it is intended as a live document]. **Action: TEC Sec**.

6. RECORD OF DISCUSSIONS

6.1 **UPDATE FROM TEAM MANAGERS ON THEMATIC REPORTS**
- Coordination – Currently collecting steering committee comments on the zero draft, but hope that by the end of January to have draft No. 1. A considerable amount of work is still required given that conclusions are not sufficiently supported by evidence and examples.
- Capacities – Comments on the zero draft for all country reports are being collated but the reports are of uneven quality. The first draft of the synthesis is expected (today) and will be sent to the steering committee next week. This will be available for comments from the working group by Feb 10th.
- LRRD – There is a good zero draft for the LRRD 'synthesis' and teams are currently working on the 3rd draft of some of the constituent reports. There is a workshop in Stockholm on 26th & 27th Jan to discuss all reports; after that the draft LRRD synthesis report will be circulated widely to everyone. The country reports will be published; the quantitative survey data possibly accessible via the website. It was noted that there is no working group for this study.
- Needs Assessment – The final draft will be available by the end of January; the SC is currently getting feedback.
- Donor Response – The final draft will be available on 3rd March.
- In terms of evaluation quality, it was confirmed by JM that the ALNAP will undertake a meta-evaluation on all TEC thematic evaluation reports using the Proforma in 2007.

6.2 **SYNTHESIS REPORT**
In addition to points made in Section 2 above, the following was discussed:
- JM provided an update on his work to recruit peer reviewers for the synthesis review panel. Out of a current short-list of 8 or 9, the CMG commented that the list doesn't have sufficient representation from the regions (a preference for two, one of whom should have a good grasp of policy-related issues) and is too anglo-focused.
- Criteria for selection should include: knowledge of the region; of the HA and recovery system; sound policy analysis; good operational knowledge. Evaluation expertise was considered less important given the experience of the CMG members. However, it was noted that someone with knowledge of the development sector more broadly would be good to bring on board.
- SN asked whether there were guidelines for the synthesis committee in terms of use of the constituent thematic reports. It was noted that there are not and that any additional guidelines to the ToR would have to be provided by the CMG. This was deemed unnecessary.

6.3 **REGIONAL FEEDBACK WORKSHOPS**
- The CMG concluded that two large workshops would reach more people. It was suggested that the TEC should also look for opportunities to link with what others are doing in the region in order to create greater impact and perceived relevance by those in the affected countries. The TEC will come back to the CMG with a more ambitious proposal end Feb / early March. WM noted that pending the proposal, UNICEF may be interested in supporting a more ambitious agenda.
- The idea of a third workshop was proposed to coincide with the ECOSOC meeting in July. SF would lead on this. It was also noted that the ECOSOC discussion in New York would be an occasion to undertake policy level presentations of TEC findings and other major Evaluations (e.g. UNICEF study).
- In a similar vein, the importance of linking to what others are discussing was noted, especially reference to the Consortium (Clinton's Office) where TEC is currently holding discussions.

6.4 **COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY**
- RH provided an update on current activity: interviews for the medial specialist; preparing contact lists on which to operationalise the communications plan and to build the media strategy; developing a database to house all the contacts; finalizing TEC designs and working with web designers to re-do the TEC website. Also pro-active dissemination of the Initial Findings report.
- WM highlighted his concern that more needs to be done to link the synthesis products to specific target audience. If TEC limits its primary communications to only policy makers, humanitarian practitioners or even the ALANP network, then it will not have succeeded in providing feedback and learning to the largest funding stakeholder in the tsunami (i.e. private and individual donors). Therefore TEC products, including the synthesis report and messages, should be targeting the general public as a primary audience. RH responded that this has already been taken into account and information to this end circulated in a table in an earlier draft of the strategy. SF requested WM to collaborate with TEC Sec to ensure appropriate audience segmentation occurs.

7. **DATE OF NEXT CMG MEETING**
The next CMG will be held in the morning and early afternoon of the February 15th 2006 in London at the CARE UK office.

Agenda
Team Leader Meeting
Tuesday 14th February
Mothers Union, London

09:00	Welcome and intro
09:15	First two presentations by each TL or Evaluation Rep on issues in other evaluations that: 1) Resonate very strongly with their team findings 2) Appear to clash with or have significant implications for their team's findings.

You will note that this implies that the team leaders should have read the other five evaluations. Each presentation to be followed by a brief discussion to identify if the point can be nuanced or needs further discussion.

10:45	Coffee
10.30 – 13.15	Next three presentations
13:15	Lunch
14:15	Drawing up list of critical items for discussion
14:30	Discussion on critical issues
15:45	Coffee
16:00	Review of TEC process from viewpoint of Team Leaders
18:00	Close

Team Leaders Meeting
Mothers' Union building, London
14 February 2006

Present:

Jerry Adams (JA) LRRD policy study
Jon Bennet (JB) Coordination study
Emery Brusset (EB) LRRD Indonesia study
John Cosgrave (JC) TEC/ALNAP
Niels Dabelstein (ND) DANIDA
Fiona English (FE) DFA (Ireland)
Michael Flint (MF) Donor response study
Susanne Frueh (SF;Chair) OCHA
Stefan Germann (SG) WVI

Claude de ville de Goyet (CVG) Needs assessment study
Rachel Houghton (RH; minutes) TEC/ALNAP
Laura Kitchin (LK; minutes) TEC/ALNAP
Wayne Macdonald (WMD) UNICEF
Suppiramaniam Nanthikesan (SN)UNDP
Margaret Stansberry (MS) IFRC
John Telford (JT) TEC/ALNAP
Sherylin Thompson (ST) TEC/ALNAP

Coordination team (Jon Bennet)

➢ Lack of NGO (international and national) representation on coordinating bodies. (Capacities evaluation focuses on national NGOs.)

➢ Assumed lead on advocacy by RC/HC, but this was a piecemeal approach and not coordinated. Thus many important issues not picked up – eg, around land tenure. Key ongoing failing in the sector.

➢ No correlation between no of staff present on the ground and the assistance given to build capacity of local / national organizations. It's one thing to complain about lack of national / local capacity; another to do something about it. (Capacities brings this up.) Linked is lack of communication (also brought up in capacities and LRRD) with national actors, incl local actors. The community just doesn't seem to know how. Coordination study recommends training.

➢ UNDAC – few resources for transport (helicopters), and 'tension' between assessment, coordination and service (support, common services – UNJLC, etc.)

➢ UNDAC in Thailand – questionable as to whether required; ended up dealing with body bags, outside their main skills. Should they be dispatched to these type of middle-income countries? Also the quality of the results: found severe criticism of UNDAC in (secondary sourced) materials/assessments.

➢ Need better resources for relief to recovery, not just in the Flash Appeal. What will happen in 2006 if no CAP appeal launched – will there be no funds for recovery coordination?

➢ 'Emergency tourism' needs to be addressed. Someone has to regulate all the visits and demands put on field operations due to the visits.

➢ Language, dynamics and methods of coordination meetings, especially re national and local authorities and actors are important. Meetings as information sharing or decision-making – it is unclear, and time is wasted going over the same issues repeatedly. Staff turnover is a major problem. Meetings skills need to be developed. Bench-mark indicators for coordination and meetings are needed.

➢ Military – the military did not know who was who in the HA sector, and also they were not directed on what to do – that they would have done better had they been instructed (Claude said later that they will always do as they please). UN common services mechanisms not strong enough to deal with issue of dialogue with the military. Need to encourage a sector-wide discussion of what these should be and what they should do.

Workshop Comments / Questions on Coordination Study

➢ Local/national coordination versus HC/RC – what is the ideal and the balance? (Capacities and LRRD recommend being there as a support to national capacity.) Question UN lead in sectoral coordination, due to hierarchy within the system.

➢ ICVA tried to set up a coordination body for the NGOs, but there was no consensus so they failed. The issue is preparation for these types of mechanisms before a disaster, to have clarity on who will represent NGOs. INTERACTION is in ICVA but seemingly does not see itself as represented by ICVA.

- Staff quality is mentioned in several evaluations - skills, training recommended for coordination but also for longer-term view of LRRD, strengthening of local capacities, etc. Seniority is not competence (but the UN system seems to think it is). Continuity and turnover is an issue. Claude: we do not have a reservoir of these people; we do not seem to resolve it though it happens each time. No clear recommendation … for example, when an evaluation complains about an operation (UNHCR) moves people from one operation to another to cover (stealing from Peter to pay Paul). Also staff poaching, undermined local organisations.

- The capacities study states that the internationals did not involve and communicate with and involve nationals and locals sufficiently in coordination. The int. community realised this but they did not know how. That is the point. They did not communicate sufficiently with the local population – they knew it should be done, but did not have the training and tools to do it.

- Applying standard one-size-fits all responses (e.g. from Africa) to middle income countries is questionable.

- Accreditation of NGOs/HA organisations was raised by Funding, assessment and coordination reports – so many (300 or 400) NGOs turned up at the emergency, many of poor quality. Should agencies be allowed in the country if they're not accredited? The governments should oversee this, but do they have the capacity and want to pass it on to OCHA. Claude says registration in the country is a different thing from (international) accreditation, and accreditation should be by cluster. Niels: Can we be more concrete? Can we say how we can do this? Stefan (WV) – ISO certification is an option (ISO9000). JC: MEDAIR is the only NGO that he knows that is ISO certified. Claude: you need accreditation by cluster/technical sector level. Having good accounting and management systems is not enough. You need assessment capacity to base your emergency response decisions on. Secondly, the standards you adhere to in your own country should be applied in emergencies as a minimum. Emery: Societe Generale de Surveillance (SGS) developed a framework for certification of NGOs but little or not applied, it seems.

- Susanne - OCHA are adding 26 admin staff to address the low OCHA admin capacity to support coordination.

- NGOs had so much money they did not need to coordinate, they felt.

- SPHERE – the agencies focussed on the technical standards, not the 'soft' principles aspect. Adherence to SPHERE was only lip-service. There is no set of coordination standard. JB said let's go back to the NGO (and others?) community to see whether we can develop such standards, bench-marks. JC clarifies that the 'common standards' in SPHERE (as opposed to the technical ones) are the ones not being applied but they include a coordination common standard.

- LRRD and coordination: **we differ in the reports re the definition of phases** (Maldives said relief ended end January …). In Oct and Nov there was almost another emergency phase due to the transitional shelter crisis, so it's unclear. **JB was more positive about later linkages/LRRD because structures were put in place for coordination that went into the recovery phase. LRRD said early stage linkages were there.**

- JC re terminology: Beneficiaries, victim, affected as a term – we benefit and they don't says Claude (see listening project reference to how the international system spends so much on itself). And what is the definition of affected – we assess people without knowing whom we are assessing. And claim-holders: that is the term used in the capacities report? **The decision was made to use affected populations.**

- Stefan (WV) – can we make general recommendations for the future, as this is based on a unique situation (issues such as staff quality, etc)? Is the system able to cope even under 'normal' circumstances? JB – we want the synthesis to pick up on the issue of the capacity of the system, and is it able to cope. JC – we increase funds consistently even though it fluctuates in scale, Iraq, Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Kosovo, etc. The overall HA budget does not seem to go down ever, so it maybe a unique situation but there is a trend. JB – numbers of NGOs grew exponentially, now 100s of NGOs. There's also a trend towards fragmentation / multiplicity; it's not just about numbers.

- JT asks – is there a privatisation process, an oligopoly, shift in power from multi-laterals, and bi-laterals to NGOs, and privatised organisations. There is a large number of NGOs, JB says, but only 20% of NGOs control most of the resources … the issue of independent organisations with mega budgets. This links to the accreditation issue …

- ➢ Wayne – linked to this, what is the accountability framework when there is so much private money? Do we need new systems and models, NGOs are still working on old models.

Assessment team – Claude de Ville de Goyet

- ➢ ==We had agreed as the TEC in previous meetings to be specific in naming agencies. We need to balance this in the reports, because few reports actually name agencies.== **It was agreed that the different studies should name them .**

- ➢ There are few contradictions between the reports – but one is that ==**JB said the international community should be praised for preventing epidemics and assessment says the opposite (JB not sure about this …). They did not prevent disease / avoid epidemics, as this is a common myth with disasters … see his report.**==

- ➢ UNDAC – we (ie, ==**the assessment study) say it should be used for assessment and JB says coordination. We need to clarify this.**==

- ➢ Gender – in terms of gender coverage in the reports: do we want to be politically correct or factually correct? All vulnerabilities should be addressed, not just gender …

- ➢ ==**Coordination was more positive on technical standards; the assessment study believes only lip-service was paid to them (SPHERE). (Capacities says that the way the current humanitarian system operates the Sphere principles are impossible to operationalise.)**==

- ➢ ==**Foreign Military (or is it UNDAC he says) – issue of dates of when they got to Banda Aceh. The first UNDAC report was on Dec. 30th … they had been stuck in Jakarta. The studies differ on these dates. When was it?**==

- ➢ Re the World Bank assessment – ==**Claude says that they did go to the field to do their damage assessment but JB says it was a desk exercise. There was a lot of desk analysis … again, what to do about this difference?**==

- ➢ ==**The Assessment team did not perceive that the HIC had edited reports, but JB said filtered … The studies need to harmonise what they say on the HIC. And the JLC?**==

- ➢ ==**The military did not use standard forms says JB, but Claude says *all* agencies used different forms.**==

- ➢ Cash … LRRD study is non-committal on its use (recognises both positives and negatives to its use). Gerry Adams said the jury is out in Indonesia as to whether it is culturally appropriate, but Claude pushes for it as an assessment mechanism. Emery says that it is not a matter of intermediaries and local structures. Claude says Brit Red Cross did a household-by-household survey and a list. The issue is cash grant and not cash for work which is different. Re the latter, JC says many problems re duration, etc. Emery says we do not have evidence to say good or bad. Synthesis study should take up the debate on this … but LRRD doesn't look at cash grants (NA says people should decide and assessment is not needed.)

- ➢ ==**Difference in between reports in terms of saying there was too much money and sufficient money.**== But surely 'excess funding' is relative to capacity rather than need? It's an issue of inefficiency rather than too much money. LRRD agrees that the disaster was not exceptional in terms of damage. They do not say there was too much money …

- ➢ Cost – is the international system significantly or even hugely inefficient? We simply do not know and we are not accountable. Are military assets additional? If the military was not available, would that fund be available to the humanitarian sector / for civilian purpose?

- ➢ JC – there is a lump-sum line-item, from Congress for the military. JB – we could not even start to discuss military costs because all donors have different mechanisms. Niels – it is totally unclear, would money be spent on the military be given to HA organisations if the money had not been spent on the military (is it extra money?). Claude says that no matter what you tell the military they do what they want (in reply to JB, who said that the military said they would have acted differently if they had direction). Claude … ==**you need to put both sides of the discussion in the report**==. Moreover, the 'problems' with involvement of the military goes beyond them claiming to have little idea as to needs. For example, would they anyway have provided field hospitals?

- **In LRRD** – Claude disagrees with the emphasis in the LRRD study about the 'poorest of the poor' (the reported referred specifically to one context, and not generally, it seems). Predominantly, the poor are more vulnerable. We agree that it needs to be clarified. Yes rich suffered and this affected the recovery, but chronic poverty was important, as the report states, and was less well addressed than transient poverty. **It was agreed the study should clarify the statement**.

- **LRRD seems not to have agreed with the assessment report that the IFI's recovery assessments were that good** … we seem to agree that the assessments were better than the HA assessments, but were not necessarily used and that seems to be the criticism in the LRRD report. Claude says that the recovery assessment was not just IFI's but also govt and NGOs. JC – was it a damage assessment or a needs assessment? JB – the lead time for the recovery assessment meant that it could not be relevant to decision-making (as with the HA assessment). Claude – there is a funding issue, more than just an assessment issue, regarding donors giving money without assessments and whether it is realistic in the early stage to get assessments.

- **Funding – you need advance funding for assessments. The donor response study misses this**. This recommendation can be linked to the CERF issue for assessment. Assessment agrees with the donor report on this.

- **The Flash Appeal cannot be assessment based, but rough-data based (see recommendation on remote sensoring in the report …) etc. and assessment need to discuss/clarify this with the coordination report … how many days? 11 days is late for the Flash Appeal. JB – we thought it was successful, in that it was well timed, people and donors by then already knew.** Claude says that in normal disasters you need it earlier. RC and all exaggerate needs with the assumption that you will get only some of the money.

- If we want to be serious about assessment the H community has to be serious about providing the UN with resources to mobilise the capacity to do this – but should the UN take the lead? Surely it should work jointly with the Red Cross?

Workshop Comments / Questions on Assessment Study

- Wayne raised the issue of insurable costs, and how the insurance industry assesses damages. International insurance adjusters association estimated some 13Bn for tsunami related insurance costs (see a Reuters report; which is only part of damage – many were not insured). Also, watch out for the Katrina report on Wed. Feb. 15th.

- The IFIs/WB did a good assessment but also they have an advantage in that the situation does not change so much whereas the HA assessments do need to evolve.

- Claude - For assessment you need to improve the administrative support to the assessment process.

- JB – UNDAC is treated as just another NGO. It is a common-service, and it needs to have been treated as such, better than it was. Claude – you need a capacity to do an overall assessment, but that should be RC and UN together. UNDAC should not be driven by donors as a tool to put their people into teams just because they have 3 weeks training (Russians without any experience, mentioned). **Susanne says the study should stress this**, and the issue that there are no performance evaluations for UNDAC team members (but donor govts. disagree to have their staff assessed like this). Claude says you need to have people on retainers, to get the best you can find in the market and dispatch them immediately. What is needed is better and more targeted training for needs assessment.

- JC brings up the issue of accreditation of individual aid personnel, not just aid agencies … like chartered accountants? Susanne – we need better and more systematic training.

- **Gerry Adams questions the statement that many NGOs (the majority?) did bad quality work. It needs to be supported better, as it is a controversial statement**. **Yes in the LRRD report they say that agencies promised too much, but they did not say that most were bad quality**. Stefan of World Vision said that 'Harley for Aceh' (Harley Davidson club?!) arrived to assist, and in Melbourne an organisation which had just been set up raised money and then created massive problems, schools without teachers, lacking understanding of Sharia Law, etc. Gerry says we need evidence for all this … what percentage of agencies were sub-standard, etc. Claude says that psycho-social area is a major area for this, with agencies offering counselling with little or no cultural, linguistic and technical capacities. JB – says that the majority (80%) of money and work done was done by mature NGOs.

Claude – the problem is that the coordination system treats them as all of the same value, and wastes time and effort on trying to track and coordinate them all, as opposed to just the ones doing most work.

➢ For NGOs: the more established NGOs have to pick up where the 2nd and 3rd rate ones have packed up and gone home. They are not able to budget for this, though they've been able to do this due to the large amount of tsunami funding. What implications for the future? Could this be linked back to the donating public? To accountability? And, ultimately, to accreditation? But then the public, if they give to smaller more 'individual' NGOs may feel their money will be of more direct use.

➢ Fiona English – what about educating our populations re all these issues of how and to whom to give money. But people often want accountability so they want to give to people close to them, known locally to them and to ask them to monitor and report, rather than the large established agencies. Flint – says the big NGOs get the most money, so does the public really differentiate?

➢ Claude - the only capital sin (for donors) is if you do not spend your money. There is no performance measurement, and if you do badly you will still get money.

➢ Niels – can we make a strong case for accreditation or at least what to do about this issue of performance? The Synthesis needs to pick up on this. Claude – it needs to be accreditation by cluster/sector (not just overall, general agency accreditation). JC – you need to be able to differentiate between NGOs with capacity, etc. from those that do not have it. Niels – we need a higher level body or process. Others – ISO 9000 and/or SGS process … and convince the national govts. re the need for registration/accreditation.

➢ Accreditation links to good governance and is not a simple solution. Add a statement on principle into GHD about accreditation? If in doubt, should donors fund nationally? How do we retain possible new – and good – players in the 'market' and discriminate between them and those big players already there?

➢ Donors should not fund low quality agencies, especially those of the same national base as the donor (flag waving … donors scouring around for national NGOs, anyone to hold the flag). Yes donors need the tools and systems to accredit, but also a statement of principle.

➢ So three possible solutions re quality control:
  o Accreditation – ISO/SGS, a new body, whatever
  o Through Codes of Conduct type initiatives, to sign up to impact related evaluation, etc … see Emery Brusset for this one …
  o GHD statement of principle and development of tools and systems

Funding study – see the presentation in PowerPoint – Michael Flint

MF listed off a number of positive aspects of much money – giant lens, etc. Then the negatives:

➢ We need balance in criticism re generous funding, coordination, upwards accountability, etc. etc. The funding study does not disagree with these but are the studies being too negative? Should there be more balance?

➢ For other points – see his PPT. For example, despite the weaknesses, thanks to resources the response is effective, but not efficient. We need to agree on our conclusion re this or discuss it.

➢ Re impartiality – this is a grossly imbalanced, distorted response, both *within* the affected areas – assessment showing groups, regions, conflict areas (unlike WB), etc – and *between* tsunami areas and other crises. Also, staff were diverted from other emergencies to the tsunami.

➢ The massive funding generated overly upward accountability to donors and donor public, etc. ==We (all TEC reports) need to sort out our conclusions re the lack of accountability==. Re upwards accountability to the donor public (funding report) - in fact, the general public are not so concerned about getting detailed reporting. Re downward, the LRRD and Capacities studies say little about downward accountability.

➢ Funding was 'supply-driven'. There were no mechanisms to guide funding, to allocate it across crises and organisations. But the big block funding to large organisations ossifies the system by just giving money to the big players.

➢ Re GHD and assessments: Claude notes the nuance that yes funding should be needs based *after* the first days, but before that it can only be based on quick rough-data gathering.

- Is it practical to pool funding, as the capacities study wanted, and how in practice would it work?

- Is this funding unique? Yes the tsunami was qualitatively and quantitatively different. Compare it with the DEC Pakistan Appeal, which was well funded but the appeal was just 15% of the response to the DEC tsunami appeal.

- Can we differentiate between this exceptional response and other less exceptional operations in our Synthesis recommendations? To what extend is the learning specific to the tsunami – ie, to well-funded, crowded emergencies – or more generally?

Workshop Comments / Questions on Assessment Study

- Re pooling of funds in the capacities study: their view is that there is a need to be more flexible, to have a mechanism to allocate funds across agencies, etc. It will be necessary to think through the allocation process, however … JB – See the DEC re experiences of pooling. And UNICEF in the Maldives reallocated money to UNFPA. UNICEF had surplus funds there and could not spend them.

- MF – we need to examine this more. Do you create a pool initially, and then fund raise into it? Or do you post-factum create a fund and put already available money into it (or into joint programmes)?

- Was there too much money? Claude says the assumption that more money is always good is not true. The people of Aceh would have been better off with ½ the money and ½ the agencies in comparison with LRRD 'TMM' idea.

- WFP re food: Claude said WFP for political reasons bumped up the numbers of needy from their assessment of 400k to some 900k people (check figures?).

- Niels - The positive aspects were mainly in the funding of the operation. It was that it was flexible, untied, etc [to an extent] so we should show that. But we also need to bring out the critique from the LRRD, the capacities, studies etc. because the money was there to have done a good job so failures are important. **We do need to name organisations, we agreed that, so we need to go through our reports and do so …**

- Stefan WV – out-sourcing and forging strategic partnerships with the private sector and other NGOs is an option. The funding study mentions the option of working in consortia.

- Rachel – we need to highlight good practice examples in the reports if we are to be serious about learning (a number of methodologies support this point).

- Rachel – The definition of effectiveness used in the donor response study – and therefore DAC – is too narrow. The Capacities study highlights the need to examine the definition of effectiveness in HA operations: are operations defined as effective in terms of *delivery* or *support*? And would accreditation favour delivery over support and thus ossify the system in the form it is now?

- Flint – no the funding study has not defined effectiveness very clearly. JC says effectiveness is whether avoidable deaths and suffering were met. In this way it helps to differentiate between initial and later phases. Claude – but the public gave for life-saving work, and that was all done before we (the international agencies) arrived.

- Major area of difference: **donor response differs to capacities in that DR sees initial phase as a success whereas capacities does not agree** – especially with regard to issues concerning sustainability. This brings a more development perspective in. Effectiveness doesn't consider issues of sustainability.

- Wayne – is there a capacity issue regarding money which left in bank accounts? The fear of and control against fraud and fear of bad audits put a brake on action, and decisions, because in the UNICEF case, this came out of their study. Auditors were happy to note that money was still in bank accounts and had not been subject to fraud (as opposed to having been used effectively to help people).

- JB – the IFRC had a 5 year plan within the first 2 weeks but this was exceptional; others did not.

- Wayne – Canadian CIDA auditors praised them for not having had fraud and that the money was in the bank. See what happens re this in the Katrina report too. Claude agrees and argues that staff are open to criticism ether way (damned if you do and damned if you don't act).

- ➤ Gerry Adams – there is an assumption that more money is better. No one accepted that it would take 5 or even 10 years to rebuild.
- ➤ We need to make the point about so much still in the accounts, and the interest on that money (the RC will use interest earned for non-tsunami work). The Danes want the interest returned to them (DANIDA).

Various

- ➤ JC - Many agency reports are 'what we did' reports and not accountability reports (what was achieved, etc.). There is no market because agencies do not attack each other, or compare themselves, argue their value-added above other, etc.
- ➤ Fiona – we need to see if there is a mid-level type emergency scenario for future funding that we can advise on, even if the tsunami is an exceptional case.
- ➤ JB Competition is good among agencies – it provides choice. Claude – do people have more choice? Can they really choose? Did the people have the information to choose.
- ➤ Nanthi – and the overall pie is fixed, so it is not like a market that can adapt supply to demand.
- ➤ Cash is a mechanism to improve choice if goods and services to buy.
- ➤ What about vouchers – Tearfund in Sri Lanka tried some.

Capacities study – Nanthi in place of Arjuna

- ➤ Nanthi – cash is not a panacea, it requires specific conditions, training and safeguards from squandering, and should be provided in instalments.
- ➤ There are many similarities in the reports. The only key area (of difference) is the <mark>initial phase where we differ from the opinion that it went well</mark>. The GHD says that linkages should be made from the initial stage into later phases. In fact this did not happen well. So this requirement for the initial phase was not met.
- ➤ <mark>**Needs assessment is the term to be used for relief and damage assessment for longer-term (see P.29 line 1081 Capacities).**</mark>
- ➤ Coordination – JT points out the <mark>**contrast between the capacities and coordination reports, in that the latter basically takes international coordination as a given.**</mark> See the national coordination issue in chapter II of the capacities report. JB – said national coordination was equally important because many local NGOs were branches of National NGOs. JB – we recommend that local NGOs be admitted to the coordination mechanisms and that support be given to the authorites for coordination.
- ➤ The beneficiary surveys show that greatest satisfaction is in the first weeks and then it decreases. This is important, says Claude, because it points out that this is before the internationals arrived. (Just Sri Lanka?).
- ➤ <mark>**Re the 'window of opportunity' … Claude says it does exist, but the issue is that it was not achieved. (re reference to the LRRD report which seems to doubt that the window exists).**</mark>
- ➤ If the international presence was negative in many aspects, should the Thailand and India cases not have shown a better performance (where the international involvement was more limited)? Thailand got 0.6% and India 16% of intl funding, Thailand had a pre-existing disaster system. It is not whether Thailand and India were better, but that the internationals in India played a positive role in seeing that vulnerable groups etc. were included. <mark>**JT asked if this can be reflected in the recommendations**</mark>. Claude asks whether people would have been better off if the intl invasion had happened in India – probably not, so … the intls are not needed (as much as we think …). Nanthi says and Claude agrees some presence and oversight by the international community is required. We agree it seems that where strong governments an India type scenario would have been desirable.
- ➤ Nanthi says that locals do not trust their own leaders. We the ints. go in with our own international standards. Capacities are overwhelmed, so there is a need for intl support. But is the way we aid 'crowding out' local capacities? Seemingly so. That is for him the issue. JT asks him to reflect these issues/their conclusions in the recommendations … to deepen the analysis of the international role, presence and performance.

- ➢ JB – says that the original TEC TOR said we would not comment on the performance of national governments and therefore the coordination team didn't do so.

LRRD – Jerry Adams in place of Ian Christoplos

- ➢ **LRRD felt that gender was not given sufficient coverage in the coordination report. Is it that gender policies were not operationalised? The report does not link to wider livelihood frameworks.**

- ➢ In the capacities report, it says an overall 'technical approach' was followed … what is meant by this?

- ➢ Coordination was more about activities than outcomes, it seems. NGOs did not need to coordinate due to a lot of private money. The LRRD team saw exceptions, like the SCF in Aceh in health care and this was because the right person with experience of health in Aceh was hired. Human resources issues like this are important, such as also the lack of local language skills, poaching of staff, etc … Ian in his report wrote that this was capacity-breaking not capacity-building (capacity breaking for national organisations).

- ➢ On funding, the pressure to disburse was great. Agencies struggle to spend money in a short time.

- ➢ Many agencies moved out of their core competencies, especially into shelter, without necessarily having the skills.

- ➢ **'Building-back-better' – what does it mean? We differ in definitions.** To what standards? Is it risk prevention? Is it to SPHERE standards? Is it good reconstruction? Is it to beneficiary and cultural preferences? Etc.

- ➢ Re the media, we see little in the reports on their role and impact – agencies pushed for a positive image.

- ➢ M&E got little mention in the reports – many agencies were slow in developing systems, processes etc. for monitoring and evaluations, etc.

- ➢ **Re the 'Window of opportunity' – the difference between the LRRD and assessment report is that the LRRD report says it rarely is availed of, or happens. Claude points out that the LRRD report seems to question the concept. It does exist and is relevant … and the real issue is that it is not availed of enough by agencies.**

- ➢ The distinction between complex and natural disasters is not useful … this was a mixed scenario with both conflict and natural disaster aspects.

Workshop Comments / Questions on LRRD Study

- ➢ Re the LRRD report, JT says the LRRD report correctly notes that LRRD is essentially a political process and that the HA agencies do not have the skills set, etc. for this linking and recovery phase. **JT asks the LRRD team to spell out the conclusions they come to on this.** Others ask why we have different principles (re impartiality, political involvement, independence, etc.) in the development and HA fields … they are all political. **JT asks the LRRD study to develop the point more … is our 'non-political' approach unrealistic, especially in the LRRD phase?** The HA principles are founded on this.

Closing comments

- ➢ The synthesis report should be some 40 pages so as to get people to read it. And the exec summary should be separate (says Fiona). You need very clear conclusions and recommendations, up front, for the field people.

- ➢ Niels says a variety of products will be provided on a single CD, including the sub or country reports, etc. A discussion on report presentation and formatting etc. followed briefly.

- ➢ A request was made to make 'actionable' recommendations. But if teams cannot give clear tasks, etc. they should give at least examples of best practice.

CMG Present

Susanne Frueh (SF) OCHA (Chair)
Mihir Bhatt (AIDMI)
Niels Dabelstein (ND) Danida
Stefan Dahlgren (SD) Sida
Francois Grunewald (Groupe URD)
Rachel Houghton (RH) ALNAP/TEC (sections 2 & 3)

Jamo Huddle (JH) World Vision
Wayne MacDonald (WM) UNICEF
John Mitchell (JM) ALNAP
Chinwe Ozugha (CO) ALNAP/TEC (minutes)
Sherylin Thompson (ST) ALNAP/TEC (sections 2 & 3)

Apologies

Rachel Bedouin (RB) FAO
Christoph Jacob (CJ) SDC

Suppiramaniam Nanthikesan (SN) UNDP
Margaret Stansberry (MS) IFRC

1   REVIEW OF CURRENT DRAFT OF THE SYNTHESIS REPORT

Discussions	Actions
SF asked for feedback from the group on the current draft. The salient points from the feedback and discussions are as follows: • Improvements were noted in the second draft compared with the previous first draft discussed in Copenhagen. Notably, the tone of the report is more balanced and the Response section reads well and is likely to be appreciated by a wide group of stakeholders. It was noted that it is valuable to identify areas for further research. • One member of the CMG had shared the report with local counterparts. He reported that there had been a perception by people who had heard about the report that it would be harsh and critical – but when read, their view changed. This is important to remember. • However, some members felt that aspects of the report need further work and improvement, particularly Section 2 on conclusions and recommendations. Specifically, the emphasis on the ownership thesis may be overdone; there is a lack of clarity as to how the findings, conclusions and recommendations relate to overlapping types of activities – relief, recovery, (rehabilitation) and development; and the recommendations could be more firmly rooted in the operational and institutional realities of the sector. They could also relate more specifically to current policy initiatives and debates. A system-wide analysis needs to be incorporated. • It should be noted that within the CMG there was also a less critical view and that a number of CMG members think that the analysis is generally adequate. • There was a consensus that the current structure of the report is not as logical as it could be. In fact the CMG request for a re-structure made in Copenhagen has not worked. The CMG pass on their apologies to the synthesis team for this. • Instead, it is proposed that the report be restructured in the following way: Begin with an executive summary that outlines the key messages. The target audience for this is senior executives and policy makers. This should be followed by The Disaster: An Overview (currently section 3); followed by The Response (currently section 4); followed by Conclusions	**SD** to end by email more details to JM of her suggested changes. **JM** to contact **JC** & **JT** for their availability to make suggested editorial changes to the document. **JM** to ask **RH** to restructure report so that the chapters run in the sequence described in the notes. He will also ask her to do a light edit of the report checking for typos and consistency. Report to be circulated by May 12th. .

and Recommendations (currently section 2). In addition, a concise additional section on Policy Implications will also be added. This is because the policy analysis needs augmenting. When the report is circulated a request will be made for comments on what the implications are for specific areas of policy reform.

- It was suggested that selected Peer Reviewers could be drafted in to assist with the above process. The area of mitigation and risk reduction was noted as a particular priority and it was suggested that the PR group may be able to provide specialist knowledge on this.

- CMG members stated that it would be appropriate to highlight in the report what worked well. There was agreement that the authors need to illustrate the report with more positive aspects of programming. The results of the stakeholder workshops illustrated some interesting initiatives. This could be reflected in the report.

- Further editing is needed on the bibliographies. There are also typos in the report and it will need copy-editing before going to the broader TEC constituency. In addition, it was noted that there is some repetition in the report which will require editing.

- In sum, the CMG fully support the process as proceeding as planned but are aware of the fact that the structure and analytical sections of the report still need attention.

2. LAUNCH EVENTS

Agreements	Actions

RH & ST presented the launch events schedule and asked for a decision from the group on who should be on the panels for the launches in Geneva, New York, London and Bangkok. The following was agreed:
 	
- No launches to be held in New York and Bangkok as most of the main stakeholders will be in Geneva. For the regions a press release will be issued instead, through World Vision.
 	
- For the Geneva and London launches there should be no more than 6 people on each panel; they should consist of representatives from the main stakeholders as well as the affected areas. It will be necessary to ensure that the panel is diverse.
 	
- Invitations to panellists the launches need to be sent out asap. They will go from Susanne Frueh as Chair of the CMG.
 	
- The group gave agreed the following to be on the panel:
 	
   o **Geneva** – Launched by Jan Egeland and presented by John Telford. Panel: Jan Egeland, Mihir Bhatt and Richard Manning. Recommendations to be given for a Red Cross rep from the region and reps for Sri Lanka, the Maldives and Indonesia.
 	
   o **London** – Possibly launched by Hilary Benn. Presented by John Cosgrave. Panel: possibly Simon Maxwell, Nola Leach (Care International), Andrew Bonwick, and the EU Commissioner for development and Humanitarian Aid as well as reps from the region
 	
- List of spokespeople agreed and ST given go ahead to send an e-mail requesting their participation in media activity.
- Meeting had no further recommendations or comments on attendees to be invited to launch.
	ST to follow-up on all invitation actions, as well as with spokespeople.

3. BUDGET

Agreements	Actions
RH presented the update of the project budget and stated that decisions had to be made on the translations and printing. The following was agreed: • There are missing donors from the TEC budget – ECHO in particular, as well as some of the recovery and development actors including UNDP. They should be approached for funding. • Currently £83,000 short for the next phase of the project (May through July). If the TEC runs until the end of January this amount increases to approximately £160,000. • CMG members will follow up a number of potential donors; RH will follow up with others. • WM pledged $30,000 from UNICEF but needs an updated proposal based on today's discussions. Other members requested this as well. • SF mentioned the possibility of $15,000 from OCHA.	**RH** to give CMG list of people who need to be contacted so CMG can follow up. CMG to follow up on their commitments. **RH** to send revised budget and proposal to CMG w/c 15 May.

4. NEXT MEETING

The next CMG meeting will **Tuesday 6 June** (another telecon) to discuss the synthesis report as well as the regional workshops, funding and other matters.

CMG Meeting to Discuss 1st Draft Synthesis Report
7 April 2006
Copenhagen

Present:

John Cosgrave (JC) TEC/ALNAP
Olivier Cossier (OC) FAO
Niels Dabelstein (ND) DANIDA
Stefan Dahlgren (SD) Sida
Susanne Frueh (SF;Chair) OCHA
Rachel Houghton (RH; minutes) TEC/ALNAP
Jamo Huddle (JH) WWI
Christoph Jacob (CJ) SDC

Ted Kliest, MFA Netherlands
Wayne MacDonald, UNICEF
John Mitchell (JM) ALNAP
Suppiramaniam Nanthikesan, UNDP
Johan Schaar (JS) IFRC
Sherylin Thompson (ST; minutes) TEC/ALNAP
John Telford, ALNAP/TEC

Apologies:

Mihir Bhatt, AIDMI
Rachel Bedouin, FAO

Francois Grunewald, Groupe URD
Margaret Stansberry, IFRC

---

1   Agreements on substantive issues

Agreements	Actions
The meeting discussed the first draft of the synthesis report and it was agreed that **all comments would be given in writing** to the synthesis team (to JC). These will represent the record of concern from those at the meeting. The meeting agreed to **restructure the report**: • Remove the Executive Summary • Bring the Conclusions and Recommendations upfront, after the Introduction • Put the Response chapter after these The meeting also agreed: • To **extend the deadline for comments** on the first draft to Friday 14 April. • That the authors should **bring out the analytical content** more clearly. • That the **tone** of the report needs to be more objective. This is especially true of the Executive Summary [now removed] and the Conclusions and Recommendations. • That **references** (at least to the thematic reports) should be in the form of the short name of the report rather than in the present format (APA 5th format) or similar. • That **references to the media** should be **reduced and triangulated**.	**Synthesis team** to take agreements forward **CMG / peer reviewers** to reinforce issue of confidentiality on this first draft

2   New synthesis timetable

Agreements		Actions
Deadline for written comments on 1st draft:	Friday 14 April	**JC** to inform peer reviewers that the deadline for comments on the first draft has been extended
Collated comments from JC to JT:	Tuesday 18 April	
TEC synthesis team meeting:	Friday 21 April	
DRAFT II:	Saturday 6 May	
CMG telecon:	Tuesday 9 May	
Deadline for written comments on 2nd draft:	Friday 26 May	

Collated comments from JC to JT:	Wednesday 31 May
Annotated comments to CMG:	Friday 2 June
CMG telecon:	Tuesday 6 June
Final version:	**Tuesday 13 June**
Deadline for Key Messages & Academic Journal:	Friday 30 June
Deadline for Condensed version:	Friday 30 June

3 Media activity for synthesis report launch and briefing events

Agreements	Actions
The **date of the launch** will be the morning of Friday 14 July at the ECOSOC meeting in Geneva, just prior to the humanitarian segment.	
There will be three briefing events on the same day of the launch in Bangkok, London and New York.	
The format of the launch at ECOSOC will include a panel discussion. The presentation will be no longer than 25 minutes. The CMG will provide recommendations for panellists, attendees (launch and briefings), moderator / MC, report presenter (launch and briefings) as well as suggestions of prominent individuals to launch the report in the event an OSE representative is unable to attend.	**CMG** to recommend participants – as soon as possible – and communicate to **ST**
Spokespeople in as many countries as possible to be made available to speak to journalists (print and radio) in July. The spokespeople's organisations' press officers will be contacted to discuss their involvement with TEC and media activity.	**CMG** to recommend spokespeople – as soon as possible – and communicate to **ST**
Crib sheets / briefing notes will be drafted to help brief journalists as well as to focus spokespeople on the key messages when being interviewed.	**ST**
A press release with only one or two key messages will be drafted, approved and translated into key languages. ST is attempting to get support from humanitarian organisations to translate the release and SF, SN and JH may be able to provide some support with translation.	**ST** to find translators for the releases – with input from the **CMG**
The world's major news agencies will be invited to the launch / briefings and the release will be sent to leading newspapers and broadcasters across the globe.	**ST** to finalise media lists
The **key messages focused** on at the launch will constitute the main suggestions for a way forward.	

4   Other TEC products

Agreements	Actions
Three additional products will be based on the synthesis report: • Key Messages (2,500) • Journal Article • Condensed Version (10,000 – 15,000 words) A journalist will be contracted to write the Condensed Version. The Condensed Version and the Key Messages will be shared at the launch.	**RH** to prepare budget with all options costed **CMG** to source translators – for example, during the feedback workshops at the end of April (**SF and SN**)

Ideally the Key Messages and Condensed Version will be translated into: French; Spanish; local languages	**TEC Sec** to approach member agencies about possible translators

5   AOB: Funding

The following was **noted**: • To date WFP, World Vision, Luxembourg, NZ Aid and CIDA have confirmed specific funding for 2006/07 • Danida, OCHA and UNICEF have confirmed, but amounts are currently unspecified • Sida will make a decision week commencing 10 April Confirmed amounts total about a quarter of what is required in 2006/07. [NOTE: Due to work on the synthesis, JC will require an additional month's funding; other products proposed by the CMG – including a journalist-authored Condensed version of the synthesis report – will also increase the current budget.]	**RH** to follow up by phone with other donors that have been approached **RH** to prepare a budget for all products proposed during the CMG

6   AOB: CMG membership

It was noted that NZAid had expressed an interest in sitting on the CMG during Phase II of the TEC. This was agreed by all, especially given their proximity to the affected region.	**RH** to contact Penny Hawkins of NZAid
It was noted that other regional actors should be approached during the regional feedback workshops (for capacities, coordination and LRRD) at the end of April.	**SF & SN**
It was agreed that the current CMG needs to discuss membership in more detail during the next CMG meeting.	**CMG**

7   Next CMG meeting
Teleconference to discuss Draft II. Time:
09:30   New York
14:30   London
15:30   EST
19:00   India
21:30   Singapore

CMG Meeting
CARE International, London
15th February 2006

CMG Present:

John Cosgrave (JC) TEC/ALNAP	Laura Kitchin (LK; minutes) TEC/ALNAP
Niels Dabelstein (ND) DANIDA	Suppiramaniam Nanthikesan (SN)UNDP
Susanne Frueh (SF;Chair) OCHA	Margaret Stansberry (MS) IFRC
Stefan Germann (SG) WVI	John Telford (JT) TEC/ALNAP
Rachel Houghton (RH; minutes) TEC/ALNAP	Sherilyn Thompson (ST) TEC/ALNAP
Wayne Macdonald (WMD) UNICEF	

Apologies:

Mihir Bhatt, AIDMI	Francois Grunewald, Groupe URD
Amy Cavender, WV (DEC)	Christoph Jacob, SDC
Stefan Dahlgren, Sida	John Mitchell, ALNAP
Andre Griekspoor, WHO	Miles Murray, CARE

1. REFLECTIONS ON TUESDAY'S MEETING

Agreements	Actions
It was **agreed** that the team meeting the previous day had been a positive meeting, especially as it appeared the 5 thematic reports were converging.	

Dissemination of TEC Findings / Production of Thematic Reports was also discussed

Agreements	Actions
It was **agreed** that, with regard to communication of TEC findings, TEC members would be requested to report back on their activities to promote the TEC. It was also **agreed** that commissioning agencies promote the TEC findings in the thematic reports in a reasonably coordinated manner through communication and feedback. Finally, it was **agreed** that the TEC will only organise TEC-specific events once the synthesis report is available.	**TEC Sec** to continue to update and distribute upcoming events calendar on a monthly basis. **CMG** will make additions / amendments each month.
	TEC Sec to design a simple performance monitoring framework that captures the rationale for each presentation / attendance, key TEC messages delivered, and the response. Also to compile a list of public references to the TEC (eg, in the media, parliamentary discussions etc)
	SF to send a letter to all thematic report managers to ensure they coordinate their communications, and explain the reasons for doing so.
	SF to feedback Jan Egeland's movements to TEC CMG.

COMMON THEMATIC REPORT ELEMENTS	
It was **agreed** that each thematic report will follow the same overall design, use of font and motifs in order that all TEC products can be identified as a family of publications. (This is for publication prior to being produced with the synthesis report in June.)	**Commissioning agencies** to ensure that each thematic report follows the TEC style guide. **TEC Sec** to provide design specifications to all commissioning agencies.

It was **agreed** that each thematic report will indicate the cost of its own evaluation – but using the terminology 'investment' rather than cost. Thus 'investments into the TEC' should be reflected in each report. An annex in the synthesis will do the same thing – but for all reports.	**TEC Sec** will provide these with the help of **evaluation managers**.
It was **agreed** that each thematic report should contain a short profile of each evaluator in the annex. This should include a few words on their background (years in the business and key areas of expertise) as well as an explanation of their role in the evaluation. Max 8-10 lines.	**Commissioning agencies / evaluation managers**.
Each thematic report will explain the independent nature of the evaluation: that this independence has been protected and that, while the commissioning agencies have managed the process, the evaluations are the product of a much larger group of agencies (the steering groups).	**Commissioning agencies / evaluation managers**.
Each report will also include an explanation of who's in the steering group and working group (if they have one); how the evaluation was organised; who was involved.	**Commissioning agencies / evaluation managers**.

2. SYNTHESIS REPORT AND FEEDBACK MECHANISMS

Agreements	Actions
It was **agreed** that, given the time-lag between the evaluations and publication, the synthesis report will consider new, documented evaluative information. However, it will not introduce new topics unless they are directly relevant to the existing themes as this would make the scope of the synthesis too broad.	**JT** and synthesis team. **WMD** and others to feed in relevant reports (eg, UNICEF report due).
It was agreed that the synthesis will have an acknowledgements which also details the process. This will be written by the Chair. It will also have a forward written by a prominent figure such as Bill Clinton or Jan Egeland. Endorsements will also be solicited for the back cover.	**SF**. **RH** will follow up with the OSE to enquire whether Bill Clinton can do it.
It was **agreed** that the policy recommendations in the synthesis report should be strategically targeted to specific stakeholder audiences and, where appropriate, actionable.	**JT** and synthesis team.
It was **agreed** that the TEC CMG would ask all TEC members to target management recommendations in order to maximise utilisation of TEC findings. This applies to both the individual studies and the synthesis report. TEC members will be asked to feedback a management response on TEC recommendations for the **thematic reports** and the **synthesis**.	**TEC Sec** to build a list of all TEC agencies in order to encourage as wide a management response as possible. **TEC CMG** and **TEC Sec** to ensure all **TEC members** (including the CMG, Steering Committees, Working Groups, funders and the wider TEC) review TEC findings in the **thematic reports** and the **synthesis**.
It was agreed that the synthesis final draft report would not go on the web for public comment in May. Depending on JT's discretion the **second** draft should be targeted and available for comments from all those involved in the TEC including the wider TEC.	**TEC Sec** to inform people through the online forum that Draft 2 of the synthesis draft is available for comments to those involved in the TEC process and provide them with an email contact to obtain the report. **TEC Sec** to target those in the regions by email for comments **JT** to devise a guide for comments in

	order to make it clear that the synthesis is to build on the 5 thematic studies

3. COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

Agreements	Actions
The CMG **agreed** that the media strategy should be based around the current issues in the humanitarian sector to maximise our impact. However, the media was also recognised as being a vehicle; as a conduit to reach the public (this answering the TEC's accountability agenda); as a tool to 'persuade'.	**ST** to ensure a targeted, holistic media strategy.

Discussion concerning the future of the TEC in ALNAP, and funding.

Agreements	Actions
It was **agreed** that, ideally, ALNAP needs to build in a budget line that indicates an allocation for a TEC-like function within ALNAP. SF reported that it looked likely the ALNAP steering committee would agree to 'dock' TEC capacity at its meeting in March.	**JM** to follow up. **JM** to investigate whether wider ALNAP membership need to be informed of this before the decision is taken (eg, by discussing this in Nairobi).
It was **agreed** a proposal would be needed to take this forward.	**JM to produce a proposal**.
In terms of funding, current TEC staff should continue to pursue funding based on the current proposal, especially as the TEC's project period does not tie in with the current ALNAP financial year. It was noted, however, that it would be better as a budget line within ALNAP as this would reduce reporting requirements.	**JM & RH**.
It was **agreed** that new donors should be targeted, eg, the Irish and ECHO.	**JM & RH**.
It was noted that ODI / ALNAP is not in a position to carry TEC work financially as it did last year and that committed funding would be required from May.	
It was **agreed** that what is needed is for ALNAP, based on its TEC experience, to produce standard ToR for future joint evaluations; also how coalition members might relate to each other [this will come out of the learning associated with aim 3].	**ALNAP / TEC staff**
CMG members **requested** to see current projected costs and a breakdown of donors who've funded the TEC Sec.	**RH** to circulate.

4. REGIONAL FEEDBACK WORKSHOPS AND LAUNCH

Agreements	Actions
It was **noted** that the capacities study with coordination is planning on conducting feedback workshops at country level, both national and local. The purpose: to calibrate the evaluations; enable 'ownership'; ascertain what action national stakeholders would consider appropriate. They may be joined in the feedback process by UNICEF. All those interviewed would be invited.	**SN** to produce a concept paper for the country level feedback workshops, and share with the CMG / TEC Sec.
It was **agreed** that this could be seen as part of a longer term strategy of TEC engagement at field level, and would not preclude the TEC's regional feedback process once the synthesis has been produced.	**[Note: TEC Sec to produce concept note for regional workshops by end March.]**
It was **agreed** that the formal launch would take place around the ECOSOC meeting in July in Geneva. (14-18)	

There will be two events: the **first** will be a public launch. Ideally this will involve representation from the OSE or possibly Jan Egeland.	**ST** to organise press briefings. **SG** offered support through contacts in Bangkok.
The **second** event will be a panel discussion, with the intention that discussion influences the debate in ECOSOC. This will be open to all agencies, not just those present for the ECOSOC meeting. Ideally it would have broad presentation: for example, the OSE, InterAction, IFRC, officials from the regions, JT. SF could chair / introduce the TEC. It would be an opportunity for panellists to look at policy implications within the humanitarian sector.	**SF** to research the best day for the panel during ECOSOC. **CMG** to start thinking about appropriate panellists and a good panellist moderator. **RH** to follow up with M Bhatt about regional representation. **SG** to follow up with second-in-command of World Vision, a Thai.
It was **agreed** there will also be a press briefing in London during the same week, and a press briefing later in Bangkok.	**ST** in London; delegate to the regions. Will work closely with OSE on this.

4.   NEXT MEETING AND TELECONFERENCE
The next CMG meeting will be on April 7th in Copenhagen.

4

**Minutes
CMG Meeting
Teleconference
18 July 2006**

CMG Present

Mihir Bhatt (MB) AIDMI
Niels Dabelstein (ND) Danida
Stefan Dahlgren (SD) Sida
Margaret Stansberry (MS) IFRC
Rachel Houghton (RH) ALNAP/TEC
Francois Grunewald (Groupe URD)

Susanne Frueh (SF) OCHA (Chair)
Chinwe Ozugha (CO) ALNAP/TEC (minutes)
Sherylin Thompson (ST) ALNAP/TEC
Suppiramaniam Nanthikesan (SN) UNDP
Andre Griekspoor (AG) WHO

Apologies

Rachel Bedouin (RB) FAO

Christoph Jacob (CJ) SDC

John Mitchell (JM) ALNAP

John Cosgrave (JC) TEC

John Telford (JT) TEC

Wayne MacDonald (WM) UNICEF

Tania Kelly (TK) OCHA

Jamo Huddle (JH) World Vision

---

1. Reactions to the report launch

Discussions	Actions
The group gave feedback on the two launches. Thanks was given to the TEC Secretariat, ALNAP and ODI for all the preparations.	
Comments given	
London Launch	
• ND reported that the London launch went well: the panel was excellent; JC gave a good presentation; journalists asked good questions. One asked how the media should be educated.	
Geneva Launch	
• SF reported positively on Geneva. However, it was noted that the press roundtable happened just after the start of the Middle East crisis so attendance was affected due to another press conference by Jan Egeland (who launched the TEC report). Questions posed by delegations were good, but one criticism was that there was not enough time for people to read the report.	
It was agreed that copies of the reports must be sent to all affected country governments as soon as they are available, and that the CMG must pro-active in disseminating the reports widely.	
Press Coverage	
• This has been quite impressive. Reuters and a number of other big press agencies made a difference.	**ST** to compile a list of media coverage for the CMG.
• Media coverage in the affected regions is unknown so far as the timing of the launch was too late for these areas (ie, in terms of time difference).	Ask launch panel members to check for regional press articles. Action: **ST**
• Denmark and Sweden actively took up the press material, as did the UK.	**ST**: to create media file.
• In India, the Hindu and Hindustan times (English language papers) carried articles; in Sri Lanka some papers also carried articles.	
• It was agreed that ST's media report should go on the web service. UNDP has a news clipping service and it was suggested that this could be used to continue to monitor coverage. It was agreed that all the press coverage on the report should be put in a file.	

2. Update on the TEC Secretariat

Discussions	Actions
RH gave an update on the Secretariat's work: **Publications** • This week finalising the funding and capacities report ready for print. All reports will be ready for circulation by the end of August. • The condensed version will now be finalised by RH as the journalist who wrote the first draft has now left the UK. This will be done when RH is back from leave. 3000 will be printed. • 3000 of each report (including the synthesis) will be printed; 6000 CD ROMs will be made. These will accompany the report set and the condensed version. • 25 sets will be sent to each CMG member and funder; wider TEC member agencies will receive 10. Reports will also be distributed in the region. • To save costs the bulk of the report sets will be sent to CMG members to distribute. **TEC personnel and finance** • CO finishes this week. Colin Hadkiss will deal with the financial administration from now on. ST finishes next week. • RH and JM will meet on his return from leave to discuss how to move forward. RH's contract finishes 18 August, but she may be retained for a few months to take the follow-up forward. • The budget is down approx £20,000 due to costs of extra personnel and activities for the launch. Additionally the report is now double its original size – and will therefore cost more to print. Decisions will need to be made on how the costs will be borne. It was agreed that the CMG may need to do some more fundraising. • The CMG requested a list of publications (including translations) and completion dates.	 **RH** to draw up.

3. Follow-up on the synthesis report / management response

Discussion	Actions
SD suggested that there should be a mechanism whereby agency leadership give responses. It was agreed that these must be tracked and compiled, including official ones from Governments. This will be done centrally. However, it will depend on CMG members and others reporting back to RH / ALNAP.	**CMG members** (and others) to feed back to TEC / ALNAP.
Also, the 59 recommendations need to be prioritized and targeted by audience. RH and JM to come up with a comprehensive strategy for follow-up in September. Feedback workshops will focus on how recommendations are being taken forward.	
It was agreed to send a letter to all agencies involved stating plans to take the project forward.	**RH** to write letter.
Plans so far: • Jan Egeland has committed to follow-up. • Puteri Watson of BRR would like presentations of the report in Indonesia – to government and civil society. • WFP will give a short report. • DANIDA will be doing the same, based on prioritisation. • Request to look into the example of the Rwanda report where there was a survey of responses to the incident. It would be good to find out about this. • JT will present the findings to UNDP.	

• With OSE, emphasis should be on building what we have. Possibility of joint presentations in the region.	
It was noted that those interested in the second phase of the LRRD study requested that this be postponed until later in 2007.	
It was agreed that SD would look back in Sida's files to find the Rwanda 'JEFF' follow up files.	**SD**.

4. Date and time of next face- to-face meeting
The next CMG meeting will be on either 21 or 22 September in Copenhagen. It will include another AAR.

Present:

Mihir Bhatt (MB) AIDMI	Maurice Herson (MH) ALNAP
Niels Dabelstein (ND) Danida	Rachel Houghton (RH) ALNAP/TEC (minutes)
Stefan Dahlgren (SD) Sida	Wayne MacDonald (WM) UNICEF
Susanne Frueh (SF) OCHA (Chair)	John Mitchell (JM) ALNAP

Apologies:

Margaret Stansberry (IFRC)	Christoph Jakob (SDC)
Rachel Bedouin (FAO)	Jamo Huddle (WVi)

Agenda Items 1, 2 & 3:

TEC Dissemination / Taking the TEC to the Affected Region / Wider TEC Meeting

Discussion & Agreements	Action
Regional Dissemination and Follow-up The group discussed the proposal put forward by Mihir (on behalf of the TEC) to facilitate dissemination and follow-up in the region. It was recognised as an important initiative and that AIDMI is well-placed to take the work forward. Importantly, it was **noted** that a number of local actors have already enquired how they can be 'TEC compliant'. The proposal is in direct response to this, and is focused on making a difference at ground level by focusing on local / national priorities. As a result the proposal concentrates on issues of particular interest to the region: DRR, local capacities and LRRD (with a view to enabling the recovery process to continue more effectively). Good linkages already exist between AIDMI and groups in Sri Lanka and the Maldives, and the proposal works on the basis of having other actors as focal points in each of the affected countries. It was **agreed** that synergies would be sought, where appropriate, with other initiatives – such as TRIAMS, the NGO/Clinton Initiative, LRRD Phase II, and follow-up work in ALNAP. The NGO/Clinton Initiative will make its events calendar available in the near future. However, to ensure active follow-up and good organisation and coordination the group **noted** that funding will be required. If this isn't obtained the work will only be able to proceed at a much more limited scale and pace.	
General Dissemination Approach Overall it was **agreed** that TEC members should be both strategic and opportunistic in terms of disseminating and communicating TEC findings and recommendations. It was also **agreed** that RH would re-institute the 'events diary' and prepare a short paper on dissemination for discussion at the Copenhagen meeting. This will indicate what's happened already, what is planned, and suggest who should do what. MB will feed in information on regional partners for this. The events diary will be kept on the website. It was **agreed** that once the recommendation matrix is complete we need to identify the generic recommendations and think about how we can disseminate these into, for example, Africa, Latin America, and the EU and US NGO community generally. It was also **agreed** that we need to follow up with BRR in Indonesia and CHA in Sri Lanka. Further enquiries will be made about other regional partners (based on input from MB and others).	**RH** to revise dissemination strategy (by 18th Sept) **MB** to suggest contacts in the region **RH** to put in a call to BRR panellists at launch; also to CHA

1

Role of ALNAP	**JM** to send invitation to CMG
JM alerted the CMG to the ALNAP SC on 27th September. He invited members of the CMG to attend that meeting (in London) with a view to discussing ALNAP's role in taking the TEC's findings and recommendations forward. This will be an active facilitation and monitoring role.	
He also clarified the process the TEC team is going through to organise the recommendations. These will be presented to the CMG on the 21st in Copenhagen. The first day of the ALNAP Biannual on 6th December will be dedicated to discussing these and also to follow-up.	
ND requested a matrix that gives an overview of the 10 themes the recommendations have been broken down into.	**RH / MH** to prepare
The issue of holding a wider TEC meeting before the ALNAP Biannual was raised and it was agreed that this would be discussed in Copenhagen on the 21st.	

Agenda item 4: Agenda for Copenhagen

Discussion / Agreements	Action
The agenda for Copenhagen is to:	
- Discuss the TEC's work in the short-term (before December when RH leaves) - Discuss further the AIDMI proposal for regional dissemination - Discuss the TEC post-December, and ALNAP's role - Present the matrix of TEC recommendations - Conduct an AAR in the afternoon (for which John Cosgrave will be in attendance; MH will facilitate)	
Suggested items for the AAR include:	
- The process to write the synthesis report - The launches / dissemination	
The AAR report will be ready for the ALNAP SC on the 27th. It will contain both do's and don'ts as well as candid lessons learnt about what worked well, what worked less well, what agencies should be prepared for in the future. Where possible it will build on the two previous AARs.	**MH**
It was **noted** that RH will also be following up with the wider TEC via a simple email survey which will also request TEC members to self-select to potential focus groups discussions / bi-lateral telephone calls.	**RH** to circulate survey questionnaire etc

Agenda item 5: Condensed Version

Discussion / Agreements	Action
While CMG members differed on the need to produce this product it was agreed to proceed with this report on the basis that the full synthesis is 'too big'; it will target a large potential audience in the region; it will reach a wider	**RH** to follow up with JC

'professional' audience, eg, people in other government ministries who won't find time to read the full report.

It was **agreed** to follow a format similar to the Initial Findings that will build on the current executive summary along with the Key Messages already produced. Making it easy to read is a priority, and it should include quite extensive use of graphs, pictures, charts etc. It will be printed in limited numbers but will be on the website as the main vehicle for dissemination.

John Cosgrave has been asked to write it and will start work from mid-September.

Item 6: AOB (AEA and UKES / EES annual conferences)

Discussion / Agreements	Action
ND requested all those involved in these conferences stay in Copenhagen on the night of 21st to discuss our approach to the presentations.	**SF and RH** to see if this is possible

TEC CMG MEETING
21 SEPTEMBER 2006
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Room M7, Asistiak Plads 2
DK 1488, Copenhagen

Present:

Mihir Bhatt (MB) AIDMI   Rachel Houghton (RH) ALNAP/TEC (minutes)
Niels Dabelstein (ND) Danida   Wayne MacDonald (WM) UNICEF
Stefan Dahlgren (SD) Sida   John Mitchell (JM) ALNAP
John Cosgrave (JC) Independent; former TEC EAC   Margaret Stansberry (IFRC)
Susanne Frueh (SF) OCHA (Chair)   Suppiramaniam Nanthikesan (SN) UNDP
Maurice Herson (MH) ALNAP

Agenda Items

Item 1: TEC Communication & Dissemination

Discussion & Agreements	Action
RH presented the dissemination work to be undertaken by the TEC team between now and December. A number of key points from the presentation / discussion are reproduced below:	
• Communication of TEC findings will happen at three levels: global, regional, and national / local, where global is understood to refer to donor and other countries outside of the tsunami-affected region. In order to effectively disseminate and communicate across these levels, TEC communications will be implemented through two parallel but connected streams of work. **Stream 1**, focused at the global, system-wide level and primarily coordinated by the TEC team at ALNAP, and **Stream 2**, which constitutes formally coordinated and facilitated work at the regional and national / local level. This will be facilitated by CMG member AIDMI. AIDMI's proposal to undertake this work **was fully endorsed by the CMG**, who will try to assist AIDMI in obtaining funding. Funding required is approx $200,000.	**CMG members** to assist AIDMI in obtaining money to take regional follow-up work forward
• The CMG encouraged AIDMI to organise the first series of regional workshops as described in the proposal. These regional workshops could co-incide with the two year anniversary.	
• TEC communications will be shaped to support efforts to optimise utilisation. Communication will be a mixture of pre-planned and pro-active efforts combined with a more responsive, opportunistic approach.	MB
• Discussion centred on how to achieve the greatest impact at policy level. It was decided, at the global level, to focus on the key networks / initiatives of the DAC, GHD, IASC, and OSE / Clinton Initiative. The group **agreed** that SF would follow up with the IASC, and ND with the DAC and GHD. SF, RH and MB are all presently involved with the Clinton Initiative and are meeting with this group on Tuesday 26th. RH is also in discussion with the ProVention Consortium and HPG/HPN at ODI.	**SF** / IASC; **ND** / DAC & GHD; **SF, RH & MB** / OSE
• It will be important to obtain the workplans for these networks / initiatives, and focus where we can make a critical difference; eg, by picking issues that link to existing agendas.	
• Another important approach will be for TEC CMG and other TEC member agencies to find champions in their own agencies beyond the evaluation	**TEC CMG & ALNAP**

departments. Related to this, it was **agreed** that ALNAP would begin to collect management responses of different organisations, and participants were asked to keep on filling in the Events Outcomes Form to assist ALNAP in this work.	**Secretariat/RH**
• UNDP will take responsibility for getting TEC reports circulated to government actors, NGOs and UN agencies in India, the Maldives and Indonesia; OCHA in Sri Lanka and Thailand. UNDP and OCHA to pass address information to the TEC team for central distribution and to their country offices for local distribution.	**SN (UNDP) and SF (OCHA)**
Other **agreements** included:	**ALNAP Secretariat**
• Presentations and other 'raw' products will be made available in the TEC Members section of the TEC Website.	
• When individuals or organisations not directly linked to the TEC present TEC findings it is not appropriate to say they are endorsed by the TEC, though they may use TEC tools such as the presentations, and of course all use of the TEC findings will be encouraged in principle.	
Role of the ALNAP Secretariat	
• It was noted that the key linkages between the TEC and ALNAP constitute utilisation, ongoing learning and improving performance.	
• In relation to this it was noted that JM has produced a short paper for presentation to the ALNAP SC next week (27 September) which will form the basis of discussion with regard to TEC follow-up work within ALNAP.	
• It was **agreed** that, given that the TEC has name recognition, the name TEC should be maintained once the TEC Coordinator has left and members of the current ALNAP Secretariat have taken responsibility for maintaining follow-up. This is also in recognition that the TEC has a membership beyond ALNAP, and that these stakeholders need still to be engaged.	
Role of TEC CMG	
• The question was asked: at what point does the CMG cease to exist? The answer: once members feel TEC work is being securely carried forward by both the ALNAP Secretariat and AIDMI; also once it is clear that CMG members have successfully transferred relevant information on findings and recommendations to decision-makers within their organisations.	
• While many CMG members will be present at the ALNAP Biannual in Rome, it was recognised that this might be the last time most of us meet face-to-face together. Thanks was given to Susanne Frueh for her excellent chairing over the past 17 months.	
• It was **agreed** that the UN members of the CMG would work together to get relevant TEC findings onto the IASC agenda. It was also agreed that the transfer of information to national governments was a key area of work still to be done. Coordination between the TEC team and AIDMI will be required to ensure this happens.	
Funding	
Members noted a projected £20,000 shortfall to cover current commitments. It was agreed that JM will follow-up with a number of potential identified donors.	**JM**

Agenda item 2 & 3: TEC Rec Matrix & ALNAP/TEC Follow-up

Discussion / Agreements	Action
JM introduced the work the TEC team and ALNAP have been doing to group and organise the recommendations from the TEC reports into a series of tables or matrices. He linked this with TEC follow-up work in ALNAP at the key intersection with evaluation utilisation, showing how the matrix of TEC recommendations will be an important monitoring tool for ALNAP over the longer term. Meeting participants voiced some disagreement with the categories chosen and it was **agreed** that the recommendations will be revised in light of their comments. Overall they were seen as useful for institutional and advocacy use; less so for operational use. It was also **agreed** that, in time, a one-page 'key message' sheet would be produced for each issue area. There was discussion about how to use the TEC's findings to stimulate change at the high policy level, given that ALNAP does not normally operate with senior policy people but wishes to both monitor and facilitate utilisation of TEC findings. This will be discussed further at the ALNAP SC on the 27th, to which CMG members are invited. The CMG is envisaged in an advisory role for this work.	**RH/MH** to produce revised matrix **RH / MH** with colleagues
LRRD Phase II **S**D reported that this will probably take place in Spring 2007. There will be a need to involve national governments more directly in this second phase of the evaluation. SD offered a presentation in Rome for the ALNAP Biannual.	

CMG Meeting at the ALNAP Biannual in Rome: 7th December 2006
Minutes

Present:

Mihir Bhatt (MB) AIDMI	Wayne MacDonald (WM) UNICEF
Rachel Bedouin (RB) FAO	John Mitchell (JM) ALNAP
Niels Dabelstein (ND) Danida	Margaret Stansberry (IFRC)
Stefan Dahlgren (SD) Sida	**Invited to attend**:
Susanne Frueh (SF) OCHA (Chair)	Eleanor Monbiot (EB) WVI / ALNAP Chair
Francois Grunewald (FG) Groupe URD	Marco Ferrari (MF) SDC
Rachel Houghton (RH) ALNAP/TEC (minutes)	Nevio Zagaria (NZ) WHO

Agenda Items

Item 1: LRRD Phase II

Discussion & Agreements	Action
SD (Sida) updated the CMG on progress toward 'LRRD Phase II'. He made a number of points: • That this evaluation is in Sida's evaluation plan for 2007 (first half) • That Sida has been waiting for TRIAMS to establish in order to seek synergies with this project before progressing to Phase II, but also to avoid potential confusion between the two projects as well as perceived overlap • That the focus will go beyond the international community to include work with the affected countries (with an expectation that the evaluation process will involve those countries piloting TRIAMS) • That Ian Christoplos (IC), who wrote the first study, is interested in maintaining his involvement • That Phase II will try to include the Maldives • That Phase II would be based upon the conclusions of Phase I • That Sida / IC will develop an approach paper by February. Discussion centred upon: o The need to widen the group involved in this evaluation to involve those others doing evaluations in this area (eg, FAO, UNICEF, Groupe URD, ECHO etc) o That the evaluation must define topics for investigation with the intended audience (ie, use the conclusions as a starting point but validate with affected communities and other 'stakeholders' to make optimally relevant) o The need to adopt a more appreciative approach and seek good practice o The relevance of TRIAMS o The importance of 'going back' based on feedback from the field that there's a loss of momentum and queries about 'what's happened to the evaluation community?' o That the study should seek to answer some questions about impact The following **agreements** were made: • That Sida would proceed with the scoping exercise, in light of the discussion • That interested members in the current CMG will act as an informal steering committee, to whom Sida will circulate the proposal for comments • That the central TEC / ALNAP mechanism will be used to do this That Sida will also seek the input of other interested parties, such as NORAD, and that SD will discuss internally the desire to broaden the formal steering committee for the study	**SD** – in conjunction with others (eg, IC, RH & TRIAMS

Item 2: Regional Dissemination

Discussion / Agreements	Action
MB updated the group on progress with the regional utilisation-focused dissemination work. This can be found in **Annex 1** below [to be added] and previous minutes of CMG meetings detail the content of this work. Two main points were that UNICEF has come on board with funding and the project coordinator has now been hired. Funding is still urgently required from other agencies. The following was agreed: • SF to write a letter in support of the work to facilitate approaches to funders, confirming that this is a core part of TEC work • AIDMI to draw on the support of TEC / ALNAP where necessary in approaching funders and finalising the proposal	 **SF** **AIDMI et al**

Item 3: Future of TEC in ALNAP

Discussion / Agreements	Action
Role of TEC CMG The future of the TEC 'Secretariat' in relation to ALNAP and the 'wider TEC' was discussed. The following was noted: • Resources are there in ALNAP to retain RH for another month to allow for more effective 'closure' of this current project period, incl reporting to donors. As from next April, TEC will appear as a workstream within the ALNAP workplan and funds will be requested accordingly – ie, there will no longer be a separate TEC budget. • Over the longer term the group does not want to loose the name TEC which will be retained at least until the larger meetings (see below). Moreover, it will be important to continue to make use of the umbrella function currently provided by TEC / ALNAP. This will better enable links with other initiatives to be maintained as well as keep the momentum behind some pro-active dissemination and the interest of the 'wider TEC'. • Re CMG: The agreement was to maintain the current CMG for now, as this will be necessary to guide the development and implementation of LRRD Phase II as well as the meetings (again, see below). However, SF proposed that someone else become chair as OCHA is not as engaged with the transition stage.	**RH** to write a workplan through end Jan

Agenda item 4: TEC Meetings in 2007/08

Discussion / Agreements	Action
It was agreed to try to hold three meetings: • One side-event at the next ECOSOC meeting in Geneva in July to disseminate information on the implementation of recommendations more broadly, incl to the multi-laterals • A day-long workshop outside of the ECOSOC environment (and hosted / facilitated by SDC) that seeks to 'take stock' one year after the launch and involving TEC members (to ascertain where there has been follow-up, where not, and why) • A third meeting in the affected region in order to increase ownership of the struck countries, and to co-involve the Asian Disaster Reduction Center (ADRC), located in Kobe, Japan in the task of taking stock of the implementation of TEC recommendations (with a special focus on DRR). Most appropriately, this could be done at the annual ADRC-meeting which normally takes place in January, hence, to be done in January 2008. No consultation with ADRC has yet happened. A close cooperation with the regional banks for that purpose should also be taken into consideration.	**RH** to prepare short concept note

TEC Evaluation Follow-up: Regional Stream

Update for ALNAP Bi-Annual Meeting (December 6, 2006)

AIDMI

A. Completed/Secured Follow-up Efforts:

National Level

- Discussed TEC and shared Hindi version of findings at humanitarian policy seminar in Pondicherry, India on 13-15 November 2006.
- Translated Synthesis Report Executive Summary into Hindi.
- A coordinator for Regional Follow-up has been appointed and has shared TEC findings and recommendations with over 60 key professionals at the Indian National Disaster Management Congress.

Regional Level

- Discussed primary TEC recommendations in Training of Trainers on Disaster Risk Reduction through Recovery in Sri Lanka including RADA and Pakistan including ERRA.
- Participants reviewed, summarized, and presented TEC methodology, conclusions and recommendations in a training program in Sri Lanka.
- Approximately 10% of requested funding has been committed from UNICEF.
- Commitment to work with AIDMI from over 15 regional partner institutions in 5 countries is received.

B. Ongoing Efforts:

- Tool for mainstreaming findings in specific organizations.
- Edition of southasiadisasters.net focusing on TEC conclusions on local capacities, claim-holder rights, and dignity in tsunami relief are being finalised.
- Feedback and commentary from TEC/CMG on proposal.
- Designing detailed agreements with regional partners.
- Audio-visual material is being prepared.

C. Further Needs:

- Funding commitments from diverse sources.
- Regional Core Group