

**CMG Telecon  
26 August 2005**

**Present:**

Susanne Frueh (SF) OCHA (Chair)  
Tijana Bojanic (TB) IFRC  
Amy Cavender (AC) World Vision  
John Cosgrave (JC) TEC/ALNAP  
Niels Dabelstein (ND) DANIDA  
Stefan Dahlgren (SD) SIDA

Andre Griekspoor (AG) WHO  
Francois Grunewald (FG) Groupe URD  
Rachel Houghton (RH) ALNAP (Minutes)  
Christoph Jakob (CJ) SDC  
Chandi Kadirgamar (CK) OCHA  
Janey-Lawry White (JLW) UNDP  
Wayne MacDonald (WM) UNICEF

---

**1 Report back on John Cosgrave's Mission**

- 1.1 JC noted three key issues that emerged from his fieldtrip:
- 1 Overall aid delivery has been very slow, for example, less than 10% of those who lost their homes in Indonesia will be housed by the first anniversary of the tsunami.
  - 2 Aid delivery has also been very patchy, and the supply of assistance completely arbitrary.
  - 3 Coordination has been an issue, and there has been little incentive for agencies with lots of money too coordinate.
- 1.2 On housekeeping issues:
- 1 Knowledge of the TEC was patchy, except in Sri Lanka due to the very active role played by David Evans of OCHA.
  - 2 Feedback overall pointed to the need for coordinated evaluation missions between all TEC joint evaluation teams, including travel in-country.
  - 3 It will be difficult to carry out fieldwork during Ramadan in the Maldives.
- 1.3 Discussion: Key Points
- Other CMG members who have been in the field seconded JC's point about the need for coordination between all TEC teams in order to reduce the evaluation burden.
  - It was also recognised, however, that there has been quite high level contact with the Maldives and Indonesia and that perhaps the TEC has escaped some people's radar due to their heavy workload.
  - However, a communications gap was identified: although communications have gone out it is necessary to consistently engage with field partners; this will be crucial for access during field work. (See below point on communications.)
  - Consultants: In place for: capacities; needs assessment; coordination. LRRD will be confirmed next week. Funding is also virtually there.

**2 Agenda for 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> September Pre-fieldwork Workshop**

- 2.1 As attached in amended form.
- 2.2 Discussion: Key Points
- Changes included bringing the last item on the second day – support from the TEC Core Team – to the introduction on the morning of the first day. A wrap up session on the Thursday will then cover unresolved issues as they've arisen over the two days.
  - It was noted that Joel Boutroue will not be available to provide input on Indonesia.
  - It was **agreed** that there needed to be a telecon between JC and the team leaders prior to the 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup>.
  - It was **agreed** that, until the Geneva meeting, communication with the team leaders should be via the evaluation managers.

- 2.3 Action:  
**SF** to organise alternative speaker for Indonesia and to revert to JC by Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup>  
**JC** to organise telecon with team leaders for Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> September, via evaluation managers

### **3 Agenda for 9<sup>th</sup> September CMG**

3.1 The proposed agenda was noted as follows:

- AAR – two hours in am, facilitated by Maurice Herson of ALNAP
- Key issues that emerge from the planning workshop
- Field workshops
- Oct 19<sup>th</sup> workshop
- Jan field workshops
- Key Messages report

3.2 Discussion: Key Points

CMG members requested the inclusion of a session on the synthesis report, on dissemination and implementation, and on communications (re: the TEC's profile and how it is perceived). This latter point is particularly important for the following reasons:

- AG: spoke about the lack of perceived independence of some of the studies in some quarters, in particular that OCHA is leading on coordination and Danida on the funding study. Other concerns aired were that so many agencies are involved such that the final product will be watered down, and that the evaluation steering committees/working groups are sufficiently representative.
- *In response, the following points were made:*
- The TEC teams are led by independent consultants and their independence will be made a priority.
- The ToR for the evaluations represent a truly consultative process and have gone through many rounds with input from a wide range of actors.
- The coordination team is planning to ID peer reviewers from the countries themselves to increase the credibility of the final report and also to increase local participation. It was **agreed** that the other studies should look into doing the same.
- The TEC is value added due to the fact that it is addressing issues that couldn't be addressed by individual agencies as effectively, has a policy focus, and will produce a synthesis report that will draw not only on the joint evaluation reports but all evaluation (etc) reports produced on the tsunami by December – thus making available in one document all the key findings from the tsunami response.
- If other agencies are still going ahead with their evaluations, despite the work of the TEC, and obviously to fulfill their own accountability requirements, we must at least ensure that the TEC runs one coordinated mission in the field in order not to be seen to overburden field staff with 'additional' work.

3.3 Nevertheless the issue of perception vs reality is a serious one and must be addressed. The communications tools utilized so far by the TEC have not been effective enough.

3.4 **Agreed:** We need to:

- Add an item on communications for 9<sup>th</sup> September CMG meeting
- Add a page on the TEC Online Forum explaining the independence of the evaluations and how this will be ensured
- Write a short 'value-added' piece on the TEC's contribution to the humanitarian sector. Distribute.

3.5 Action: TEC core team (JC & RH)

Also:

- WM cannot attend the meeting on the 9<sup>th</sup> and will request Simon Lawry White attends.  
Action: WM
- **All CMG** members to communicate when they need to leave on the 9<sup>th</sup> to RH by Wednesday 31<sup>st</sup> August.

## 4 Timing of Missions

### 4.1 Roughly:

	Coordination team	Capacities team	Needs assessment team
<b>Indonesia</b>	11 Sept – 1 October	13 Sept – 4 October	17 Sept – 8 October
<b>Sri Lanka</b>	2 – 21 October	5 – 25 October	9 – 22 October
<b>Maldives</b>	2 – 17 Nov	25 October – 9 Nov (team split)	
<b>Thailand</b>	Case study (desk review)	25 October – 9 Nov (team split)	
<b>Somalia</b>	Case study (desk review)		

### 4.2 Discussion: Key Points

- The Chair requested that the NA team advance their mission by a few days to better coordinate with the other two teams, and in particular to ensure they're in-country for the TEC's meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup> September.
- The need to coordinate between the two teams in the Maldives was recognised.
- LRRD will be able to confirm dates by 2<sup>nd</sup> September.
- The impact assessment study will report by end of October. It is being managed by the Global Consortium. Its relationship to the TEC five joint evaluations needs to be re-represented on the TEC Online Forum.
- JC reported that the Indonesia govt requested one of the field workshops in Medan rather than two in Banda Aceh. This would make it easier to obtain information on Nias.
- The workshops will be funded directly through participating agency offices in the field, mostly likely UNFPA (with OCHA as a back up).

### 4.3 Field Workshops will be held as follows:

Jakarta: September 16<sup>th</sup>  
 Banda Aceh: September 19<sup>th</sup>  
 Medan: September 21<sup>st</sup>.

### 4.4 Action:

- **JC:** to put the above information into timeline form and email to evaluation managers (and others).
- **JC:** to write a standard letter of invitation and likely agenda for field workshops and email to evaluation managers (and others).
- **Evaluation managers:** to forward TEC information into the field. This information should then be sent out via the organizing agency (UNFPA; if not, then the RC – and on behalf of the TEC).
- **JC:** to organise a telecon with commissioning agencies/evaluation managers for Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> September (10.30am US time) and with the team leaders for Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> September.
- **RH:** to add section on in-country timelines to Online Forum.
- **RH:** to check Online Forum vis-à-vis impact assessment study.
- **All CMG agencies:** to communicate to RH where they are now NOT doing other evaluations as their needs are being met by the TEC evaluations. This information can then be communicated to the wider community in response to some of their concerns that the TEC represents an additional burden.
- **JC:** to obtain names of local contacts from TEC members in-country and to centralise these for use by all the teams.
- **SF:** to investigate which participants from the OCHA lessons learned workshops should be invited and provide these details to JC.
- **Teams:** to similarly work to identify key informants and provide to JC.

## **5 Coordination**

5.1 The need for coordination between evaluation teams in the field was recognized as a priority:

- Using Sri Lanka as an example (as it is, so far, best organized in terms of the TEC's work), JC reported on the need for a focal point in-country from the commissioning agencies. These focal points need to inform their local agencies about when the TEC's evaluation teams will do.
- The CMG agreed that focal points are needed; it is good practice and facilitates missions. The focal points can also contribute to the workshops and perhaps assist with facilitation.
- The focal points are a key tool for facilitating contact with key stakeholders.
- The needs assessment team therefore needs to decide who will act as the focal point: SDC or WHO.
- Another key point re coordination concerns transport and accommodation for the TEC's evaluation teams.

5.2 Action:

- **CJ / AG:** to nominate their focal point after the telecon on Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> and to provide all relevant contact details to JC immediately afterwards.

## **6 Synthesis Consultant**

6.1 SF reported back on the synthesis consultant interviews. Three people were interviewed: Margie Buchanan Smith, Tony Beck and John Telford. All three were recognised as being extremely well-qualified to do the job and have extensive humanitarian field experience as well as solid writing and synthesis experience.

6.2 Based on the interviews, however, John Telford emerged as the leading candidate and has been offered the job. He will be able to attend the dissemination / learning workshop on 19 October.

## **7 AOB**

7.1 Country reports

- It was **agreed** that these should be produced at the end of each country visit. They are a crucial credibility tool and allow the evaluation teams to triangulate their findings with the key stakeholders ensuring that they represent their views accurately. They could also be used to collect supplementary information in the event of any identified gaps in information.
- It was also **agreed** that the teams should coordinate their feedback workshops and produce a short report for each country based on a similar format. This would help with synthesis.
- Sensitivity would need to be taken not to heighten any political sensitivities.

7.2 Action

To discuss in the telecon on Tuesday and agree a common debriefing / feedback outline.

7.3 Role of the media

It was noted that the media played a key role in the response to this disaster but that it is not being sufficiently looked at by any of the studies. Its natural home would be in the funding study.

7.4 Action: **JC / SF** to discuss with ND.