

- Provide options for how to conduct the evaluation

The TOR has evolved as the assignment has progressed, so that the inception report in its current form puts more emphasis on the strategic considerations of how to add value using the evaluation and much less on the literature review. This change in emphasis was agreed with the Asia/Pacific Desk and the Monitoring and Evaluation Division in July, after the first week of the assignment.

The period for review in the inception report is from 26 January to 31 May 2001. This covers the 120-day emergency period and half of the transition to rehabilitation period.

1.5. Methodology

This consultancy was undertaken between July and September 2001 and has proceeded as follows:

- Stakeholder interviews, one week in Geneva and a further week in Delhi/Ahmedabad (Bhuj was not visited)
- Collection of documentation in Geneva and Delhi and from the Internet and other sources
- Feedback sessions with Federation personnel in Delhi and Geneva, to improve the consultant's analysis
- Questionnaire to donor national societies on the performance of the Federation Secretariat, the IRCS and their own National Society in the India earthquake operation
- Discussions of the draft report with principal stakeholders and reshaping of the report to the final product

The inception report has been compiled in a total of four weeks by a single consultant. All findings are tentative and are based on a synthesis of interview feedback and from a review of documentation. As far as possible, balanced judgements have been applied to the information collected, but there are bound to be some shortcomings and gaps in the analysis from this short exercise. Firm conclusions must await the full evaluation.

The draft report presented a number of topics for possible inclusion in the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the main evaluation. The draft was discussed with the Directors of Disaster Management and Coordination and Programme Coordination, as well as with the Asia Pacific Desk and the Evaluation and Monitoring Department. The proposed Terms of Reference included in this final version of the report take account of their feedback and updates, and corrections have been made in the light of comments from a number of interviewees.

2. Key success factors in the Federation's response

The Federation response to the Gujarat earthquake was amongst its largest operations since the Goma crisis in 1994. All parties agree that the response to the emergency was excellent in many respects. Several factors combined to make a fast, major and effective response possible. The IRCS, the Secretariat and the National Societies all played a part, as did the Indian Government, and several external factors outside the Federation's control.

These factors have been summarised below, and besides a recognition of the positive contribution made by many actors, this section also shows just how many aspects needed to come together to make the response successful from the Federation's viewpoint. The absence of one or more of the inputs described below would have hampered the operation.

2.1. Context of the India Earthquake response

- India is subject to frequent disasters, especially flood and drought. The Kutch District of Gujarat State, the epicentre of the January 26 earthquake, is in the highest risk area in India for earthquakes¹. At magnitude 7.9, this earthquake was the worst in India for 50 years.
- In the recent past India has been reluctant to ask for international assistance. After the earthquake the Government did not appeal for assistance but welcomed offers of help.
- Over the past decade the Indian Red Cross (IRCS) and the Federation have not worked closely together, though this situation has been improving in recent years.

¹ The Kutch region lies in Zone V on the Seismic Zoning Map of India prepared by the Indian Standards Institution