

# Terms of Reference

(Approved 17/12/99)

## 1 Background

DEC agencies have been present in Orissa for much of the past decade, with several already having established relief programmes as a result of an earlier cyclone experienced on the night of 17<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> October. In the early hours of the morning of 29<sup>th</sup> October, 1999, a severe cyclonic storm – measuring seven on the eight point scale – devastated much of Orissa State. The cyclonic storm continued through the daylight hours, with winds of over 250km per hour accompanied by heavy rain and tidal waves. Gale force winds and further heavy rain persisted through the next day, finally abating on 31<sup>st</sup> October. The destruction of homes and livelihoods, damage to coastal and inland infrastructure and communications caused by the winds and floods, compounded significant damage from the earlier cyclone.

Of the 13 Districts in Orissa State, the worst affected are Jagatsinghpur and Kendrapara, with eight other districts seriously affected – Balasore, Bhadrak, Bhubaneswar, Cuttack, ganjam, Khurda, Mayurbhanj and Puri. The Prime Minister declared the disaster a National Emergency; the Indian Army and other government personnel set to work immediately to clear rail lines and re-establish communication and transport links with the flood-affected areas.

On 5<sup>th</sup> November, the government's Disaster Management Committee estimated that 10 million people had been affected (half of them seriously) and at least 20,000 people were feared dead. Over 200,000 cattle (draught and milk cows) have also been killed and cash crops worth US\$ 23 million are estimated destroyed.

The government is reported to have significant resources available at central and State level, and will lead the response to the emergency. NGOs have been asked to supplement and support government efforts. With around 100 local NGOs working in Orissa, a Coordination Committee has been established in the State capital, Bhubaneswar; coordination meetings have also been held in Delhi.

The Disasters Emergency Committee (DEC) is a UK umbrella charitable organisation which launches and co-ordinates a National Appeal in response to a major disaster overseas. It brings together a unique alliance of aid, corporate, public and broadcasting services to rally compassion and ensure that funds raised go to those amongst the fifteen UK member aid agencies best placed to bring effective and timely relief.

The DEC 'India Cyclone Appeal' was launched on 9<sup>th</sup> November, 1999. To date, the appeal has generated some £5m of pooled funds to be disbursed to the 11 DEC agencies participating in the appeal (*see Appendix 1 for summary of disbursement shares*) These funds are supporting activities in: food aid; medicine and health care; clothing and household items; water and sanitation; shelter and housing; medium term livelihood support, including cash for work; working capital (in cash or in kind);

rehabilitation support for farmers and fishermen (*see Appendix 2 for summary of agencies' activities*).

DEC pooled funds should be spent within six months of the launch of an appeal and statements of expenditure submitted in the seventh month.

DEC rules require an independent evaluation of the expenditure of all appeal funds. This provides an important mechanism for DEC transparency and accountability to fundraising partners and the British public. Evaluation also enables DEC agencies to extend individual and collective learning on good practice in response to humanitarian emergencies. The final report will be made public on completion of the evaluation.

#### ▪ **Main purpose of the evaluation**

To provide independent assessment of the effectiveness and impact of the DEC agencies' response following the India cyclone, supported by DEC pooled funds and implemented by DEC agencies and/or with local partner agencies.

#### **Appropriateness**

- Were assessments undertaken appropriate to identification of need? Were the actions undertaken appropriate in the context of the needs of the affected population and the context in which the agencies were operating? Was sufficient attention given to the identification of clear objectives and activities that would ensure objectives were met?
- Was the assistance appropriate in relation to the customs and practices of the affected population?
- To what extent were potential and actual beneficiaries consulted as to their perceived needs and priorities? What was the level of beneficiary involvement in project design, implementation and monitoring? How effective and appropriate were these processes in ensuring relevant and timely project delivery in support of the most needy and vulnerable?
- Was the assistance provided in a timely manner?

#### **Efficiency**

- Were resources used efficiently? For instance, were more expensive forms of response (such as air transport) used longer than was necessary? Would greater investment in preparedness measures have resulted in more effective and less costly responses?

#### **Impact**

- What direct and indirect evidence is available that the action taken contributed to the reduction of mortality, morbidity and suffering and that the affected population was assisted in maintaining or resuming basic dignity and livelihoods? In the absence of much baseline data, it is suggested this might best be measured against the level of satisfaction of beneficiaries and their perception of appropriateness and effectiveness of the response.
- What systems or indicators did agencies use to evaluate the effectiveness of their work?

### **Coverage**

- Was DEC assistance provided to all major population groups facing life-threatening situations?
- What efforts were made to ensure that particular populations, vulnerable groups and areas were not overlooked?
- Were beneficiaries correctly and fairly identified and targeted?

### **Connectedness**

- Was the assistance provided in a way that took account of the longer-term context?
- Did the assistance seek to strengthen the capacity of local agencies and personnel?

### **Coherence**

- What steps were taken by participating agencies to ensure their responses were co-ordinated with each other and with other agencies?
- Were other actions, such as advocacy work, undertaken by the member agencies to complement their immediate relief actions?

These criteria take into account 'standard' evaluation questions, and also reflect the DEC's Objective, the NGO/Red Cross Code of Conduct and those disaster response objectives of DEC member agencies that are broadly shared. Thus, objectives such as achieving a co-ordinated response, ensuring that relief activities take account of longer-term considerations and that the capacity of local organisations and personnel is strengthened during the response, are explicitly included in the criteria.

Following the field visits the evaluation team should be in a position to comment on the adequacy of management, accounting, monitoring and reporting processes of the DEC agencies and their field level partners. They should also be able to comment on the key constraints that affected the DEC supported programs, and how the different DEC agencies dealt with them.

## **3 Specific Issues for Consideration**

- What was the added value of DEC appeal funds in the context of the overall humanitarian response? Did DEC funds facilitate a quick response?
- Was gender considered in the agencies' emergency assessments? Did relief provision include special components for women and, if so, were these systematically monitored?
- Were the special needs of acute vulnerable groups (e.g. children/elderly/disabled etc) considered in the agencies' emergency assessments and were they consulted in the same way as other groups? Did relief provision include special components for them and if so were these appropriate and systematically monitored?
- Did the response of the DEC agencies strengthen and complement the response of local organisations and coping mechanisms, or hinder them?

- What was the level of co-operation in the field? Could more have been done to help improve the effectiveness of DEC agencies' responses in terms of co-ordination, joint logistics, communications packages, and information flows between the key relief players?
- What role did the Government of India fulfil in respect of the overall relief effort and the coordination of that response?
- Was there appropriate geographical coverage within the affected region?
- To what extent did responses reflect lessons learned from previous cyclone disasters?

#### 4 Method

Participating DEC agencies are required to submit the following material (in both hard copy and electronic format) to the Secretariat **to assist the** evaluation team's work:

- a summary chronology
- key documents on the agency's response to the emergency and their use of DEC funds, including the '48 Hour Plan of Action'; the '4 Week Plan of Action'; '12 Week Interim Report'; and the '7<sup>th</sup> Month Declaration of Expenditure'
- names, contact details and roles during the response of key agency and partner personnel in the head office and in the relevant field offices.

The Secretariat will prepare a package of materials on each participating agency to be given to the evaluation team.

The evaluation team will begin with a review of available documentation.

The evaluation team will be responsible for ensuring appropriate data collection is undertaken in the field over the 6-month expenditure period so that key information, that may no longer be available in the later stage of the DEC funded response, is not lost to the evaluation proper.

Following submission of DEC agencies' '7th Month Declaration of Expenditure', member(s) of the evaluation team will visit the head office of each participating agency to undertake preliminary interviews and collect and review supplementary documentation. Evaluators should be allowed full access to relevant files. The schedule of the fieldwork will be discussed during these visits. Since certain operations will already have closed down by the time the evaluation proper is underway, it may be appropriate to undertake preliminary fieldwork during the expenditure period. **The evaluation team's schedule, accommodation and transport arrangements will be finalised and communicated to all agencies at least one week prior to the team's visit.**

In the field the evaluation team will seek to spend a period with each agency that is roughly proportional to the share of DEC pooled funds received by each agency. During their work the evaluators will fill out the chronology of decisions and actions so as to understand the context and the level of information that was available to the

agency in deciding on a particular action. During their time with each agency the team will interview key personnel remaining in-country (contacting others prior to the field visits or on their return) and undertake visits to selected project sites/areas. The evaluators will have to make extensive use of agency reports and their own preliminary data collection, where later site visits would prove pointless. It should be noted that in the case of agencies that are part of larger organisations UK assistance might not be distinguishable from that of global counterparts, nevertheless, every effort should be made to distinguish DEC funding.

As well as interviewing the agencies' project officers and key officials in co-ordinating agencies (e.g. UNICEF, OCHA, central and state governments) and partner agencies, a sample of beneficiaries will be selected and interviewed by the evaluators. These interviews will be conducted without agency personnel being present, using interpreters hired directly by the evaluation team. The beneficiaries will be questioned on their views of the assistance provided, the way they were selected and their overall views of the agency. Interviews with individuals may be complemented by discussions with groups of beneficiaries. So as to assess the agency's targeting and beneficiary selection methods the evaluation team will also interview a selection of potential beneficiaries who did not receive assistance.

It is expected that the evaluation team will use gender-aware and participatory approaches to seek the views of beneficiaries and, where appropriate, non-beneficiaries. Inclusive techniques will be expected of the evaluators, to seek active participation in the evaluation by members of local emergency committees, staff of implementing partner agencies and member agencies, representatives of local and central governments.

Agencies' '7<sup>th</sup> Month Declaration of Expenditure' will be examined to assess direct and indirect project costs, and, in conjunction with beneficiary/team assessment of direct and indirect benefits, and to compare the cost-effectiveness of different approaches.

The evaluation will be undertaken with due reference to the Red Cross/Red Crescent NGO Code of Conduct, which all agencies have signed. Reference should also be made to the Sphere Standards.

Before leaving the country members of the team will indicate their broad findings to the Country Representative and senior staff of each agency and note their comments.

A workshop should be held in London to disseminate a draft report of the evaluation, the report should be circulated one week prior to the workshop to allow for preliminary comment.

## **5 The Report**

The evaluation report should consist of:

- executive summary and recommendations (not more than six pages)
- main text, to include emergency context, evaluation methodology, appeal management, commentary and analysis addressing evaluation purpose and outputs, conclusions (not more than thirty pages)
- appendices, to include evaluation terms of reference, maps, sample framework, summary of agency activities, sub-team report(s), end notes (where appropriate) and bibliography. (All material collected in the undertaking of the evaluation process should be lodged with the Secretariat prior to termination of the contract)

## **6 Evaluation team and timeframe**

It is anticipated there will be a core team of three people, with others drawn in as necessary. The Team Leader should have a relevant skill and a proven background in emergency evaluations. The appropriate balance of professional and analytical skills amongst the remaining team members should be determined following a preliminary examination of agency activities. It is likely, however, that sector expertise in areas such as water and sanitation, public health and shelter will be required. **At least** one person from the region should be included in the team that makes the field visits. All team members should be gender aware, a reasonable gender balance within field teams is desirable.

Consultants or independent evaluation teams short-listed in the tendering process should seek DEC approval for any proposed changes to the composition of the team originally submitted.

The evaluation timeframe should allow for circulation of a first draft in mid September 2000, followed by presentation of the draft by the evaluation consultant(s) to member agencies in late September. A formal comment period for the participating agencies and their partners will then follow. The completion date for the Final Evaluation Report will be 1<sup>st</sup> November 2000, the consultants having addressed agencies' comments as appropriate.