



Annex-B

Terms of Reference of a Real Time Evaluation of WFP's Response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami - January to June 2005

1. Introduction

Real time evaluation (RTE) supports organizational learning, identifies key ingredients of a successful emergency response and should help achieve better accountability for emergency operations. The distinguishing feature of an RTE is that, in contrast to *ex post* evaluation exercises, it is conducted during implementation. This avoids the time lag when evaluative judgements are for the most part made in a post-operational period, when many key players have departed and when information collection depends more heavily on selective historical documentation rather than actual observation.

The ultimate benefit of applying RTE to WFP's emergency operations is to reach conclusions regarding the intervention's relevance, design and progress towards achieving its stated objectives. This includes any gaps or unintended outcomes, the effectiveness of the mode of implementation, and the appropriateness and application of operational guidelines and policies. Ideally, an RTE should support the implementation process by providing timely feedback to WFP management, staff and donors. It should also document lessons to improve WFP's response to emergencies in the future

This real-time evaluation of WFP's response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami will be the second exercise of its kind by WFP, the southern Africa regional emergency RTE of 2002-03 having been the first experience.¹ Because of the exceptional scale both of the tsunami disaster and WFP's response, it was found impractical to start the RTE at the height of the relief phase in January 2005. However a preliminary visit to Bangkok, Jakarta and Colombo was undertaken over twelve days in February-March 2005 by the evaluation manager and the logistics consultant to identify the main issues to be considered. These TOR have been informed both by the findings of this initial mission and by interviews with key Headquarters staff who have been involved in the tsunami response (including some who worked temporarily in the affected areas but have now returned to their posts).

Although this RTE may not influence the form and scope of much of the tsunami relief operation, in addition to assisting WFP learn lessons for future responses, it should still contribute to on-going debates at all levels in WFP regarding the design of recovery operations and the optimal role for food aid in this recovery process. In addition this RTE needs to address issues of accountability in the broadest sense. It includes the fulfillment of public expectations and organizational goals, as well as responsiveness to the concerns of a wider constituency.² This is especially important given the unprecedented public interest aroused by the tsunami and the immediate relief operation.

¹ In addition, however, WFP has participated financially and in other ways in the OCHA-led inter-agency real-time evaluation of the Darfur crisis.

² J.Hailey & M.Sorgenfrei: *Measuring Success: Issues in Performance Measurement* (INTRAC 2004).



1.1 Scope of the RTE

Although the Indonesia earthquake and related tsunami affected at least eight countries in two continents, the scope of this RTE is focused on the Regional Bureau in Bangkok, Indonesia and Sri Lanka. As the scope and duration of its activities in the other countries has been limited, the mission will not visit the smaller relief programmes in India, the Maldives, Myanmar, Somalia and Thailand.³ Since the Office of Evaluation (OEDE) is planning a concurrent evaluation of WFP's programme in Somalia in June 2005, however, it is planned that this Somali evaluation will should take the opportunity to examine the tsunami relief efforts there.

1.2 Team Composition

WFP's policy is that the team leader should be someone external to WFP. Team members should between them have considerable emergency experience and expertise in relation to food aid, the UN system, aid co-ordination, logistics, health and nutrition. The OEDE evaluation manager (Chief Evaluation Officer) will be a full team member, however, focusing on issues that relate more to internal WFP management, finance and resources.

2. Background to the response

A powerful earthquake measuring 9.1 on the Richter scale struck off the coast of Aceh province/Sumatra in Indonesia at 0800 hours local time on 26 December 2004, setting off a series of large tsunamis across the Indian Ocean region. After a month, the toll from the tragedy was estimated at some 260,000 people dead and missing in the regional countries affected, with the highest number of victims being recorded in Indonesia, Sri Lanka, India and Thailand. In addition, millions have been displaced or lost their homes and means of production.

WFP's Regional Emergency Operation (EMOP) number 10405⁴ was approved on 3/4 January 2005 by the WFP Executive Director and the Director-General of FAO to assist up to 2,000,000 victims for a period of six months from January to June 2005. WFP planned to deliver 169,315 tons of foodstuffs at a total cost, including overheads, of US\$185.46 million. The EMOP is being supported by two Special Operations. WFP has taken the lead role in establishing the United Nations Joint Logistics Centre (UNJLC), covered by a third SO.⁵ Thus, the total intended WFP support for the relief operations amounted to some US\$256 million over six months.⁶

The objectives of the EMOP are twofold:

- To save lives by preventing a deterioration in the nutritional status of vulnerable children and mothers, which could lay them open to disease; and
- To promote the rehabilitation of housing, community infrastructure and livelihoods.

³ A desk review of the main elements of the smaller country operations will be undertaken, however, and a short report prepared for the full evaluation report, as an annex.

⁴ The title of the regional EMOP 10405 is: "Assistance to Tsunami Victims in Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Maldives and other countries in the Indian Ocean region".

⁵ The three Special Operations are: (1) SO 10406.0 "Logistics augmentation in support of WFP Indian Ocean tsunami EMOP 10405.0" valued at US\$24.37 million; (2) SO 10407.0 "WFP Air support of humanitarian relief operations in response to the Indian Ocean tsunami" valued at US\$42.42 million; and (3) SO 10408.0 "Establishment of UN Joint Logistics Centre for Indian Ocean tsunami" valued at US\$3.92 million.

⁶ Subsequent budget revisions brought the total requirement down to some US\$214 million. With confirmed contributions of some US\$264 million at mid-March 2005, the operations' overall requirements are more than fully covered.



The EMOP follows immediate short-term operations funded from the WFP Immediate Response Account (IRA). The above objectives closely reflect WFP's first two Strategic Priorities – *to save lives in crisis situations* (SP1), and *to protect livelihoods in crisis situations and enhance resilience to shocks*. (SP2)

3. Evaluation Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

- assess the relevance of WFP's response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami crisis, its progress in achieving its objectives and any gaps or unintended outcomes;
- measure the effectiveness of the mode of implementation, and the appropriateness and application of operational policies, guidelines and support;
- assess the phasing down mechanisms/transition into PRRO.

The evaluation will provide:

- both formal and informal feedback to the operation at sub-office, country, regional, and Headquarters levels;
- general lessons on strengthening WFP's emergency preparedness and response;
- a record of WFP's response and the view of key external stakeholders (for example, beneficiaries, co-operating partners, and government agencies) on the quality of this response;
- accountability to WFP management, donors and to the WFP Executive Board.

4. Key Issues

These TORs guiding the RTE define the major parameters and core questions which the evaluation seeks to answer in its final report to the Executive Board. These questions remain generic, but are consistent with standard approaches to programme implementation evaluation. There should be an element of flexibility, as the evaluation mission progresses, to shift the evaluation's focus in response to changing circumstances.

The list of key issues follows the logic of a project cycle, i.e. inquiry in the origin and context of the crisis followed by review of WFP's preparedness measures, the needs assessment process, emergency response planning, operational management and finally evaluation of results and drawing of lessons.

In conducting the RTE, the team needs to take account of relevant international standards, including the Sphere Guidelines and the Red Cross Code of Conduct. The Sphere Minimum standards of greatest relevance to this RTE are those in relation to Nutrition and Food, including assessment, M&E, participation of the affected population, food requirements, targeting, resource management, logistics, distribution, human resources, and local capacity issues.⁷

⁷ See www.sphereproject.org



4.1 Context and Origins of Emergency

- Distinguishing characteristics of this sudden onset natural disaster emergency, the regional context and nature of the response.
- What political or security factors have affected events and the implementation of the response and how have these changed over time?
- WFP's institutional context in both countries.

4.2 Emergency Preparedness, Needs Assessment and Appeals Process

PREPAREDNESS:

- How well prepared was WFP to respond?
- What baseline information existed (Vulnerability profiles, Logistics Capacity Assessments, Baseline surveys)?
- Did contingency planning exist?
- How flexible has WFP been in meeting changing needs?

EMERGENCY NEEDS ASSESSMENT:

- How (and how timely) were the food aid needs of the at-risk population and particular groups assessed?
- Are they being adequately re-assessed in the light of a rapidly changing situation?
- How effectively has vulnerability been defined and mapped?
- What information was used for targeting? Was it gender-disaggregated, addressing the special needs of pregnant and nursing women and children?
- Was food aid an appropriate response and what alternatives were considered during the assessment?
- How are food and cash responses being combined or coordinated?

EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLANNING: DESIGN

- How did existing Country Programmes or other activities in the affected countries support the emergency operation, where relevant?
- Is the rationale and targeting of WFP assistance clear and sound, and how well do the objectives reflect the specific nature of this emergency?
- Are the assumptions reasonable and have the risks been identified and addressed?
- Are the response activities appropriate for meeting stated objectives?
- Which special needs of women and children are being addressed?
- Are there indicators for an exit strategy?

OPERATIONAL PLANNING:

- Do the design documents and implementation plans provide the framework and tools needed for the effective implementation of the operation?
- What is changing/has changed in the operation and is this sufficiently reflected in the planning design?
- On what basis are adaptations from the original design being made?



4.3 Implementation

GUIDELINES AND POLICIES:

- How are operational guidelines and policy directives being interpreted and implemented?
- Are the operational guidelines realistic and what are the inconsistencies or gaps in guidance?
- To what extent are staff and partners aware of relevant Sphere Guidelines?

MANAGEMENT ISSUES:

- What is the added value of the regional approach?
- Are the management and coordination functions appropriate to the regional response? Have the roles of the Country Offices, the Regional Bureau and HQs been appropriately defined?
- Is the budget adequate to support the operation?
- Is the staffing of the operation appropriate, and how have staffing needs and requirements evolved over time? What was the role of WFP emergency roster staff and stand-by partner staff in the overall initial surge response?
- Are adequate systems in place including management information systems and security arrangements?
- How have UNJLC and UNHAS functioned and how have they supported WFP operations?
- How have UN Security Procedures assisted or constrained the relief operation?
- Is the monitoring and reporting system effective and responsive to management and evaluation needs? Is there adequate baseline information? Are the indicators for tracking progress appropriate? Are there gender sensitive monitoring indicators?
- What other internal factors, formal or informal, support or constrain implementation?

PARTNERSHIPS:

- How well are implementing partners performing and what is WFP doing to enhance their capacity?
- How transparent is their food distribution and how are beneficiaries selected?
- Are the number and nature of Implementation Partners, including government agencies, adequate and appropriate for implementing the range of activities?
- Are WFP's major policies and priorities reflected in the MOU's with Partners?

COORDINATION:

- How well is assistance being coordinated between the host governments, humanitarian agencies and organisations and what contribution is WFP making?
- How successful have been WFP's relationships with the armed forces from both donor and host countries?
- What efforts are agencies making to coordinate the phasing down and transition to non-crisis operation?

4.4 Results in Relation to Selected OECD/DAC Definitions

EFFICIENCY:

- To what extent were different options (e.g. sea freight/airfreight) costed before decisions were made?
- Overall, has the operation been implemented at a reasonable cost?



- What are the perceptions of the different stakeholders, especially beneficiaries, partners, government agencies, NGO's, other UN Agencies, and bilateral donors, of WFP's objectives and performance?

EFFECTIVENESS:

- Was WFP's response timely?
- Is food aid being effectively targeted?
- How effective have particular mechanisms for the delivery of assistance been?
- How are internal WFP factors affecting effectiveness, including logistic support and the predictability and regularity of resources and flexibility of the budget?
- How are external factors like limits on access to affected areas impacted on effectiveness?

IMPACT:

- What are the perceptions of the different stakeholders, especially beneficiaries, partners, government agencies, NGO's, other UN Agencies, and bilateral donors, about the overall impact of WFP's programme and, in particular, of food aid? Both immediate and medium-term impacts should be reviewed.

5. Methodology

The methods used by the team will include:

- Extensive review of all relevant documentation;
- Individual and group meetings with WFP staff at all levels;
- Meetings with partner agencies, government staff, other UN agencies and NGO's;
- Focus group discussions both with beneficiaries and other people directly or indirectly affected by the tsunami.

As this is a 'real time' evaluation the team will aim to feed back and discuss their findings with WFP staff as much as possible as the work progresses.

6. Timing & Outputs

The evaluation will cover the period from the approval of the regional EMOP until the end of the first six months' period of the regional EMOP in June 2005. (The regional EMOP will be extended in time for a further six months, to end 2005 and then be followed by a regional PRRO or country specific PRROs, where necessary). Its findings are not, however, confined to the EMOP alone but to all aspects of the regional response, including the Special Operations.

Field Visit to the Regional Operation (7 May to 4 June 2005):

The evaluation team will travel to the region from 7 May to 4 June to directly observe the regional emergency. The mission will start with a two day visit to the Asia Regional Bureau in Bangkok, then proceed to field visits in Indonesia (Jakarta, Aceh and northern Sumatra) and Sri



Lanka (Colombo and the eight sub-offices). The mission will return to Bangkok for a few days for final discussions and a de-briefing.

Report writing phase (June-August 2005)

This stage of the evaluation will focus on the preparation of the final and summary evaluation reports, based on the present Terms of Reference and the findings from the preparatory and main missions.

The final (full technical) report and the Executive Board summary report should be prepared by the Team leader, with inputs from the team members, by the end of June 2005.

The final (full technical) report should be maximum 100 pages in length, including all annexes. Normally, the core text should be no more than 60 pages.

The EB summary report should be maximum 5,000 words in length (approx. 12 pages) and may include one or two brief annexes of no more than one page each (e.g. tables comparing targeted resource levels and distributions to actual resource levels, deliveries and distributions etc). There is also a 2000 word recommendations tracking matrix (also known as the "Management response matrix"), which is annexed to the EB summary report.

The internal deadline for submitting the EB summary report and recommendations tracking matrix for final editing and translation is 26 August 2005. The deadline for OEDE to finalize and print the full technical report is end September 2005.

Outputs:

- An initial de-briefing of WFP Regional Bureau management and staff in Bangkok will be held in early June 2005 at the end of the field visits, and a further de-briefing will be held in Headquarters in mid-June. In addition the Evaluation Team will provide informal and mainly verbal feedback to WFP staff in the field before leaving their areas.
- Full Evaluation Report (maximum 100 pages, including all annexes). Deadline for first draft is end June 2005.
- Submission of Executive Board Evaluation Summary Report (max. 5000 words) for EB2/2005, to be held in early November 2005. Deadline for first draft is end June 2005.

Cost of the evaluation:

The estimated cost of this evaluation is US\$125,000. This includes consultants' honoraria, travel costs, per diem, internal country costs and incidentals. It excludes the cost of the WFP/OEDE evaluation manager (although it includes his travel and per diem costs) and the cost of the OEDE support staff.

JL/HG

Original February 2005; revised April 2005.