



Annex 1: Terms of reference

Background

81

The tsunami catastrophe that struck Asia on 26 December 2004 is one of the worst natural disasters in modern history. Although the major impact was felt in India, Indonesia, the Maldives, Sri Lanka and Thailand, several other countries were affected, including Myanmar and Somalia, or touched by the tsunami including Bangladesh, Kenya, Malaysia, Seychelles and Tanzania. More than 170,000 people are thought to have died and thousands of people were injured, with many needing urgent medical or surgical treatment. Overall, an estimated two million people have been directly or indirectly affected. Damage and destruction to infrastructure destroyed people's livelihoods, and left many homeless and without adequate water and healthcare facilities.

The world – both governments and people – responded with unprecedented generosity, in solidarity with the rescue and relief efforts of the affected communities and local and national authorities. This has been instrumental in reducing or mitigating the consequences of the disaster, and in boosting the current recovery and rehabilitation efforts.

Purpose, scope and objectives

This evaluation is undertaken as part of the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition. It is a thematic evaluation of the coordination by various actors throughout the first nine months following the tsunami. The evaluation will focus on coordination issues as they relate to national and regional assistance efforts and include country case studies on Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Maldives and Somalia.

The purpose of the evaluation is three-fold:

- (i) Assess the extent to which immediate and longer-term responses and strategies were guided by timely, relevant and adequate coordination arrangements and address the basic questions of: What was done well and why, and what could have been done better and how?

- (ii) Distil lessons learned for improving coordination practice for future crisis response, and recovery systems and processes i.e. in what way can future coordination arrangements be better organised, and their tools and services rendered more effective?
- (iii) Serve as a test case for undertaking joint but parallel inter-agency evaluations within a larger umbrella evaluation effort, the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition.

The evaluation will take into account three 'phases' or stages of the tsunami assistance period: (I) immediate emergency, (II) early recovery phase, (III) transition from relief to rehabilitation/recovery. It is understood that the last two 'phases' may not necessarily have occurred sequentially but in parallel and that the duration of phase I, II and III will have differed from location to location. Not included in this evaluation is preparedness.

The evaluation will look at the coordination between the UN, NGOs, donors and military as well as between these actors and national actors, and where relevant, with other actors in South-east Asia. Coordination aspects will be also reviewed from a general, sectoral and a geographic perspective.

The evaluation is expected to distil good/best practice; practice-to-be-avoided as well as targeted recommendations to the humanitarian community on how to improve current and future coordination mechanisms.

Evaluation criteria

Coordination performance will be evaluated utilizing the following evaluation criteria: timeliness, efficiency, effectiveness, appropriateness, coherence, value-added, and connectedness. Added to these OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC)-criteria is one additional criteria: leadership effectiveness. Sensitivity to gender issues will be considered whenever appropriate.

Key questions and issues

The evaluation will seek to address five key questions:

- What worked well in coordination and why? What did not work and why?
- Did the various coordination efforts result in:
 - a Avoidance of critical gaps at sectoral and geographic levels?
 - b Absence of duplication?
 - c Increased/decreased operational costs in the use of assets, resources and funds?
 - d Appropriate use of common assets and tools?
 - e Better ownership and/or participation by local actors and beneficiaries?
 - f Value-added support to national coordination structures?
- How appropriate was the structure, strategy and style of coordination to the circumstances at country, regional and international level and with specific actors?
- Did coordination actors bring the right expertise and appropriate critical mass to the relief effort at critical times?
- Were key lessons on coordination from previous major emergencies applied/not applied in the tsunami response? Did early lessons learned exercises and workshop result in immediate action and improvements where needed?

Specific questions to help answer these key questions are contained in Annex I to these TOR and are expected to guide the evaluation team in their work. The team will look at key coordination tasks and techniques, facilitation of coordination and tools and structures used for coordination. It is recognised that this may assume a key set of coordination functions and responsibilities and as such may not be an inclusive list. The team will, as necessary, expand or recast these issues in their inception report.

Management of the evaluation

The evaluation will be managed by OCHA as lead agency with the support of a thematic steering committee.

The draft TOR will be circulated through the ALNAP network and to the Humanitarian Coordinators of the involved countries for sharing these with all relevant stakeholders. The OCHA office in the case study countries will provide logistical support to the evaluation team in preparation for country visits and throughout the team's stay in the country.

Evaluation team and method

It is proposed that the evaluation team would consist of three international consultants, one with humanitarian coordination expertise (team leader), the second a specialist in natural disaster response (evaluator # 2) and the third a specialist on civil-military liaison (evaluator # 3). National consultants (evaluator # 4,5,6,7) will join the core team during each of the country case studies. The evaluation team will be supported by at least one research assistant. To the extent possible the evaluation team shall be balanced geographically as well as gender-wise.

The team may be accompanied by evaluation staff from one of the participating agencies on parts or the entire portion of the field visits. The role of evaluation staff accompanying the team would be to provide policy and operational feedback to the team, facilitate work with country teams and undertake any detailed work as requested by the team leader.

The team leader will work closely with the TEC Evaluation Advisor and Coordinator (EAC) and seek his/her guidance on method and planning the field visits. To the extent feasible the country visits of the various themes will be coordinated and a joint workshop should be organized for all themes in early September. The EAC will seek to ensure that there is no unnecessary duplication between the themes and provide guidance on complementarity and coverage where needed.

The team leader will be responsible for preparing the evaluation report; team members are expected to work under the direction of the team leader and provide inputs as requested by the team leader. The team leader will report to the OCHA manager and liaise with the TEC Lead Evaluator and consult with and inform him/her on methodological issues and timing/implementation issues.

It is anticipated that the Team will make use of the following methods:

- desk review of the most relevant reports, documents and tools used and/or produced in the first 6 months related to coordination and the key-questions above
- desk review of stand-alone evaluation reports and lessons learned meeting documents by Government, UN agencies, NGOs and donors providing assessments on coordination

- key stakeholder interviews in all country case studies, and among those involved in the coordination and priority setting process; key stakeholder interviews with key informants who participated in the response at national and/or international level (presumably much of these will require phone interviews as many actors will have moved on)
- creation of ideal scenario for coordination (actors, instruments, space and time) and match this with what happened and suggest what needed/needs to be done to get there;
- country-level workshops with a broad spectrum of participants
- establishment of timelines – if necessary by issue – to identify key events and key decision-making points
- preparation of a Coordination Performance Indicator checklist (see Annex II) for each country to be annexed to the final report; the format of this checklist should be revised/updated by the team in their inception report
- visits to the disaster affected areas in Sri Lanka and western Sumatra, including interviews with the affected population in the sites visited
- the team will split up to visit Somalia and the Maldives.

It is proposed that country-level workshops will be part of the methodology, to present initial findings following the desk review and discuss emerging key issues and lessons with key stakeholders. This should be part of a broader workshop together with the other studies. The workshops will most likely take place in the month of September.

Outputs

- i. An inception report of no more than 2,500 words outlining the team's approach. This inception report is due two weeks after the start-up of the evaluation.
- ii. Interim status report (or power point presentation) per country of no more than 1,500 reflecting the key issues identified by the team. These reports should be prepared prior to departure of the in-country visit and be presented to a joint meeting to be organized by the Office of the Humanitarian Coordinator. This meeting should include at minimum agencies that are members of the theme evaluation and relevant Government counterparts.
- iii. A report of no more than 20,000 words, excluding an executive summary of no more than 500 words and annexes. The report is expected to meet the standards set by the ALNAP quality proforma and the UN standards for evaluation.
- iv. The draft and final report will be made available on the dedicated Tsunami Evaluation Coalition website, and disseminated through all appropriate channels.

Use of the evaluation report

The evaluation report will be a stand alone report and will be discussed at relevant interagency fora, e.g. the December ALNAP meeting and the February IASC meeting. The report will also feed into the TEC synthesis report – planned to be available in draft form by late December 2005.

The recommendations made by the team should be discussed by the IASC and should be responded to by the concerned agencies. A management response matrix will be prepared once the report has been finalised.

Tentative time schedule

Tentative time schedule		Team leader	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluators 4, 5, 6, 7
By 19 May	Draft TOR ready for TEC meeting in Geneva				
By June 10	Circulate and finalize for discussion at ALNAP meeting in The Hague)				
By 17 June	Post the TOR on the web, for recruitment of consultants				
July	Selection of consultants				
July	Initial briefing visit of team leader to NY or GVA	3			
Week(WK) 1-4	(2 x 5 days) desk review including an inception report and first round of telephone interviews	10	10	10	30 (10+10 +5+5)
End WK 4	Submission of inception report				
WK 5	Review of desk review				
WK 6	Initial HQ interviews in Geneva and Bangkok	7	7	7	
	Preparation of national workshops				8 (2+2+2+2)
WK 7-8	2 weeks Sri Lanka (including national workshop)	14	14	14	14
WK 9-10	2 weeks Aceh (including national workshop)	14	14	14	14
WK 11	Kenya/Somalia (including national workshop)	7			7
	Maldives (including national workshop)		7		7
WK 12	1 week team analysis and joint work	5	5	5	5
WK 13-15	3 weeks (3 x 5 days) writing reports	15	15	15	40 (10+10 + 10+10)
WK 16	Submission of draft report				
WK 16-17	Review of report by Theme Group				
WK 17	Formal debriefing of TL				
Mid Dec	Synthesis workshop (tentative), includes written comments on draft synthesis report	3			
End Dec	Finalisation of report	5	2	2	8 (2+2+2+2)
		96	84	74	125