



Annex 1: Terms of reference

Evaluation of the impact of tsunami response on local and national capacities

Background

On 26 December 2004, devastating earthquakes along the western coast of Northern Sumatra, the Andaman Islands and Nicobar Islands caused tsunamis to sweep over South and Southeast Asia, reaching as far as the shores of East Africa and producing one of the worst natural disasters in modern history. Those countries worst affected were India, Indonesia, the Maldives, Sri Lanka, and Thailand, with others including Myanmar and Somalia also suffering damage and loss of life. Countries less severely affected by the tsunami included Bangladesh, Kenya, Malaysia, the Seychelles and Tanzania.

In total, more than 170,000 people are thought to have died. Overall, an estimated 2 million people have been directly or indirectly affected, of whom 1.7 million are internally displaced.¹⁵ Damage and destruction to infrastructure has destroyed people's livelihoods and left many homeless and without adequate water, sanitation, food and healthcare facilities.

Governments and people around the world responded with unprecedented generosity in solidarity with the rescue and relief efforts of the affected communities and local and national authorities. This has meant that considerable resources have been available for relief and recovery activities by the international community.

The actual extent of damage to infrastructure, state capacity and lives and livelihood varied from country to country. Sri Lanka, with over 31,000 dead, nearly a million displaced and intense damage to the livelihood capacities of fisheries and tourism sectors (total losses and

¹⁵ Figures for numbers dead and missing are taken from Guha-Sapir and Van Panhuis (2005).

damage about US\$1.5 billion), was the worst hit in terms of the proportionate damage to its infrastructure and local government capacity to respond. In absolute terms, Indonesia suffered the most in terms of life loss (over 128,000 killed), and extent of localised damage to infrastructure and capacity in Aceh (estimated to be between US\$4.5 and 5 billion). While the human toll in the Maldives (81 dead and 21 missing) was not as great as in some neighbouring countries, proportionate to its size and economy, nearly a third of the population was affected and its economic capacity severely damaged (with estimated damages and losses of about 62 per cent of GDP or US\$450 million¹⁶). Thailand (with over 5,400 dead and 20,000 households affected) and India (human toll around 10,750, recovery and reconstruction costs estimated at US\$1.2 billion) suffered considerable damage in absolute terms, yet in terms of the impact on local and national capacities, the damage was not as significant as for Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Maldives.

Pre-existing conflicts in Sri Lanka and Indonesia posed additional challenges and opportunities for relief and recovery efforts, limiting both local and international capacities.

The impact of the tsunami on different countries reflected not only the force with which it struck, but also the individual country's levels of disaster preparedness, and the local infrastructure in terms of ability to respond to a disaster of such proportions. India and Thailand showed a remarkable ability to respond to the crisis effectively, particularly in the recovery phase. These two countries restricted the flow of external assistance to their recovery efforts because they felt they could manage with less international assistance. In Indonesia the military sector is well developed, and played a large part in the response. By contrast, Somalia has no government and was therefore unable to mount more than a very limited internal response.

Disasters offer unique opportunities for change. Relief efforts can serve not only to reverse losses but also can set the direction for long-term sustainable recovery. If the transition from relief to recovery is perceived essentially as a development activity, and local capacity is engaged and enhanced throughout the process, the legacy of even a major disaster such as the tsunami can be a tangible improvement in the quality of life for the survivors.

The combination of such an opportunity to set the direction for development, and the unprecedented level of international assistance, provide a chance to take stock and assess the contributions of international actors undertaking relief and recovery efforts.

Purpose, objectives and scope of this study

This evaluation is one of five thematic evaluations being co-coordinated by the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition (TEC), an informal grouping of donors, UN agencies, INGOs and the Red Cross/Red Crescent movement, formed to develop a sector-wide approach to evaluations of tsunami response, including multi-agency evaluations of those aspects of the tsunami relief, recovery and rehabilitation activities which will benefit from joint evaluation.¹⁷ In tandem with the other four studies, this evaluation will therefore serve as a

¹⁶ The estimated figures for amount of damage are all based on the preliminary needs assessment published by the World Bank, ADB and UNDP.

¹⁷ The other themes are: coordination (including civil-military issues), impact assessment, needs assessment, linking relief, rehabilitation and development, and donor response, including an assessment of the role of the media. For further details see www.alnap.org/tec.

test case for undertaking joint but parallel multi-agency evaluations within a larger, umbrella evaluation effort.

Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to determine the impact of the tsunami response – including the role of international actors – on local and national capacities for relief and recovery, and risk reduction. That is, ‘What worked and why?’, and ‘What could have been improved and how?’, and ‘What did not work and why?’ are questions that need addressing in order to: (i) provide lessons for strengthening the ongoing activities¹⁸ as well as future responses to emergencies, and (ii) hold international actors accountable to the individual, institutional and country donors.

Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

- 1 assess how local and national capacities changed as a result of the tsunami response
- 2 assess how well international actors engaged with local and national capacities in providing relief and recovery assistance
- 3 assess the intended and unintended changes to local and national capacities as a result of the tsunami response by international actors
- 4 assess the extent to which transition/ risk reduction/ recovery programming, planned and implemented, is likely to influence local and national capacities
- 5 distil lessons learned for efforts to strengthen local and national capacities for future crisis response and recovery
- 6 ensure that all of the above assess and highlight gender differences and the varied experiences of women and men.¹⁹

Scope

The assessment will take into account the three phases of the tsunami assistance in the first six months: (a) immediate emergency, (b) early recovery phase, (c) initiating the transition from recovery to development. It is understood that the transition between these phases is blurred between different sectors. Phases occurred in parallel and lasted for different lengths of time in different sectors and at different locations.

The evaluation will be based on in-depth field studies of three of the following: Sri Lanka, Indonesia, the Maldives and Thailand.

18 Including positive and negative policy spin-offs, such as environmental management, land-use planning, and conflict transformation. For example, In Sri Lanka, the tsunami led to a bipartisan process of taking stock of the current state of disaster-risk management in the country and identifying directions for the future. This process itself is a positive spin-off that could be extended to other issues.

19 Research has shown that significantly more women than men died as a result of the tsunami, which has major implications for gender relations in the reconstruction phase. Throughout the evaluation, disaggregated data on the capacities of women and men should be used, as an understanding of the gender imbalance in the death toll is a major factor to be considered in preparedness plans and recovery programmes, as well as in understanding the capacities of affected populations.

For each of these case studies the evaluation will consider intended and unintended changes in local and national capacities among different sections of the population. The core of the evaluation will be to consider the impact of the actions of international actors on local and national capacities but, in order to understand the total impact of the response on capacity, a 'stocktaking' of the impact of the national response will be included. The assessment will also identify the contextual constraints and opportunities in which these changes happened.

These capacities include: (a) capacity to respond to the disaster as shown by those affected, NGOs, local women's organisations, the private sector and local and national government (including capacities of women, men and other vulnerable groups in affected communities to participate in decision-making related to relief and recovery efforts, local governance, resource mobilisation, planning and implementation, protection, advocacy, training, and livelihoods recovery); and (b) Capacity of community members to access services and markets (for labour as well as goods and services), including the capacities of the private sector to recover and create livelihoods, and relief- and recovery-related services of government.

The evaluation will focus on communities, formal and informal civil-society institutions (including NGOs), and local and national government, considering the different capacities and experiences of women, men and other vulnerable groups at each level. The evaluation will include an assessment of the baseline capacities in place at the time of the tsunami to respond to the relief and recovery needs of the affected.

Selection of case-study countries

The selection of countries for field studies has been made to illustrate a cross-section of response situations based on the following:

- 1 extent of tsunami damage and reconstruction needs
- 2 response capacity with regard to state as well as civil-society capacity
- 3 level of international support
- 4 local context, including pre-existing conflict, linked to addressing capacity needs
- 5 availability of evaluative evidence
- 6 subject to time and budget, the inclusion of a 'control' variable country – that is, one in which the response was largely handled internally.

The four following countries will be studied subject to the security situation: Sri Lanka, Indonesia (Aceh), the Maldives and Thailand.

Evaluation criteria

Performance will be evaluated using the DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance, OECD (1991): relevance/appropriateness, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability/connectedness. Gender analysis and the protection of vulnerable groups will be fully integrated at every stage and in all aspects of the evaluation.

Key questions for consideration

Key questions are to be addressed at local and national levels to assess whether international actors did the right things and if they did things right. Different groups of people have different capacities to cope with crises, as well as different vulnerabilities. In addition, the capacities of one group of people may change over time. It should be noted, therefore, that these questions are also posed to understand whether response activities strengthened the capacities of the weak and vulnerable groups, particularly women, children and the poor, and if the efforts strengthened local participation.

With relevance to all the key questions, the team must identify as far as possible the differential impact of relief and response activities on the capacities of vulnerable groups in each situation. If it becomes apparent that some groups benefited very little from the assistance, their views should be sought, as they may reveal problems with the targeting of beneficiaries.

Initial questions are included in Appendix B. These are to serve as a starting point. A detailed list of questions to be covered in the evaluation will be discussed when the evaluation team has been appointed.

In the light of this study's role as a test case for undertaking joint but parallel multi-agency evaluations within a larger, umbrella evaluation effort, the report should also document what has been learned through the process in terms of good practice in multi-agency evaluation.

Management of the evaluation

The two lead agencies (DMI and UNDP) will form a thematic Evaluation Steering Committee²⁰ (ESC) with the support of UNICEF, Action Aid and CordAid to manage the evaluation. The ESC will be responsible for ensuring an inclusive process to finalise the ToR, mobilise resources, identify the team members, and ensure quality throughout the process. The theme management group will benefit from the advice of the TEC Evaluation Adviser and Coordinator (EAC), who will provide guidance to the group to ensure coherence among the evaluations of the five thematic areas. The ToR will be circulated to the relevant UN agencies and Resident/Humanitarian Coordinators.

A wider working group will also have input into the evaluation in terms of providing funding, in-kind assistance at country level (for example, accessing key stakeholders including beneficiaries, hosting workshops, providing documentary evidence for the desk reviews), commenting on the ToR and final report, and assisting with follow-up in their own agencies. A team of independent consultants will be recruited to carry out the evaluation. The UNDP Evaluation Office will provide daily management and logistical support to the evaluation team.

Evaluation methodology and team composition

All members of the team will participate in a joint inception workshop with all the evaluation teams, to be held close to the start of the evaluation,²¹ during which the detailed methodology will be agreed on, in consultation with the TEC Evaluation Adviser and Coordinator (EAC) and the lead agencies.

20 Membership of the ESC is open to other agencies/organisations who wish to be included.

21 Scheduled for 7 and 8 September, in Geneva.

It is envisaged that the approach will encompass a number of methods, including:

- desk reviews (including additional in-depth studies of countries not visited for case-studies)
- stakeholder interviews (with male and female beneficiaries and vulnerable groups, community and civil-society groups, local organisations, local and national government, private institutions, international agencies and INGOs) based on a semi-structured questionnaire that will gather both quantitative and qualitative information
- timelines to identify key events and key decision-making points
- focus-group discussions with male and female beneficiaries
- semi-structured interviews with key policy makers
- a review of the results of previous studies of post-disaster recovery to see the extent to which the findings of this evaluation are coherent with, reinforce or contradict previous findings.

Analysis will be both qualitative and quantitative. Examples of good/best practice will be noted and a comparative analysis made of relief and recovery efforts leading to positive changes in capacities across communities, institutions and countries. Within any emergency response it must be noted that different stakeholders may have different perceptions of relief and response, and may not share common objectives, possibly even seeking contradictory results. In order to minimise the bias of one group of stakeholders, different methodologies that can serve to triangulate findings are important. The methodology must enable the evaluation team to consider the differential impact of relief and response activities on the capacities of different, vulnerable groups in all the situations considered.

It is accepted that 'Current thinking is that no evaluation can be "value-free", and that values should always be made explicit' (ALNAP, 2004, p 28). The question of the value framework of this evaluation needs to be part of the discussion around detailed methodology.

In addition to the inception workshop, national workshops will be held for briefing and debriefing at the start and end of each country study. These will seek to involve a broad spectrum of female and male participants including stakeholders, beneficiaries and decision makers in the government. These workshops in case-study countries will be conducted jointly with other thematic evaluations and coordinated by the EAC to minimise duplication of effort and disruption to stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The purpose of the initial in-country workshop is: (i) to introduce the evaluation to key beneficiaries and stakeholders; (ii) to consult with the participants as part of the process of refining the ToR; and (iii) to identify relevant civil-society networks, key informants and key stakeholders for the evaluation. These should represent both women and men, and vulnerable groups such as IDPs and people living in conflict areas. During these initial workshops, an emphasis will be placed on promoting participation and ownership by local stakeholders, male and female, during the case studies. Local views will be solicited on capacity issues which beneficiaries and stakeholders consider to be important, as well as on those groups, informants and government actors to be included in interviews.

Finally, a debriefing workshop will be held at the end of each case study so that preliminary findings, lessons learned, and recommendations can be thoroughly discussed with local stakeholders, both male and female. It is important that information/feedback on the evaluation process and its preliminary findings and recommendations are provided to the district levels (operational level), and not to the national level only. This information will also be posted on the TEC Online Forum so that other evaluations can benefit from the process.

Upon completing all the country studies, the team will meet and jointly agree on the findings, key lessons and recommendations emerging. Based on this discussion, the team leader will be responsible for preparing the draft evaluation report in close collaboration with the other team members. The draft evaluation report will be available by end November and findings and lessons presented and disseminated to all relevant stakeholders.

Key findings and recommendations from this final capacity report will be synthesised by three authors: a lead synthesis writer, the EAC, and the researcher/deputy coordinator into one synthesis report to be presented to, and discussed by, the TEC.

The evaluation team will consist of an evaluation team leader and two team members, at least one of which will be a national consultant for each of the country case studies. The team will represent a balance of skills and experience, including:

- substantial evaluation experience
- experience of humanitarian response and recovery programmes
- familiarity with the region
- experience of working with government departments
- experience of working with local organisations (civil societies and NGOs)
- experience of capacity assessment and building
- gender balance and demonstrable experience in integrating gender considerations²²
- experience in beneficiary consultation, surveys, and conducting focus groups
- excellent spoken and written communication skills in English
- sectoral technical expertise (for example, health, water, education, socioeconomics – accepting that not all sectors can be covered).

It is hoped that, in addition to the national consultant for each case-study country, other members of the team will come from the region. To the extent possible, the team will have competence to ensure an approach sensitive to issues such as corruption, HIV/AIDS and environmental issues whenever relevant. In addition to leading the capacity team, the team leader will liaise with the other five thematic leads and the EAC, consulting with him on methodological and timing/implementation issues.

The evaluation will start in early August 2005. The field studies will take place during September and October,²³ with the draft report produced by the end of November. The project will be finalised by the end of December 2005.

Outputs

- An inception report of no more than 2,500 words outlining the team's approach, due three weeks after the start of the evaluation.

²² See ALNAP Proforma (ALNAP, www.alnap.org).

²³ Scheduling of fieldwork in Indonesia and the Maldives will need to take account of Ramadan, during October.

- Interim status report (or PowerPoint presentation) per country of no more than 1,500 words reflecting the key issues identified by the team and prepared prior to departure from the study country. The report will be presented at the debriefing workshop at the end of each field study, to be organised by UNDP and DMI. This meeting should include at minimum agencies that are members of the theme evaluation and relevant government counterparts.

Tentative time schedule

Tentative time schedule	
Date	Activity
July 5–19	Post working ToR on the web, advertise for consultants
July 22–25	Selection of consultants
July 25–29	Initial briefing visit of team leader
Aug 1–19	Desk review
Aug 22 – Sept 2	Review of desk review Setting up appointments in case-study countries with stakeholders, initial HQ interviews in NY, Geneva and Bangkok, preparation of national workshops in collaboration with EAC
Sept 7–8	Joint inception workshop with other evaluation teams in Geneva
Sept 9–Nov 4	Field studies: 3 weeks Sri Lanka (including national workshop) 3 weeks Aceh (including national workshop) 2 Weeks Maldives/Thailand (including national workshop)
Nov 7–11	1 week team analysis and joint work
Nov 14–Dec 2	Meeting for 6 team leaders with TEC EAC to consider the key issues and lessons learned before draft reports prepared. Venue tbc Report writing
Dec 2	Submission of draft report
Dec 5–16	Review of report by steering group
Dec 19–23	Formal debriefing of TL
Early Jan	Synthesis workshop (tentative), includes written comments on draft synthesis report

- A final report of no more than 20,000 words, excluding an executive summary of no more than three pages and annexes. For further guidance for the report, see the ALNAP Quality Proforma.

Use of the evaluation report

The final report will be a stand-alone report and will be discussed at relevant interagency forums, such as 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 draft and final report will be made available on the dedicated TEC website the Online Forum, and disseminated through all appropriate channels.

The recommendations made by the team should be discussed by the IASC, including a working group on gender, and should be responded to by the concerned agencies. A management response matrix will be prepared once the report has been finalised, involving all commissioning agencies.

Appendix A: Roles of key groups and individuals in the evaluation

Role of the thematic evaluation steering committee (ESC) (e.g. Capacities ESC)

A steering committee composed of a core group of participating agencies will be set up to provide overall management guidance for each thematic evaluation. The ESC will be chaired by the commissioning agency or agencies. The role of the steering committee is to:

- ensure an inclusive process to finalise the ToR
- provide funding for the evaluation and assist in the mobilisation of resources (financial and in-kind)
- participate in the selection of the evaluation team members (identifying the team, and ensuring quality throughout the process)
- participate in teleconferences on key issues regarding this evaluation
- advise their own agencies and staff on this evaluation as well as coordinating agency-internal substantive feedback back to the group
- ensure that field representatives are aware of the TEC and fully involved and available to contribute to the evaluation
- participate in any workshop that may be planned once the draft report has been received.

Role of the thematic working groups (e.g. Capacities Thematic Working Group)

In addition, a number of agencies and donors have signed up to participate in this evaluation. While not part of the ESC, these theme members are expected to provide support to the thematic evaluations as follows:

- provide funding for this evaluation
- provide technical advice or staff on secondment
- provide comments on the inception report and on the draft report(s)
- ensure that field representatives are aware of the TEC and fully involved and available to contribute to this evaluation and related workshops
- provide in-kind support at country level (that is, facilitate meetings, transport, contacts)
- advise their own agencies and staff on this evaluation as well as coordinating agency-internal substantive feedback back to the group
- if possible, participate in any workshops planned as part of the evaluation.

Role of the TEC evaluation advisor and coordinator (EAC)

The EAC will provide methodological and substantive advice to the evaluation team through the steering committee and the evaluation team leader. The EAC will promote connectivity between this evaluation and the other evaluation exercises undertaken by the TEC, alerting the evaluation team members to any additional information they may need for undertaking their work (eg third-party evaluation reports, lessons-learned events, etc). The EAC will be in regular contact with the evaluation team leader. Any joint workshops, in particular the start-up workshops, would be organised and facilitated by the EAC in collaboration with the evaluation team leaders. The EAC reports to the TEC Core Management Group.

Role of the TEC Core Management Group (CMG)

The CMG provides general guidance for the TEC and seeks to ensure complementarity and connectivity between the various thematic evaluations. The CMG will be advised by the EAC and will review and comment on any outputs produced by the thematic evaluation. Responsibility for the quality and acceptance of the report rests with the commissioning agency/ steering committee.

Role of the evaluation team leader

The evaluation team leader will report to the thematic ESC for the evaluation. S/he will be in regular contact with the EAC, coordinate mission timing and key events with the EAC as part of the TEC initiative and seek the EAC's advice when needed. The team leader is responsible for the team's report(s) as well as for contributing inputs to the TEC synthesis report. This will require participation in a synthesis workshop to be held in December 2005, as well as providing written feedback on the draft synthesis report as it relates to this theme.

Role of the Online Forum (www.tsunami-evaluation.org)

The Online Forum links thematic evaluations, posts all ToR, maps all evaluation and lessons exercises, and provides an online forum for each thematic evaluation working group.

Appendix B: Key questions to be used in the evaluation

Background

- What is the 'disaster history' of each case-study country, particularly with respect to the affected areas?
- How much did international actors know of the historical processes that had shaped and configured risk in each context?
- To what extent were local organisations experienced in managing disaster risks and in recovery?
- To what extent were local/national resources adequate to meet the needs of the affected populations? (For example, what were the capacities of the local and national actors to coordinate, plan and implement relief and recovery efforts, consult the

affected population, differentiate between the needs of women, men, children and the elderly, advocate among external partners, and train those affected to cope with the disaster.)

Relevance/appropriateness

- To what extent was the response based on needs assessment for relief and recovery, including an assessment of the needs of different groups in the community? Did the needs assessments include an assessment of local response capacities, including the different capacity of women, men and other vulnerable groups? If not, why?
- How adequate are existing policies for engagement in differentiating between the needs of different groups among affected populations?
- How did international actors determine their priorities for engagement with local and national capacities? (Through agency mandates, consideration of vulnerable groups, etc.)
- Were these priorities re-assessed at different phases of the response to remain relevant in a fluid situation?
- To what extent did international actors' perceptions of the affected areas correspond with those of the local actors? Were there mechanisms in place to discuss these?
- To what extent did international actors have an understanding of organisation and decision-making structures at government, local government and community level?
- Who did the international agencies engage with and why? Which individuals (women, men, IDPs) and which organisations (including women's organisations) were targeted?
- To what extent did the international efforts recognise the local context (existing conflicts, tensions, inequalities, coping mechanisms of women and men, and opportunistic capacities that surface in response to the urgency of the situation) and existing indigenous capacities?
- What were the approaches used by international agencies?
- What attention did international agencies and national organisations pay to the gender composition of their teams, and their capacity to address gender issues?
- How well did beneficiaries (women, men, boys, girls, the elderly) understand international relief mechanisms and how to make best use of them?
- How well did international and national actors take into account the impact of their assistance on local markets in their planning?

Efficiency

- To what extent had institutional and legislative arrangements been put in place to deal with disaster response?
- Given the local capacities of different individuals and groups when the tsunami struck, how effectively did international engagement work to strengthen those capacities, given the constraints of needing to deliver relief quickly to affected communities?
- To what extent did the international efforts leverage existing local and national capacities, both at the level of accessing services and information, and also in terms of providing necessary services and opportunities for relief and recovery?
- How well did different actors plan and coordinate among their efforts? Was there duplication of, or gaps in, capacity?

- To what extent did local and international actors support each other to include vulnerable groups, such as women, children and the poorest?
- Did international efforts utilise relevant past experience and evaluations of disaster preparedness and response, including the different needs of women and men?

Effectiveness

- How was the performance of existing local institutions (government and non-government) with a mandate to provide post-disaster relief?²⁴
- What was the impact of previous capacity strengthening on the tsunami response and recovery?
- How effective were international actors in meeting their own priorities for engaging with different groups of local and national actors?
- Did the relief and recovery efforts utilise or displace local capacity among different groups of the affected population? How was the impact of different groups assessed?
- Did international actors have the intention of building capacity during the relief phase?

Impact

- How did the capacities of different groups of beneficiaries change throughout the period under review (in terms of both provision of services and ability to access them)
- To what extent did international efforts strengthen/weaken capacities of local and national actors (differentiating between different groups of the affected population) to deliver services and opportunities for relief, recovery and risk reduction?
- To what extent did international efforts strengthen/weaken the capacities of local and national actors (differentiating between different groups of the affected population) to participate in, and own the relief and recovery efforts?
- To what extent did international efforts strengthen/weaken the capacities of male and female beneficiaries to access relief, rehabilitation and development services and opportunities?
- What has been the different experience of women and men, and how have gender relations, and women's and men's capacities, been affected (positively or negatively) by tsunami assistance (both national and international assistance)?
- To what extent did the efforts aim to strengthen synergies between local and national capacities to provide services?
- Did the response activities lessen or exacerbate existing conflicts, including domestic violence, and thereby assist or weaken capacities to respond?
- Has the capacity of local and national actors to use international or national standards for disaster response been enhanced?
- How were markets for affected and non-affected populations impacted by the influx of relief goods and services?
- What kinds of impacts did the efforts, launched prior to the tsunami, to build capacity

24 For example, in Sri Lanka the National Disaster Management Centre (NDMC), set up by an earlier UNDP capacity-building project, was completely sidelined by more powerful institutions such as the Presidential Secretariat, partly because the NDMC lacked the capacity to match the scale of the disaster but largely for political reasons. In the end, the NDMC, which should be a stable institution looking at all aspects of disaster-risk management in the country, has emerged as a highly disempowered institution.

in disaster-risk management have on the post-tsunami operations?

Sustainability/connectedness

- Was there local ownership of provision of relief and recovery efforts and access to these services, and if so, by whom? To what extent did beneficiary groups, local organisations and the state participate in the decision-making processes related to relief and recovery efforts? Were women and men equally involved, and were their voices and different concerns heard? Were all key groups, including women's organisations, included?
- Drawing on the lessons learned from past emergencies, and evaluations of the tsunami response already completed, how will current and planned activities in tsunami-affected countries affect local capacity among different members of the population?
- Is a commitment to capacity strengthening among all sections of society explicit within transition and recovery plans and programmes (for both national and international players)? How well do these reflect local needs? What are the chances of their being successful, in the light of the tsunami experience to date?

Future planning and capacity strengthening

The following questions should also be considered, in the light of lessons from responses to the questions above.

- What lessons and good/best practice can be drawn from a comparison between those countries where there had been a process of capacity strengthening in disaster-risk management before the tsunami with those where this had not taken place?
- Are there more effective steps toward better preparedness to manage future disasters?
- Could the international agencies have taken different steps to improve the effectiveness of their efforts?