



# Annex 1: Concept paper and terms of reference

## Introduction

### **Background**

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 including Myanmar, Somalia, Bangladesh, Kenya, Malaysia, the Seychelles and Tanzania were also affected. More than 170,000 people are thought to have died and thousands more were injured. Overall, an estimated 2 million people have been directly or indirectly affected, of whom 1.7 million are internally displaced.<sup>67</sup> Damage and destruction of infrastructure has destroyed people's livelihoods, and left many homeless and without adequate water and healthcare facilities.

The world – governments and people – responded with unprecedented generosity in solidarity with the rescue and relief efforts of the affected communities and local and national authorities. More than US\$6 billion<sup>68</sup> has been pledged for humanitarian emergency relief and reconstruction assistance to tsunami-affected areas. This has been instrumental in reducing or mitigating the consequences of the disaster, and in boosting the current recovery and reconstruction efforts.

### **Purpose**

This evaluation is part of the overall evaluation by the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition. It is a thematic evaluation of the funding response by the various governments, UN agencies, NGOs and INGOs.

---

<sup>67</sup> Figures for numbers dead and missing are taken from Guha-Sapir, D and WG Van Panhuis (2005) Health Impact of the Tsunami: Indonesia 2005. Brussels Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (July).

<sup>68</sup> This amount is a minimum; some estimates go to US\$10 billion

The purpose of the evaluation is to:

- provide an overview of the total volume of funding of the response by the various actors, and to sample the flow of donation of goods in kind for a few specific countries or agencies
- assess the appropriateness of allocation of funds in relation to the actual relief and reconstruction needs and in relation to other emergencies
- contribute to a better understanding of public responses to emergencies
- provide a basis for follow-up studies after two and four years.

The evaluation will cover a ten-month period: December 2004 to October 2005.

### **Evaluation criteria**

The following DAC evaluation criteria will be applied where relevant: timeliness, appropriateness (relevance), coherence, connectedness, efficiency and effectiveness. Donors' funding policy and decisions should be assessed against the Good Humanitarian Donorship principles.

## Key issues

### **Mapping the volume and distribution**

- How much has been raised/pledged by donor countries' governments, INGOs, NGOs and private sector and by affected countries' governments, NGOs, communities, etc (both financial and in-kind contributions). How much 'new money' has the tsunami generated?
- Has the generous response to the tsunami affected funding of other emergencies in 2005?
- How much has been allocated to various main purposes: emergency/humanitarian relief, reconstruction, development? How much has been earmarked?
- How much has been allocated to various geographical areas (countries)?
- How much has actually been spent or committed?
- How has the flow of funds been coordinated internationally and nationally (in affected countries)? What role did the Flash Appeal play as a mechanism for funding priority needs?
- Have new funding structures or channels developed? What is the significance of the involvement of several 'non-traditional' donors and other actors?

### **Appropriateness**

- How and to what extent was allocation of assistance based on needs assessment during the emergency phase of the response? How were funds being allocated to various purposes (relief/reconstruction/development) and to geographic locations?
- To what extent has assistance been supply-driven (in-stock supplies, military assets, etc)? How and on what basis were decisions made? How have in-kind contributions been costed? (The cost-effectiveness is to be evaluated in another study.)
- To what extent and how have beneficiaries/communities been involved in defining needs and making choices? (Analysis here should be drawn from the TEC needs assessment study.)

- Has the generous response (funds available per capita) affected quality of assistance (meeting or surpassing Sphere Standards)? (Analysis here should be drawn from the TEC impact study [this wasn't actually carried out].)
- Has the volume of assistance had any national economic effects? (Build here on the work done by the ODI.)

### **Fundraising**

- Why was the response so generous? (Hypotheses need to be tested about the significance here of natural versus human-made disaster, familiar tourist areas, affected Westerners and the near-Christmas timing.)
- What lessons are there for future fundraising? (This may have to be based on previous market research carried out immediately after the response.)
- Were needs and delivery capacities accurately presented to the public? (Review in one or two key countries for which data are available.)
- What are the public's main concerns about how funds are spent? How do organisations report on spending to contributors?
- How have various organisations handled the surplus of funds over and above that which they initially appealed for? Did the flow of private funds change the behaviour of key donors/actors?

## Evaluation methodology

The evaluation will be conducted as a series of concurrent studies, which will provide the basis for synthesising findings on the above key issues. The studies will cover the following eight themes, analysing:

- overall global flows of funding
- a number of specific donor governments' contributions
- the UN Flash Appeal and Consolidated Appeal process
- financial flows through and within the Red Cross/Crescent system
- the NGO sector, with specific studies on a number of the larger NGOs
- funding flows and motivation of the general public, focusing on a few key countries
- funding and goods in-kind from the corporate sector
- local response within the region, focusing on Indonesia, Thailand, Sri Lanka and India.

Mapping the volume and distribution will be based on available statistics (FTS, DAC, Reuter AlertNet, National reporting, etc) supplemented, if necessary, with visits to India, Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Thailand to obtain data on national fundraising. Appropriateness will be assessed through interviews with key decision makers and observers as well as by drawing on the other tsunami evaluations. Fundraising will necessarily be assessed through several studies at donor-country level and, in the case of INGOs, cross-country studies. These studies could build on the DEC study 'Maximising the opportunity in the charitable marketplace' and at minimum will address the above questions.

The evaluators will seek out and make use of already commissioned tsunami evaluations and other relevant studies from the donor, the response community and research institutes. Evaluators will be encouraged to use a range of both quantitative and qualitative

investigative techniques. For studies focusing on the disaster-affected countries, the use of participatory appraisal techniques will be encouraged.

Evaluators will be required to feed back their thinking and initial findings to the organisations and communities they are studying. This is partly to help the process of validation but also to encourage a sense of trust in the evaluation process. Evaluation drafts and initial findings will be made available on an interactive file-sharing site such that each evaluation team is able to review and draw insight from the work of the other teams.

## Outputs

A synthesis report of maximum 50 pages will cover all three issues. It will build on the eight thematic studies. The synthesis report will be targeted to the donor community, the aid agencies involved in the tsunami response and the national government officials in charge of each country's response. Each evaluation team will be charged with creating an appropriate distribution list for the report, to ensure that it goes to local as well as international agencies and officials.

It is also intended that the results of the evaluations will receive wide general distribution, given the major involvement of the public around the world in funding the tsunami response. To that end, specific additional materials will be developed to facilitate press launches around the world. The synthesis report will be produced in English and also in the key languages of the affected countries.

## Evaluation teams and management

The synthesis will be prepared by a small team while the thematic studies will be conducted by separate teams as per detailed terms of reference. Where teams are charged with in-country evaluations, the preference will be to contract proven evaluators and researchers from those countries.

The evaluation process and the synthesis report will be coordinated by a group consisting of Danida, DC Ireland, World Vision and DEC (plus other interested and committed parties). Each sub-study will be managed by a single agency. Each participating agency will be responsible for commissioning and supervising their studies. We envisage that participating agencies will each take responsibility for one or more of the thematic studies. Themes 2 and 5 may be split between several country-specific studies, as national consultants may be better placed than international consultants. It is further envisaged that participating agencies will finance or secure financing for 'their' studies.

## Time schedule

- June 2005: finalisation of concept paper/overall TOR.
- July 2005: mobilisation of participating agencies and initiation of search for consultants.
- August 2005: select consultants.
- September 2005: start work.
- November (mid-) 2005: draft reports to synthesis team.
- December 2005: draft synthesis report (contribution to overall tsunami evaluation report)
- January 2006: final report to print.