

Concept Paper and Terms of Reference for Evaluating The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief

1. 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 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 more injured. Overall, an estimated 2 million people have been directly or indirectly affected of whom 1.7 million are internally displaced¹. 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 \$ 6 billion² 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.

2. 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.

The purpose of the evaluation is:

- a) 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.
- b) to assess the appropriateness of allocation of funds in relation to the actual relief and reconstruction needs and in relation to other emergencies,
- c) to contribute to a better understanding of public responses to emergencies
- d) provide a basis for follow up studies after 2 and 4 years

The evaluation will cover a 10 month period: December 2004 – October 2005.

3. 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.

¹ Figures for numbers dead and missing taken from Guha-Sapir, Van Panhuis, "Health Impact of the Tsunami: Indonesia 2005". Brussels Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, July 2005

² This amount is a minimum; some estimates go to USD 10b.

4. Key Issues

4.1 *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. (Financial contributions 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?
- Has new funding structures/channels developed? What is the significance of the involvement of several 'non-traditional' donors and other actors?

4.2 *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 has in-kind contributions been costed? (The cost effectiveness 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 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 Impact study)
- Has the volume of assistance had any national economic effects? (build on the work done by the ODI)

4.3 *Fundraising*

- Why was the response so generous? (hypotheses about nat. disaster/manmade disaster; familiar tourist areas; also affected "white people", Christmas effect etc. need to be tested.) What lessons 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 is available)
- What are the public's main concerns about how funds are spent? How do organisations report on spending to contributors?
- How has various organisations handled surplus of funds over and above that which they initially appealed for? Did the flow of private funds change the way key donors/actors behaved?

5. 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:

- Theme one: Analysis of the overall global flows
- Theme two: Analysis of a number of specific donor governments' contributions.
- Theme three: Analysis of the UN flash Appeal and Consolidated Appeal process
- Theme four: Analysis of financial flows through and within the Red Cross/Crescent system
- Theme five: Analysis of the NGO sector with specific studies on a number of the larger NGOs
- Theme six: Analysis of the funding flows and motivation of the general public, focussing on a few key countries.
- Theme seven: Analysis of the funding and goods in kind from the corporate sector.
- Theme eight: Analysis of the local response within the region, focussing 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 get 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 case of INGOs, cross country studies. These studies could build on the DEC study "Maximising the opportunity in the charitable marketplace" and at minimum 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 focussing on the disaster affected countries, the use of participatory appraisal techniques will be encouraged.

Evaluators will be required to feedback 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 each other team.

6. Outputs

A synthesis report of maximum 50 pages will cover all three issues. It will build on the 8 thematic studies.

The synthesis report will be targeted to the donor community, the aid agencies who were involved in the tsunami response and to the national government officials who were in charge of each country's response. Each evaluation team will be charged with creating an appropriate distribution list for the report, to ensure 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 well as in the key languages of the affected countries.

7. Evaluation Team(s)

The Synthesis will be prepared by a small team while 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

8. Management

The evaluation process and the Synthesis report will be coordinated by a group comprising Danida, DC Ireland, World Vision and DEC (+ 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 take responsibility for one or more of the thematic studies. Themes 2 and 5 may be split in several country specific studies as national consultants may be better placed than international consultants. It is further envisaged that participating agencies will finance/secure financing of "their studies".

9. Time Schedule

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

Outline of Evaluation Report

The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief

1. Introduction

- Setting the scene
- Comparison with past disaster funding
- Why it is so vital to look at this disaster?
- Using the Good Donorship Initiative as a template for judging the quality of donations

2. Funding flow overview

- The known global totals of pledged, committed, disbursed and spent. Some analysis of how this changed over time.
- Breakdown by receiving states
- Breakdown by purpose (Relief, reconstruction or development)
- Breakdown by sector
- Comparative with other humanitarian funding flows
- Reflection of effect tsunami flows had/have on other flows.
- Comparison with other aid and trade/tariff flows.

3. Key state donors

Analysis of the:

- Pledging (was it new funds, was it against needs, was it delivered on?)
- Commitments (To which agencies for which sectors and with what strings) and
- Spending of the key state donors including the EU. How much has been spent and has it been spent on clearly identified needs?
- Analysis of flow of goods in kind. Have unsolicited goods been donated? Has military assistance been charged at cost?

4. The UN

- Analysis of the flash and consolidated appeal process was it timely and what response did it solicit?
- How states funded and did not fund the appeals. Why are some bits of the appeal still unfunded?
- Evidence of funding against needs assessment
- Spending; how timely and appropriate has been the spending of UN agencies?

5. The IFRC and ICRC

- Where have the funds come from and with what strings?
- Controlling the flow. How has the Fed's Secretariat sought to manage the flow of resources?
- Managing funding and allocation in a Federal system.
- Donor or recipient driven?

6. Major NGOs

Examples from Europe, N America

- Relationship between their competence, presence and appeals on the one hand and funding flows, spending and impact on the other.
- Issues of how the appeal has affected their supporter base.
- How their systems coped with financial overload. (How have organisations handled surplus funds? – Reallocation to other emergencies?)
- How programming was driven (need to spend or need to be effective)

7. Public donations

Maybe pick four or five countries. (UK can be covered by DEC, Canada by WVC, Denmark by Danida, Netherlands by IOB, Germany by BMZ? US by? Japan by?)

- Track how much the public gave and why.
- Get some breakdown of who gave and to whom.
- What are the public's main concerns about how funds are spent? How do organisations report on spending to contributors?
- Explore the role of the internet in giving.
- Explore the legal relationship between individuals giving and agencies obligation to spend on tsunami relief.

8. Corporate donations

- Which companies donated, to whom and in what fashion?
- From which company budget lines did the funds come (Publicity, philanthropy, new market development)
- Is there any relationship between cooperate funding and commercial presence in country or contracts with the aid system?
- Were corporate funds timely and un-tied?

9. Local response

Look at

- India,
 - How much was donated locally by the public,
 - How much came from state funds.
 - Any estimate of very local (in the affected community) self help.
 - The role of local NGOs

- What say have local affected communities had in the spending of funds? Foreign and local.
- Sri Lanka,
 - How much was donated locally by the public,
 - How much came from state funds.
 - Any estimate of very local (in the affected community) self help.
 - The role of local NGOs
 - What say have local affected communities had in the spending of funds? Foreign and local.
- Thailand and
 - How much was donated locally by the public,
 - How much came from state funds.
 - Any estimate of very local (in the affected community) self help.
 - The role of local NGOs
 - What say have local affected communities had in the spending of funds? Foreign and local.
- Indonesia.
 - How much was donated locally by the public,
 - How much came from state funds.
 - Any estimate of very local (in the affected community) self help.
 - The role of local NGOs
 - What say have local affected communities had in the spending of funds? Foreign and local.

10. Conclusions

The Tsunami Evaluation Coalition

Background

Early in January 2005, in recognition of the added value joint evaluations bring to the humanitarian sector, OCHA and WHO together with the ALNAP Secretariat began to discuss how best to coordinate evaluations of tsunami response. The intention was twofold:

- To promote a sector-wide approach to evaluations of the tsunami response in order to optimise sector-wide learning.
- To develop, test and validate produces for the future timely establishment of such an evaluation coordination (coalition) mechanism that could facilitate such an approach.

An interagency and donor meeting was convened in Geneva on 23 February 2005 to discuss how best to develop this approach. At that meeting participants agreed to constitute an 'evaluation coalition' (subsequently named the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition, or TEC), guided by a Core Management Group (CMG). It was also agreed, among other things, that the ALNAP Secretariat would act as the facilitating platform for the initiative.

The Core Management Group (CMG)

The CMG constitutes representatives from OCHA, UNDP, WHO, UNICEF, DANIDA, SDC, Sida, the IFRC, DMI, the ALNAP Secretariat and Groupe URD. It provides general oversight and guidance for the TEC on behalf of its wider membership. The CMG discusses and guides the developing work of the TEC, in particular the joint thematic evaluations that are the current focus of the TEC's work (see below) and the process of preparing the synthesis report. The CMG also seeks to encourage synergies between the various themes and seeks, through its membership, to encourage coordination between these themes. The CMG includes agencies and donors involved in and/or leading one of the multi-agency thematic evaluations as well as representatives from international and regional/local NGOs. The CMG will be substantively and methodologically advised by a TEC evaluation advisor/coordinator (EAC).

Agency-specific Evaluations

Agencies involved in the TEC will continue to carry out planned real-time evaluations, reviews and lessons learned exercises. The resulting reports will feed into the synthesis analysis and report. Participating agencies are encouraged, however, to undertake joint evaluations with other partners where feasible. Agencies not currently part of the TEC and that have not yet planned an evaluation are encouraged to consider the TEC as a substitute evaluation exercise/mechanism and determine, based on the outcome of the synthesis report as well as internal accountability needs, whether or not to launch a future evaluation. It is hoped that the TEC will reduce the requirement for certain agency-specific evaluations for 2005.

TEC Thematic Joint Evaluations

In addition to individual agency evaluations a number of TEC members will work together to undertake five thematic joint evaluations. These will focus on more macro, policy-related aspects of the response rather than operations per se. The focus of these studies is:

- Coordination (including civil-military issues)
- Needs assessment and targeting
- Impact on local and regional capacities
- Linking relief, rehabilitation and development
- Complex issue of funding and fundraising, including as assessment of the role of the media
- In addition a longer term impact assessment study will be undertaken.

These thematic evaluations will be 'partially joint', with joint work on some aspects and separate work by each of the evaluation teams on other aspects. The EAC will provide methodological advice and guidance and seek to promote synergies and coordination between the studies. For more information see www.alnap.org/tec/resources and go to 'Multi-agency Evaluation Framework'.

Role of the Thematic Evaluation Steering Committee (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(s). The role of the steering committee is as follows:

- Ensure an inclusive process to finalize the TOR.
- Provide funding for the evaluation and assist in the mobilization of resources (financial and 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 coordinate agency internal substantive feedback back to the group.
- Ensure 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 (does not apply to this funding evaluation)

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 advise or staff on secondment
- Provide comments on the inception report and on the draft report(s)
- Ensure 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 (ie. Facilitate meetings, transport, contacts)
- Advise their own agencies and staff on this evaluation as well as coordinate agency internal
- substantive feedback back to the group
- If possible, participate in any workshops planned as part of the evaluation

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 into the TEC Synthesis Report. This will require participation in a synthesis workshop to be held in November 2005 as well as providing written feedback on the draft synthesis report as it relates to this theme.

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 and alert the evaluation team to any additional information they may need for undertaking their work (e.g. 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 organized and facilitated by the EAC in collaboration with the evaluation team leaders. The EAC reports to the CMG.

The Role of the ALNAP Secretariat

The ALNAP Secretariat, on behalf of the TEC and under the guidance of the CMG, will provide the institutional platform for the TEC and will assist in the coordination of the Coalition as well as the development of a number of different 'outputs' or products. These are:

- The Evaluation Map of actual and planned evaluations.
- The Synthesis Report.

- The Online Forum www.alnap.org/tec.

The Evaluation Map

The evaluation map is a compilation of all information received by the Secretariat about current and planned evaluative activity in tsunami-hit countries. This information is put into a set of tables that detail who is doing what, where, and when, as well as the focus of the evaluative activity. The evaluation map is intended for use by Coalition members to help them harmonise their work and avoid duplication of effort. To this end it includes all contact details of those agencies that appear on the map.

The Synthesis Report

The most important output of the Coalition's work will be the Synthesis Report. This report will focus on the emergency and initial recovery phase of the response. It will synthesise evaluation findings and learning included in both individual agency as well as the thematic joint evaluations. Agencies must be a part of the Coalition to have their study included in this report.

Key messages emerging from the synthesis will be communicated by the 1st anniversary of the disaster. The final synthesis, however, will be published in February 2006.

The Online Forum

The Online Forum hosts all information relating to the work of the Coalition. Importantly it will include:

- Resources for those evaluating tsunami assistance, including quality tools such as the Common Frameworks and the ALNAP Quality Proforma.
- An evaluation map of current and planned evaluation activity, with a form for agencies to fill in to tell us of the details of their evaluative work ('Evaluation Map – Online Form' at <www.alnap.org/tec/resources>).
- Minutes and other documents from all Coalition and Core Management Group meetings.

Membership of the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition

Anyone involved in evaluating activity in tsunami-hit countries can join the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition at any time. Membership can take two different forms. At its 'first level' it is based on an agency's willingness to abide by the Guiding Principles of the Coalition – based on common values of sharing, joint learning, transparency, mutual support and accountability – and includes a commitment to sharing:

- ToRs of evaluative activity: to add to the evaluation map and to help the humanitarian sector harmonise its work and avoid duplication of effort. These will therefore be shared with other Coalition members.
- Emerging lessons from evaluations and other types of activity.
- Evaluation – and other – reports for inclusion in the end-of-year Synthesis Report.

At its 'second level' membership involves being part of one of five joint thematic evaluations, detailed above.

Getting Involved / Queries

If you would like to get involved or have any questions, please contact Rachel Houghton, Deputy Evaluation Adviser and Coordinator, on <r.houghton@odi.org.uk> or tel: +44 207 922 0403.

Note that the **deadline** for submission of evaluation reports to be included in the Synthesis Report is the end of November 2005. Work on the joint thematic evaluations will begin in August, so there is still time to get involved and agencies are encouraged to do so.

Terms of Reference

The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief.

Theme 1

Analysis of overall funding flows

Please read this document after reading the two attached background documents, "The Tsunami Evaluation Coalition: An Introduction" and "Concept Paper for Evaluating The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief"

Background

Please read this document after reading the two attached background documents, "The Tsunami Evaluation Coalition: An Introduction" and "Concept Paper for Evaluating The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief"

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 more injured. Overall, an estimated 2 million people have been directly or indirectly affected of whom 1.7 million are internally displaced³. 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 \$ 6 billion 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.

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. The overall shape of the funding response evaluation is laid out in the Concept Paper annexed to these TORs.

The purpose of this specific evaluation is to:

1. Provide as comprehensive a picture as possible of the known global totals of pledged, committed, disbursed and spent funds, showing how these totals built up over time.
2. Show how the totals breakdown by receiving states
3. Show how the totals breakdown by purpose (Relief, reconstruction or development)
4. Show how the totals breakdown by sector
5. Make a comparative analysis with funding flows in other recent humanitarian emergencies and reflect upon the effect tsunami flows had/have on other flows.

³ Figures for numbers dead and missing taken from Guha-Sapir, Van Panhuis, "Health Impact of the Tsunami: Indonesia 2005". Brussels Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, July 2005

6. Describe some of the other key funding flows into the affected countries (development aid, tariffs on local exported goods, military assistance) and reflect upon the nature of these comparative flows.

Final report

The author's final report should be presented in a structure common to all the pieces of work being commissioned for this evaluation.

1. An introduction which describes the nature of the data and subject specifically being evaluated.
2. An overview of the methodology adopted with particular reference to data sources.
3. A presentation, in narrative, table and graphical form, of the data gathered.
4. An analysis of the data in the light of the six key issues presented above.
5. An annex containing cited references

The main report should be presented as a MS Word file in English using British English spelling. Tables and graphs may in addition be presented as MS Excel files.

Authors should note that their report will be compiled and edited into the overall report on the evaluation of flows which in turn is one of a number of key evaluations being conducted.

Timetable

1. The penultimate draft of the evaluation must be submitted to the evaluation organizers, by email, no later than 7th October.
2. The organizers will feed comments back to the evaluator in weeks two and three of October.
3. Final draft material must be presented by email to the organizers by Friday 4th November.

Terms of Reference

The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief.

Theme 2

Key donor state funding flows

Background

Please read this document after reading the two attached background documents, "The Tsunami Evaluation Coalition: An Introduction" and "Concept Paper for Evaluating The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief"

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 more injured. Overall, an estimated 2 million people have been directly or indirectly affected of whom 1.7 million are internally displaced⁴. 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 \$ 6 billion 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.

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. The overall shape of the funding response evaluation is laid out in the Concept Paper annexed to these TORs.

The purpose of this specific evaluation is to:

3. Key state donors (including the EU)

1. Document the amount and pattern of pledges made by donor states in the months following the tsunami. Analyse these pledges commenting on evidence that they represent new funding, or reallocated funding. Seek to comment on the relationship between appeals for assistance from agencies and states on the one hand and the nature of pledges on the other.
2. Commitments. Document for each donor actual financial commitments made and comment on how these relate to their pledges. Where possible show to which countries

⁴ Figures for numbers dead and missing taken from Guha-Sapir, Van Panhuis, "Health Impact of the Tsunami: Indonesia 2005". Brussels Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, July 2005

- and to which agencies commitments have been made. Comment on where these commitments with to agency and affected-state identified programming
3. Commitment mechanisms – identify mechanisms used by donors to disburse funds (i.e. traditional methods versus new methods)
 4. Identify trends related to flow of donor funding from countries not traditionally associated with disaster responses (i.e. a % of funds pledged/committed came from countries and regions of the world not usually involved in worldwide government commitments)
 5. Of these commitments, what has actually been spent? How well has spending in these first six months been prioritised and disbursed in a way that demonstrates impartiality?
 6. Analysis of flow of goods in kind from each major donor state paying particular attention to military assets and pharmaceuticals. Have unsolicited goods been donated? Has military assistance been charged at cost?

Final report

The author's final report should be presented in a structure common to all the pieces of work being commissioned for this evaluation.

1. An introduction which describes the nature of the data and subject specifically being evaluated.
2. An overview of the methodology adopted with particular reference to data sources.
3. A presentation, in narrative, table and graphical form, of the data gathered.
4. An analysis of the data in the light of the four key issues presented above.
5. An annex containing cited references

The main report should be presented as a MS Word file in English using British English spelling. Tables and graphs may in addition be presented as MS Excel files.

Authors should note that their report will be compiled and edited into the overall report on the evaluation of flows which in turn is one of a number of key evaluations being conducted.

Timetable

1. The penultimate draft of the evaluation must be submitted to the evaluation organizers, by email, no later than 7th October.
2. The organizers will feed comments back to the evaluator in weeks two and three of October.
3. Final draft material must be presented by email to the organizers by Friday 4th November.

Terms of Reference

The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief.

Theme 3

The UN appeals and funding

Background

Please read this document after reading the two attached background documents, "The Tsunami Evaluation Coalition: An Introduction" and "Concept Paper for Evaluating The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief"

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 more injured. Overall, an estimated 2 million people have been directly or indirectly affected of whom 1.7 million are internally displaced⁵. 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 \$ 6 billion 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.

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. The overall shape of the funding response evaluation is laid out in the Concept Paper annexed to these TORs.

The purpose of this specific evaluation is to:

1. Analysis of the flash and consolidated appeal process for the tsunami. Was it timely and appropriate as compared to other mechanisms established? What financial response did it solicit?
2. Analyses the pledging, commitments and fund transfers from states to the appeal. How timely were they? Were certain parts of the appeal under funded and if so why?
3. Is there evidence that donors were funding against needs assessment?
4. How timely and appropriate has been the spending of UN agencies in the first six months of this operation?

⁵ Figures for numbers dead and missing taken from Guha-Sapir, Van Panhuis, "Health Impact of the Tsunami: Indonesia 2005". Brussels Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, July 2005

Final report

The author's final report should be presented in a structure common to all the pieces of work being commissioned for this evaluation.

1. An introduction which describes the nature of the data and subject specifically being evaluated.
2. An overview of the methodology adopted with particular reference to data sources.
3. A presentation, in narrative, table and graphical form, of the data gathered.
4. An analysis of the data in the light of the four key issues presented above.
5. An annex containing cited references

The main report should be presented as a MS Word file in English using British English spelling. Tables and graphs may in addition be presented as MS Excel files.

Authors should note that their report will be compiled and edited into the overall report on the evaluation of flows which in turn is one of a number of key evaluations being conducted.

Timetable

1. The penultimate draft of the evaluation must be submitted to the evaluation organizers, by email, no later than 7th October.
2. The organizers will feed comments back to the evaluator in weeks two and three of October.
3. Final draft material must be presented by email to the organizers by Friday 4th November.

Terms of Reference

The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief.

Theme 4

The IFRC and ICRC funding

Please read this document after reading the two attached background documents, "The Tsunami Evaluation Coalition: An Introduction" and "Concept Paper for Evaluating The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief"

Background

Please read this document after reading the two attached background documents, "The Tsunami Evaluation Coalition: An Introduction" and "Concept Paper for Evaluating The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief"

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 more injured. Overall, an estimated 2 million people have been directly or indirectly affected of whom 1.7 million are internally displaced⁶. 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 \$ 6 billion 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.

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. The overall shape of the funding response evaluation is laid out in the Concept Paper annexed to these TORs.

The purpose of this specific evaluation is to:

1. Analyse the flow of funds from the general public and donor states through the National Societies to the Federation and on down to the affected national Societies.
 - How large was the flow? How timely was it? What % of donation was used along the way for overheads?
 - Where have the funds come from and with what strings?

⁶ Figures for numbers dead and missing taken from Guha-Sapir, Van Panhuis, "Health Impact of the Tsunami: Indonesia 2005". Brussels Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, July 2005

- Analysis of flow of goods in kind including pharmaceuticals. Have unsolicited goods been donated?
- 2. Analyse the management of these funds.
 - How has the Fed's Secretariat sought to manage the flow of resources.
 - How has it sought to manage the over funding of its initial and secondary appeals?
- 3. Comment upon the balance between operations being driven by needs or driven by resources available.
- 4. Analysis of local national society financial control. How well have the affected national societies been able to influence the allocation of funds?

Final report

The author's final report should be presented in a structure common to all the pieces of work being commissioned for this evaluation.

- 6. An introduction which describes the nature of the data and subject specifically being evaluated.
- 7. An overview of the methodology adopted with particular reference to data sources.
- 8. A presentation, in narrative, table and graphical form, of the data gathered.
- 9. An analysis of the data in the light of the six key issues presented above.
- 10. An annex containing cited references

The main report should be presented as a MS Word file in English using British English spelling. Tables and graphs may in addition be presented as MS Excel files.

Authors should note that their report will be compiled and edited into the overall report on the evaluation of flows which in turn is one of a number of key evaluations being conducted.

Timetable

- 4. The penultimate draft of the evaluation must be submitted to the evaluation organizers, by email, no later than 7th October.
- 5. The organizers will feed comments back to the evaluator in weeks two and three of October.
- 6. Final draft material must be presented by email to the organizers by Friday 4th November.

Terms of Reference

The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief.

Theme 5

NGO funding

Background

Please read this document after reading the two attached background documents, "The Tsunami Evaluation Coalition: An Introduction" and "Concept Paper for Evaluating The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief"

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 more injured. Overall, an estimated 2 million people have been directly or indirectly affected of whom 1.7 million are internally displaced⁷. 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 \$ 6 billion 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.

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. The overall shape of the funding response evaluation is laid out in the Concept Paper annexed to these TORs.

The purpose of this specific evaluation is to:

1. Understand how the big international NGOs (BINGOs) acquired and managed their funding for the tsunami relief effort, taking examples from Europe and north America – it would also be interesting to consider a few smaller NGO's and NGO's from non-traditional donor countries so the focus is not just on the large NGO's. The tsunami attracted an unusual number of actors from the broader NGO world so it would be important to have a representation of that broader group, even if time and capacity will limit what can be done
2. Analyse the relationship between the agencies competence – competence in terms of what?, presence and appeals on the one hand and funding flows, spending and impact on the other. Note: it will be difficult to have much in terms of impact beyond the

⁷ Figures for numbers dead and missing taken from Guha-Sapir, Van Panhuis, "Health Impact of the Tsunami: Indonesia 2005". Brussels Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, July 2005

initial emergency response and recovery/early rehabilitation phase as in most cases we are considering a response framework of 3-5 years+ - the link between funds raised, funds spent and impact needs to be defined to the short term timeframe of the evaluation process itself. What we also need to focus more on is implementing agency plans and how funds raised/accessed are/will be allocated in terms of the overall response timeframe

3. Describe the overall nature of the agencies' funding base for this operation. What is the ratio of government to private funds and how does this compare with their normal profile? How important have corporate donations been?
4. Describe what evidence there is that the tsunami response has tapped into a hitherto un-accessed supporter base? Is there any evidence of a ratcheting up of the supporter base of the agencies?
5. Analyse how well the agencies financial systems have coped with the significant increase in funding flows? Is there evidence of system overload. On the programming side, is there evidence of funding to other operations being affected? Is there evidence of tsunami funds being used to offset previously under funded areas of work?
6. Analyse if programming was needs driven or more influenced by the need to send quickly.
7. Analysis of flow of goods in kind including pharmaceuticals. Have unsolicited goods been donated?

Final report

The author's final report should be presented in a structure common to all the pieces of work being commissioned for this evaluation.

1. An introduction which describes the nature of the data and subject specifically being evaluated.
2. An overview of the methodology adopted with particular reference to data sources.
3. A presentation, in narrative, table and graphical form, of the data gathered.
4. An analysis of the data in the light of the six key issues presented above.
5. An annex containing cited references

The main report should be presented as a MS Word file in English using British English spelling. Tables and graphs may in addition be presented as MS Excel files.

Authors should note that their report will be compiled and edited into the overall report on the evaluation of flows which in turn is one of a number of key evaluations being conducted.

Timetable

1. The penultimate draft of the evaluation must be submitted to the evaluation organizers, by email, no later than 7th October.
2. The organizers will feed comments back to the evaluator in weeks two and three of October.
3. Final draft material must be presented by email to the organizers by Friday 4th November.

Terms of Reference

The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief.

Theme 6 **Funding from the general public**

Background

Please read this document after reading the two attached background documents, "The Tsunami Evaluation Coalition: An Introduction" and "Concept Paper for Evaluating The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief"

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 more injured. Overall, an estimated 2 million people have been directly or indirectly affected of whom 1.7 million are internally displaced⁸. 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 \$ 6 billion 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.

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. The overall shape of the funding response evaluation is laid out in the Concept Paper annexed to these TORs.

The purpose of this specific evaluation is to:

Understand the motivation and nature of the tremendous outpouring of generosity from the general public, and the implications of this for future mega disaster response operations.

This analysis should be carried out in two or three countries, one of them being the USA.

1. How generously did the public give and why? Is there any significant geographical, social or other pattern to the giving within the country and between countries?
2. Identify various forms the public used in giving
3. Which type of agencies benefited most from the public giving and what is the relationship between their traditional constituency and this new one?

⁸ Figures for numbers dead and missing taken from Guha-Sapir, Van Panhuis, "Health Impact of the Tsunami: Indonesia 2005". Brussels Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, July 2005

4. What have been the public's main concerns about how funds are spent? How do organisations report on spending to contributors? Is there more focus on public accountability as compared to previous disasters ? Why ?
5. Explore the role of the internet in giving. Has it significantly changed the way people donate?
6. Explore the legal relationship between individuals giving and agencies obligation to spend on tsunami relief.

Final report

The author's final report should be presented in a structure common to all the pieces of work being commissioned for this evaluation.

1. An introduction which describes the nature of the data and subject specifically being evaluated.
2. An overview of the methodology adopted with particular reference to data sources.
3. A presentation, in narrative, table and graphical form, of the data gathered.
4. An analysis of the data in the light of the five key issues presented above.
5. An annex containing cited references

The main report should be presented as a MS Word file in English using British English spelling. Tables and graphs may in addition be presented as MS Excel files.

Authors should note that their report will be compiled and edited into the overall report on the evaluation of flows which in turn is one of a number of key evaluations being conducted.

Timetable

1. The penultimate draft of the evaluation must be submitted to the evaluation organizers, by email, no later than 7th October.
2. The organizers will feed comments back to the evaluator in weeks two and three of October.
3. Final draft material must be presented by email to the organizers by Friday 4th November.

Terms of Reference

The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief.

Theme 7 Funding from Corporations

Background

Please read this document after reading the two attached background documents, "The Tsunami Evaluation Coalition: An Introduction" and "Concept Paper for Evaluating The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief"

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 more injured. Overall, an estimated 2 million people have been directly or indirectly affected of whom 1.7 million are internally displaced⁹. 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 \$ 6 billion 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.

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. The overall shape of the funding response evaluation is laid out in the Concept Paper annexed to these TORs.

The purpose of this specific evaluation is to:

Understand the motivation and nature of funding flows from the corporate sector into tsunami relief operations. Taking two or three donor countries as examples, explore the nature of corporate giving:

1. Which companies donated, to whom and in what fashion?
2. Consider how many companies had previous donation track records and how many were involved for the first time?
3. From which company budget lines did the funds come (Publicity, philanthropy, new market development)
4. Is there any relationship between corporate funding and commercial presence in country or contracts with the aid system?

⁹ Figures for numbers dead and missing taken from Guha-Sapir, Van Panhuis, "Health Impact of the Tsunami: Indonesia 2005". Brussels Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, July 2005

5. Were corporate funds timely and un-tied?
6. What future trends can be drawn from corporate involvement with the tsunami response?

Final report

The author's final report should be presented in a structure common to all the pieces of work being commissioned for this evaluation.

1. An introduction which describes the nature of the data and subject specifically being evaluated.
2. An overview of the methodology adopted with particular reference to data sources.
3. A presentation, in narrative, table and graphical form, of the data gathered.
4. An analysis of the data in the light of the four key issues presented above.
5. An annex containing cited references

The main report should be presented as a MS Word file in English using British English spelling. Tables and graphs may in addition be presented as MS Excel files.

Authors should note that their report will be compiled and edited into the overall report on the evaluation of flows which in turn is one of a number of key evaluations being conducted.

Timetable

1. The penultimate draft of the evaluation must be submitted to the evaluation organizers, by email, no later than 7th October.
2. The organizers will feed comments back to the evaluator in weeks two and three of October.
3. Final draft material must be presented by email to the organizers by Friday 4th November.

Terms of Reference

The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief.

Theme 8

Local response

Background

Please read this document after reading the two attached background documents, "The Tsunami Evaluation Coalition: An Introduction" and "Concept Paper for Evaluating The International Community's Funding of the Tsunami Emergency and Relief"

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 more injured. Overall, an estimated 2 million people have been directly or indirectly affected of whom 1.7 million are internally displaced¹⁰. 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 \$ 6 billion 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.

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. The overall shape of the funding response evaluation is laid out in the Concept Paper annexed to these TORs.

The purpose of this specific evaluation is to:

Understand the nature of funding flows from and at the level of the affected countries. For each of the main affected countries (Indonesia, Thailand, Sri Lanka, India) the following analysis should be carried out.

1. How much was donated locally by the public and to what sorts of organisations? – compare donations to local versus international organizations
2. How much came from state funds and from the corporate sector?
3. Estimate the value of self help generated within the affected community (whether as cash, good or labour)

¹⁰ Figures for numbers dead and missing taken from Guha-Sapir, Van Panhuis, "Health Impact of the Tsunami: Indonesia 2005". Brussels Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, July 2005

4. The role did local NGOs and CBOs play and how did they compare with the intentional NGOs?
5. What say have local affected communities had in the spending of funds?

Final report

The author's final report should be presented in a structure common to all the pieces of work being commissioned for this evaluation.

1. An introduction which describes the nature of the data and subject specifically being evaluated.
2. An overview of the methodology adopted with particular reference to data sources.
3. A presentation, in narrative, table and graphical form, of the data gathered.
4. An analysis of the data in the light of the five key issues presented above.
5. An annex containing cited references

The main report should be presented as a MS Word file in English using British English spelling. Tables and graphs may in addition be presented as MS Excel files.

Authors should note that their report will be compiled and edited into the overall report on the evaluation of flows which in turn is one of a number of key evaluations being conducted.

Timetable

1. The penultimate draft of the evaluation must be submitted to the evaluation organizers, by email, no later than 7th October.
2. The organizers will feed comments back to the evaluator in weeks two and three of October.
3. Final draft material must be presented by email to the organizers by Friday 4th November.